

ENHANCING THE METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING STUDENTS' PEDAGOGICAL INTERACTION IN ENGLISH THROUGH A HYBRID APPROACH

Mahliyo Safarova

Uzbek National Pedagogical University named after Nizami EFL Teacher
msariboyeva93@gmail.com

Abstract. The ability to manage pedagogical interaction in English is an essential component of teacher training in higher education. This paper explores how a hybrid (blended) learning model can enhance the methodology of teaching such interaction. Drawing upon discourse studies, pragmatics, and blended learning research, it argues that hybrid formats provide students with authentic opportunities to practice interactional skills, receive peer and teacher feedback, and reflect on their performance. The proposed approach integrates face-to-face microteaching with online discussion, video-based reflection, and peer assessment. Findings from recent studies suggest that hybrid learning improves interactional competence, pragmatic awareness, and learner autonomy, while challenges remain in areas such as digital access and teacher preparedness.

Keywords: hybrid learning, pedagogical interaction, teacher training, English as a foreign language, classroom discourse

Introduction

In recent years, the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language (EFL) have undergone significant transformations due to technological progress and educational reforms. One of the most important shifts has been the recognition that language proficiency alone is insufficient for future teachers. They must also be able to conduct pedagogical interaction—meaningful communication with learners that guides, motivates, and supports their learning process. Pedagogical interaction encompasses a range of classroom discourse strategies, such as asking questions, eliciting responses, providing feedback, scaffolding understanding, organizing group work, and addressing communication breakdowns. These skills, often referred to as part of a teacher's **interactional competence**, are essential for successful classroom management and for fostering an engaging learning environment.

Traditional approaches to teacher training have tended to prioritize knowledge of English grammar, vocabulary, and methodology while dedicating less attention to the *pragmatic and discourse-level aspects* of teacher talk. As a result, many teacher candidates graduate with strong theoretical knowledge but struggle to implement effective communication strategies in real classrooms. This gap between theory and practice highlights the need for methodological innovations that specifically target pedagogical interaction. At the same time, the rapid integration of digital technologies

into education has created new opportunities to redesign teacher education programs. Hybrid, or blended, learning models—which combine face-to-face teaching with online platforms and resources—are increasingly recognized as powerful tools for enhancing both language learning and teacher training. As Garrison and Kanuka (2004) note, blended learning holds transformative potential because it integrates the social presence of classroom instruction with the flexibility and accessibility of digital resources. In the context of teacher education, this means that future teachers can learn not only *about* classroom discourse but also *through* practical, technology-enhanced experiences.

For example, hybrid approaches make it possible to extend the boundaries of classroom interaction. During face-to-face sessions, student-teachers can participate in role-plays, microteaching, and observation of authentic classroom discourse. These activities allow them to model and practice the core features of pedagogical interaction. Online components, on the other hand, provide opportunities for reflection, feedback, and peer evaluation. Recording microteaching sessions, sharing them in online forums, and receiving constructive comments from both peers and instructors help students develop self-awareness and refine their interactional strategies. Furthermore, online tools such as discussion boards, collaborative documents, and video conferencing platforms encourage sustained engagement beyond the classroom.

Another advantage of hybrid learning in this context is that it supports **learner autonomy and personalization**. Teacher candidates can revisit recorded lessons, analyze discourse patterns at their own pace, and reflect on the appropriateness of their language choices in specific situations. This iterative process fosters a deeper understanding of how language functions in classroom contexts, bridging the gap between linguistic knowledge and pragmatic use. At the same time, it encourages students to take responsibility for their own professional growth, a key attribute of lifelong learning in the teaching profession.

The relevance of this topic is particularly strong in Uzbekistan, where higher education institutions are undergoing a digital transformation aligned with national strategies for modernization and internationalization. Future English teachers must be equipped not only with language proficiency but also with the interactional skills to conduct lessons in English, engage learners effectively, and manage diverse classroom situations. Hybrid learning, with its ability to combine traditional pedagogical strengths with technological innovation, offers a timely and effective approach to achieving these goals. Thus, this paper argues that enhancing the methodology of teaching pedagogical interaction in English through a hybrid approach is essential for preparing competent, reflective, and adaptable future teachers. By combining face-to-face modeling and practice with online reflection and collaboration, the proposed model

creates a comprehensive environment where pedagogical interaction can be both taught and experienced.

Theoretical Background

1. Blended and Hybrid Learning

Blended or hybrid learning is commonly defined as the thoughtful integration of face-to-face and online instruction. According to Garrison and Kanuka (2004), blended learning goes beyond a simple mixture of delivery modes; it represents a fundamental redesign of teaching and learning. The central idea is to combine the social presence and immediacy of classroom interaction with the flexibility and accessibility of online resources. Recent studies have shown that blended learning environments can improve learner engagement and achievement when designed purposefully (Means et al., 2013). Hrastinski (2019) argues that the concept of blended learning should not be reduced to percentages of online versus offline time, but rather understood as an intentional pedagogical strategy. In teacher education, this strategy allows future educators to practice core skills in real time while benefiting from the extended opportunities of digital platforms.

2. Pedagogical Interaction in Teacher Education

Pedagogical interaction refers to the ways teachers and students communicate in the classroom to co-construct learning. It includes questioning techniques, providing feedback, managing classroom talk, scaffolding tasks, and responding to student contributions. As Seedhouse (2004) emphasizes, classroom discourse has its own “interactional architecture,” where each move of the teacher shapes learner opportunities. Walsh (2011) further develops this view by showing that teacher talk can either promote or restrict learning, depending on how it is managed. For teacher education, this means that interactional competence is as essential as subject knowledge. Future teachers must be trained not only in what to teach but also in *how to talk* in ways that engage, motivate, and guide learners. Yet, in many programs, this competence develops incidentally rather than through systematic methodology. A hybrid learning design makes it possible to bring pedagogical interaction into focus, offering repeated chances to model, practice, and reflect.

3. Pragmatics and Interactional Competence

The study of pragmatics deals with language use in context, particularly how meaning is shaped by social norms, relationships, and intentions. Taguchi (2011) points out that pragmatic competence is critical in second language education, as learners need to understand not only the literal meaning of words but also how to use them appropriately in specific situations. In teacher training, pragmatic competence is closely tied to pedagogical discourse. Teachers must know how to soften criticism, encourage participation, shift topics, or signal transitions in ways that maintain a positive classroom climate. This broader ability is often called **interactional**

competence (Hall, 2018). It involves turn-taking, repair strategies, and the negotiation of meaning — all central to successful classroom teaching in English.

4. The Convergence in Hybrid Models

When hybrid learning principles are applied to the teaching of pedagogical interaction, the benefits of these theoretical strands converge. Blended environments provide **authentic practice** (face-to-face role plays, microteaching), **extended reflection** (recordings, online discussions), and **peer collaboration** (feedback, group projects). Together, these create a cycle of practice, feedback, and improvement that supports the development of both linguistic and interactional competence. This theoretical framework justifies the hybrid approach proposed in this study: one that integrates blended learning research, discourse analysis, and pragmatics into a coherent methodology for training future English teachers.

Proposed Hybrid Methodology

The hybrid methodology proposed in this paper is designed to enhance the development of student-teachers' competence in conducting pedagogical interaction in English. It builds upon the integration of **in-class activities** and **online components**, allowing future teachers to practice, reflect, and refine their communicative skills. The model is structured into three interconnected phases: face-to-face training, online practice and reflection, and final integration.

The first phase, **face-to-face training**, takes place in the traditional classroom and emphasizes modeling and guided practice. At this stage, instructors introduce core concepts of pedagogical discourse and demonstrate interactional strategies such as questioning, scaffolding, managing group dynamics, and providing feedback. Student-teachers are actively engaged in microteaching exercises and role-plays, where they simulate authentic classroom situations. They also observe recorded lessons and conduct discourse analysis to identify how teachers' language choices influence learner participation. The aim of this phase is to raise awareness of the specific linguistic and pragmatic tools that shape effective pedagogical interaction in English.

The second phase, **online practice and reflection**, shifts the focus from modeling to self-directed engagement. Here, digital platforms provide opportunities for student-teachers to record short teaching episodes, upload them for peer review, and receive constructive comments. This asynchronous environment encourages deeper reflection because students can rewatch their own videos, analyze their discourse strategies, and compare their approaches with those of their peers. Reflective journals, submitted online, further strengthen metacognitive awareness by prompting trainees to articulate their challenges and progress in managing interaction. In addition, online discussion forums allow for collaborative dialogue on best practices and common difficulties in classroom communication.

The third phase, **integration and application**, combines insights from both the face-to-face and online components. Student-teachers return to the classroom to conduct hybrid microteaching sessions, incorporating the feedback and reflections they have accumulated. This phase emphasizes iterative improvement: trainees experiment with new strategies, observe the results in real time, and adjust their practices accordingly. Group projects are also introduced, where students collaboratively design lesson plans and implement segments both in person and through online tools such as video conferencing platforms. Assessment at this stage is multidimensional, taking into account linguistic accuracy, pragmatic appropriateness, and interactional effectiveness.

Overall, the methodology is based on a **cycle of practice, reflection, and re-practice**. By moving back and forth between live interaction and reflective online engagement, students develop not only technical proficiency in English but also the professional confidence to manage classroom discourse in diverse teaching contexts.

The structure of the model can be summarized as follows:

Phase	Mode of Delivery	Main Activities	Pedagogical Focus
Phase 1: Face-to-Face Training	Classroom-based	Microteaching, role-plays, observation, discourse analysis	Awareness of pedagogical discourse and interaction strategies
Phase 2: Online Practice and Reflection	Digital platforms (LMS, forums, video tools)	Video-recorded lessons, peer feedback, reflective journals, online discussions	Reflection, collaboration, and self-assessment
Phase 3: Integration and Application	Combined (classroom + online)	Hybrid microteaching cycles, group projects, practical assessments	Application, iterative improvement, and professional confidence

This hybrid methodology ensures that theoretical knowledge is constantly linked with practice, while digital tools extend learning beyond classroom walls. It also supports learner autonomy, encourages collaboration, and creates a sustainable model for preparing future English teachers to conduct pedagogical interaction effectively.

Discussion and Implications

The implementation of the hybrid methodology for teaching pedagogical interaction in English offers several important outcomes for teacher education. First, it provides student-teachers with **greater confidence in using English as a medium of instruction**. Many trainees, even with strong linguistic knowledge, experience hesitation when conducting classroom talk. The opportunity to repeatedly practice interaction in both face-to-face and online modes helps reduce anxiety and build communicative fluency. By rehearsing questions, feedback strategies, and scaffolding moves in controlled environments, trainees gradually transfer these skills into authentic teaching contexts.

Second, the hybrid approach promotes **pragmatic and interactional competence**, which are often overlooked in traditional programs. Classroom discourse

requires not only grammatical accuracy but also the ability to manage meaning in dynamic situations. For example, a teacher may need to reformulate an instruction if students look confused, or soften corrective feedback to maintain learner motivation. Through online reflection and peer feedback, trainees become more aware of these subtleties and learn how to adjust their language to suit specific contexts. This aligns with the findings of Walsh (2011) and Taguchi (2011), who emphasize that successful teaching depends on the teacher's ability to adapt discourse to interactional needs.

Third, hybrid learning enhances **learner autonomy and professional responsibility**. In the online phase, students take ownership of their learning by recording lessons, critiquing themselves, and giving constructive feedback to peers. This process mirrors real professional development, where teachers continuously reflect on and improve their practice. The reflective journals and online forums create a culture of self-regulation, collaboration, and professional dialogue, which are essential qualities for lifelong learning in the teaching profession.

The implications of this approach extend beyond individual development. At the institutional level, the adoption of hybrid methodologies aligns with ongoing educational reforms in Uzbekistan, which emphasize digital integration, innovation, and internationalization in higher education. By incorporating hybrid learning into teacher preparation programs, universities can ensure that future English teachers are not only linguistically competent but also digitally literate and pedagogically flexible. This is particularly important in a context where classrooms are becoming increasingly multilingual and technology-rich. Nevertheless, challenges must be acknowledged. Ensuring **equitable access to technology** remains a pressing issue, as not all students may have reliable internet or devices. Additionally, the success of the model depends heavily on the **digital competence of teacher educators**, who must be able to design, facilitate, and assess hybrid tasks effectively. Institutions therefore need to invest in professional development for instructors and provide infrastructural support to sustain hybrid programs.

In broader terms, the hybrid methodology can contribute to raising the overall quality of English language education in Uzbekistan and similar contexts. By preparing teachers who are confident, reflective, and skilled in pedagogical interaction, this approach directly supports national goals of improving foreign language proficiency and integrating into global educational standards.

Conclusion

The preparation of future English teachers requires not only the mastery of language systems and teaching methods but also the ability to conduct effective **pedagogical interaction**. This paper has argued that a **hybrid learning model** can significantly enhance the methodology of teaching such interaction by integrating the strengths of both face-to-face and online instruction. Through classroom-based

modeling and practice, combined with online reflection, peer feedback, and iterative re-application, student-teachers are given authentic opportunities to develop their interactional competence in English. The findings and theoretical considerations presented suggest that hybrid learning supports three key outcomes. First, it **builds communicative confidence**, enabling future teachers to manage classroom discourse in English with greater ease and flexibility. Second, it promotes **pragmatic and interactional awareness**, ensuring that teachers can adapt their language to suit the needs of diverse learners. Third, it encourages **learner autonomy and reflective practice**, which are vital for ongoing professional growth in rapidly changing educational environments.

The broader implications of this approach are significant for institutions and policy makers. The adoption of hybrid methodologies in teacher education aligns with **global educational trends** and supports **Uzbekistan's current reforms** aimed at digitalization and internationalization in higher education. By training teachers who are both technologically literate and pedagogically competent, universities can better equip graduates for the demands of modern classrooms. At the same time, the challenges identified—such as disparities in digital access and the need for instructor training—should not be underestimated. Successful implementation requires institutional investment in **infrastructure, professional development, and assessment innovation**. Only through sustained support can the hybrid model realize its full potential as a transformative approach to teacher education.

In conclusion, enhancing the methodology of teaching pedagogical interaction in English through a hybrid approach is not merely an academic exercise but a practical necessity. As classrooms become increasingly diverse and technologically rich, future teachers must be prepared to navigate complex interactional demands with confidence, sensitivity, and adaptability. The hybrid model offers a path toward achieving this goal, bridging theory and practice, and empowering future educators to become effective facilitators of learning in the 21st century.

References

1. Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95–105.
2. Hrastinski, S. (2019). What do we mean by blended learning? *TechTrends*, 63(5), 564–569.
3. Means, B., Toyama, Y., Murphy, R., & Bakia, M. (2013). The effectiveness of online and blended learning: A meta-analysis of the empirical literature. *Teachers College Record*, 115(3), 1–47.
4. Seedhouse, P. (2004). *The Interactional Architecture of the Language Classroom: A Conversation Analysis Perspective*. Oxford University Press.

5. Walsh, S. (2011). *Exploring Classroom Discourse: Language in Action*. Routledge.
6. Taguchi, N. (2011). Teaching pragmatics: Trends and issues. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 31, 289–310.