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Abstract
We capture communicative core when another result of a speech act marked with information load falls into the “memory trap” of an interlocutor (student) and becomes his/her personal possession i.e. makes a significant effect upon education results. The point of communicative core (central communicative situation of the class) lies in maximal neutralization of speech control effect. Experiments show that in case of correct realization of communicative core (when educate cannot but speak, when nobody interferes with his speech, no one corrects and stops him) education results enhance greatly.
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1. Introduction
Many scholars have studied the problem of communicative kernel personality or the kernel of the school of communication [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12].

We define communicative core of academic interaction as a speech situation that bears several features [13, 14, 15]:
• interaction is presented in the form of a monologue and dialogue;
• the content of monologue and dialogue has a contradiction, problem;
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• interaction is of argumentative or polemical character;
• communication core develops according to the scheme: motivation of interaction – introduction to speech act – evolvement of speech act – climax of the act (interaction) – resolution – consequence (conclusion, moral);
• the core neutralizes speech control effect and makes interaction free and easy.

2. Method

We fix communicative core when another result of speech act marked with information load falls into the “memory trap” of an interlocutor (student) and becomes his/her personal possession i.e. make a significant effect upon education results.

If educational activity is regarded in accordance with general scheme “motive – analysis – synthesis – interiorisation”, the latter phrase “interiorisation” (translation of internal activities into external ones or speaking and speech control) seems to be quite problematic.

3. Results and discussion

The truth is that traditional school and higher education practice fail to consider speech control mechanism although almost 80% of students’ mistakes can be classified not as non-traditional (actual or speech) mistakes but mistakes of speech control (mistakes caused by the fear to be mistaken).

The paradox is that a teacher is a guardian of speech control who is unaware of the fact that by correcting student’s speech he/she involuntarily contributes to rolling-up of productive thinking and intellectual activity mechanisms. Here it is worth to mention the thesis that a student is a person and he/she has a right to be mistaken: the man who never made a mistake, never made anything.

That is why the point of communicative core (central communicative situation of the class) lies in maximal neutralization of speech control effect. Experiments show that correct realization of communicative core (when educate cannot but speak, when nobody interferes with his speech, no one corrects and stops him) gives a powerful boost for intellect, cognition and speech development as well as for establishment of moral and other personal features.

In the communicative core situation a student can certainly make a mistake and give the wrong answer. The teacher should let him/her speak out. Other students should also express their opinion (including the right and wrong answers). Mistakes can be corrected in the framework of another situation, for instance, answers’ expert check situation. In this case students take remarks in a positive way which makes a positive effect upon education results.

The experiment based on students of the Institute of Psychology and Education of Kazan (Volga Region) Federal University was carried out in 2011-2013. Total sample of students under experiment was 638. The following factors served as formal indices of communication core presence:

Index 1. Did a problem situation occur during the class?
Index 2. Did the problem mobilize students to search for the right answer?
Index 3. Did the group (or particular students) suggest its own variant of problem solution?

We had been monitoring these indices under their realization at psychology and pedagogy lecture sessions. Education results in disciplines were estimated according to traditional tests (100 score scale).

During the lectures the first group regularly encountered problematic situations that mobilized group attention, thus causing the group demonstrate its interest in the lecture theme (see 1 item of the Table 1).

The second group along with problematic situations faced other conditions for the right answer search; answers had been discussed (see 2 item of the Table 1).
The third group along with the problem of the right answer and search for the right answer was suggested to find its own (original) problem solution (see 3 item of the Table 1). At that, the third index was taken in account if the problem solution was actually effective.

Education results of these of these groups were compared to those of groups that did not use communicative core (see the 4 item of the Table 1).

Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Indices of communicative core</th>
<th>Education results (average score for the group)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Did a problem situation occur during the class?</td>
<td>73.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Did the problem mobilize students to search for the right answer?</td>
<td>88.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Did the group (or particular students) suggest its own variant of problem solution?</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Without communicative core</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As you can see, in conditions of communicative core lack (see the 4 item of the Table 1) students gain 68 scores at average; under problematic situations (see the 1 item of the Table 1) – 73.5 scores; under further mobilization to search for the right answer (see the 2 item of the Table 1) – 88.5 scores; in case of problem solving as a result of created problematic situation and students´ mobilization to search for the answer – 95 scores (see the 4 item of the Table 1).

Questionnaire survey of university teacher has revealed that the majority of teachers (90%) realize the importance of communicative core for the purpose of high education results, although only 32% of them try to apply it practically.

88% of teachers consider that classroom use of communicative score requires profound teachers´ preparation for the class as well as great response from students. Only 12% of teachers believe that communicative core is a natural and indispensable attribute of classes.
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