



КАЗАНСКИЙ НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЙ
ПЕДАГОГИЧЕСКИЙ УНИВЕРСИТЕТ
ИМЕНИ АБАЙ



**«TURKIY XALQLARNING MA'NAVIY
INTEGRATSIYASI: TILI, ADABIYOTI,
MADANIYATI»
MAVZUSIDAGI II XALQARO
ILMIY-NAZARIY KONFERENSIYA**

TOSHKENT - 2025

**O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TA'LIM, FAN VA
INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI**

**ALISHER NAVOIY NOMIDAGI TOSHKENT DAVLAT
O'ZBEK TILI VA ADABIYOTI UNIVERSITETI**

**«TURKIY XALQLARNING MA'NAVIY
INTEGRATSIYASI: TILI, ADABIYOTI,
MADANIYATI»**

**MAVZUSIDAGI II XALQARO ILMIY-NAZARIY
KONFERENSIYA MATERIALLARI**

TOSHKENT - 2025



Mazkur ilmiy maqolalar to'plamida «Turkiy xalqlarning ma'naviy integratsiyasi: tili, adabiyoti, madaniyati» II Xalqaro ilmiy-amaliy konferensiyasi materiallari jamlangan. Maqolalarda turkiy tillarning rivoji va o'zaro o'xshashliklarini, umumiy adabiy merosimizni ilmiy asosda chuqur o'rganish; madaniy aloqalarni zamonaviy texnologiyalar orqali kengaytirish; tarjima va adabiy almashinuv orqali xalqaro miqyosda muloqotni kuchaytirish; raqamli platformalar orqali integratsiyani amalga oshirishga oid fikrlar yoritib berilgan. To'plamdan dunyo bo'yicha taniqli turkiyshunos olimlar, metodistlar, o'qituvchilar hamda ToshDO'TAU iqtidorli talabalarining maqolalari ham o'rin olgan.

To'plam til va adabiyot ta'limi bilan shug'ullanuvchi professor-o'qituvchilar, shu sohaning tadqiqotchilari, magistrant va talabalarga mo'ljallangan.

Taqrizchilar:

G.Asilova – *pedagogika fanlari doktori (DSc), professor.*

G.Norimova – *filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent.*

Tahrir hay'ati:

S.Muhamedova, S.Qambarova, O.Turaqulova,
Y.Shirnova, M.Yo'ldosheva.

Mazkur to'plam matni Alisher Navoiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat o'zbek tili va adabiyoti universiteti Kengashining 2025-yil 2-iyundagi 10-sonli majlisida muhokama qilinib, nashrga tavsiya qilingan.

Izoh: Maqolalarning ilmiy saviyasi uchun mualliflar o'zlari mas'uldirlar.



o'zgarishlar, zamonaviy tadqiqotchilarni yangi metodologiyalar va ilmiy yondashuvlarni ishlab chiqishga undamoqda.

Tillardagi til variativligi muammosi, har qancha murakkab bo'lmasin, bu tillarning boyligi va dinamikasining ko'rsatkichi hisoblanadi. Ushbu muammolarga zamonaviy yondashuvlar asosida yechim topish, ayniqsa sotsiolingvistika, kompyuter lingvistikasi va ta'lim texnologiyalari sohasidagi yangiliklarni jalb qilish orqali, turkiy tillarning barqaror taraqqiyotiga xizmat qiladi. Sotsiolingvistik yondashuvlar: Til variativligining ijtimoiy qatlamlar, yosh guruhlari, shahar va qishloq joylari o'rtasidagi tafovutlar asosida shakllanishini tahlil qilish orqali tadqiqot ishlari olib borilmoqda. Shuningdek, zamonaviy texnologiyalar yordamida variativlikni o'rganish — masalan, sun'iy intellekt, avtomatik til tanish tizimlari va tarjima vositalari orqali turli variantlarni aniqlash va solishtirish — tadqiqotlarning yangi, innovatsion yo'nalishlaridan biri bo'lib bormoqda.

FOYDALANILGAN ADABIYOTLAR

1. Baskakov N.A. Turk tillarining tasnifi. – M.: Nauka, 1966.
2. Labov, U. "Nyu-Yorkda ingliz tilining ijtimoiy stratifikatsiyasi" – Ushbu asarda tilning ijtimoiy qatlamlarga ko'ra farqlanishi va vaziyatga qarab o'zgarishi tahlil qilingan.
3. Holms J. "Sotsiolingvistikaga kirish" – Til va jamiyat o'rtasidagi munosabat, til variativligi va ijtimoiy omillarni o'rganishga bag'ishlangan.
4. Trudgill P. "Sotsiolingvistika: til va jamiyatga kirish" – Tilshunoslikda variativlik va ijtimoiy tafovutlar haqida asosiy manbalardan biri.
5. Shermatov Z. O'zbek tili dialektologiyasi. – Toshkent: Fan, 1985.

DOI: 10.52773/tsuull.conf.2025/DGOH5043

IKKKINCHI TILNI O'QITISHDA IJTIMOY VA LINGVISTIK XILMA-XILLIKNI QOLLAB - QUVVATLOVCHI (EQUITABLE) YONDASHUV

Rahmatillayeva Nozima Nigmatilla qizi

Toshkentdagi Webster universiteti TESOL magistranti

raxmatillayeva.n.n@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0006-3632-202X>

Annotatsiya: Zamonaviy jamiyatda ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy holat, madaniy me'yorlar, tengdoshlarning ta'siri va ta'lim konteksti kabi ijtimoiy omillar insonlarning tildan turli holatlarda va muloqotda qanday foydalanishini shakllantirishda muhim rol o'ynaydi. Bu omillarni tushunish til va madaniyat jihatidan xilma-xil bo'lgan sinflar uchun dars rejalashtirishda muhim ahamiyatga ega. Ushbu profil tadqiqot maqolasi IELTS imtihoniga tayyorlov kursida butun guruh, kichik guruhlar va individual o'quvchilarning ehtiyojlarini qondirish uchun qo'llanilayotgan pedagogik strategiyalar va baholash usullarini o'rganishga qaratilgan. Sinfda O'zbekiston, Toshkent shahridagi o'quv markazida tahsil olayotgan, yoshi 13–14da bo'lgan, turli til, madaniyat va ijtimoiy kelib chiqishga ega bo'lgan 15 nafar o'quvchi mavjud. Ushbu kontekstda o'qituvchi sifatida o'quvchilarning ishtiroki, faolligi, natijalari va xatti-harakatlariga jins, etnik kelib chiqish, til interferensiyasi va madaniy omillar kabi ijtimoiy omillar qanday ta'sir qilishini chuqur tushunish muhimdir, ayniqsa IELTS kabi yuqori



natijaga erishishni talab qiladigan imtihonlarga tayyorlanish jarayonida bu njuda muhimdir. Labov (1963, 1972) tadqiqotlari, Tannen (1990) tomonidan ilgari surilgan Farqlanish modeli, Zimmerman va West (1975) tomonidan ishlab chiqilgan Hukmronlik modeli hamda Francis & Skelton (2005) tomonidan taklif etilgan Tenglik modeli, Bayley & Villarreal (2018) va Baugh (2005)ning madaniy jihatdan inklyuziv yondashuvlari asosida bu tadqiqot maqolasi jins, til interferensiyasi va madaniy sezuvchanlikni hisobga olgan holda inklyuziv, empatik va qo'llab-quvvatlovchi pedagogik yondashuvlar, differensial ta'lim va baholash uslublari qanday qilib o'quvchilarning natijalarini yaxshilash va har bir oquvchi uchun qollab quvvatlovchi imkoniyatlar yaratishda yordam berishini tahlil qiladi. Maqola yakunida ta'lim va baholashda qo'llanishi mumkin bo'lgan turli strategiyalar taklif etiladi hamda madaniy jihatdan inklyuziv va teng imkoniyatlarni ta'minlovchi yondashuvlarni boshqa o'qituvchilar ham o'z kontekstlarida qo'llashlari muhimligini olg'a suradi.

Kalit so'zlar: differensial ta'lim, inklyuziv pedagogika, baholashni moslashtirish, o'smir o'quvchilar, sotsiomadaniy omillar, til interferensiyasi, jins dinamikasi, etniklik, madaniy sezgirlik, ko'p tilli sinf, adolatli ta'lim, yuqori natijali testlar, ta'limda tenglik, o'quvchi xilma-xilligi, o'qitish strategiyalari, formatif baholash, moslashuvchan ta'lim, til o'rganish.

Аннотация: В современном обществе такие социальные факторы, как социально-экономическое положение, культурные нормы, влияние сверстников и образовательный контекст, играют значительную роль в формировании того, как люди используют язык в различных ситуациях и взаимодействиях. Понимание этих факторов имеет решающее значение при разработке обучения для классов с лингвистическим и культурным разнообразием. Данное исследование направлено на изучение педагогических стратегий и адаптаций в оценивании, применяемых на курсе подготовки к экзамену IELTS, с целью удовлетворения разнообразных потребностей учащихся — как всей группы, так и подгрупп и индивидуальные учеников. В классе обучаются 15 студентов в возрасте 13–14 лет, представляющих разные лингвистические, культурные и социально-экономические слои населения, в образовательном центре в Ташкенте, Узбекистан. Преподавателем в этом контексте, важно осознавать и глубоко понимать, как на вовлечённость, участие, успеваемость и поведение студентов влияют такие социальные факторы, как гендер, этническая принадлежность, языковая интерференция и культурные особенности, особенно в условиях подготовки к экзамену с высокими ставками, такому как IELTS. Основываясь на исследованиях Лабова (1963, 1972), моделях, таких как модель различий (Tannen, 1990), модель доминирования (Zimmerman and West, 1975) и модель справедливости (Francis & Skelton, 2005), а также используя идеи инклюзивного обучения Bayley & Villarreal (2018) и Baugh (2005), исследование анализирует, как инклюзивные педагогические практики, сочувственный и поддерживающий подход, дифференцированное обучение и оценивание с учётом гендерных различий, языковой интерференции и социокультурных особенностей могут помочь сократить разрыв в результатах и создать равные условия для каждого ученика. Статья завершается предложением различных стратегий в обучении и оценке, подчеркивая, что адаптация дифференцированных и инклюзивных подходов может значительно улучшить успеваемость учащихся, учитывая их потребности как группы, подгрупп и отдельных личностей, и призывает других преподавателей внедрять справедливые и культурно чувствительные методы в своих классах.

Ключевые Слова: дифференцированное обучение, инклюзивная педагогика, адаптация оценивания, подростковые учащиеся, социокультурные факторы, языковая интерференция, гендерная динамика, этничность, культурная чувствительность, многоязычный класс, справедливое образование, экзамены с высокими ставками, образовательное равенство, разнообразие учащихся, стратегии преподавания, формативное оценивание, адаптивное обучение, изучение языков



Abstract: In the modern society, social factors such as socioeconomic background, cultural norms, peer influence, and educational context play a significant role in shaping how individuals use language across different settings and interactions. Understanding these factors is essential when designing instruction for linguistically and culturally diverse classrooms. This profile research paper aims to explore the pedagogical strategies and assessment adjustments employed in IELTS preparation course to meet diverse needs of students – as a whole group, as sub-groups and as individual learners. The classroom comprises of 15 students, aged 13–14, from different linguistic, cultural, and socioeconomic backgrounds studying at learning center in Tashkent, Uzbekistan. As being an instructor this context, it is important to recognize and deeply understand how they way students' engagement, participation, performance, behaviors are influenced by social factors such as gender, ethnicity, language interference, and cultural sensitivities particularly when they are preparing for high stakes exam such as IELTS (International English Language Testing System) examination. Relying on research studies Labov (1963) and Labov (1972), theories, models such as the Difference Model (Tannen, 1990), the Dominance Model (Zimmerman and West, 1975), and the Equity Model (Francis & Skelton, 2005), adapting culturally inclusive teaching ideas from Bayley & Villarreal (2018) and Baugh (2005), the research article analyzes how inclusive teaching practices, empathetic and supporting pedagogical approaches, differentiated instructions and assessment methods especially focusing on learners' needs regard to gender dynamics, language interference and socio-cultural sensitivities, differentiated teaching approaches, I am planning to adopt, can help bridge performance gaps and create equitable opportunities for every individual learner in my classroom. The research paper concludes with suggesting different strategies in pedagogy and assessment highlighting the importance of adapting differentiated pedagogy and assessment can significantly improve student outcomes by focusing on their as a whole, as sub-groups and as an individual specific needs in my specific context which ultimately calls for other instructors to adapt culturally inclusive and equitable classroom approaches in their own contexts.

Keywords: differentiated instruction, inclusive pedagogy, assessment adjustments, adolescent learners, sociocultural factors, language interference, gender dynamics, ethnicity, cultural sensitivity, multilingual classroom, equitable education, high-stakes testing, educational equity, learner diversity, teaching strategies, formative assessment, responsive teaching, language learning.

GENERAL ROFILES

The class consists of 15 learners who are at the age of 13-14, 10 females and 5 male eenagers, preparing for IELTS examinations at a private language center. This year is their second year of studying at this language center. They have started learning English from the

beginning course last year. Their average proficiency level is around Band 5 (“modest user”) in which five students have band 5.5 score certificate while six of all hold band 4.5 score certificate from IELTS. The rest four students did not experience real IELTS examination but thei approximate level is around band 5 score according to their in-class performance. Despite there are some variety in their proficiency level, their shared goal is to reach Band 6–6.5 (“competent user”) to access international educational opportunities.

In this class, the students come from varied linguistic and socioeconomic backgrounds. Majority of students can be considered as from middle to high socioeconomic backgrounds as they are affording additional private course to



improve their language proficiency as well as they are very active participants of travel club founded by our language center which is fee-based.

Around 8 students can be considered as from middle socioeconomic backgrounds since they cannot afford this type of travel clubs or other fee-based clubs of our center where there are 5 students from middle socio-economic backgrounds who cannot afford fee-based travel clubs but they still pay their monthly payment for the center on time. There are also students (two female Uzbek students) from low socio-economic backgrounds who are fundraised by government projects supporting youth learning English. Their low socioeconomic background is obvious for the class where they cannot afford to travel club's trips, extra-curriculum activities their classmates attend and they usually lack technological resources such laptops, smartphones, high quality earbuds/earphones which we sometimes use in the classroom.

Moreover, most of students (total 9 students) in this class came from different regions of Uzbekistan such Fergana, Bukhara, Khorezim and including Karakalpakstan as well. This geographical diversity also influences their language acquisition process, as they are different in terms of their dialects, regional traditions, preferences, life style and others. The ethnical diversity also can be found in the class, as there are students from Russian, Kazak, Karakalpak, Kirgiz, Tajik ethnic groups which means they vary in terms of their L1, culture, traditions, values, religious beliefs, and they share different identities. According to Mesthrie et al. (2009), cultural diversity within educational settings not only influences students' worldviews but also affects their learning styles, communication patterns, and social interactions.

The class also consists some city dwellers (around 7 students) as well as students from rural areas (around 8 students) where they differ in terms of linguistic preferences and social stratifications such as over prestige, covert prestige, hypercorrections, style, markers and in their L1 they speak in different dialects.

Considering diversity in social factors, the class can be divided into two distinct subgroups: *Uzbek-dominant learners from urban middle-class backgrounds and Russian-speaking learners from mixed or lower socioeconomic backgrounds*. Understanding their differences in linguistic characteristics, social stratification, and identity markers of these subgroups creates a room for strong pedagogical implications to help students better absorb language instruction and succeed in language production (Mesthrie et al., 2009).

SUBGROUPS

The 1st subgroup – 9 Uzbek-dominant students from mixed socioeconomic families.

The group consists of students came from different regions of Uzbekistan such as Fergana, Bukhara, Khorezim and Tashkent, mainly from the cities. This geographical diversity also influences their language acquisition process, as they are different in terms of their dialects, regional traditions, preferences, life style and others (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2014). All subgroup members use Uzbek as



their L1. But they use different dialects of Uzbek for their everyday communication purposes in the region where they were born (and live). However, in the classroom for their general communication, learners typically speak a dialect of Uzbek shaped by the Tashkent city, which is considered more “standard” than rural dialects because of its association with the capital and prestige.

In terms of their educational background, students in this sub-group has been exposed to English primarily in formal, structured classroom settings, where instruction focuses on grammar, reading, and writing rather than interactive speaking and using language in real life situations. As a result, many of these learners are more accustomed to written activities and

written tasks, which supports their proficiency in academic language but limits their speaking and listening skills. As according to Long (1996) acquirers of L2 highly likely achieve progress at grammar and succeed in written genres as long as they acquire the L 2 in formal classroom settings with explicit grammar instructions mainly based on writing tasks. Their IETLS certificates and in-class assessment results mirror the concept of Long (1996) where members of sub-group 1 achieve higher marks in writing tasks rather than members of sub-group 2 who achieve higher marks for speaking. However, sub-group 1 students are hesitant, not fluent in speaking activities like role-plays in shopping, restaurants, interviews which require real-life, spontaneous language use. This creates high effective filters as they usually do not speak because of the fear of making mistakes in front of people. Their speech is usually short, structured and responsive. If we look through their certificates and in-class assessment results, for speaking, they are graded with minimal scores across four skills. This could be a result of their learning context which is structured, formal, mainly focus on grammar and writing. This could be their weaknesses which calls for modifications and adaptations in pedagogical implications.

As members of the Uzbek ethnic group, these learners are also multilingual, with Uzbek being their first language and Russian or English as their second languages, depending on their regional background. The effect of their L1 in the process of learning English as L2 is seen in many cases. One problem is the issue of word order where members of sub-group 1 struggle with. As in Uzbek, word order is Subject+Object+Verb whereas in Russian and English, the word order is Subject+Verb+Object. Members of sub-group 1 confuse the word orders especially in spontaneous speech activities and might say “he very much likes football’. Which is not a problem for my Russian speaking students who are in the sub-group 2. Moreover, in Uzbek phonetic alphabet, there is no exact [v] sound so members of subgroup 1 mainly mix it with [w]

sound and pronounce “very” as “/’we.ri/” where my Russian speaking students in the sub-group 2 can pronounce “very” more accurately as their L1 allows them. Another huge problem in pronunciation is final consonant clusters where members of sub-group 2 struggle with pronouncing accurately words like “needs”, “texts”, as Uzbek typically avoids ending words with multiple



consonants. They pronounce as /ni:dez/ or /tekistes/ because of the influence of their L1. However, it is not a problem for my students from sub-group 2, since as a Russian speakers they have an experience with words with multiple consonants such as [взгляд] – [vzgljad] “glance”.

The 2nd subgroup- 6 Students from diverse ethnic groups with mixed socioeconomic backgrounds.

In this subgroup, there are learners from various ethnic groups including three Russians, Tajiks, Kazakhs, Karakalpaks, Kirgizs and many of whom come from multilingual backgrounds. According to their ethnic backgrounds they share diverse L1 and they use Russian as a “Lingua Franca” – use Russian to communicate with each other as well as with Uzbek students outside English classroom (Long, 1996). Living in Uzbekistan, they are also acquiring Uzbek as L2 or L3 due to immersion. The multilingualism of the students in this subgroup can be both a strength and a weakness. While multilingualism promotes cultural hybridity and cognitive flexibility, it can also impact in linguistic interference and make it more difficult to transfer syntactic or phonological structures to L2 (English in our case) (Deumert 2011). For example, one my Karakalpak student in sub-group 2, struggles with reading the word when he meets it for the first time. This is an effect of Cyrillic alphabet where Karakalpak and Russian uses Cyrillic alphabet which can delay literacy in English using Latin alphabet, especially spelling and reading fluency due to script interference. His L1 makes him difficult to read unfamiliar English words in Latin alphabet. Where Uzbek students in sub-group 1 have less problem with this since Uzbek uses Latin alphabet with many substitute sounds for English phonetics. Despite they are from different ethnic backgrounds, members of sub-group 2 use Russian as their L1(effect of Sovet Union) at home, with friends, with family members and relatives. Two students in the sub- group 2: Kazakh and Kirgiz cannot even fluently speak in their home/ethnic languages which are Kazak and Kirgiz, since they were born in Russian speaking families and grown-up in Russian speaking environments. So we can consider them as Russian speakers. As being Russian speakers, members of sub-group 2 have problems in English pronunciation such as Palatalization- over-softening of consonants. In Russian phonology there is a special sign for

softening some consonants in particular Russian words called “myagkiy znak” or “soft sign” – [ь]. Members of sub-group 2 unconsciously apply this feature of their L1 to English words when words like “tune” or “duty” may sound like /t^hu:n/ or /d^hu:ti/ — making them sound closer to “tyune” or “dyuty”, similar to British English but often even more palatalized. They pronounce certain English sounds (like /t/, /d/, /n/) with more softness than is natural in English where “thing” may be pronounced closer to “sing” or “ting”, and softened consonants may be added unintentionally which is not a problem for Uzbek students who are the members of subgroup 1. As in Uzbek, this sign does not exist –softening of consonants does not occur.



Another distinct feature of this particular sub-group 2 from sub-group 1 is learners in this sub-group 2 had more exposure to real English use mostly through migration to English-speaking countries and/or having family members living in English-speaking countries. Two Russian students' siblings study and live in America while Kazak and Kirgiz students spent years in their childhood in migration to Canada and USA. One Kirgiz student did not live in English-speaking countries, although, he spends more time in English public speaking clubs and has online English-speaking friends across the world. This exposure increased their speaking skills as confirmed by Long (1996), in second language acquisition, immersion significantly enhances speaking skills, often leading to rapid development in oral proficiency, while accuracy in forms mostly in writing are to be mastered through formal language instructions. This exposure to authentic language use improved their pragmatic competence—the ability to use language effectively in real-world contexts (Long, 1996). This can be seen in results of the in-class activities mirroring IELTS speaking examination where members of sub-group 2 mostly achieve higher results than those members of sub-group 1. However, they lack the formal language, have frequent grammar mistakes and common spelling errors in their written production. They may write "definitely" instead of "definitely" and their written production often include informal

vocabulary and structures or phrases such as "stuff like that" which are not suited to academic writing but more appropriate in conversations. This shows that despite the immersion influences positively to communicative confidence, it does not guarantee high proficiency in other skills such as writing where the formality, precision, accuracy and coherence are valued and tested by high-stake proficiency tests like IELTS (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2014). Which means members of sub-group 2 are highly likely to achieve lower scores for academic language use, grammar and spelling accuracy in IELTS writing than those in sub-group 1.

GENDER/SEXUALITY

As my IELTS preparation classroom consists of mixed-gender learners (male and female) aged 13- 14, I aim to create equitable and inclusive classroom environment which takes into account how gender affects students' performance and participation in the classroom. The Difference Model (Tannen 1990) and The Dominance Model (Zimmerman and West 1975) both have an influence on the strategy I use in the classroom. While the dominance model places more emphasis on power dynamics in interactions the difference model suggests that men and women have distinct but equally valid communication styles that have been shaped by socialization. This calls for acknowledging and appreciating a range of discourse styles in the classroom while being mindful of the potential impact that gendered power dynamics may have on participation. In group and pair work, for instance, I make sure that there are equal speaking opportunities for both genders while being attentive to any tendency for boys to dominate the conversations and discussions. I also make use of gender-neutral language in my materials. I use male/female pronouns alternately in sample



tasks- he/she. I also actively counteract stereotypes with limiting examples such as female nurses or male computer engineers. I sometimes support girls especially from Uzbek backgrounds who are particularly shy and hesitant in providing and supporting arguments in debates by inviting them namely asking their opinions and helping with ideas for arguments and sentence starters. Moreover, frequently, my female students feel hesitant talking about their private life e.g. favorite wearing style, cinema, meal; family members, family relations, home/house, the place they live, their own room which are the topics widely discussed in IELTS speaking examination in part 1 which they are preparing for. Before engaging them to the conversation, as being female teacher, I support those girls with stating examples from my own experience: "My favorite wearing style is casual even though as being teacher I sometimes wear formal style. In casual I feel comfortable and relaxed. It allows me to express my personalities freely" and then I ask "So hey Zarina, what is yours?" then they feel confident to talk about their preferences. The reason why I implement mentioned above strategies in my classroom is that I support Equity Model (Francis & Skelton, 2005) emerged from feminist educational theory which recognizes that certain behaviors of females are shaped by social, cultural, and institutional factors not much showing their differences in gender. While rejecting the

Deficit Model (Lakoff, 1975) which claims women lacks confidence use hesitancy markers in language compared to man, I think that my female students show this kind of behavior not for just they are tent to use, but their behavior shaped by gendered expectations from society and because of unequal access to resources or opportunities in society.

PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS AND ASSESSMENT MODIFICATION

In my IELTS preparation class, as it was ensured by my institution, a systematic skill-based approach is necessary to improve all language skills (speaking listening reading and writing) in order to prepare my students for the IELTS exam. The students varied ethnic backgrounds— including Tajik, Russian, Uzbek and others—as well as the regional dialects they speak have an impact on how they learn and communicate in the language. To do this, as a teacher I modify my lessons to take into account cultural sensitivities, different learning styles and language interference. Additionally, the socioeconomic diversity of the students necessitates providing equitable access to resources and support. By institutional policies PARSNIP-related subjects are avoided guaranteeing a classroom atmosphere that is impartial and courteous. To ensure that every student has a positive and inclusive learning experience, my instruction strikes a balance between the academic focus of IELTS preparation and cultural sensitivity.

Moreover, deep sociolinguistic understanding of general profiles and two sub-groups have many issues to consider when deciding on pedagogical implications to be done and assessment strategies to be implemented. In effective ELT classroom preparing for IELTS, for teacher instructions it is



essential to help students overcome some phonological problems they face. However, for assessment part I will be more culturally, ethnically, linguistically sensitive, not counting those distinctiveness of students as an incorrect performance.

For Uzbek dominant students in sub-group 1 who tend to do better in academic writing and lacks oral proficiency, pedagogical implications need to focus on development of their overall speaking skills such as pronunciation, fluency, coherence and clarity, turn-taking, intonation and others. This can be achieved by implementing to lessons more speaking-focused activities. For example, I use interview, discussion, debate activities to increase fluency and coherence, turn -taking during procedure part of my lesson as a main activity and in the assessment of those activities, I differentiate the instruction with supporting members of sub- group 1 (Uzbek dominant students) by giving them more time to speak compared to sub-group 2 members have and provide members of sub-group 1 (Uzbek dominant students) with sentence starters, supporting vocabulary with meaning, ideas as pre-exam preparation materials.

Furthermore, I implement “Story-telling” activities to extend the length of their speech and “Describe Something” activities to prepare them for giving descriptive speech for speaking part 2 in IELTS examination. Both sub-group members do these activities during the class, as they are beneficial by preparing them to the external assessment – IELTS speaking examination. For assessing the results of these activities I differentiate pre-exam preparation phase for members of sub-group 1 where I share sample answers for both story telling and describe something activities to elicit the structure and vocabulary they need. Moreover, I use peer modeling- strategical grouping of students from sub-group 1 with those with sub-group 2 (dominant speakers) serves as a model to members of sub-group 1 when they learn and shadow the communicative competence from the members of sub-group 2. The more the students speak fluently, the more their effective filters to be reduced which help them learn more effectively from the classroom environment.

Particularly, members of sub-group 1 also need pronunciation support instructions targeting the interference issues of their L 1. For example, they have a problem of final consonant clusters and the [v]/[w] confusion. To overcome this confusion, they need focused minimal pair drills and auditory discrimination tasks which help them contrast [v] and [w] sounds (e.g., vet vs. wet, vest vs. west). I will use these tasks in the form of mini activity additional to wrap-up phase of the lesson. Moreover, diagrams and videos showing mouse positioning - visual articulation modeling- can be effective to support better pronunciation of the target sounds. I will use them as a board attached on the wall and I highlight the sound production when I notice students are pronouncing incorrectly. Syllable-timing practice – braking-down sounds into manageable chunks (e.g., texts → text + s) can be used to help with final consonant cluster issues. I will use them as mini and additional activity to warm-up phase of the lesson. Ongoing teacher feedback on those issues and shadowing- repeating after native



speakers' speech patterns can be an effective solution to those problems that learners in the sub-group 1 suffer. Where I will give more formative feedback during the lesson and shadowing techniques as a homework. Grouping students effectively by assigning members of sub-group 1 more on speaker positions creates them a room for more practice speaking and get ongoing and immediate teacher feedback on their speech which ultimately prepares them to achieve target results from speaking in IELTS examinations. Relying on recommendations of Fought (2011) about sensitive teaching I will not consider pronunciation problems of Uzbek speaking students as incorrect performance for summative assessments. As the problems in their pronunciation are mainly influenced by their social backgrounds and effect of their L1, I plan to help them during lessons to reach the maximum improvements in their pronunciation (mainly American style) as majority of the students are planning to migrate abroad to further their education (majority of them are preparing for studying at American universities). However, in assessing their overall performance in speaking I will not decrease their marks for pronunciation even though External

assessment they are preparing for assesses pronunciation. The first reason for this my decision is to implement culturally, socially inclusive, empathetic classroom environment and second reason is that despite IELTS speaking exam checks candidates against the criteria of correct pronunciation, the target band score my students are preparing for is only 6.0-6.5 which means candidate still developing their pronunciation and therefore still they have some problems in the pronunciation.

For sub-group 2 -Russian-dominant multilingual students who demonstrate strong oral proficiency due to immersion and more exposure to real English use but struggle with academic tone, grammar and spelling accuracy in writing, differentiated approach that values their communicative strength as well as addresses their structural weaknesses can be one the most effective pedagogical implications. They could benefit from short *explicit grammar instructions* (modals, conjunctions, conditionals, etc.) in pre-task phase every lesson after warm-up activities and *genre-based writing tasks* as main activities during the lessons. Implementing genre-based writing activities such as group projects and role-plays focused on writing help them keep engaged to writing and grammar lessons. The role play can be writing a formal letter (asking something and reply) to departments in workplace, writing an essay as a response for asking their opinions on one issue, writing a report describing trends to the shareholders as being an employee who would lose her/his job if he fails to do it, etc. Additionally, I can ask them to use learnt grammar elements in pre-task in their reports in main task. These activities will be done as a whole group as they are beneficial for members of sub-group 2 as well by enhancing peer collaboration. However, in assessment of those activities I differentiate the instructions by adapting conditions where I assign writer roles mostly for members of sub-group 2 and checker roles for members of sub-group 1 who are good at writing tasks. I also differentiate the instructions in pre-exam



preparation phase in the assessment where I provide members of sub- group 2 with structures, formal vocabulary and forms to model their reports before assessing their final product such as essay.

Moreover, integrating to lessons materials which highlight academic vocabulary, collocations and increase register awareness along with genre-specific modeling (e.g analyzing sample IELTS band 6-7 score essays and re-writing them) can help members of sub-group 2 notice academic tone, vocabulary and sentence structures which are valued and tested in writing tasks in IELTS examination. Formative Assessment methods which is broken into phases -outlining, editing, peer-evaluating, revising- in which between phases, teacher provides targeted feedback on target structure can be helpful for members of sub-group 2. For example, quarterly assessments are done as traditionally by our learning center to disclose the progress of students to parents and learning center where members of sub-group 2 usually had lower results for writing part. I can use formative assessment techniques for members of sub-group 2 before giving them tasks of quarterly assessment as summative where I assess members of sub-group 1 in the quarterly assessment, without formative preparation. Students in sub-group 2 will benefit from formative feedback before I disclose the results as summative aligning with the recommendations of Bayley and Villarreal (2018) about considering educational background factors effect on learners' performance. Moreover, for their problems in spelling, using ongoing spelling, grammar checker tools and teacher-guided feedback serves as self-correction habit. I will use those techniques in the form of as additional recommended practice for home for only members of sub-group 2.

As members of sub-group 1, students in the sub- group 2 also have some problems associated with interference of their L1 to L2 such as Palatalization, where it can be reduced through constructive phonetic training where students are provided with audio recordings of both palatalized and non-palatalized versions of words such as "new", "students" and ask them to identify the difference or record their own pronunciation of those words and compare it to standard pronunciation (mainly American as they are preparing to migrate to America to further their studies) can help them better grasp the different phonological patterns. Learners also benefit from shadowing techniques where they repeat short audio clips from the native speakers immediately after hearing them. Informal assessments (which are not graded) -peer-correction tests where students work in pairs and correct each other's pronunciation based on the rubric can enhance metalinguistic awareness as well as encourage collaborative learning. To achieve this,

formative assessments can include pronunciation into rubrics where students are being aware of the pronunciation problems are being monitored but as for summative assessments, palatalization should not be penalized taking into account of Labov's (1972) research showed that language forms may carry social meaning which calls for culturally and linguistically responsive



assessments. Additional information: The learning center provides every stationary we need in the classroom. All students do the tasks related to writing and grammar together and are assessed together (with some differentiation in the assessment as I mentioned above). Only the activities related to pronunciation are done by the members of subgroup 2 as a supplementary to the instructions (mainly for home) and the only members of the sub-group 2 are assessed on those activities they did for pronunciation.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the research has illuminated how language learning is deeply connected with issues of identity, equity and social factors influencing every single individual's learning habits, performance and behaviors. As being an example of multicultural classroom, my IELTS preparation classroom is not just a course for preparing students for the IELTS examination, but also it is an alive learning environment where power, privilege, social dynamics demonstrate its effects on learner's performance. By supporting female students constrained by gender norms, supporting Uzbek dominant students in oral proficiency activities and assessments- providing extra help in pre-exam preparations as well as adapting exam conditions, engaging Russian- speaking students into writing and grammar instructions with interactive and engaging activities, providing them formative assessment feedback improvements, supporting emotionally vulnerable students like my Karakalpak learner, I reject one-size-fits-all models in favor of context-responsive teaching. My teaching approach mirrors culturally inclusive, student- centered, equitable practices which is new for education system of Uzbekistan. Relying on the research done on equitability and social factors effecting language use, identity in the classroom (which I relied on my research paper) and relying on positive results of my own experience trying inclusive approach for teaching, my role as a teacher to address each students needs in my classroom and I can state that inclusive teaching calls for other instructors to think about positive results and create inclusive and equitable teaching and learning environment in their own contexts.

REFERENCES:

1. Bayley, R., & Villarreal, D. (2018). Cultural attitudes toward language variation and dialects. In J. I. Lontas (Ed.), *The TESOL encyclopedia of English language teaching* (Vol. 3, S2, Cultural Attitudes Toward Language Variation and Dialects). John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0297>
2. Dörnyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, 31(3), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S026144480001315X>
3. Deumert, A. (2011). *Multilingualism*. In R. Wodak, B. Johnstone, & P. Kerswill (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 26–40). SAGE Publications Ltd.
4. Fought, C. (2011). *Language and ethnicity*. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), *The Cambridge handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 238–257). Cambridge University Press.
5. Francis, B., & Skelton, C. (2005). *Reassessing gender and achievement: Questioning contemporary key debates*. Routledge.
6. Labov, W. (1972). *The social stratification of English in New York City* (2nd ed.).



Cambridge University Press.

7. Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound changes. *WORD*, 19(3), 273–309. <https://.org/10.1080/00437956.1963.11659799>
8. Lakoff, R. (1975). *Language and woman's place*. New York: Harper & Row.
9. Long, M. H. (1996). The role of the linguistic environment in second language acquisition. *Language Teaching*, 29(1), 49-74. <https://.org/10.1017/S0261444800003164>
10. Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap, W. L. (2009). *Introducing sociolinguistics* (2nd ed., Chapter 3). Edinburgh University Press.
11. Norton, B. (2000). *Identity and language learning: Gender, ethnicity and educational change*. Longman.
12. Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand: Women and men in conversation*. New York: Ballantine Books.
13. Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2015). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (7th ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
14. Zimmerman, D., & West, C. (1975). Sex roles, interruptions and silences in conversation. In B. Thorne & N. Henley (Eds.), *Language and sex: Difference and dominance* (pp. 105–129). Newbury House.



<i>И «ИСТОРИИ ВЧЕРАШНЕГО ДНЯ» Л.Н. ТОЛСТОГО</i>	
<i>To'raqulova Nilufar Amirqulovna. DEGREES OF COMPARISON OF ADJECTIVES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK</i>	498
<i>Türkan Mahmudzada. MEHMET AKIF ƏRSOY MILLI KIMLIK MƏSƏLƏSI</i>	501
<i>Xamidullayeva Fotima Adxam qizi. XORIJIY TILNI O'RGANISHDA GAPIRISH KO'NIKMALARINI SHAKLLANTIRISHNING NAZARIY ASOSLARI</i>	506
<i>Xojiyeva Iroda Zokirjon qizi. DAVLAT TILINI O'QITISHNING ASOSIY TAMOIYILLARI (TOJIK TILLI MAKTABLAR MISOLIDA)</i>	513
<i>Mohinur Akhmedova Ziyodulla Kızı. ORTAK TÜRK EDEBIYATI MI, MILLÎ EDEBIYAT MI? PARADIGMALAR ARASI DENGE ÜZERINE KARŞILAŞTIRMALI BİR İNCELEME: TÜRKİYE, AZERBAIJAN VE ÖZBEKİSTAN ÖRNEĞİ</i>	519
<i>Xatirə Bayramova. QARABAĞIN FÜZULI RAYONUNUN HIDRONİMLƏRİNİN LEKSIK-SEMANTİK XÜSUSİYYƏTLƏRİ</i>	527
<i>Davletova Shalola Bahodir qizi. XORXE LUIS BORXES ASARLARIDA EKZISTENSIALİZM</i>	536
<i>Ismailova Gulnoza Odiljon qizi. A CATEGORIZED AND STATISTICAL EXAMINATION OF RELIGIOUS TERMINOLOGY IN KUTADGU BILIG</i>	539
<i>Ro'ziyeva Aziza Bobirovna, Abdusattorova Xadicha Xusanboy qizi. 10-11-SINF O'QUVCHILARIGA SUN'YI INTELLEKT ORQALI MATN YOZISHNI O'RGATISH</i>	548
<i>Валида Шухалиева Надир кызы. НОВЫЕ ПОЭТИЧЕСКИЕ ТЕНДЕНЦИИ В СОВРЕМЕННОЙ ИРАКСКО-ТУРКМЕНСКОЙ ЛИТЕРАТУРЕ</i>	553
<i>Omonova Qunduz Alisher qizi. HOZIRGI TURKIY TILLARDA UCHRAYDIGAN VARIATIVLIK MUAMMOLARI VA TADQIQOT YONALISHLARI</i>	559
<i>Rahmatillayeva Nozima Nigmatilla qizi. IKKKINCHI TILNI O'QITISHDA IJTIMOYIY VA LINGVISTIK XILMA-XILLIKNI QOLLAB - QUVVATLOVCHI (EQUITABLE) YONDASHUV</i>	562
VI SHU'BA. TURKIY TILLAR TARAQQIYOTI VA ZAMONAVIY LINGVODIDAKTIKA MASALALARI	
<i>Tursunoy Yusupova Axmedovna. O'QUVCHILAR NUTQIY KOMPETYENSIYASINI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA NUTQIY OMILLARNING O'RNI</i>	576
<i>Shodmonova Munira Burxonovna. TA'LIM JARAYONIDA PSIXOLOGIK-DIAGNOSTIK METODNING O'RNI</i>	579
<i>Kuldasheva Sanobar Xayotovna. RAQAMLI TEXNOKRATLASHUV SHAROITIDA QO'SHMA GAPLARNI O'QITISH USULLARI</i>	587
<i>Iskandarova Gulbahor Turabayevna. XORIJLIK LARNING O'ZBEK TILINI O'RGANISHIDA SO'Z MA'NOLARINING O'ZLASHTIRISHI</i>	592

