LINGUODIDACTIC CONDITIONS FOR ENHANCING THE PROFESSIONAL AND METHODOLOGICAL PREPAREDNESS OF PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHERS

Tuxtayeva Nilufar Achilovna – *Doctor of Philosophy in Pedagogical Sciences*
nilufartuxtayeva0609@gmail.com
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

BO‘LAJAK INGLIZ TILI O‘QITUVChILARINING KASBIY-METODIK TAYYORGARLIGINI TAKOMILLAShTIRIShNING LINGVODIDAKTIK ShART-ShAROITLARI

Tuxtayeva Nilufar Achilovna – *pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori*
O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

ЛИНГВОДИДАКТИЧЕСКИЕ УСЛОВИЯ СОВЕРШЕНСТВОВАНИЯ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНО-МЕТОДИЧЕСКОЙ ПОДГОТОВКИ БУДУЩИХ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Тухтаева Нилуфар Ачиловна – *доктор философии по педагогическим наукам*
Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков

Tayanch so‘zlar: bo‘lajak ingliz tili o‘qituvchilari, kasbiy-metodik tayyorgarlik, lingvodidaktik shart-sharoitlar, metodik qaror qabul qilish, o‘qituvchi tafakkuri, refleksiv faoliyat, pedagogik ta’lim.

Rezyume. Maqolada oliy ta’limdagi metodika fanlari orqali kasbiy-metodik tayyorgarlikni rivojlantirishga ko‘maklashuvchi lingvodidaktik shart-sharoitlar tahlil qilinadi. Pedagogik mazmun bilimi, o‘qituvchi tafakkuri, kasbiy ta’limning kontekstga bog‘liqligi, refleksiv faoliyat va raqamli texnologiyalar integratsiyasi haqidagi ilmiy qarashlarga tayanib, tayyorgarlikning lingvometodik, metodik-operatsion, kommunikativ-metodik va refleksiv-baholash tarkibiy qismlari ajratiladi. Metodika kurslarini loyihalash uchun oltita shart-sharoit taklif etiladi. Taklif etilgan tizim tajribada hali tekshirilmagani bois, uning ahamiyati kelgusi empirik tadqiqotlar uchun nazariy asos sifatida talqin qilinadi.

Ключевые слова: будущие учителя английского языка, профессионально-методическая подготовленность, лингводидактические условия, принятие методических решений, профессиональное мышление учителя, рефлексивная практика, педагогическое образование.

Резюме. В теоретико-концептуальной статье рассматриваются лингводидактические условия развития профессионально-методической подготовленности в университетских курсах методики. На основе исследований предметно-педагогических знаний, профессионального мышления учителя, контекстуального обучения, рефлексивной практики и интеграции цифровых технологий выделяются четыре взаимосвязанных компонента подготовленности: лингвометодический, методико-операциональный, коммуникативно-методический и рефлексивно-оценочный. Для проектирования курсов предлагаются шесть условий. Поскольку предложенная модель пока не прошла экспериментальную проверку, она рассматривается как теоретическое основание для совершенствования учебных программ и последующих эмпирических исследований.

Key words: pre-service English language teachers, professional and methodological preparedness, linguodidactic conditions, methodological decision-making, teacher cognition, reflective practice, teacher education.

Summary. The article examines the linguodidactic conditions through which university methodology courses can foster such professional and methodological preparedness. Drawing on scholarship concerning pedagogical content knowledge, language teacher cognition, situated professional learning, reflective practice and technology integration, the article distinguishes four connected dimensions of preparedness: linguo-methodological, methodological-operational, communicative-methodological and reflective-evaluative. It proposes six conditions for course design: the integration of linguistic and methodological knowledge. A cyclical sequence connecting the interpretation of teaching situations with analysis, decision-making, design, enactment and revision illustrates how these conditions may work together. As the framework has not been experimentally tested, its value is presented as a theoretically grounded proposition for curriculum development and future empirical investigation.

Introduction. Teacher education faces a familiar but unresolved problem: students can explain a teaching principle accurately and still find it difficult to decide what to do when a lesson does not unfold as planned. A prospective English teacher may know the rationale for communicative language teaching, for example, yet struggle to organise a discussion when some learners dominate while others remain silent. Another may understand formative assessment in theory but be uncertain about what a learner’s incorrect response reveals and what kind of feedback would be useful [1]. These are not simply failures to remember methodological terminology. They concern the ability to translate knowledge into situated professional judgement.

English language classrooms make this transition particularly demanding. Teachers work simultaneously with linguistic content, interactional opportunities, learner confidence, curricular expectations and limited instructional time. A grammatical explanation may be correct but inaccessible to a particular group; an engaging digital task may encourage participation without advancing the intended language outcome. The quality of teaching therefore depends not on the presence of individual techniques but on the reasoning that connects a choice to its purpose and context.

University programmes commonly distribute teacher preparation across language proficiency, linguistics, psychology, pedagogy and methodology courses. This arrangement provides valuable disciplinary breadth, but the relationships among these fields are not always made visible to students. When learning is assessed mainly through definitions of methods or descriptions of theoretical

approaches, students may have few opportunities to defend a teaching decision, test its feasibility or revise it in response to evidence [5]. The problem is especially pertinent to English Language Teaching Methodology, a course expected to connect linguistic understanding with classroom action.

In this study, professional and methodological preparedness refers to an emerging capacity to interpret teaching circumstances, transform linguistic knowledge into learning opportunities, justify instructional decisions, conduct pedagogical interaction and evaluate outcomes. "Linguodidactic conditions" denotes the organised features of instruction that make this development possible: the nature of tasks, forms of interaction, criteria for feedback and relationships between theoretical content and professional action. The distinction matters because a teacher education programme may state ambitious outcomes while providing learning activities that do little to cultivate them.

Literature review. A teacher's command of English is indispensable, yet linguistic competence does not itself explain how a learning activity should be sequenced or why one explanation may be more accessible than another. Shulman's (1987) account of pedagogical content knowledge helps clarify this distinction. Teaching requires selecting representations, anticipating misconceptions and relating subject matter to learners' existing understanding [6]. For a future English teacher, such transformations may involve choosing examples of a grammatical pattern, deciding whether a pronunciation feature needs explicit attention or creating communicative conditions in which a target expression has a meaningful function.

Richards and Rodgers (2014) document the theoretical assumptions and procedures associated with different approaches to language teaching. Their account provides an important conceptual repertoire, but knowledge of approaches is only a starting point. A student who can distinguish task-based instruction from presentation–practice–production still needs to determine which sequence fits a particular objective and group of learners [4]. Methodological preparedness therefore includes the capacity to interpret and adapt approaches rather than merely classify them.

This distinction also exposes a weakness in overly fragmented course designs. When linguistic analysis and lesson planning are taught separately, students may treat the former as academic content and the latter as a procedural exercise. An integrated task can make their relationship explicit: students examine a linguistic feature, anticipate learner difficulty, formulate a learning objective and justify an instructional sequence. The value of such a task lies not only in the resulting lesson plan but in the reasoning it requires.

From subject knowledge to teachable content. A teacher's command of English is indispensable, yet linguistic competence does not itself explain how a learning activity should be sequenced or why one explanation may be more accessible than another. Shulman's (1987) account of pedagogical content knowledge helps clarify this distinction. Teaching requires selecting representations, anticipating misconceptions and relating subject matter to learners' existing understanding [6]. For a future English teacher, such transformations may involve choosing examples of a grammatical pattern, deciding whether a pronunciation feature needs explicit attention or creating communicative conditions in which a target expression has a meaningful function.

Richards and Rodgers (2014) document the theoretical assumptions and procedures associated with different approaches to language teaching. Their account provides an important conceptual repertoire, but knowledge of approaches is only a starting point [4]. A student who can distinguish task-based instruction from presentation–practice–production still needs to determine which sequence fits a particular objective and group of learners. Methodological preparedness therefore includes the capacity to interpret and adapt approaches rather than merely classify them.

Research methodology. This article is a conceptual study rather than an empirical report or a systematic literature review. Its purpose is to construct a theoretically defensible framework for methodology-course design. The analysis draws on selected foundational contributions in pedagogical content knowledge, language teacher cognition, reflective professional learning, language teaching methodology and educational technology. These works were chosen for their conceptual relevance to the relationship between knowledge, instructional action and professional judgement. The selection is not presented as an exhaustive or reproducible database search, and no claims about the frequency or prevalence of themes in the wider literature are made.

The framework was refined by distinguishing dimensions of preparedness from the conditions intended to support their development. Dimensions describe what students should become capable of doing; conditions describe how course learning can be organised. This distinction prevents the proposed model from equating a teaching activity with a professional outcome. The framework remains a theoretical proposition: its predictive validity and instructional effectiveness require empirical testing.

Results and discussion. The synthesis identifies four mutually dependent dimensions. The linguo-methodological dimension concerns the ability to view linguistic content through the lens of learning: identifying language demands, anticipating difficulty and selecting suitable explanations or examples. The methodological-operational dimension concerns the planning and adaptation of instructional procedures, from learning objectives to task sequence and assessment. The communicative-methodological dimension concerns the enactment of teaching through instructions, questioning, feedback and the organisation of classroom interaction. The reflective-evaluative dimension concerns the interpretation of evidence, appraisal of decisions and revision of practice.

These dimensions should not be interpreted as separate modules that can be completed independently. A prospective teacher planning a speaking lesson draws on linguistic knowledge to anticipate vocabulary needs, operational knowledge to sequence activities, communicative ability to facilitate interaction and evaluative judgement to determine whether learners have achieved the objective. Weakness in any one dimension may affect the whole lesson. The analytical separation is

useful for course design and feedback, while professional activity requires their coordination.

Six linguodidactic conditions for methodology-course design

Condition	Instructional purpose	Illustrative task
Knowledge integration	Connect language content to teaching decisions	Analyse a language feature and redesign its teaching sequence
Contextualised problems	Make learner and classroom constraints explicit	Adapt a reading task for a mixed-proficiency group
Reasoned decisions	Require justification of methodological alternatives	Compare two lesson openings against stated criteria
Practice-oriented interaction	Rehearse classroom communication and instruction	Microteach a short activity and review peer observations
Evidence-informed reflection	Link feedback to observable teaching and learning	Revise a lesson plan using a focused observation rubric
Critical digital integration	Evaluate technology through learning objectives	Critique and improve an AI-generated activity

Table 1. Proposed linguodidactic conditions and their instructional applications.

A cycle connecting knowledge with professional action. The six conditions can be organised through a recurring sequence: understanding the teaching situation → methodological analysis → justified decision → instructional design → communicative enactment → reflection and revision. At the outset, the prospective teacher identifies learners, objectives and constraints. Analysis then links relevant language content with possible instructional strategies. The decision stage requires a reasoned selection, while design converts that selection into materials, activities and assessment evidence. Enactment tests the plan through microteaching or supervised practice; reflection draws on observations to inform revision.

The sequence is intentionally cyclical. An initial plan may need to be reconsidered before enactment, and classroom interaction may require immediate adaptation. The stages therefore represent connected functions of professional reasoning rather than a rigid lesson-planning formula. Their value for teacher education is that they make the usually implicit reasoning behind teaching decisions available for discussion, feedback and assessment.

Conclusion. Preparing future English language teachers involves a transition that is easily described but difficult to organise: the movement from knowledge about teaching to defensible action in specific classrooms. The analysis presented here suggests that this transition requires coordinated attention to linguistic interpretation, methodological planning, professional communication and reflective evaluation. These four dimensions are inseparable in practice, although distinguishing them helps make course outcomes and feedback more precise.

The article proposes six linguodidactic conditions that can support their development: knowledge integration, contextualised professional problems, reasoned methodological choices, opportunities for instructional rehearsal, evidence-informed reflection and critical digital integration. Their value lies less in any individual activity than in the way they can be connected through a cycle of situation analysis, decision-making, design, enactment and revision. This synthesis offers a course-oriented account of professional methodological learning while acknowledging that its effectiveness remains to be tested.

Future studies should examine the framework in actual English Language Teaching Methodology courses through lesson-plan analysis, microteaching observations, reflective records and school-based teaching evidence. Such work could determine which conditions are most consequential in different contexts and how professional judgement develops over time. Until then, the framework is best understood as a reasoned proposal for bringing theory and teaching practice into closer conversation.

References

1. Borg S. Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what language teachers think, know, believe, and do. // Language Teaching, 2003, 36(2). – P. 81-109.

2. Freeman D., Johnson K. E. Reconceptualizing the knowledge-base of language teacher education. // TESOL Quarterly, 1998, 32(3). – P. 397-417.

3. Mishra P., Koehler M.J. Technological pedagogical content knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge. // Teachers College Record, 2006, 108(6). – P. 1017-1054.

4. Richards J.C., Rodgers T.S. Approaches and methods in language teaching (3rd ed.). – Cambridge University Press, 2014.

5. Schön D.A. The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action. – Basic Books, 1983.

6. Shulman L.S. Knowledge and teaching: Foundations of the new reform. // Harvard Educational Review, 1987, 57(1). – P. 1-22.