LINGUODIDACTIC INTEGRATION OF RUSSIAN AND UZBEK METHODOLOGICAL EXPERIENCE IN TEACHING ENGLISH

Hayitova Nadejda Davlatovna
Lecturer, ASMAN University.
Bukhara, Republic of Uzbekistan.
E-mail: ***hayitnadya@gmail.com***
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24473702

Abstract. Background. *English functions as a key instrument of academic and professional mobility, which calls for effective teaching models in the post-Soviet educational space. Sharing a common historical and methodological foundation, Russia and Uzbekistan have, over the last three decades, developed their English language teaching (ELT) methodologies along partially diverging paths, which creates conditions for mutually enriching integration.*

Aim. *To identify zones of convergence and divergence between the Russian and Uzbek ELT methodological systems and to substantiate a linguodidactic model of their integration.*

Methods. *Comparative analysis of normative documents (Russian Federal State Educational Standards; Uzbek Presidential Decree PP-1875, Cabinet Resolution No. 124, Presidential Decree PP-5117), content analysis of scholarly literature from both countries, linguodidactic modelling, and expert-analytical systematisation.*

Results. *The Russian school retains a strong theoretical and psycholinguistic foundation (communicative-cognitive and sociocultural approaches, speech activity theory), whereas the Uzbek model is characterised by rapid institutionalisation of CEFR standards, an early start of instruction, and an orientation toward international certification. Five zones of integration are distinguished: goal-setting, content, technologies, assessment, and teacher education. A three-level integration model (conceptual, content-technological, instrumental-assessment) is proposed.*

Conclusion. *Integrating the two countries' experience compensates for the deficits of each system — operationalising and standardising Russian practice while deepening the theoretical reflection of the Uzbek one — and may underpin joint educational programmes and teacher professional development.*

Keywords: *linguodidactics; ELT methodology; integration; comparative education; CEFR; communicative-cognitive approach; Russia; Uzbekistan; language policy.*

1. Introduction

Contemporary linguodidactics develops under a tension between the global unification of requirements for foreign-language competence (CEFR, international examinations, the Bologna Process) and the need to preserve the national and cultural specificity of educational systems. For post-Soviet countries this tension is intensified by the fact that their methodological schools were formed within a single Soviet paradigm — the conscious-practical method (B. V. Belyaev), speech activity theory (A. A. Leontiev, I. A. Zimnyaya), the communicative method of E. I. Passov — and then evolved autonomously for thirty years under different external reference points.

Russia and Uzbekistan represent an illustrative case of such "divergent evolution." The Russian school preserved and advanced a deep theoretical tradition: the communicative-cognitive approach (A. V. Shchepilova), the sociocultural approach (V. V. Safonova), the concept of the

"secondary linguistic personality" (I. I. Khaleeva), and multicultural language education (P. V. Sysoev). The adoption of unified level descriptors and standardised assessment, however, proceeded gradually and unevenly. Uzbekistan, by contrast, launched a rapid institutional reform after Presidential Decree PP-1875 of 10 December 2012 "On Measures to Further Improve the System of Foreign Language Learning": foreign-language (predominantly English) instruction was introduced from Grade 1; a State Educational Standard for Foreign Languages in the system of continuous education (Cabinet Resolution No. 124 of 8 May 2013) was adopted, built entirely on CEFR levels; a national certification system was created; and Decree PP-5117 of 19 May 2021 established the Agency for the Promotion of Foreign Language Learning and approved an equivalence scale between national and international certificates.

An asymmetric situation has thus emerged: one system possesses methodological depth with relatively weak standardisation; the other has a high degree of standardisation alongside a persistent deficit of indigenous theoretical reflection and insufficient adaptation of imported models to local conditions (a multilingual environment, large classes, regional disparities in teacher qualifications). This creates objective preconditions for *linguodidactic integration*, understood here not as mechanical borrowing but as the systemic mutual complementation of methodological resources on the basis of a shared conceptual language.

Research problem. There is no holistic theoretical model describing the mechanisms and levels of integrating the two countries' methodological experience in ELT. Existing works are either descriptive (language policy overviews) or limited to single aspects (CEFR implementation, digitalisation).

Aim. To identify zones of convergence and divergence between the Russian and Uzbek ELT systems and, on this basis, to substantiate a linguodidactic model of their integration.

Objectives: (1) to define the theoretical grounds for comparing the two systems; (2) to conduct a comparative analysis of their normative frameworks, conceptual approaches and assessment practices; (3) to identify zones of integration and describe the systems' "reciprocal deficits"; (4) to develop and substantiate a multi-level integration model.

Hypothesis. The Russian and Uzbek ELT systems are complementary: the strengths of one correspond to the deficits of the other, making integration possible on the principle of mutual compensation while preserving a common conceptual core — the communicative-activity paradigm.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Theoretical framework

The study is situated within comparative linguodidactics and draws on activity theory (L. S. Vygotsky, A. N. Leontiev, A. A. Leontiev); the concept of communicative foreign-language education (E. I. Passov); linguodidactics as an independent science of language acquisition regularities (N. D. Galskova, N. I. Gez; A. N. Shchukin); and "post-method" pedagogy and appropriate methodology (B. Kumaravadivelu; A. Holliday), which treat method borrowing as cultural adaptation rather than transfer.

Linguodidactic integration is defined as the process and outcome of systematically combining the conceptual, content-related, technological and assessment components of national methodological systems, grounded in their identified complementarity and aimed at increasing the

effectiveness of foreign-language teaching while preserving the cultural-educational identity of each system.

2.2. Materials

Three corpora were analysed.

Corpus A — normative documents (n = 11). Russia: Federal State Educational Standards (FSES) for primary, basic and secondary general education (2021–2022 editions); Federal curricula in English; FSES for higher education programmes 44.03.05 and 45.03.02; Unified State Exam (USE) specifications in English. Uzbekistan: PP-1875 (2012); Cabinet Resolution No. 124 (2013); Cabinet Resolution No. 352 (2013) on the national assessment and certification system; PP-5117 (2021); the list of recognised international certificates and the equivalence scale (2021).

Corpus B — scholarly and methodological literature (n = 48): monographs, textbooks and articles by Russian (E. I. Passov, N. D. Galskova, A. N. Shchukin, I. L. Bim, V. V. Safonova, P. V. Sysoev, E. N. Solovova, R. P. Milrud, S. G. Ter-Minasova) and Uzbek (J. Jalolov, O'. Hoshimov, I. Yoqubov, D. Hasanova et al.) authors published in 1989–2024.

Corpus C — coursebook series: Russian school series (*Spotlight*, *Starlight*, *Rainbow English*, V. P. Kuzovlev's series) and Uzbek series (*Kids' English*, *Fly High Uzbekistan*, *Teen English*, national adaptations of *English Matters* and *Scale Up*).

2.3. Methods

1. **Comparative analysis** of normative documents against a unified matrix of 12 parameters (aims; starting age; target levels by stage; competence structure; balance of language skills; content selection principles; recommended technologies; forms of assessment; role of the mother tongue; sociocultural component; teacher requirements; standard-renewal mechanisms).
2. **Content analysis** of the literature by frequency and semantic weight of key concepts ("communicative competence," "linguistic personality," "CEFR," "authenticity," "intercultural," "digital," "learner autonomy," etc.).
3. **Linguodidactic modelling** — constructing an integration model from identified complementary links.
4. **Expert-analytical systematisation** — verifying the zones of integration against the criteria of consistency with the conceptual core, feasibility in both systems, and measurability of outcomes.

2.4. Procedure

The study proceeded in three stages: *analytical* (corpus formation and parametric analysis), *synthetic* (compilation of a comparative matrix; identification of convergence, divergence and complementarity), and *modelling* (development of the multi-level model and formulation of its implementation conditions).

2.5. Limitations

The study is theoretical-analytical and does not include experimental teaching; conclusions on complementarity require subsequent empirical verification (teacher surveys, diagnostic testing, comparison of learner outcomes).

3. Results

3.1. Shared conceptual foundation (zone of convergence)

Analysis of Corpus B showed that, despite three decades of autonomous evolution, both systems retain a single conceptual core rooted in the Soviet psycholinguistic tradition. In Uzbek methodological literature — notably J. Jalolov's foundational textbook *Chet til o'qitish metodikasi* — the communicative aim, the principle of consciousness, the exercise typology (language → conditional-speech → speech exercises) and the treatment of the four skills as interrelated components correspond to the positions of the Russian school (Passov, Bim, Galskova). This provides a **shared metalanguage**, a critical precondition for integration: specialists in both countries operate with commensurable notions, unlike comparisons with Western methodology, where conceptual systems require "translation."

Content analysis recorded high frequencies of "communicative competence," "speech activity," "motivation" and "exercise" in both corpora, confirming the common paradigm. Differences appear at the level of peripheral concepts (see 3.2).

3.2. Zones of divergence

Parametric analysis revealed substantial differences on six of the twelve parameters (Table 1).

Table 1. Comparative matrix of the ELT systems (excerpt)

Parameter	Russian Federation	Republic of Uzbekistan
Start of compulsory instruction	Grade 2 (Grade 1 at the school's discretion)	Grade 1 (since 2013/14, PP-1875)
Goal-setting in the standard	Via subject / meta-subject / personal outcomes; CEFR levels indicative only (A2+ basic, B1 advanced at upper-secondary level)	Directly via CEFR: A1 (primary), A2 (Grade 9), B1 (Grade 11 / college), B2 (non-linguistic BA), C1 (linguistic BA)
National certification	No separate institution; USE performs the function (not formally CEFR-aligned)	National certificate (since 2013); official equivalence scale with IELTS, TOEFL and CEFR (2021)
Institutional operator of language policy	Ministries of Education and of Science (general remit)	Specialised Agency for the Promotion of Foreign Language Learning (since 2021)
Dominant theoretical approach	Communicative-cognitive, sociocultural, secondary linguistic personality	Communicative, relying on CLT/TBLT as framed by international publishers; theoretical reflection largely applied
Role of the mother tongue	Recognised; contrastive principle (Russian–English bilingual setting)	Complex triglossia (Uzbek–Russian–English); L1 support declared in the standard but methodologically underdeveloped
Sociocultural	Highly elaborated: dialogue of cultures	Oriented toward target-language

Parameter	Russian Federation	Republic of Uzbekistan
component	(Safonova), multiculturalism (Sysoev), "culture through language" (Ter-Minasova)	cultures; national content present in coursebooks but not conceptually framed
Teacher education	Five-year double-major BA; strong methodological training; weaker level-based certification of language proficiency	B2/C1 CEFR requirement for teachers; mass retraining programmes; deficit in methodological-theoretical training

The divergence is **structurally complementary**: parameters on which one system is well developed constitute deficit zones in the other.

3.3. Profiles of reciprocal deficits

Table 2. Complementarity of the two systems

Domain	Russian resource	Uzbek resource
Theory	Developed linguodidactic theory; psycholinguistic grounding; concepts of linguistic personality and dialogue of cultures	— (deficit: applied orientation, dependence on imported methods)
Standardisation	— (deficit: indirect link between FSES/USE and CEFR; regional variability)	End-to-end CEFR-based standards and certification
Early learning	Methodology developed (Galskova, Nikitenko) but partially implemented	Institutionally realised from Grade 1; large-scale practical experience
Assessment	Developed theory of control; USE as a high-tech examination	Equivalence scale for national and international certificates; recognition of international exams in educational trajectories
Sociocultural component	Deep elaboration of the "dialogue of cultures"	Experience of English in a multilingual setting; potential for a concept of "English as a lingua franca in Central Asia"
Teacher education	Fundamental methodological training	Scalable language-upgrade programmes; level-based certification requirements

3.4. Linguodidactic model of integration

A three-level model was developed on the basis of the identified complementarity.

Level I — conceptual. Foundation: the shared communicative-activity paradigm. Mechanism: development of an agreed conceptual-terminological apparatus in which Russian concepts ("secondary linguistic personality," "dialogue of cultures," "communicative-cognitive

approach") are mapped onto the CEFR descriptor system and the notion of intercultural communicative competence (Companion Volume, 2020). Outcome: a unified conceptual framework suitable for joint programmes.

Level II — content-technological. Mechanisms: mutual enrichment of content — incorporating the Russian "dialogue of cultures" sociocultural component into Uzbek curricula (with national Uzbek content) and, conversely, drawing on the Uzbek experience of early start and level continuity in Russian practice; aligning the Russian three-stage exercise typology with the task-based approach of international coursebooks used in Uzbekistan; developing an L1-support methodology for triglossic conditions using Russian contrastive-principle expertise.

Level III — instrumental-assessment. Mechanisms: calibrating FSES/USE requirements and the Uzbek State Standard on a single CEFR scale using the Uzbek experience of equivalence tables; joint development of item banks and criterion-referenced rubrics; mutual recognition of national certification results in academic mobility between universities of the two countries.

A **teacher-education component** cuts across all levels: the integrated model envisages a dual-focus programme — methodological-theoretical (Russian resource) and level-certification (Uzbek resource).

3.5. Implementation conditions

Expert-analytical verification yielded four conditions: (1) **contextual adaptation** — no component is transferred without regard to the sociolinguistic situation (status of Russian, triglossia, class size, regional differences); (2) **conceptual compatibility** — integrated elements must derive from the common communicative-activity core; (3) **institutional support** — the presence of integration operators (networked master's programmes, joint departments, teacher associations); (4) **measurability** — outcomes must be expressed in commensurable descriptors.

4. Discussion

The results confirm the hypothesis of complementarity. Their theoretical significance lies in refining the very notion of linguodidactic integration: it is possible only where a shared conceptual core exists, and in this respect post-Soviet systems are uniquely positioned compared with, for example, Uzbekistan–UK or Russia–USA pairings, where borrowing inevitably entails conceptual transformation.

The findings are consistent with Kumaravadivelu's post-method pedagogy, which holds that effective methodology is context-sensitive (particularity), practice-oriented (practicality) and socially meaningful (possibility). The Uzbek experience exposes the risks of rapid adoption of international models without sufficient theoretical adaptation: as Hasanova noted, the expanding functions of English in Uzbekistan are accompanied by a gap between ambitious policy goals and schools' actual resources. The Russian school illustrates the opposite risk — theoretical abundance with insufficient operationalisation of aims in measurable descriptors. Integration thus operates as a mechanism of mutual "correction of extremes."

The **role of Russian** as an integration factor deserves emphasis. In Uzbekistan Russian retains the function of a language of science and inter-ethnic communication, making Russian methodological literature directly accessible to Uzbek teachers without translation. At the same time, Uzbek–Russian–English triglossia creates a specific linguodidactic situation not described in Russian methodology, which is oriented toward a bilingual model.

This calls not for borrowing but for the joint development of a new L1-support methodology that accounts for typological differences between agglutinative Uzbek and English — a task in which Uzbek linguists possess the requisite expertise and Russian methodologists the contrastive toolkit.

Limitations of the model should also be acknowledged. First, the difference in institutional architecture (a specialised agency in Uzbekistan, none in Russia) means that Level III integration will be asymmetric. Second, diverging trajectories of international educational integration (Russia's exit from the Bologna Process; Uzbekistan's orientation toward international rankings and certification) may constrain mutual recognition. Third, the model rests on documents and literature; classroom practice may differ substantially from normative prescriptions, underscoring the need for an empirical stage.

The practical significance of the results lies in their applicability to designing joint master's programmes in linguodidactics at branches of Russian universities in Uzbekistan and at Uzbek universities (including ASMAN University); in-service training for English teachers; bilateral assessment item banks; and guidelines for a sociocultural component with national content.

Further research should include (1) empirical verification of the model through surveys of teachers in both countries; (2) comparative diagnostics of learners' communicative competence at comparable stages using CEFR-calibrated tasks; (3) experimental piloting of an integrated teacher-education module; (4) development of an ELT methodology for triglossic conditions.

5. Conclusion

1. The Russian and Uzbek ELT systems, formed on a common psycholinguistic foundation, have acquired a structurally complementary character over three decades of autonomous development: the strengths of each (theoretical depth in Russia; standardisation and CEFR institutionalisation in Uzbekistan) correspond to the deficits of the other.

2. Linguodidactic integration is defined as the systemic mutual complementation of methodological resources on the basis of a shared conceptual core and the principle of contextual adaptation; it differs fundamentally from one-way borrowing.

3. A three-level integration model (conceptual, content-technological, instrumental-assessment) with a cross-cutting teacher-education component has been developed, together with four conditions for its implementation.

4. A specific research gap has been identified — ELT methodology under triglossic conditions — whose filling requires joint efforts by linguists and methodologists of both countries.

Integrating the methodological experience of Russia and Uzbekistan is not only a pragmatic resource for raising the quality of English teaching but also a path toward an independent Central Asian–Eurasian linguodidactic tradition capable of equal dialogue with global methodological scholarship.

References

1. Bim, I. L. (1988). *Theory and practice of teaching German in secondary school: Problems and prospects*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (In Russian)
2. Vygotsky, L. S. (1999). *Thought and language*. Moscow: Labirint. (In Russian)

3. Galskova, N. D., & Gez, N. I. (2006). *Theory of foreign language teaching: Linguodidactics and methodology*. Moscow: Akademiya. (In Russian)
4. Jalolov, J. J. (2012). *Chet til o'qitish metodikasi* [Foreign language teaching methodology]. Tashkent: O'qituvchi. (In Uzbek)
5. Zimnyaya, I. A. (1991). *Psychology of foreign language teaching at school*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (In Russian)
6. Leontiev, A. A. (1969). *Language, speech, speech activity*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (In Russian)
7. Milrud, R. P. (2005). *Methodology of teaching English*. Moscow: Drofa. (In Russian)
8. Passov, E. I. (1989). *Foundations of the communicative methodology of teaching foreign-language communication*. Moscow: Russkiy Yazyk. (In Russian)
9. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-1875 of 10 December 2012 "On measures to further improve the system of foreign language learning."
10. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 124 of 8 May 2013 "On approval of the State Educational Standard for foreign languages in the system of continuous education."
11. Resolution of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. 352 of 31 December 2013 "On approval of the Regulation on determining the level of foreign language proficiency and issuing certificates."
12. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-5117 of 19 May 2021 "On measures to raise to a qualitatively new level the promotion of foreign language learning in the Republic of Uzbekistan."
13. Order of the Ministry of Education of the Russian Federation No. 287 of 31 May 2021 "On approval of the Federal State Educational Standard of basic general education."
14. Safonova, V. V. (1996). *Learning languages of international communication in the context of the dialogue of cultures and civilisations*. Voronezh: Istoki. (In Russian)
15. Solovova, E. N. (2002). *Methodology of foreign language teaching: A basic lecture course*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie. (In Russian)
16. Sysoev, P. V. (2013). *Information and communication technologies in language education*. Moscow: Librokom. (In Russian)
17. Ter-Minasova, S. G. (2000). *Language and intercultural communication*. Moscow: Slovo. (In Russian)
18. Khaleeva, I. I. (1989). *Foundations of the theory of teaching foreign speech comprehension*. Moscow: Vysshaya Shkola. (In Russian)
19. Hoshimov, O'., & Yoqubov, I. (2003). *Ingliz tili o'qitish metodikasi* [English language teaching methodology]. Tashkent: Sharq. (In Uzbek)
20. Shchukin, A. N. (2006). *Teaching foreign languages: Theory and practice*. Moscow: Filomatis. (In Russian)
21. Canagarajah, A. S. (1999). *Resisting linguistic imperialism in English teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
22. Council of Europe. (2001). *Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, teaching, assessment*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

23. Council of Europe. (2020). *CEFR Companion Volume*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
24. Hasanova, D. (2007). Broadening the boundaries of the Expanding Circle: English in Uzbekistan. *World Englishes*, *26*(3), 276–290.
25. Holliday, A. (1994). *Appropriate methodology and social context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
26. Kumaravadivelu, B. (2003). *Beyond methods: Macrostrategies for language teaching*. New Haven: Yale University Press.