DIDACTIC MODEL FOR DEVELOPING DISCURSIVE COMPETENCE OF SENIOR SECONDARY STUDENTS THROUGH AN INDIVIDUALIZED APPROACH

Rustamova Dilobar Abdimalik qizi
6-DIUO‘T maktab ingliz tili fani o’qituvchisi
rustamovadilobar10@gmail.com
Tel+998935610555

Annotatsiya. Mazkur maqolada individual yondashuv asosida yuqori sinf o‘quvchilarida diskursiv kompetensiyani rivojlantirishning didaktik modeli ilmiy jihatdan tahlil etilgan. Modelning nazariy-metodologik asoslari, uni bosqichma-bosqich amalga oshirish mexanizmlari hamda ta’lim jarayonida qo‘llash imkoniyatlari ochib berilgan. Shuningdek, o‘quvchilarning kommunikativ faoliyatida muloqot madaniyati, diskursni tushunish va uni samarali tashkil etish qobiliyatlarini shakllantirish masalalari yoritilgan. Tadqiqotda ilg‘or xorijiy tajribalar, o‘zbek pedagogikasida mavjud metodik yondashuvlar va zamonaviy pedagogik texnologiyalardan foydalanish orqali diskursiv kompetensiyani rivojlantirishning didaktik asoslari ishlab chiqilgan. Natijada yuqori sinf o‘quvchilarining shaxsiy ehtiyojlari va qobiliyatlarini hisobga olgan holda individual yondashuv asosida samarali ta’limni tashkil etishning ilmiy va amaliy ahamiyati asoslab berilgan.

Kalit so‘zlar: diskursiv kompetensiya, individual yondashuv, yuqori sinf o‘quvchilari, didaktik model, kommunikativ metodika, ta’lim texnologiyalari, lingvodidaktika, muloqot madaniyati.

Аннотация. В данной статье представлен комплексный анализ дидактической модели развития дискурсивной компетенции у старшеклассников на основе индивидуального подхода. Рассматриваются теоретико-методологические основы модели, механизмы её поэтапной реализации и возможности применения в учебном процессе. Особое внимание уделяется формированию у учащихся культуры общения, способности к пониманию и организации дискурса в реальных жизненных ситуациях. В исследовании обобщены современные международные практики, подходы узбекской педагогики и инновационные образовательные технологии, что позволило выработать дидактическую основу для эффективного развития дискурсивной компетенции. В результате обоснована научная и практическая значимость организации обучения, ориентированного на личностные особенности и способности старшеклассников.

ISSN 3030-3907

Ключевые слова: дискурсивная компетенция, индивидуальный подход, старшеклассники, дидактическая модель, коммуникативная методика, образовательные технологии, лингводидактика, культура общения.

Abstract. This article provides a comprehensive analysis of the didactic model for developing discursive competence among high school students based on an individual approach. The theoretical and methodological foundations of the model, its step-by-step implementation mechanisms, and its applicability in the teaching process are explored. Particular attention is given to fostering students' communication culture, their ability to understand discourse, and to organize it effectively in real-life contexts. The study synthesizes advanced international practices, existing approaches in Uzbek pedagogy, and modern educational technologies to design a didactic framework for enhancing discursive competence. As a result, the article substantiates the scientific and practical significance of organizing effective education tailored to high school students' personal needs and abilities through an individualized approach.

Keywords: discursive competence, individual approach, high school students, didactic model, communicative methodology, educational technologies, linguodidactics, communication culture.

Introduction

In recent years, the concept of discursive competence has become one of the most crucial components of foreign language education, particularly at the secondary school level. Globalization, digitalization, and the growing role of intercultural communication demand that students not only acquire linguistic knowledge but also develop discursive skills that allow them to construct coherent, logical, and contextually appropriate communication. In Uzbekistan, the introduction of the State Educational Standards (DTS) in 2013 and its alignment with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR) has created a new pedagogical landscape in which discursive competence is recognized as a fundamental learning outcome for higher-grade students.

ANALYSIS OF LITERATURE ON THE TOPIC

Within this framework, individualized approaches have gained prominence as an effective didactic strategy. Individualized learning emphasizes the needs, abilities, and personal interests of each student, thereby fostering deeper engagement in communication-oriented tasks. This paper proposes a didactic model designed to enhance discursive competence among higher-grade students through individualized learning, grounded in contemporary pedagogical theories and empirical studies. The concept of discursive competence has been widely discussed in international scholarship. According to Canale and Swain [3],

ISSN 3030-3907

communicative competence includes grammatical, sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic components, of which discourse competence is essential for achieving coherence and cohesion in communication. H.G. Widdowson [5] emphasizes the need for learners to move beyond sentence-level skills towards mastering extended discourse structures. In the Uzbek educational context, recent reforms have emphasized communicative and discursive approaches in alignment with international standards. The individualized approach, rooted in Vygotsky's [15] sociocultural theory and Bruner's [1] constructivist pedagogy, suggests that learning is most effective when instruction is aligned with the learner's zone of proximal development and cognitive profile. Thus, integrating individualized instruction with discourse-focused pedagogy provides a powerful framework for enhancing the quality of language education at the senior secondary level.

Research Method

The proposed didactic model for developing discursive competence in senior secondary students (Grades 9–11) through an individualized approach comprises **five interrelated components**. Each component includes operational definitions, implementation steps, instruments, and evidence indicators to ensure replicability and evaluability.

1. Goal-Oriented Component

Discursive competence is the learner's ability to plan, produce, comprehend, and critically evaluate extended oral/written texts that display coherence, cohesion, genre/rhetorical control, register appropriateness, and strategic interaction (turn-taking, hedging, repair).

SMART Learning Outcomes by Grade (End-of-Year)

The presented table conceptualizes a three-tiered progression of discursive competence development across Grades 9–11 within the framework of SMART learning outcomes. The structure reflects a cumulative and scaffolded model in which linguistic performance, discourse strategies, and communicative functions are gradually expanded in both written and oral modes.[13]

Grade	Writing Outcomes	Speaking Outcomes
Grade 9 (B1+)	Produce a 250–300-word explanatory or problem–solution text using at least 10 cohesive devices (e.g., however, therefore, in contrast) with ≤7% sentence-level errors and a clear paragraph structure (intro–body–conclusion).	Deliver a 3–4 min mini-talk on a curricular topic, using signposting language (e.g., *firstly, moving on to…*) and responding to 2 audience questions with clarification strategies.

ISSN 3030-3907

Grade 10 (B2-)	Compose a 350–450-word argumentative essay with two claims and one counter-argument; integrate one source (paraphrase/short quote) and apply hedging (*might, tends to*).	Participate in a 6–7 min paired discussion (e.g., fishbowl) demonstrating turn-taking, justification, and soft disagreement.
Grade 11 (B2 / optional C1-band)	Produce a 450–600-word evaluative report or op-ed synthesizing two sources (at least one audio/visual) with accurate citation and topic-appropriate register.	Engage in a structured debate (8–10 min) with claim–evidence–warrant moves, refutation, and closing statement; manage follow-up questions.

At the Grade 9 (B1+) level, learning outcomes are oriented toward establishing the foundations of discourse construction. Written production emphasizes coherence, cohesion, and control of sentence-level accuracy, whereas oral tasks promote monologic delivery skills through structured short talks and audience interaction.

At the Grade 10 (B2-) level, the focus shifts toward argumentative competence and the integration of source-based evidence. Writing outcomes require the articulation of multiple claims, counter-arguments, and hedging devices, while speaking outcomes target dialogic interaction, turn-taking, and the ability to sustain collaborative discussions.

At the Grade 11 (B2 with C1 extension), students are expected to demonstrate advanced discursive operations such as synthesis of multimodal sources, register adaptation, and structured debate. Writing tasks involve evaluative and critical genres, whereas speaking emphasizes sustained argumentation, refutation, and strategic question management. This gradual progression from B1+ to B2–C1 aligns with CEFR descriptors and provides a didactic trajectory ensuring that senior secondary students develop the cognitive, rhetorical, and communicative capacities required for academic, professional, and intercultural discourse.[12]

2. Content Component

A central dimension of the didactic model for developing discursive competence lies in the systematic design of communicative tasks and careful selection of authentic materials. To ensure alignment with both curricular goals and learners' developmental needs, the instructional process integrates a genre–task bank and a set of criteria for authentic material selection.[11] The genre–task bank

ISSN 3030-3907

provides students with structured opportunities to engage in diverse written, oral, and interactional discourses, thereby broadening their rhetorical repertoire and enhancing transferability of skills across contexts. Complementarily, authentic materials are selected not only for their linguistic level but also for their cognitive, socio-cultural, and discourse value, ensuring that students encounter texts and audio-visual inputs that mirror real-world communicative practices.

Component	Sub-categories	Examples / Criteria
Genre and Task Bank	**Written genres** **Oral genres** **Interactional genres**	Explanation, Problem–solution, Argument, Comparative review, Policy memo/brief, Reflective commentary Mini-lecture, Panel discussion, Debate, Interview, Research pitch, Podcast segment Socratic seminar, Jigsaw synthesis, Round-table
Authentic Materials (Selection Criteria)	Relevance Leveling (CEFR B1–C1) Discourse value Length benchmarks	Science & technology, Health, Society, Environmental issues, Media literacy Reading: 600–900 words (B1+), 900–1200 (B2); Listening: 3–6 min (B1+), 6–9 min (B2) Argument map, Discourse cloze, Paragraph re-ordering, Stance/hedge spotting
Cross-Curricular Infusion	**Integration across subjects**	Core (grade-level), Support (simplified with glosses), Extension (longer/denser)

3. Process Component

ISSN 3030-3907

The process component operates as a cyclical system with four stages—Diagnostic, Instructional, Interactive, and Reflective—implemented at both unit (3–4 weeks) and lesson (45–90 min) scales. The following table summarizes the structure, tools, and outputs for each stage. Following table they can be seen clearly.

Stage	Key Activities & Tools	Outputs & Outcomes
Diagnostic Stage (Week 1 of term & start of units)	- Writing baseline (25-min prompt scored with analytic rubric) - Oral baseline (2-min impromptu talk + Q&A, recorded) - Receptive diagnostics (reading/listening with discourse items) - Learner profile (survey, feedback preferences, confidence rating)	- Individual learning contract (2 goals + evidence + timeline) - Grouping plan (flexible tiers A/B/C)
Instructional Stage (Explicit teaching + guided practice)	- Micro-lessons (10–15 min) on: - Rhetorical organization (Toulmin, problem–cause–solution) - Cohesion devices (reference, conjunction, lexical chains) - Register/stance (hedging, boosters, reporting verbs) - Genre-specific openings/closings - Differentiation: - Must/Should/Could task layers	- Genre awareness via checklists & exemplars - Independent production with scaffolds
Interactive Stage (Production + co-construction)	- Debate protocol (Proposition → Constructive → Rebuttal → Cross-exam → Closing) - Socratic seminar (clarify → probe assumptions → implication) - Jigsaw (expert groups synthesize & re-teach) - Scaffolds: sentence stems, roles (moderator, evidence-keeper,	- Enhanced argumentation skills - Co-constructed knowledge - Evidence-based discussions

ISSN 3030-3907

	summarizer), note-taking grid (claim–data–warrant)	
Reflective Stage (Metacognition + consolidation)	- Learner journals (weekly reflection on rhetorical moves/devices) - Peer feedback rounds (two-stars-and-a-wish + rubric rows) - Portfolio curation (two drafts + final per unit with reflection) - 1:1 conferences (5–7 min per learner per unit)	- Improved self-regulation & metacognition - Consolidation of discursive competence - Documented progress portfolio

Practical Implementation

The model was piloted within senior classes (Grades 9–11) in selected schools, where differentiated instructional strategies were applied. For example, high-achieving students were assigned tasks requiring the synthesis of complex texts and critical debates, whereas students with lower proficiency levels were engaged in scaffolded tasks focusing on building coherence and basic discourse markers. The combination of collaborative group work, individual projects, and ICT-based activities ensured that each learner could develop discursive competence at their own pace.

Conclusion

The analysis shows that developing discursive competence in higher-grade students is both a linguistic and pedagogical necessity. The didactic model proposed in this research builds upon international and local theoretical foundations while addressing the specific needs of the Uzbek education system. It emphasizes:

1. Integration of CEFR-based competencies with individualized learning strategies.
2. Development of discourse skills through authentic, communicative, and context-based tasks.
3. Use of modern pedagogical technologies (digital tools, collaborative platforms, formative assessment).
4. Differentiation of instruction to cater to diverse learners' needs.

Thus, individualized approaches represent not only a methodological choice but also a didactic requirement for ensuring that students in higher grades can engage in meaningful discourse in academic, social, and professional contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Bruner, J. (1975). The ontogenesis of speech acts. Journal of Child Language,p. 9–15 → Explanation of scaffolding in discourse development (proto-conversations → full dialogue).

ISSN 3030-3907

2. Brown, H. D. (2015). *Teaching by principles: An interactive approach to language pedagogy*. Pearson Education.
3. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Applied Linguistics, 1*(1), 1–47.
4. Gal'perin, I. R. (2010). *Discourse and its functions in communication*. Moscow: Nauka.
5. Widdowson, H. G. (2003). Defining issues in English language teaching. Oxford: OUP.p. 35–40: The balance between linguistic form and communicative function in discourse.
6. Hymes, D. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics* (pp. 269–293). Penguin.
7. Makhkamova, D. (2019). Competence-based approach in teaching foreign languages in Uzbekistan. *Journal of Linguistic Education, 12*(2), 45–53.
8. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
9. Rakhimov, A. (2021). Individualized learning in foreign language teaching in Uzbekistan. *Uzbek Journal of Pedagogical Innovation, 7*(3), 98–105.
10. Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as structure and process*. Sage Publications.
11. Verbitskaya, L. (2016). Pragmatic aspects of discursive competence in foreign language education. *Russian Journal of Applied Linguistics, 2*(1), 112–125.
12. Yuldasheva, M. (2022). Developing discursive competence of high school learners through communicative tasks. *Uzbekistan Journal of Language and Education Studies, 4*(5), 55–63.
13. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Companion volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe. p. 65–70: Writing descriptors (B1–C1) with focus on coherence, cohesion, and argumentation.
14. Nation, I. S. P. (2009). Teaching ESL/EFL reading and writing. New York: Routledge. p. 27–32: Text simplification and leveling for scaffolding comprehension.
15. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press. p. 79–91: Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD) and scaffolding in language learning.

ISSN 3030-3907