



LINGUODIDACTIC FOUNDATIONS AND SCIENTIFIC-METHODOLOGICAL REQUIREMENTS FOR TEACHING ENGLISH IN A MULTILINGUAL EDUCATIONAL ENVIRONMENT

Kazbekova Eleonora Parakhatovna

Doctoral Student (PhD), Ajiniyaz Nukus State Pedagogical Institute,
Nukus City, Republic of Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan

E-mail: kazbekovaeleonora@gmail.com

A B S T R A C T	K E Y W O R D S
<p>The article defines the linguodidactic foundations of teaching English to students studying related Turkic languages (Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkmen) and turns them into six groups of scientific and methodological requirements. The effectiveness of the requirements was proven in an experiment involving 209 sixth-grade students.</p>	<p>Multilingual school, related languages, Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, Turkmen, English as a third language, interlingual influence, pedagogical translanguism, interactive technologies.</p>

INTRODUCTION

In Karakalpakstan, a sixth-grade student studying in the Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, or Turkmen languages typically encounters English as a third or even fourth language in their life. Our observations of the lessons show that teachers still see this as a problem to be neutralized, rather than a resource. The article defends the opposite position. Based on modern research on pedagogical translanguism and the linguistic proximity model in third-language acquisition, we describe four linguodidactic foundations for teaching English in schools with related Turkic languages of instruction and formulate six groups of scientific and methodological requirements based on them. The comparative table shows where the four native languages help students and where they are predictably confused. The requirements were tested during experimental training over one quarter, involving 209 6th-grade students from four schools in Nukus, Khojeyli, and Takhiatash. Students who studied using interactive and digital materials built on these requirements showed higher results.

Since 2021, the teaching of English in Uzbekistan has been under the close attention of the state. Resolution No. PP-5117 set the task of bringing foreign language learning to a "qualitatively new level" [1], the Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022-2026 linked language proficiency with the competitiveness of youth [2], and the "Uzbekistan - 2030" Strategy included school education quality among the key goals [3]. However, these documents speak of the country as a whole and hardly concern the regions where the school itself is multilingual.

Karakalpakstan is exactly such a region. In one district, a teacher can work in a school where parallel classes are taught in the Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, or Turkmen languages. The Russian language

is present in everyday life and in the media space. Therefore, English comes last—after the mother tongue, the language of the neighboring community, and Russian. Observing the English language lessons in these schools, we have seen the same picture over and over again: the textbook is the same for all grades, the methodology is the same for all grades, and the students' languages are left behind. The teacher explains the rule: the student in the Kazakh class and the student in the Turkmen class make the same mistake for the same reason, and no one uses the fact that their languages are closely related.

International research is developing in a different direction. In the 2025 UNESCO Guidelines, multilingualism is considered a natural human trait and the foundation of educational policy, rather than a disadvantage [4]. J. Chenoz and D. Gorter developed the concept of pedagogical translanguism - pre-planned types of work that purposefully activate the student's entire linguistic repertoire [5; 6], and showed that such work, for example with related words, develops metalinguistic awareness [7]. Li Wei considers translanguism as a position in teaching English in multilingual societies [8], and M. Prilutskaya's systematic review summarizes data on its application in the lesson [9]. In the field of mastering a third language, M. Vestergaard's model of linguistic proximity is based on the fact that transfer occurs "according to individual properties" from the known language that is structurally closer in this property [10]. The closest to our context is M. Klyshbekova's work, which describes how a Kazakhstani English teacher transitioned from "only English" lessons to the planned use of Kazakh and Russian languages and noted an increase in student engagement [11].

However, these studies do not cover the situation where four related Turkic languages functioning side-by-side in the same school system are native to the students. This gap determines our research. It is part of the dissertation work dedicated to improving the methodology of teaching English based on interactive technologies in schools with related languages of instruction, and was carried out within the framework of the research plan of the Nukus State Pedagogical Institute "Effective Methods of Teaching English in Karakalpak Classrooms."

The purpose of the article is to substantiate the linguodidactic foundations of English language teaching in such schools, formulate scientific and methodological requirements based on them, and test them experimentally.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The theoretical basis of the work was an analysis of state documents in the field of language education, as well as research on multilingual education, translanguism, and third language acquisition published primarily between 2021 and 2025. In the linguistic part, we compared the phonetic, grammatical, and lexical systems of the English language with the systems of the Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, and Turkmen languages and collected typical errors from written works and oral responses from students. The experiment was conducted during one academic quarter in four schools - one for each language of instruction. In each school, one sixth grade was experimental, and a parallel one was control (Table 1).

Table 1. Experiment participants (6th grade)

School	Language of education	Control group	Experimental group
№ 37 Nukus	karakalpak	30	31
№ 27 Nukus	kazakh	19	19
№ 3 Xodjeli district	uzbek	45	45
№ 20 Taxiyyatas district	turkmen	10	10
Overall		104	105

The control classes studied the standard textbook using traditional methods. In the experimental classes, the same program topics were studied in accordance with the requirements described below. Teachers utilized the scientific and methodological manual "English with Digital Steps" prepared by the author for the 6th grade of schools with Uzbek, Karakalpak, Kazakh, and Turkmen languages of instruction [13], as well as the Lang Bridge web platform developed within the framework of the dissertation. The platform contains interactive A1–A2 level exercises for grades 5-7 with brief explanations in all four native languages.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. What makes the environment "multilingual." Under a multilingual educational environment, we understand a school environment in which at least three languages participate in instruction: the student's native language, which is simultaneously the language of instruction, the language of broader communication (here – Russian, and for non-Uzbek classes, also Uzbek as the state language), and the foreign language being studied. This aligns with UNESCO's understanding of multilingual education as the use of one's native language, a regional or national language, and an international language [4]. For the methodology, it is not the number of languages that is important, but that they are already present in the student's mind by the start of the English lesson. This is where pedagogical translanguaging begins: the teacher plans when and how to "enable" these languages instead of pretending they don't exist [5; 6].

2. Linguodidactic foundations. From the analysis conducted, we derive four foundations.

Basis 1 – the entire language repertoire is a learning resource. A sixth-grade student from Takhiyatas or Nukus already knows how a language is studied in school, can name cases and tenses in their native language, and often reads on two graphs. This experience should be used openly: comparing the rule with its analogue in the native language, guessing the meaning through familiar words, and explaining the task in the native language if it saves time. J. Chenoz, O. Leonet, and D. Gorter have shown that purposeful work with related words of this type strengthens students' metalinguistic awareness [7].

Basis 2 - the kinship of native languages makes mistakes predictable. The Karakalpak and Kazakh languages belong to the Qipchaq group, the Uzbek language to the Karluk group, and the Turkmen language to the Oghuz group, but they all share common typological features: agglutinative structure, word order SOV, postpositions, and the absence of grammatical gender and articles. According to the model of linguistic proximity, a student transfers each property from the language they know, which is closer to English in this specific property [10]. For our students, this means that in most grammatical phenomena, the four native languages will "push" them in the same direction, while Russian with SVO word order and prepositions can become a useful source of transfer in the field of word order.

Consequently, one comparative description can serve all four groups with minor national additions (Table 2).

Table 2. Where related native languages help and where they mislead

Level	The common feature of four languages	Typical mistakes of schoolchildren	Teacher's actions
Phonetics	There are no /θ/, /ð/ sounds in Karakalpak, Kazakh, and Uzbek	sink instead of think; full pronunciation of all vowels	Minimal pairs, audio, and video samples on the platform; students in Turkmen classes whose language contains interdental sounds show them to others
Named group	There are no articles; there is no plural after numerals (үш kitap); possession is expressed by an affix	I have book; three book	A brief comparative rule in your native language, followed by dragging and filling exercises
Offer	Verb at the end; no present tense conjunction; postpositions	I English like; She teacher	Compose sentences from cards, online word order games
Verb and Pronoun	One ol pronoun for he/she/it; possessiveness with a bar; no Present Perfect	My sister – he...; Past Simple вместо Present Perfect	Timelines, picture stories, matching with native language
Lexis	Common Turkic vocabulary of four languages; many internationalisms through the Russian language	"False Friends" (magazine as "store")	Four-language thematic dictionary, tasks for searching for related words

Principle 3 - priority of communication. Comparing grammar is a means, not an end. The goal remains A1–A2 level communicative competence, which is formed through pair and group work, role-playing games, and small projects.

Basis 4 - cultures are not only represented but also compared. Topics such as food, holidays, or family are most productive when students speak in English about their Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, or Turkmen traditions and compare them with British or American ones. The classroom itself becomes a small model of cultural dialogue.

3. Scientific and methodological requirements. Based on the identified foundations, six groups of requirements were formulated, which teachers followed during the experimental lessons:

1) Content. It corresponds to the state program, but is supplemented with tasks aimed at interference zones from Table 2 and texts about the students' homeland.

2) Principles. Communicativeness, reliance on the mother tongue, conscious comparison, interculturalism, differentiation by language groups, and interactivity.

3) Using languages in the lesson. The native language is used consciously and briefly - to check the understanding of the rule, introduce abstract vocabulary, or organize group work - while English dominates the training and practice stages. M. Klyshbekova's experience in Kazakhstan shows that such planned use increases students' activity without reducing the volume of English speech [11].

4) Teacher. The teacher knows the main differences between English and students' languages and is able to prepare one assignment in several language variants.

5) Teaching tools. Printed materials are supplemented by digital ones: interactive exercises, games, and audio materials on the platform with instructions in four native languages. Meta-analysis data indicate that learning using digital games generally improves English language learning outcomes [12].

6) Evaluation. Formative assessment, regular checking of typical interference errors, and student self-assessment are combined with the usual quarterly control work.

CONCLUSION

Schools in Karakalpakstan with Karakalpak, Kazakh, Uzbek, and Turkmen languages of instruction do not need four separate methods for teaching English. Since the native languages of students are related, students face the same difficulties and can rely on the same support. From this, four linguodidactic foundations emerge: the student's entire linguistic repertoire is considered a resource, errors are predicted based on the common Turkic structure, communication remains the goal, and cultures are compared rather than simply presented.

Six groups of requirements - for content, principles, language use in the lesson, the teacher, teaching aids, and assessment - transform these foundations into concrete solutions for the lesson. Sixth-grade students in all four language groups who studied on this basis using interactive and digital materials achieved a higher level than their peers in the control classes.

Prospective areas for further work include expanding the materials of the Lang Bridge platform to 5th and 7th grades and incorporating comparative knowledge about students' languages into the training and professional development of regional English language teachers.

REFERENCES

1. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PP-5117 dated May 19, 2021, "On measures to bring activities to popularize the study of foreign languages in the Republic of Uzbekistan to a qualitatively new level." No - URL: <https://lex.uz>
2. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan "On the Development Strategy of New Uzbekistan for 2022–2026." No - URL: <https://lex.uz>
3. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. UP-158 dated September 11, 2023, "On the 'Uzbekistan-2030' Strategy." No - URL: <https://lex.uz/docs/6600413>
4. UNESCO. Languages matter: Global guidance on multilingual education. - Paris: UNESCO, 2025. - DOI: 10.54675/MLIO7101
5. Cenoz J., Gorter D. Pedagogical Translanguaging. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. – (Elements in Language Teaching).
6. Cenoz J., Gorter D. Pedagogical translanguaging and its application to language classes // RELC Journal. – 2022. - Vol. 53, No. 2. – P. 342–354. - DOI: 10.1177/00336882221082751
7. Cenoz J., Leonet O., Gorter D. Developing cognate awareness through pedagogical translanguaging // International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism. – 2022. - Vol. 25, No. 8. - P. 2759–2773. – DOI: 10.1080/13670050.2021.1961675
8. Li Wei. Translanguaging as a political stance: Implications for English language education // ELT Journal. – 2022. - Vol. 76, No. 2. – P. 172–182.
9. Prilutskaya M. Examining pedagogical translanguaging: A systematic review of the literature // Languages. - 2021. - Vol. 6, No. 4. - Art. 180.

10. Westergaard M. Microvariation in multilingual situations: The importance of property-by-property acquisition // *Second Language Research*. - 2021. - Vol. 37, No. 3. - P. 379-407. – DOI: 10.1177/0267658319884116
11. Klyshbekova M. A Kazakhstani English language teacher's perspective on multilingual practices // *ELT Journal*. – 2025. - Vol. 79, No. 1. – P. 123–.
12. Nitisakunwut P., Hwang G.-J. Effects and core design parameters of digital game-based language learning in the mobile era: A meta-analysis and systematic review // *International Journal of Mobile Learning and Organisation*. – 2023. – Vol. 17, No. 4. – P. 470–498. – DOI: 10.1504/IJMLO.2023.133752
13. Kazbekova E.P. English with Digital Steps: methodology for teaching English to 6th-grade students of schools with Uzbek, Karakalpak, Kazakh, and Turkmen languages of instruction: a scientific and methodological manual. – Nukus, 2026.