

ADAPTING THE EXPERIENCE OF EDUCATIONAL CENTERS TO GENERAL SECONDARY SCHOOLS IN DEVELOPING STUDENTS’ SPEECH COMPETENCIES: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Khumorakhon Buriyeva Ulmasboy kizi

UzSWLU Independent Researcher

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23686647>

Abstract: *This article presents a comparative analysis of the process of developing the speech competencies of students in general secondary schools and in educational centers. The study identifies the pedagogical features that make educational centers effective in developing oral communication – small groups, an individual approach, a free communication environment, interactive methods and the systematic use of digital technologies – and contrasts them with the conditions of the traditional school lesson. On this basis, the article substantiates the possibilities of adapting the experience of educational centers to general secondary schools according to students’ learning styles (auditory, visual, kinesthetic) at A2–B1 levels of language proficiency, proposes blended learning models suitable for school practice and outlines the role of teachers’ professional training. The results of the pedagogical experiment conducted with 720 students of grades 10–11 confirmed that the approaches used in educational centers increased students’ results by 1.14–1.15 times compared to the traditional approach.*

Keywords: *speech competence, general secondary school, educational centers, comparative analysis, learning styles, auditory, visual, kinesthetic, A2–B1 level, blended learning, teacher training, adaptation of best practices*

Annotatsiya. *Mazkur maqolada umumiy o‘rta ta’lim maktablari va o‘quv markazlarida tahsil olayotgan o‘quvchilarning nutqiy kompetensiyalarini rivojlantirish jarayoni qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda o‘quv markazlarining og‘zaki muloqot ko‘nikmalarini rivojlantirishdagi samaradorligini ta’minlovchi*



pedagogik xususiyatlar — kichik guruhlarda ishlash, individual yondashuv, erkin muloqot muhiti, interaktiv metodlar va raqamli texnologiyalardan tizimli foydalanish aniqlanib, ular an'anaviy maktab darsining shart-sharoitlari bilan taqqoslanadi. Shu asosda A2–B1 til bilish darajalarida o'quvchilarning o'rganish uslublari (audial, vizual va kinestetik)ni hisobga olgan holda o'quv markazlari tajribasini umumiy o'rta ta'lim maktablariga moslashtirish imkoniyatlari asoslab beriladi, maktab amaliyotiga mos aralash ta'lim modellari taklif etiladi hamda o'qituvchilarning kasbiy tayyorgarligi o'rni yoritiladi. 10–11-sinf o'quvchilaridan iborat 720 nafar ishtirokchi bilan o'tkazilgan pedagogik tajriba natijalari o'quv markazlarida qo'llaniladigan yondashuvlar an'anaviy yondashuvga nisbatan o'quvchilar natijalarini 1,14–1,15 baravar oshirganini tasdiqladi.

Kalit so'zlar: *nutqiy kompetensiya, umumiy o'rta ta'lim maktabi, o'quv markazlari, qiyosiy tahlil, o'rganish uslublari, audial, vizual, kinestetik, A2–B1 darajasi, aralash ta'lim, o'qituvchilar tayyorgarligi, ilg'or tajribalarni moslashtirish.*

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the reform of the education system of Uzbekistan has been aimed at improving the quality of teaching, introducing the principles of individualization and developing students' independent thinking and practical skills [1; 2]. In foreign language teaching, special attention is paid to students' ability to communicate freely, to express and justify their opinions and to take part in real-life communicative situations. Nevertheless, in the practice of general secondary schools, reproductive methods still prevail, communicative activities are not organized sufficiently, and the opportunities for developing each student's individual speech activity are limited.

At the same time, a large number of secondary school students attend educational centers, where English is taught in small groups and according to students' proficiency levels. In world educational practice, such institutions



(learning centers, tutoring centers, enrichment programs) are considered an important complement to general secondary education, and research is being carried out to identify their pedagogical potential and to integrate their experience with school education [3; 4]. However, the mechanisms for transferring the effective practices of educational centers to the school system have not yet been studied sufficiently.

The aim of this article is to compare the conditions for developing students' speech competencies in general secondary schools and in educational centers and to substantiate the ways of adapting the best practices of educational centers to school practice.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical basis of the study is the communicative approach, according to which a language is learned most effectively when it is used for real communication [5]. Research on teaching speaking shows that the development of oral fluency requires a large amount of meaningful practice, regular feedback and a gradual transition from controlled to free activities [6; 7]. These conditions are difficult to provide in large classes with limited lesson time, which is one of the main reasons for the gap between students' knowledge of the language and their ability to use it in speech.

Individual differences between learners are another important factor. The concept of learning styles, which distinguishes auditory, visual and kinesthetic learners, has been widely used in language teaching to diversify classroom activities [8]. Although researchers warn against labelling students with a single style, there is broad agreement that combining auditory, visual and physical (movement-based) activities, as in Total Physical Response [12], makes lessons more accessible and engaging for a wider range of students. The CEFR, in its turn, provides level descriptors that help teachers to select tasks corresponding to students' actual abilities [9].

Blended learning models – Flipped Classroom, Rotation, Flex, Self-blended and Enriched Virtual – are described by M. Horn and H. Staker as ways of combining face-to-face teaching with online learning in schools [10]. The flipped classroom model, in which theoretical material is studied at home and class time is devoted to practice, is especially relevant for increasing students’ speaking time [11]. The author’s previous studies have shown the effectiveness of such models and of communication technologies in educational centers [13–15].

METHODS

The study combined theoretical methods (analysis, comparison, modelling), empirical methods (interviews, questionnaires, observation of lessons, classification) and methods of mathematical and statistical analysis. The comparative analysis covered the organization of the learning process, the methods used, the role of the teacher and the conditions for students’ speech activity in general secondary schools and in educational centers.

The pedagogical experiment was conducted in the 2023–2024 and 2024–2025 academic years at Everest educational centers in Tashkent, Namangan and Samarkand. 360 students of grades 10–11 participated in the experimental groups, where teaching was organized on the basis of the approaches typical of educational centers, and 360 students in the control groups, where the traditional approach was used. The experiment included diagnostic and prognostic, organizational and preparatory, practical and generalizing stages.

RESULTS

The comparative analysis made it possible to identify the main differences between the conditions for developing speech competencies in general secondary schools and in educational centers (Table 1).

**Table 1. Conditions for developing students' speech competencies in
general secondary schools and educational centers**

Aspect	General secondary school (traditional approach)	Educational center
Group size and composition	large classes; students with different levels of English in one class	small groups formed according to students' proficiency level
Approach to the student	mainly frontal work with the whole class	individual approach taking into account students' needs and pace
Prevailing methods	reproductive methods: memorizing words and rules, reading and translating texts	interactive and communicative methods: role-play, debate, presentations, problem situations, project work
Speaking time	limited speaking time for each student	a large share of the lesson devoted to pair and group speaking
Communication environment	formal atmosphere; fear of mistakes	free communication environment; supportive feedback
Use of technologies	occasional use of digital tools	systematic use of digital platforms, mobile applications and blended learning
Main strength	solid theoretical knowledge, foundations of grammar and vocabulary	practical communicative skills and fluency

The analysis showed that the two types of institutions complement each other. The traditional approach of the school provides students with solid theoretical knowledge and the foundations of grammar and vocabulary, while educational centers create conditions for using this knowledge in real communication. Therefore, the task is not to replace the school approach but to enrich it with the practices of educational centers that have proved effective.

Since most secondary school students are at A2–B1 levels, the adaptation was planned with these levels in mind. To make lessons accessible to students with different learning preferences, communicative tasks were grouped according to auditory, visual and kinesthetic learning styles (Table 2).

Table 2. Adapting speaking activities to students' learning styles at A2–B1 levels

Learning style	A2 level	B1 level
Auditory	"Listen and repeat"; short audio dialogues followed by question–answer practice; chain stories	short podcasts with discussion; retelling what was heard; pair interviews
Visual	describing pictures; mind maps and word cards (Quizlet); dialogues based on picture stories	describing charts and infographics; presentations with slides; video responses (Flipgrid)
Kinesthetic	role-play of simple situations (greeting, shopping); TPR games; "find someone who..." activities	simulations and role-play with extended dialogues; "walk and talk" discussions; project work with presentation

To increase speaking time without increasing the number of lessons, blended learning models used in educational centers were adapted for school practice (Table 3).

**Table 3. Blended learning models suitable for adaptation in general
secondary schools**

Model	Description	Example topic	Classroom activity	Online / independent activity
Flipped Classroom	theory is studied at home; practice is done in class	Past simple tense	making dialogues, storytelling, working on errors	watching video lessons
Rotation	students move between activities according to a schedule	Daily routines	dialogue and question– answer with the teacher	videos, interactive exercises, written tasks
Flex	most learning is online; the teacher acts as a consultant	My future profession	individual consultations and discussions	reading texts, tests, written work
Self-blended	students use online resources in addition to regular lessons	Improving speaking skills	discussions	listening to podcasts, independent speaking practice
Enriched Virtual	main learning is online; classroom sessions are limited	Travel and tourism	debates and speaking sessions	video lessons, written tasks

The results of the pedagogical experiment confirmed the effectiveness of these approaches. In the experimental groups, where small-group work, a student-centered approach, regular communicative methods and exercises based on real-life situations were used, the results were on average 1.14–1.15 times higher than in the control groups taught according to the traditional approach. Blended learning models gave similar results: Flipped Classroom and Rotation – 1.14 times in the 2023–2024 academic year; Flex, Self-blended and Enriched Virtual – 1.15 times in the 2024–2025 academic year.

DISCUSSION

The results show that the effectiveness of educational centers is explained not by any single method but by a combination of conditions: grouping by level, an individual approach, sufficient speaking time, a supportive atmosphere and the systematic use of technologies. Some of these conditions can be transferred to the school relatively easily. For example, within one class students can be divided into level-based groups for speaking activities; pair and group work can increase each student’s speaking time; and blended learning models allow part of the theoretical material to be moved outside the lesson.

The study also revealed the decisive role of the teacher. Teachers working in network educational centers have high potential in applying the communicative approach, modern methods and technologies. Therefore, exchange of experience between schools and educational centers and professional development courses based on international standards (for example, CELTA – the Cambridge English certificate course for teachers of English) are necessary for successful adaptation. In this sense, educational centers can serve not only as providers of additional education but also as platforms for testing and disseminating pedagogical innovations.

At the same time, the limitations of the study should be noted. The experiment was conducted in educational centers of one network, and further research is needed

to test the adapted approaches directly in general secondary schools and to compare the results of school and center students.

CONCLUSION

General secondary schools and educational centers have different but complementary strengths in developing students' speech competencies: schools provide solid theoretical foundations, while educational centers create conditions for practical communication. The best practices of educational centers – small-group and level-based work, an individual approach, a free communication environment, interactive methods and blended learning – can be adapted to school practice with due regard for students' learning styles at A2–B1 levels. The experiment showed that these approaches increase students' results by 1.14–1.15 times.

It is recommended to develop cooperation between schools and non-governmental educational institutions, to organize the exchange of teaching experience and to improve teachers' qualifications through internationally recognized professional development programmes.

References

1. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-5712 dated April 29, 2019 "On approval of the Concept for the Development of the Public Education System of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030".
2. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PQ-5117 dated May 19, 2021 "On measures to bring the activities of popularizing the learning of foreign languages in the Republic of Uzbekistan to a qualitatively new level".
3. Bray M. Confronting the Shadow Education System: What Government Policies for What Private Tutoring? – Paris: UNESCO International Institute for Educational Planning, 2009.
4. Jarvis P. Adult Education and Lifelong Learning: Theory and Practice. 4th ed. – London: Routledge, 2010.



5. Richards J.C., Rodgers T.S. Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching. 3rd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
6. Thornbury S. How to Teach Speaking. – Harlow: Longman, 2005.
7. Goh C.C.M., Burns A. Teaching Speaking: A Holistic Approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2012.
8. Reid J.M. The learning style preferences of ESL students // TESOL Quarterly. – 1987. – Vol. 21, No. 1. – P. 87–111.
9. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. Companion Volume. – Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020.
10. Horn M.B., Staker H. Blended: Using Disruptive Innovation to Improve Schools. – San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2014.
11. Bergmann J., Sams A. Flip Your Classroom: Reach Every Student in Every Class Every Day. – Eugene, OR: ISTE, 2012.
12. Asher J.J. Learning Another Language Through Actions. – Los Gatos, CA: Sky Oaks Productions, 1977.
13. Buriyeva X.O'. Developing the speaking competencies in language training centers // American Journal of Education and Evaluation Studies. – 2025. – Vol. 2.
14. Buriyeva X.O'. Using blended learning to develop students' speaking skills at level B1 // Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy. – 2026. – Vol. 2, Issue 4. – P. 127–134.
15. Buriyeva X.O'. Communication technologies in developing the speaking competences of secondary school pupils // "Zamonaviy pedagogika va psixologiyada shaxs rivojlanishining dolzarb muammolari: axborot, raqamli texnologiyalar va tarbiya mexanizmlari" ilmiy-amaliy konferensiya materiallari.