QO‘QON DAVLAT PEDAGOGIKA INSTITUTI ILMIY XABARLARI
(2026-yil 10-son)

PEDAGOGIKA
PEDAGOGY

https://doi.org/10.70728/c.series.ped.v08.i10.215

A REFLECTIVE CORRECTIVE PROCEDURE FOR INDEPENDENT ORAL REVISION WITHIN THE POSM MODEL

Kulmirov Jonibek Ğulomiddin öğli
Independent Researcher at Uzbekistan State World Languages University
kulmirovdzonibek@gmail.com

Annotation. This methodological article develops the reflective corrective component of Problem-Oriented SOLO Mastery (POSM) for university English learners. Its focus is the transition from recognising a difficulty in a recorded response to selecting and testing a purposeful oral revision. Through conceptual analysis of dissertation-based procedures and relevant literature, the article specifies a sequence of selective transcription, diagnosis, prioritisation, rehearsal, rerecording and a subsequent task with a changed condition. The proposed contribution is an evidence record connecting a learner’s revision decision with an identifiable passage of speech. Reasoning quality, linguistic effectiveness and preparation conditions are documented separately. A classroom illustration and a process documentation matrix show how the procedure can be implemented without turning reflection into a lengthy written assignment. The article presents a methodological proposal rather than an experimentally validated intervention. Improved performance on a practised response is distinguished from evidence of transfer to another task.

Keywords: oral revision, reflective practice, selective transcription, self-regulated learning, feedback uptake, learner decisions, POSM.

РЕФЛЕКСИВНО КОРРЕКТИВНАЯ ПРОЦЕДУРА САМОСТОЯТЕЛЬНОЙ ДОРАБОТКИ УСТНОЙ РЕЧИ В МОДЕЛИ POSM

Аннотация. В статье разрабатывается рефлексивно-коррективный компонент модели Problem-Oriented SOLO Mastery (POSM) для студентов, изучающих английский язык. Основное внимание уделяется переходу от обнаружения затруднения в аудиозаписи к выбору и проверке конкретного речевого изменения. На основе концептуального анализа положений диссертации и научной литературы предложена последовательность избирательной расшифровки, диагностики, определения приоритетов, тренировки, повторной записи и выполнения следующего задания с изменённым условием. Методический вклад заключается в документировании связи между решением студента и конкретным фрагментом речи. Качество аргументации, языковое оформление и условия подготовки рассматриваются раздельно. Пример

задания и матрица фиксации процесса показывают возможности практического применения процедуры. Представлена методическая разработка, а не экспериментально подтверждённая эффективность отдельного вмешательства. Улучшение отработанного ответа не приравнивается к переносу умения на другое задание.

Ключевые слова: доработка устной речи, рефлексия, избирательная расшифровка, саморегулируемое обучение, использование обратной связи, решения студента, POSM.

POSM MODELIDA OĞZAKI NUTQNI MUSTAQIL QAYTA ISHLAŞNING REFLEKSIV KORREKTIV TARTIBI

Annotatsiya. Maqolada ingliz tilini örganayotgan universitet talabalari uchun Problem-Oriented SOLO Mastery (POSM) modelining refleksiv-korrektiv komponenti işlab chiqiladi. Asosiy e’tibor nutq yozuvidagi qiyinçilikni aniqlaşdan uni bartaraf etişga qaratilgan özgarişni tanlaş va tekşirişga ötiş jarayoniga qaratiladi. Dissertatsiyadagi metodik qoidalar va ilmiy adabiyotlar konseptual tahlili asosida tanlab transkripsiyalaş, taşxislaş, ustuvor yönalişni belgilaş, maşq qiliş, qayta yoziş va şarti özgartirilgan keyingi topşiriqni bajariş ketma-ketligi taklif etiladi. Metodik hissa talabaning qayta işlaş qarorini nutqning aniq parçasi bilan boğlab qayd etişdan iborat. Fikrlaş sifati, til vositalarining samaradorligi va tayyorgarlik şaroitlari alohida körib çiqiladi. Amaliy misol va jarayonni qayd etiş matritsasi refleksiyani ortiqça yozma vazifaga aylantirmasdan taşkil etiş imkonini körsatadi. Mazkur iş metodik taklif bölib, mexanizmning alohida tajribaviy samaradorligini tasdiqlamaydi. Maşq qilingan javobning yaxşilanişi könikmaning boşqa topşiriqqa köçişi bilan tenglaştirilmaydi.

Kalit sözlar: oğzaki nutqni qayta işlaş, refleksiya, tanlab transkripsiyalaş, özini özi boşqarib örganiş, qayta aloqadan foydalaniş, talaba qarorlari, POSM.

INTRODUCTION

A learner can recognise that an oral explanation is unsuccessful and still be unable to decide what to practise next. General comments such as “develop your answer” identify an expectation but leave the learning action unspecified. For university students preparing independently, this gap makes revision difficult to organise: additional preparation may produce a longer response without resolving the original communication problem.

The author’s earlier article introduced the POSM model and its assessment framework [1]. The present article addresses a different methodological question: how can an observed difficulty become a specific revision decision whose implementation can be examined in a later recording? It develops the reflective corrective mechanism described in the author’s dissertation, particularly the procedures for reviewing speech, identifying manageable priorities and organising independent correction. The contribution concerns the organisation and documentation of revision rather than another presentation of the model’s taxonomy.

The aim is to specify a practical procedure linking evidence from speech with learner decisions, targeted practice and a subsequent performance.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The article uses conceptual analysis and methodological design. Its primary materials are the author’s published POSM article and Sections 1.3, 2.2 and 2.3 of the dissertation manuscript. Passages dealing with self-review, independent preparation and revision were examined in relation to literature on self-regulation, formative assessment, transcription and oral task planning. This is a focused selection of relevant sources, not a systematic review.

The design process involved identifying decisions that learners must make after a speaking task, specifying observable records of those decisions, and distinguishing practice outcomes from broader claims about competence. The resulting procedure, documentation matrix and classroom illustration are proposed applications of these principles. The illustration contains constructed task conditions; it is not an account of an observed lesson or a transcript from a participant.

The dissertation’s group-level diagnostic results are not reanalysed here. Its combined intervention does not isolate the effect of the reflective corrective component. Consequently, the article reports no newly collected sample, statistical significance, effect size or measured improvement attributable to this procedure.

THEORETICAL BASIS

Zimmerman’s account of self-regulated learning provides a basis for treating learners’ goals, monitoring and evaluations as connected processes [2]. For the present procedure, this suggests that reflection should produce a decision about the next attempt. The proposed application is deliberately narrow: a learner identifies a communication difficulty, chooses an action and examines whether that action changed the relevant passage. A completed reflection sheet alone cannot establish independence or oral proficiency.

Nicol and Macfarlane-Dick connect formative assessment with learners’ active involvement in evaluating and regulating their work [3]. Carless and Boud similarly emphasise the capacity to interpret feedback and act on it [4]. These perspectives support requiring a visible response to a comment. The instructional design proposed here links each selected comment to an action and a later piece of speech evidence, allowing implementation to be examined rather than inferred from agreement with the reviewer.

Lynch’s study involved adult learners collaboratively transcribing and editing their own speaking, followed by teacher correction and discussion [5]. It supports the relevance of examining recorded output but does not validate individual POSM self-review. Selective individual transcription in this article is an adaptation: it reduces the amount of writing and concentrates attention on a passage containing the difficulty under review.

Ellis’s review distinguishes rehearsal, pre-task planning and within-task planning, with more consistent benefits reported for fluency than for complexity and accuracy [6]. This distinction matters because rerecording a familiar response changes the preparation conditions. A smoother second recording cannot by itself establish an improvement across all dimensions of speaking or demonstrate transfer to an unfamiliar task.

THE PROPOSED REFLECTIVE CORRECTIVE PROCEDURE

The procedure begins with an initial recording under stated conditions. The task record identifies the audience, decision, source materials, preparation allowance and permitted notes.

Learners retain the original recording so that revision can be examined against actual output. They then select a short passage in which the intended message was unclear or insufficiently supported. The learner transcribes the selected passage and marks the point where the intended meaning becomes unclear. Selection is based on communicative importance.

During diagnosis, the learner distinguishes intention from expression: “What did I want the listener to understand?” and “What does this passage actually make clear?” A reasoning difficulty may involve an unsupported recommendation, an omitted condition or a comparison without a decision criterion. A language difficulty may involve ambiguous reference, inaccurate vocabulary or a grammatical choice that changes the intended meaning. The distinction prevents a language correction from being treated as a solution to a missing argument.

The next decision is prioritisation. For a manageable cycle, the learner chooses one reasoning priority and one language priority when both are relevant. This is a workload convention proposed for the procedure, not a validated optimum. A student should not invent a second priority when the passage contains only one important difficulty. Minor errors that do not obstruct the target meaning can be recorded for later work.

Each priority is translated into an action. “Improve coherence” becomes “state the criterion before comparing the two options”; “improve vocabulary” becomes “replace the ambiguous expression naming the affected group.” The learner identifies the intended change before rehearsing. When the diagnosis is uncertain, a teacher can ask for clarification or supply a bounded example without composing the learner’s complete answer.

Targeted rehearsal is followed by a second recording. The student compares corresponding passages and notes whether the intended relationship or expression is now communicated. The comparison asks whether the selected problem was addressed, remained unresolved or was replaced by another difficulty. It does not require the learner to declare progress in every cycle.

A subsequent task changes a meaningful condition, such as the audience, available budget or stakeholder need. The learner attempts to use the same revision strategy with different content. This provides an opportunity to examine use beyond the exact practised passage. A single successful attempt remains limited evidence; transfer requires observation across suitably varied tasks and documented support conditions.

Table 1 summarises the records needed to make these decisions inspectable:

Table 1

Documentation of independent oral revision

Decision point	Minimum record	Interpretive boundary
Initial performance	Task conditions and original recording.	Performance must be interpreted with the available preparation and support.
Diagnosis	Selected passage and the intended meaning.	A general feeling of difficulty is insufficient to locate the problem.

Decision point	Minimum record	Interpretive boundary
Priority selection	A specific reasoning or language issue and its consequence for meaning.	The number of identified errors is not a measure of proficiency.
Revision action	What the learner will change and what assistance is used.	A teacher-supplied complete answer cannot show independent formulation.
Comparison	Corresponding passages from the two recordings.	Change in one passage is not evidence of comprehensive improvement.
Next task	A changed condition, response and support record.	Success on one additional task does not establish general transfer.

CLASSROOM ILLUSTRATION

An illustrative task asks a university student to recommend how a campus cafeteria could reduce food waste while maintaining affordable meals. The learner receives short information cards describing two options: smaller portions with optional refills and advance meal ordering. The cards provide a shared information base; students must still explain which option better meets the specified needs.

Suppose an initial response names both options and recommends advance ordering but does not explain why it is preferable for students with irregular timetables. The selected reasoning priority is the missing connection between the timetable constraint and the recommendation. The language priority is an ambiguous expression referring to the students affected. These are constructed examples of possible difficulties, not reported participant errors.

The learner’s action is to compare each option against timetable flexibility and identify the affected group explicitly. If the comparison weakens the original recommendation, the student may change the decision itself. Revision therefore includes reconsidering the argument, rather than merely adding polished language to a conclusion that the evidence no longer supports.

After recording the revised recommendation, the learner checks whether the comparison is audible and whether the listener can identify the relevant group. The subsequent task introduces a different constraint: kitchen staff cannot administer advance orders. The student must reconsider the options while using the same strategy of naming a criterion and applying it consistently. Performance under this new condition would be collected for analysis; a successful outcome is not assumed.

DISCUSSION AND IMPLEMENTATION CONDITIONS

The procedure makes independent learning decisions more visible without equating autonomy with the absence of assistance. A learner may choose a dictionary, request clarification or consult a short model. Recording the assistance makes the performance interpretable and helps distinguish learner formulation from externally supplied content. As decisions become more purposeful across tasks, prompts may be reduced; support should not be withdrawn merely because a fixed number of lessons has elapsed.

Documentation must remain proportionate. A brief audio note can replace a written reflection when writing would displace speaking practice. The essential record is the connection between the difficulty, chosen action and later speech. For routine teaching, the learner can retain one selected excerpt and one revision note rather than producing a complete transcript of every performance.

Evaluation should also separate the clarity of the recommendation from linguistic effectiveness. A student may supply a better reason while continuing to hesitate, or produce a more accurate sentence while leaving the argument incomplete. These outcomes require different subsequent actions. Neither should be hidden inside a single global claim that the response “improved”.

For empirical validation, a future study would need a documented comparison condition with similar speaking opportunities and teaching time, consistent recording procedures, clear indicators and appropriately trained assessors. Assessment of a new task should be distinguished from immediate rerecording. Evidence of independent decisions should be examined alongside oral performance rather than substituted for it. The present article specifies what could be studied; it does not supply that validation.

CONCLUSION

The reflective corrective component of POSM can be specified as a sequence connecting recorded speech, selective diagnosis, purposeful practice and examination of a later response. Its methodological contribution is the explicit link between a revision decision and identifiable oral evidence. The procedure also preserves distinctions between reasoning and language, learner decisions and supplied support, and revision of a familiar response and performance on a changed task. These distinctions make independent oral practice easier to organise and its outcomes more transparent to investigate. Whether the procedure produces sustained gains remains an empirical question.

DECLARATION USE OF ARITIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Artificial intelligence tools were used solely for language editing and stylistic refinement in the preparation of this article. The scientific content, analysis, and conclusions are the author’s own.

REFERENCES

1. Kulmirov, J. Ğ. (2026). A proposed model to improve speaking skill through problem-based learning for university students. Pedagogik mahorat, 7(1), 229–232.

2. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. Theory Into Practice, 41(2), 64–70. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15430421tip4102_2

3. Nicol, D. J., & Macfarlane-Dick, D. (2006). Formative assessment and self-regulated learning: A model and seven principles of good feedback practice. Studies in Higher Education, 31(2), 199–218. https://doi.org/10.1080/03075070600572090

4. Carless, D., & Boud, D. (2018). The development of student feedback literacy: Enabling uptake of feedback. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 43(8), 1315–1325. https://doi.org/10.1080/02602938.2018.1463354

5. Lynch, T. (2001). Seeing what they meant: Transcribing as a route to noticing. ELT Journal, 55(2), 124–132. https://doi.org/10.1093/elt/55.2.124

6. Ellis, R. (2009). The differential effects of three types of task planning on the fluency, complexity, and accuracy in L2 oral production. Applied Linguistics, 30(4), 474–509. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amp042