© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

A LINGUOCULTURAL APPROACH TO PEDAGOGICAL RENEWAL IN THE CONTEMPORARY EDUCATION SYSTEM

Mamura Norpulatovna Narziyeva
Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology, Associate Professor.
Samarkand State University, Uzbekistan, Samarkand
E-mail:mamuranarziyeva164@gmail.com
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22687253

Abstract. This article examines the theoretical and methodological foundations of a linguocultural approach to pedagogical renewal in contemporary education. The study aims to develop a model linking the interpretation of cultural meanings in language to learning activities and assessment criteria. Its methods include a targeted literature review, conceptual comparison, contextual analysis, and pedagogical modelling. Selected publications on language, culture, multilingual education, and intercultural competence provide the documentary basis. Three author-designed learning scenarios illustrate how the model operates; they are not presented as evidence collected in actual classrooms. The proposed sequence involves establishing the context, examining linguistic form, interpreting cultural meaning, comparing alternatives, completing a communicative task, and reflecting on the outcome. The study offers principles for selecting materials, sample activities, and four criteria for assessing learner-produced work. It also distinguishes context-supported cultural interpretation from stereotypical generalisation. The model may inform language and teacher education at university level and continuing professional development. Its effectiveness remains to be tested through a separate empirical study.

Keywords: linguocultural studies, pedagogical renewal, language education, cultural meaning, linguistic personality, intercultural competence, multilingualism, contextual analysis, cultural mediation, learning task, criterion-based assessment, reflection.

1 Research problem and rationale.

Pedagogical renewal in language education requires reconsidering what learners should be able to do through language. Knowledge of grammatical forms and dictionary meanings alone does not explain why a statement with the same propositional content may convey respect in one situation but create distance or misunderstanding in another. Curriculum design therefore needs to connect language norms with the communicative context, participants' cultural experience, and the purpose of interaction. This article examines that connection primarily in university programmes for philology students and prospective teachers.

A problem arises when cultural material enters the curriculum as information about celebrations, traditions, and prominent figures without providing a basis for communicative action. A student may reproduce a description of a custom yet struggle to explain it to someone with different experience. Similarly, familiarity with politeness formulas does not ensure an appropriate choice of address, request, or disagreement. Addressing this gap requires specifying how cultural content becomes a task and how task performance becomes an observable indicator of learning.

International discussion of multilingual education supports this research focus. UNESCO's Languages matter guidance treats linguistic diversity as a resource for more accessible and inclusive learning [6]. Of particular relevance here is the possibility of discussing cultural meanings through languages that learners understand. The model proposed below concerns the design of classroom interaction; it does not replace an investigation of language policy in a particular country.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

Pedagogical renewal is understood here as a coordinated change in objectives, content, learning activities, and assessment. If only the mode of presentation changes, as when a printed text is replaced by an electronic presentation, the organisation of learning may remain unchanged. A linguocultural approach becomes methodologically significant when students explain utterances through linguistic evidence, compare interpretations, and select a form of communication for a particular addressee.

The study aims to develop a theoretically grounded model for incorporating linguocultural analysis into the pedagogical renewal of language education. Its objectives are to clarify the approach, compare selected research, establish criteria for selecting learning material, illustrate a sequence of activities through author-designed examples, and propose assessment criteria and conditions for subsequent piloting. The research question is: how can the analysis of cultural meaning in a linguistic expression be translated into an assessable learning activity?

2 Previous research and unresolved issues.

V.Maslova describes linguocultural studies as an investigation of cultural manifestations embedded in language and links the field's emergence to research on the relationship between language and culture [1, p. 28]. For teaching methodology, this identifies the object of analysis: cultural content must be located in linguistic material. The pedagogical implication adopted here is that students should explain which words, forms, or textual connections support a particular interpretation.

K.Risager's timeline traces research on cultural content in learning materials from the 1960s onwards [5]. In our model, material analysis is specified by examining the activities offered: recognising a cultural referent, explaining meaning, comparing positions, and making an independent communicative choice.

The 2020 CEFR Companion volume provides a practical basis for describing learning outcomes. It includes descriptors for drawing on a pluricultural repertoire that focus on participants' actions [3, pp. 124–125]. This supports a distinction central to the proposed model: knowledge of a cultural fact and the ability to take it into account in communication require different assessment tasks. The criteria introduced below were developed for this article and do not reproduce an official CEFR scale.

The 2024 review by R.Zhou, A.Samad, and T.Perinpasingam addresses intercultural communicative competence in English language teaching, particularly in the Chinese educational context. It examines teachers' understanding of this competence, assessment methods, and conditions for its integration into teaching [7]. Its relevance here lies in the problem of aligning pedagogical orientations with classroom procedures. Its conclusions are not treated as a direct description of universities in Uzbekistan or Kyrgyzstan.

N.S.Alharbi's 2024 study draws on semi-structured interviews with thirty English language instructors at Saudi Arabian universities. Participants' positive attitudes towards integrating twenty-first-century skills coexisted with reported academic and institutional obstacles [2]. Although this study does not demonstrate the effectiveness of a linguocultural model, it highlights the need to consider teachers' working conditions. The present proposal therefore takes a bounded learning module with a predefined output as its unit of implementation.

The 2026 systematic review by M. Naranjo-Toro and colleagues compares digital approaches to intercultural competence in higher education. The authors associate more consistent positive outcomes with structured contact, facilitation, feedback, collaboration, and reflection, while noting the predominance of self-reports over direct performance evidence [4]. This supports including analysis of completed tasks in the assessment design. The use of a digital environment alone is not taken as evidence that an educational objective has been achieved.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

Comparison of these publications identifies the working problem of this study: within the selected material, the transition from an individual culturally marked linguistic expression to a task, learner output, and assessment criterion for prospective teachers remains insufficiently specified. This is a limited conclusion about a targeted selection of sources, not a claim that comparable solutions are absent from the literature as a whole. The proposed contribution brings these elements together and demonstrates their relationship through three constructed scenarios

3 Theoretical foundations and research methodology.

A linguocultural approach to teaching is defined here as work with linguistic material in which learners identify culturally significant meaning, support it through context, and consider it when producing their own utterances. This working definition includes an object, an analytical procedure, and a learning outcome. Its necessary reliance on linguistic form distinguishes it from general cultural familiarisation; its connection with intercultural learning lies in explaining meaning to an addressee whose experience may differ from that of the text's author.

The unit of analysis is a linguistic expression in a minimally sufficient context. An isolated word does not always reveal evaluation, communicative function, or the speaker's position. Context includes participants, their relationship, the message's purpose, genre, and preceding utterances. Cultural meaning is understood as an interpretation connecting an expression with socially acquired understandings or norms, provided that textual or documentary evidence supports that connection.

Four interrelated principles underpin the methodology. Contextual substantiation requires identifying linguistic evidence for a conclusion. Variation entails considering alternative explanations and differences within cultures. An action-oriented principle connects analysis with producing a message for a specific addressee. Reflexivity involves examining how and why an initial interpretation has changed. Together, these principles constitute the author's framework for organising learning activities.

The study is theoretical and methodological. A targeted review covers the seven sources listed in the references: one theoretical textbook, one interview-based study, three review publications, and two international guidance documents. Sources were selected for their relevance to language and culture, learning materials, intercultural competence, and instructional design. The selection is not an exhaustive systematic review; neither a frequency analysis of the research field nor a meta-analysis of effects was conducted.

Four questions guided source comparison: what counts as cultural content; what actions learners should perform; what evidence can indicate an outcome; and what conditions limit the application of proposals. Theoretical propositions were related to task-design requirements. Pedagogical modelling then produced three scenarios: addressing an instructor, expressing disagreement in academic discussion, and interpreting the image of bread in a short text. All utterances and microtexts in these scenarios were written specifically for this article.

The documentary basis and illustrative material have different evidential status. Publications support theoretical comparison; the author-designed scenarios allow examination of the proposed procedure's internal coherence. This study contains no primary empirical dataset of student responses, classroom observations, or experimental results. Its findings are therefore methodological proposals, not demonstrated improvements in achievement or intercultural competence.

4 Main findings

The first outcome is a sequence of six interconnected stages. When establishing context, students identify who is speaking, to whom, for what purpose, and in which genre. They produce a brief situation profile and mark unavailable information as unknown. Instructors should not demand a single cultural explanation where the material permits several equally plausible interpretations.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

The analysis of form identifies lexical, grammatical, and compositional resources relevant to interaction. These may include an address term, pronoun, modal construction, turn order, or repetition. Students first describe an observable feature and then propose its possible function. Separating observation from explanation is necessary because the same form can serve different purposes depending on intonation, genre, and participants' relationships.

Cultural interpretation examines which understandings of the acceptable, respectful, valuable, or customary an expression activates. Each hypothesis requires a basis: a textual passage, information from a verifiable source, or an established feature of the situation. Where evidence is insufficient, students formulate a clarification question. The ability to withhold an unsupported conclusion is treated as a substantive analytical outcome.

At the comparison stage, one parameter changes: the addressee, degree of familiarity, genre, or purpose. Students examine whether the initial interpretation still holds. For example, a message to a classmate becomes a message to an instructor. Cross-language comparisons must retain comparable communicative conditions: differences between an informal spoken remark in one language and a formal letter in another cannot be attributed solely to national characteristics.

At the communicative-action stage, students produce a letter, dialogue, explanation of a text, or commentary for a reader with different cultural experience. The task must specify the addressee and the anticipated difficulty in understanding. The output includes a brief justification of two or three linguistic choices. Instructors can thus assess both the utterance's correctness and the relationship between its form and context.

During reflection, learners compare their initial and final versions. They explain which interpretation they revised, what information helped, and what remains uncertain. Feedback addresses a specific decision: an overgeneralisation, insufficient evidence, an unclear request, or failure to consider the interlocutor's position. Reworking a small part of the task completes the cycle and provides material for comparing versions.

Scenario 1 concerns addressing an instructor. Students receive the constructed message "Ustoz, topshiriqni ertaga yuborsam bo'ladimi?" Its working Russian translation is "Преподаватель, можно отправить задание завтра?" ("Instructor, may I send the assignment tomorrow?"). The task specifies that a student is contacting an instructor for the first time through an educational messaging service to request an extension. Here, ustoz functions as a term of address; this analysis applies to the given utterance and does not exhaust its meanings elsewhere.

Students prepare a Russian version for an addressee conventionally addressed by first name and patronymic. One possible response is "Анна Сергеевна, добрый день! Можно ли отправить задание завтра? Мне нужно дополнительное время, чтобы проверить примеры" ("Good afternoon, Anna Sergeyevna! May I send the assignment tomorrow? I need additional time to check the examples"). Students explain the replacement of the literal address term, addition of a greeting, and clarification of the reason. Assessment examines whether the communicative purpose is preserved as the message's form changes. This is one acceptable response, not the only possible solution.

The linguocultural question concerns the relationship between a linguistic designation of a role and the stance towards the addressee. To examine it, the situation changes: the student has known the instructor for a long time or is writing a formal letter. The group discusses which elements remain appropriate and which need revision. The example cannot establish a universal rule about all Uzbek or Russian speakers; actual norms within a particular community require separate observation.

Scenario 2 involves academic disagreement. The original constructed utterance is "Вы неправильно понимаете этот текст" ("You misunderstand this text"). A student is commenting on a classmate's seminar presentation, and the discussion aims to compare interpretations. The student

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

must revise the message while retaining the substantive objection and supplying textual evidence. For example: "I suggest a different reading: repetition of the word 'home' in the final sentence connects the image with the character's memory."

The analysis distinguishes evaluation of a person from evaluation of an interpretation. In the initial version, the object of criticism can become confused with a judgement about the interlocutor; the revised version identifies the disagreement and provides an argument. In another situation, direct correction may be justified, for example when briefly correcting a factual error. The learning task therefore does not amount to banning a particular form. Students must explain the relationship between directness, evidence, and communicative purpose.

Scenario 3 uses an author-written microtext: "The guest was about to push the remaining piece of bread aside, but the host carefully placed it in the centre of the table. The conversation briefly fell silent." Students explain why the narrative foregrounds the host's action. Observable features include the adverb "carefully", the object's change of position, and the others' reaction. These suggest that bread has particular significance in this situation but do not, by themselves, identify a specific religious or ethnic tradition.

At least two hypotheses are discussed: the action expresses care for food or regulates the guest's behaviour. Additional information is needed to choose between them. A cautious student commentary might read: "In this episode, the treatment of bread functions as a behavioural norm; its precise content requires a wider context." An alternative task is to add one sentence supporting each hypothesis and explain how the new information changes the original text's meaning.

The methodological outcome of analysing these scenarios is a shared task structure across different objects. The first concerns an address term, the second a form of disagreement, and the third an object represented in a narrative. In every case, cultural interpretation becomes assessable when context, linguistic evidence, a plausible explanation, and the limits of inference are identified. The model thus covers pragmatic and textual material without assuming that every word necessarily carries a nationally specific meaning.

The second outcome specifies material-selection requirements. A learning unit should be short enough for close analysis, contain a significant linguistic feature, and allow the production of an utterance for an addressee. If cultural explanation depends on an unknown fact, that fact should be supplied in the task or made an object of inquiry. Materials should favour comparison of several justified solutions over guessing the instructor's single preferred judgement.

The proposed module comprises two ninety-minute sessions and independent revision of the output. The first session covers the initial task, analysis of context and form, comparison of alternatives, and preparation of an utterance. The second involves peer review, revision, and reflection. This proposed organisation requires adjustment after piloting.

A digital environment can store initial and revised versions, support comparison of comments, and host a collaborative glossary. Each glossary entry includes an expression, context, explanation, possible equivalent, and limits to equivalence. Without internet access, the same activities can use cards and written feedback sheets. The module's methodological core is the work of interpretation; the medium is therefore selected to serve the learning task.

The third outcome is a proposed analytic assessment framework with four criteria. Contextual accuracy concerns attention to participants, purpose, genre, and unknown conditions. Interpretive substantiation concerns the connection between a conclusion and linguistic evidence or sources. Communicative appropriateness concerns the fit between the output, addressee, and task. Reflective justification concerns the ability to explain changes in one's own decisions and the limits of their applicability.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

Each criterion is scored from zero to two. Zero indicates an absent action or a substantial error; one indicates partial performance with insufficient explanation; two indicates independent, justified performance. For interpretive substantiation, two points require precise identification of a linguistic feature and explanation of its connection to the conclusion; one point indicates a feature identified without adequate argument; zero indicates unsupported generalisation. Instructors prepare comparable scoring examples for the remaining criteria before teaching begins.

The total ranges from zero to eight. It provides a concise description of performance on a particular task and must not be interpreted as a universal level of intercultural competence. The profile of four scores is more useful for feedback. Accurate contextual understanding, for example, may coexist with difficulty explaining a choice of form. Revision should then target argumentation; repeating cultural information does not address the difficulty identified.

Piloting should use comparable tasks before and after the module, retain anonymised versions of student work, and involve two assessors. Inter-rater agreement requires separate examination. A task with a new addressee can investigate transfer, while a self-assessment questionnaire may supplement the performance evidence.

Limitations include the targeted review, small number of constructed scenarios, and absence of classroom data. The proposed components are internally coherent, but their effectiveness in a particular institution has not been demonstrated. Applying the model to school education, professional subjects, or groups with different language profiles requires adapting the material, extent of commentary, and complexity of the output.

5 Conclusions and prospects for practical application

A linguocultural approach can support pedagogical renewal when cultural interpretation, learning activity, and assessment are aligned. The model establishes this connection through contextualisation, analysis of form, interpretation, comparison, utterance production, and reflection. Each stage yields an output that can be discussed and revised. The theoretical contribution specifies the transition from cultural content to a classroom procedure.

At the level of pedagogical modelling, the three author-designed scenarios show that a common procedure can address terms of address, academic disagreement, and narrative images of objects. Distinguishing observable linguistic evidence from the hypothesis explaining it is essential. Cultural generalisation remains bounded by the available evidence. This task design incorporates the examination of stereotypical judgements directly into work with texts and communication.

The practical outcomes comprise material-selection requirements, a proposed two-session module, and four criteria for analysing learner output. These resources can inform courses in linguocultural studies, language-teaching methodology, speech culture, and pedagogical communication. In continuing teacher development, the model can guide revision of an existing task: specify the addressee, add comparison of alternatives, and formulate a criterion linked to the learner's activity.

Further research should empirically pilot the model through analysis of student work, independent assessment, and tests of transfer to new situations. Particular attention should be paid to whether interpretations remain evidence-based when the language, genre, and cultural material change. Such data would allow the model's educational effects to be identified and the conditions of its practical application to be refined.

References

1. Маслова, В. А. Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие для студентов высших учебных заведений / В. А. Маслова. – Москва : Академия, 2001. – 208 с.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

2. Alharbi, N. S. Exploring the perspectives of cross-cultural instructors on integrating 21st century skills into EFL university courses / N. S. Alharbi // Frontiers in Education. – 2024. – Vol. 9. – Art. 1302608. DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2024.1302608.
3. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion volume. – Strasbourg : Council of Europe Publishing, 2020. – 278 p. – URL: https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16809ea0d4 (accessed: 09.09.2026).
4. Naranjo-Toro, M. Digital approaches to intercultural competence in higher education – a PRISMA systematic review with bibliometric and SWiM evidence / M. Naranjo-Toro, A. Basantes-Andrade, M. Meneses, J. Guerra // Frontiers in Education. – 2026. – Vol. 11. – Art. 1725080. – DOI: 10.3389/feduc.2026.1725080.
5. Risager, K. Analysing culture in language learning materials / K. Risager // Language Teaching. – 2023. – Vol. 56, no. 1. – P. 1–21. DOI: 10.1017/S0261444822000143.
6. UNESCO. Languages matter: Global guidance on multilingual education. – Paris : UNESCO, 2025. DOI: 10.54675/MLIO7101. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000392477 (accessed: 09.09.2026).
7. Zhou, R. A systematic review of cross-cultural communicative competence in EFL teaching: insights from China / R. Zhou, A. Samad, T. Perinpasingam // Humanities and Social Sciences Communications. – 2024. –Vol. 11. – Art. 1750. DOI: 10.1057/