**Mid-term assessment feedback**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | **Instructor Feedback** | **Midterm Assessment** |
| 2. | **Course** | Developing Intercultural Communication Competence |
| 3. | **Group** | 2210 |
| 4. | **Task** | Role-play presentation – Intercultural Comparison |
| 5. | **Assessment Theme** | Traditions, Taboos, and Food of an English-Speaking Country (with comparison to Uzbek culture) |
| 6. | **Instructor** | Raykhona Gulomova |
| 7. | **Date** | 20.05.2025 |
| **Overall performance summary** | | |
| The 2210 group presented a cohesive and well-structured role-play that broadly fulfilled the midterm assessment objectives. The performance demonstrated notable effort in capturing key cultural features of the United Kingdom — with specific focus on food, taboos, and linguistic nuances — while making introductory attempts to compare British and Uzbek cultural practices. The group collaborated effectively, and most members engaged actively with the material.  It is important to note that this role-play performance was designed as the culmination of 30 hours of independent work. This preparation phase was expected to include the reading and review of Roger Anderson’s article “Recognizing and Reassessing the Stereotypes,” a research study on Gerard Hofstede’s “Five Dimensions” cultural model, as well as the development of a practical group project applying Hofstede’s framework. The RADAR technique was also to be reviewed and considered for intercultural analysis. Completion of the full 28 hours of independent work prior to the role-play was essential for comprehensive engagement, theoretical grounding, and informed performance. | | |
| **Individual Student Performance** | | |
| 1.**Karimova Nodira – Excellent** **Strengths**: Exhibited outstanding command of culturally specific vocabulary and speech features reflective of British English. Her understanding of British taboos and food customs reflected independent research and conceptual application. **Development Points**: Could improve by integrating Hofstede’s dimensions more explicitly in cultural comparisons to demonstrate application of theoretical models.  **2. Raxmonqulova Feruza – Excellent** **Strengths**: Delivered clear and well-structured arguments about taboos. Her performance was culturally sensitive and well-informed. Contributed positively to group coherence. **Development Points**: Including reference to either Hofstede’s cultural dimension theory or Anderson’s findings could have elevated the analytical level of her role.  **3. Norquvvatova Dinora – Good** **Strengths**: Effectively employed relevant vocabulary tied to British culture and demonstrated awareness of cultural behaviors and food-related norms. **Development Points**: More depth in the theoretical underpinning of comparisons (e.g., using RADAR or Hofstede’s power distance/individualism) would enhance critical analysis.  **4. Abduxalilova Marjona – Good** **Strengths**: Attempted to introduce traditional elements and supported team effort. **Development Points**: The traditions aspect lacked detail. Including national holidays or deeper symbolic customs and linking them with Hofstede’s “uncertainty avoidance” or “masculinity” dimension would show stronger conceptual engagement.  **5. Bekpo‘latova Mohichehra – Good** | | |
| **Strengths**: Participated actively in illustrating cultural taboos. Presented content with confidence and supported group transitions. **Development Points**: Presentation would benefit from more references to theory and comparative analysis, particularly with clearer application of the RADAR technique. | | |
| **Group Collaboration & Independent Work** | | |
| The group’s collaboration was commendable, and most members appeared to have fulfilled their preparatory responsibilities. However, the integration of theoretical frameworks (Hofstede’s model, RADAR, and Anderson’s perspectives) into the role-play itself was not consistently visible across all parts of the presentation. As this midterm is a performance-based outcome of a 30-hour independent learning module, the final presentation should reflect not only performative skills but also deep theoretical awareness. | | |
| **Assessment Criteria Overview** | | |
| |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Criterion** | **Rating** | **Comments** | | Fulfillment of Task Requirements | **Good** | All three aspects addressed, though traditions and comparative analysis could be expanded. | | Integration of Independent Work (30 Hours) | **Satisfactory to Good** | Evidence of individual preparation was visible, but clearer reference to assigned academic resources was needed. | | Cultural Comparison | **Satisfactory** | Attempts made but lacked strong conceptual links to Hofstede's model or stereotypes reassessment. | | Target Vocabulary & Accent Use | **Good to Excellent** | Notably strong among Karimova and Norquvvatova. | | Group Collaboration | **Excellent** | Balanced participation and supportive group dynamics. | | | |