Dear Dilsoz, here's detailed feedback on your practicum portfolio entry, focusing on both strengths and areas for development:

## **Overall Impression:**

Your report provides a good overview of your observations regarding teaching methodologies and your experience organizing a school event. It demonstrates an effort to reflect on your experiences and draw conclusions.

## Section 1: The Method Analysis

## Strengths:

Clear Identification of Methods: You clearly identify the Grammar-Translation Method (GTM) and Audio-Lingual Method (ALM) as commonly used in the school you observed.

Target Age/Level for ALM: You correctly identify ALM as suitable for primary school-aged children (7-9, A1-A2 levels) and note its effectiveness for language development through drills and repetitions. You also highlight its benefit for vocabulary enhancement in kids.

Acknowledging Both Sides: You effectively present both the advantages and disadvantages of each method. For ALM, you acknowledge the benefit of repetition for memorization but also the potential for students to memorize without understanding context or real-life usage. For GTM, you note its use for students aged 12-15 (B1 level) for comprehensive texts and vocabulary development, but also its limitation in attracting all students and not being entirely sufficient for effective results in Uzbek schools.

Observation-Based Insights: Your analysis is grounded in your observations, such as students needing direct translations with definitions and showing less enthusiasm with traditional approaches.

Areas for Development and Further Reflection:

Elaborate on "Challenges and Misunderstandings": You mention that GTM and ALM are used "Because of some challenges and misunderstandings in study". This is a very interesting point. Could you elaborate on what these challenges and misunderstandings are? Providing specific examples would strengthen your argument.

"Traditional Approach" and "Less Enthusiasm": You state that the teachers' approach is "mostly traditional" and students show "less enthusiasm". How do you define "traditional" in this context? What specific behaviors or classroom dynamics led you to conclude there was less enthusiasm? Giving concrete examples would make this observation more impactful.

Specificity on GTM Usage: While you mention GTM is used for students aged 12-15 (B1 level) to enhance reading skills and vocabulary, you also state that "not all of the class is involved in GTM". This seems to contradict itself slightly. Could you clarify why only some students are involved if it's the most common method? Or perhaps clarify that it's used with the intention of developing vocabulary, but its implementation doesn't involve everyone effectively?

Impact of GTM on Student Engagement: You note that only students with a "wide range of vocabulary managed to use this method, but the others not". This is a crucial observation. What are the implications of this for overall class learning and student motivation? How might this contribute to the "less enthusiasm" you observed?

Connecting Methods to Specific Learning Outcomes (Beyond Vocabulary): While you discuss vocabulary development, how do these methods impact other language skills (speaking, listening, writing)? For instance, you mention ALM relies on drills and repetitions and has "good effects on the kids' development

of the language". Could you expand on which aspects of language development you observed improving with ALM, beyond just vocabulary memorization?

Alternative Methods: Since you identified limitations, what alternative methods or adaptations might you suggest to address the observed challenges? This would demonstrate your problem-solving skills and deeper pedagogical thinking.

Citation for Method Effectiveness: When you state "I can say that this method is not completely sufficient in the Uzbek schools because not all of the class is involved in GTM, as well having effective results", this is a strong conclusion. Ensure your observations fully support this claim.