

Evaluating the Effectiveness of the Integrated Success Pedagogical Model in EFL Higher Education: A Multi-Site Quasi-Experimental Study

Abdullayeva Lola Tohirovna

Associate professor at Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

Abstract. *This study presents the experimental evaluation of the Integrated Success Pedagogical Model (ISPM) in three higher education institutions, involving 360 participants across three courses. A quasi-experimental design compared experimental and control groups to assess ISPM's impact on cognitive, motivational, behavioral, and reflective outcomes. Data collection methods included testing, surveys, observation, project analysis, and reflective journals. Results show significant improvements in the experimental groups, confirming the pedagogical and methodological value of ISPM in EFL instruction. Practical recommendations are provided to support systematic integration of success-oriented learning activities.*

Keywords: *ISPM, Quasi-Experimental Design, EFL Higher Education, Success-Oriented Learning, Reflective Practice.*

Introduction. Integrating value-laden concepts such as success into EFL higher education curricula is essential for developing motivated, autonomous, and reflective learners. While concept-based frameworks are increasingly advocated, empirical validation through multi-site experimental studies remains limited. The present study implements the Integrated Success Pedagogical Model (ISPM) in three universities to systematically evaluate its effects on students' cognitive, motivational, behavioral, and reflective competencies. The research aims to determine whether ISPM can enhance learner development and provide practical strategies for educators to integrate success-oriented learning into EFL instruction.

Methods.

Participants and Experimental Design

The quasi-experimental study involved 360 students across three universities: University 1 (120), University 2 (130), and University 3 (110). All participants were future philologists and teachers with intermediate English proficiency. Students were assigned to:

- Experimental Group (EG): instruction based on ISPM
- Control Group (CG): traditional instruction with grammar, vocabulary, reading and translation exercises.

The intervention lasted 15 weeks, with two 80-minute sessions per week. Instruction included modular content blocks, communicative exercises, project-based learning, and reflective journals for the EG.

Data Collection Methods. Multiple methods were employed to comprehensively assess learner outcomes:

1. Testing: assessed lexical, grammatical, and conceptual acquisition related to the success-oriented curriculum.
2. Surveys: Likert-scale questionnaires measured motivation, self-esteem, and attitudes toward success.
3. Observation: monitored engagement in discussions, role-plays, and project activities.
4. Project Analysis: evaluated understanding of success-related concepts, communicative competence, and creativity.
5. Reflective Journals: documented daily progress and metacognitive reflection.

Experimental Procedure

- Diagnostic Stage (Weeks 1–2): Baseline assessment of cognitive, lexical, and motivational levels.
- Main Stage (Weeks 3–13): EG participated in ISPM-based instruction; CG followed traditional methods. Progress was monitored via mini-tests, projects, and participation.
- Final Stage (Weeks 14–15): Post-testing, surveys, and project analysis; comparative analysis between EG and CG was conducted.

Evaluation Criteria

Tab 1. Effectiveness of ISPM was evaluated across four criteria:

Criterion	Indicators	Instruments	Levels
Cognitive	Knowledge of lexicon, grammar, understanding of success	Tests, essays, concept maps	Low: 0–39; Medium: 40–69; High: 70–100
Motivational	Interest in language learning, personal motivation	Surveys, Likert scales	Low: 1–2; Medium: 3; High: 4–5
Behavioral	Engagement in discussions, projects, role-plays	Observation, participation records	Low: 0–3; Medium: 4–6; High: 7–10
Reflective	Metacognitive reflection, journal keeping	Reflective journals, self-assessment	Low: 0–3; Medium: 4–6; High: 7–10

Results. The ISPM intervention led to improvements across all measured domains.

Cognitive Gains: EG outperformed CG in all universities by 12–13% on average, indicating stronger acquisition of lexical, grammatical, and conceptual knowledge.

Motivational Gains: EG scored 0.7 points higher than CG, demonstrating increased engagement and self-directed motivation.

Behavioral Gains: EG exhibited greater participation in communicative and project-based tasks (+1.7 points), reflecting enhanced practical application of language skills.

Reflective Gains: EG showed improved metacognitive reflection and journal-keeping skills (+1.5 points).

Integral Effectiveness: Normalized across all criteria, ISPM resulted in a 13.6% improvement over CG, confirming its pedagogical and methodological value.

Examples of Tasks and Instruments. To operationalize ISPM, the following tasks and instruments were implemented:

1. Mini-project: “My Path to Success”

Analysis of personal and professional goals.

Study of successful models in English-speaking contexts.

Presentation of findings in structured project format.

2. Reflective Journal

Daily records of achievements.

Self-evaluation for metacognitive reflection.

Monitoring changes in motivation, attitudes, and strategies.

3. Case Analysis

Examination of real or simulated success/failure scenarios.

Identification of contributing factors and strategies.

Promotion of critical thinking and practical application.

4. Survey

Likert-scale assessment of motivation, self-esteem, and attitudes.

Provides quantitative data to guide instructional adjustments.

Adjustments and Recommendations. Based on experimental outcomes, ISPM was refined:

1. Increased the number of mini-projects and case-based tasks per module.
2. Strengthened reflective components through systematic journals and self-assessment.
3. Expanded lexical and grammar blocks with contemporary English-speaking examples.
4. Developed a step-by-step implementation guide for instructors.

Practical Recommendations:

Embed the concept of success at all stages of lessons, integrating cognitive, communicative, and project-based activities.

Use diverse assessment forms, including tests, essays, projects, presentations, and journals.

Adapt materials and activities to students' age, proficiency, and cultural context.

Conclusion. The experimental implementation of ISPM demonstrates its effectiveness in higher education EFL contexts:

1. EG achieved superior cognitive, communicative, motivational, and reflective outcomes compared to CG.
2. The integral effectiveness index increased by 13.6%, validating ISPM's pedagogical value.
3. Refinements based on experimental data enhanced reproducibility and practical applicability.
4. ISPM promotes learner motivation, project planning, self-assessment, and readiness to achieve personal and academic goals.

References

1. Boud, D., Keogh, R., & Walker, D. (1985). *Reflection: Turning experience into learning*. Routledge.
2. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.
3. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68–78. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68>
4. Dörnyei, Z. (2005). *The psychology of the language learner: Individual differences in second language acquisition*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
5. Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.

6. Farrell, T. S. C. (2015). *Reflective practice in ESL teacher development groups: From practices to principles*. Palgrave Macmillan.
7. Gay, L. R., Mills, G. E., & Airasian, P. (2012). *Educational research: Competencies for analysis and applications* (10th ed.). Pearson.
8. Johnson, B., & Christensen, L. (2017). *Educational research: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed approaches* (7th ed.). Sage Publications.
9. Krashen, S. D. (1985). *The input hypothesis: Issues and implications*. Longman.
10. Kuh, G. D. (2008). High-impact educational practices: What they are, who has access to them, and why they matter. *Association of American Colleges and Universities*.
11. Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2013). *How languages are learned* (4th ed.). Oxford University Press.
12. Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2015). *Second language research: Methodology and design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
13. Maley, A., & Peachey, N. (Eds.). (2015). *Creativity in the English language classroom: Developing teaching materials and activities for language learners*. British Council.
14. Moon, J. A. (2004). *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice*. RoutledgeFalmer.
15. Nunan, D. (1999). *Second language teaching & learning*. Heinle & Heinle.
16. Oxford, R. L. (2016). *Teaching and researching language learning strategies* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
17. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and methods in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
18. Schön, D. A. (1983). *The reflective practitioner: How professionals think in action*. Basic Books.
19. Tomlinson, B. (Ed.). (2017). *Second language acquisition and task-based language teaching*. Wiley Blackwell.
20. Zimmerman, B. J. (2002). Becoming a self-regulated learner: An overview. *Theory Into Practice*, 41(2), 64–70.