UDC 811.161.1
IRSTI 16.21.47
https://doi.org/10.48371/PEDS.2025.79.4.012

DEVELOPMENT OF PROFESSIONAL SKILLS OF LEXICAL ANALYSES OF FUTURE PHILOLOGY TEACHERS

*Zhanalina I.M.[1], Sapargaliyeva B.O.[2], Zhunisbayeva A.S.[3]
*[1]al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[2]Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
[3]International Information Technology University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Abstract. High-quality teacher education necessitates the systematic development of prospective philology teachers' competence in lexical analysis and manipulation, as these abilities form a cornerstone of their professional linguistic and pedagogical expertise. This study presents an empirical evaluation of a targeted instructional intervention aimed at enhancing lexical analysis skills among third-year undergraduate students enrolled in an English philology teacher-training program. A quasi-experimental design was employed with 100 participants randomly assigned to either an experimental group (n = 50), which completed a six-month structured lexical-analysis curriculum, or a control group (n = 50) that continued standard instruction. Assessment tools included standardized lexical analysis tests, blind-rated pedagogical performance rubrics, and self-report surveys on confidence in lexical tasks. Post-intervention results revealed that the experimental group significantly outperformed the control group across all measures. Notably, mean scores on the lexical analysis test increased by 74% in the experimental group versus 18% in the control group ($t(98) = 10.5$, $p < 001$, Cohen's $d \approx 1.2$), indicating a very large effect size. Statistically significant improvements were also observed in teaching-related lexical application and in participants' confidence ratings ($p < 01$), suggesting both cognitive and affective gains. These findings support prior empirical evidence advocating for technology-enhanced, student-centered vocabulary instruction. The intervention's integration of explicit morphological parsing, contextual inference training, and corpus-based discovery tasks within a blended learning format was instrumental in strengthening participants' professional language competence. The study underscores the pedagogical efficacy of embedding authentic digital resources, collaborative vocabulary exploration, and reflective metalinguistic practice into pre-service teacher curricula. Implications for teacher education include the strategic use of corpus tools, structured vocabulary instruction, and confidence-building tasks to elevate future educators' linguistic precision and instructional readiness.

Key words: lexical competence, teacher training, corpus tools, vocabulary instruction, morphology, philology, blended learning, pedagogical performance, self-efficacy

Introduction

Lexical competence-understood as the capacity to recognize, comprehend, and appropriately employ lexical items within diverse communicative contexts-represents a foundational pillar in the professional preparation of language educators [1]. For pre-service teachers specializing in English philology and related linguistic disciplines, such competence is essential not only for personal linguistic development but also for the pedagogical task of facilitating students' language acquisition. The ability to conduct nuanced lexical analysis, deconstruct word morphology, and interpret meaning from context significantly enhances teachers' instructional effectiveness in all core modalities of language learning: reading, writing, listening, and speaking.

An extensive body of scholarship highlights the need to develop this competence through a diversity of pedagogical strategies. These include explicit vocabulary instruction, semantic mapping, use of lexical sets, and integration of lexical items into authentic communicative tasks [2]. With the advent of educational technology, particularly in language learning, the use of blended learning modalities-where in-person teaching is augmented by digital platforms-has emerged as a particularly potent method. Empirical findings suggest that such hybrid models promote increased learner autonomy, deeper cognitive engagement with lexical material, and more robust long-term retention compared to exclusively traditional classroom formats [3]. Additionally, corpus linguistics and digital concordancers are increasingly employed as tools for both teaching and researching vocabulary. Their use exposes learners to authentic and frequency-based lexical patterns, fostering more precise and contextually appropriate language use [4].

Beyond vocabulary knowledge per se, teacher preparation must address the broader construct of speech culture and communicative competence. This includes clarity of pronunciation, command of register, adherence to normative linguistic conventions, and sensitivity to cultural and pragmatic aspects of communication. The cultivation of such attributes not only enables teachers to function as linguistic models but also equips them to navigate diverse educational settings with agility [5]. According to Meirbekova and Meiirbekov (2025), speech culture serves as a critical mediating factor in pedagogical success, particularly for teachers of philological disciplines, who are often expected to uphold elevated standards of language use and stylistic precision [6]. Consequently, a comprehensive approach to teacher education must integrate lexical analysis training with the development of broader communicative proficiency.

Despite growing recognition of the importance of these competencies, empirical research on the structured development of lexical analysis skills in teacher education programs remains insufficient. While short-term interventions-such as workshops on corpus literacy or vocabulary strategy seminars-have shown potential, the field lacks large-scale, systematically designed studies that examine longitudinal curricular impact. Notably, emerging evidence does indicate that targeted lexical interventions can yield statistically significant gains in both linguistic competence and learner self-efficacy, provided they are delivered in

an active, student-centered format. These preliminary findings underscore the need for more comprehensive, data-driven evaluations of such instructional approaches.

Research Question:

To what extent does the implementation of a structured, technology-supported lexical-analysis curriculum enhance the professional lexical competence and instructional readiness of pre-service philology teachers compared to traditional language-teacher education methods?

Materials and Methods

This study employed a quasi-experimental research design to assess the impact of a structured lexical analysis curriculum on the development of professional linguistic competence among pre-service philology teachers. The intervention was implemented at a leading Kazakhstani institution of higher education, within the framework of a teacher preparation program specializing in English philology. The design was chosen to enable a comparative evaluation of instructional effects while accommodating naturalistic constraints typical of educational settings.

Participants:

A total of 100 undergraduate students in their third year of study were recruited from the Department of English Philology. All participants were enrolled in a teacher education track and met the inclusion criteria: a cumulative Grade Point Average (GPA) of at least 3.0 on a 4.0 scale and demonstrated intermediate proficiency in English (B1-B2 CEFR level), verified through institutional placement testing. Students with formally diagnosed language-learning disabilities were excluded from the sample to ensure homogeneity in baseline cognitive-linguistic capabilities. Following random assignment procedures, participants were allocated into an experimental group (n = 50) and a control group (n = 50), thereby enabling the application of inferential statistical techniques while preserving ecological validity.

Intervention Design:

The intervention lasted six months (one academic semester) and comprised a specially developed Lexical Analysis Course. The curriculum for the experimental group integrated five core components grounded in evidence-based vocabulary instruction:

a) Morphological awareness training, involving systematic dissection of lexical units into prefixes, roots, and suffixes;

b) Contextual inference strategies for deducing word meanings from linguistic and semantic cues in authentic texts;

c) Use of digital corpora and concordancing tools (e.g., Sketch Engine, AntConc) to analyze frequency, collocations, and semantic prosody of target vocabulary items;

d) Gamified vocabulary practice, implemented via platforms such as Quizlet and Kahoot to enhance retrieval fluency and learner motivation;

e) Peer-teaching assignments, wherein students designed, presented, and received feedback on micro-lessons targeting lexical skills.

These components were integrated into a blended learning format that combined traditional instruction (lectures, textbook-based tasks) with interactive seminars and laboratory-based digital sessions. The control group continued with the standard curriculum, which lacked structured lexical modules and technology-enhanced activities.

Instruments:

Three primary instruments were employed to assess the outcomes of the intervention:

a) Lexical Analysis Test. A researcher-constructed instrument measuring morphological knowledge, contextual reasoning, and semantic precision. The test, scored on a 100-point scale, was administered pre- and post-intervention to both groups under equivalent conditions.

b) Pedagogical Performance Rubric. A standardized evaluation tool developed in alignment with teacher education competencies. Blind raters (n = 3) assessed anonymized lesson plans and simulated teaching excerpts according to criteria including terminological accuracy, appropriateness of lexical input, and integration of new vocabulary into instructional planning.

c) Self-Efficacy Survey. A five-point Likert scale survey measuring perceived competence in executing lexical-analysis tasks (e.g., morphological parsing, corpus consultation, and contextual guessing). Internal consistency was verified (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.87$), and the tool was adapted from validated instruments in applied linguistics research.

Data Analysis:

All statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS version 27. Descriptive statistics (means, standard deviations) were computed for each measure. To examine between-group differences at posttest, independent samples t-tests were employed, while paired-samples t-tests evaluated within-group pre-post changes. Effect sizes were calculated using Cohen's d, with interpretation aligned to conventional thresholds (0.2 = small, 0.5 = medium, 0.8+ = large), and particularly noting values above $d \approx 1.2$ as indicators of substantial practical significance [7]. Normality and homogeneity of variances were confirmed via the Shapiro-Wilk and Levene's tests respectively. All statistical tests were two-tailed, with significance set at $p < 0.05$.

Ethical Considerations:

This research adhered strictly to institutional and international ethical standards for human subjects research. Written informed consent was obtained from all participants. Participation was voluntary, and individuals retained the right to withdraw at any time without academic penalty. The study protocol received formal approval from the University's Institutional Review Board (IRB).

Results

Prior to the commencement of the intervention, no statistically significant difference was observed between the experimental and control groups in their

lexical analysis proficiency. Specifically, the mean score on the pre-test for the experimental group was M = 45.2, with a standard deviation of SD = 7.4, while the control group achieved M = 46.1, SD = 6.8. An independent-samples t-test confirmed the absence of initial disparity (p > 05), indicating a baseline equivalence between groups in terms of lexical competence.

Following the six-month intervention period, marked improvements were recorded, particularly within the experimental cohort. Their average lexical-test score rose to M = 78.6, SD = 8.1, representing a substantial 74% increase relative to their pre-intervention performance. In contrast, the control group demonstrated only an 18% improvement, with a post-test mean of M = 54.3, SD = 7.0. The between-group difference in post-test performance was statistically significant ($t(98) = 10.5$, $p < 001$), with a very large effect size (Cohen's $d \approx 1.3$), which confirms the robust impact of the lexical intervention. These findings are consistent with prior meta-analyses emphasizing the effectiveness of active, student-centered lexical instruction models [8]. A detailed breakdown of lexical test outcomes is presented in Table 1.

Table 1. *Lexical Analysis Test Results (Pre- and Post-Test Scores)*

Group	Pre-Test Mean (SD)	Post-Test Mean (SD)	Gain (%)	t-value	p-value	Cohen's d
Experimental	45.2 (7.4)	78.6 (8.1)	+74%	10.5	<.001	≈1.3
Control	46.1 (6.8)	54.3 (7.0)	+18%	-	-	-

The pattern of results extended to pedagogical application. According to the Pedagogical Performance Rubric, which assessed content integration, instructional clarity, and vocabulary use in teaching simulations, the experimental group nearly doubled its performance, with scores increasing from M = 40.8 to M = 81.4, reflecting a 99% gain. Conversely, the control group showed a modest rise from M = 42.0 to M = 50.1 (a 19% gain). This between-group contrast was again statistically significant ($t(98) = 12.1$, $p < 001$, $d \approx 1.5$), suggesting that the intervention's effect extended beyond knowledge acquisition into instructional behavior. These data are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2. *Pedagogical Performance Scores*

Group	Pre-Test Score (Mean)	Post-Test Score (Mean)	Gain (%)	*t*-value	*p*-value	Cohen's *d*
Experimental	40.8	81.4	+99%	12.1	<.001	≈1.5
Control	42.0	50.1	+19%	-	-	-

In terms of affective outcomes, self-reported confidence in performing lexical-analysis tasks increased considerably in the experimental group. Prior to the intervention, both groups reported low confidence levels, with average ratings between 2.0-2.1 on a 5-point Likert scale. Post-intervention data revealed that the experimental group's confidence rose significantly across all measured domains, reaching average ratings between 4.3-4.4. In contrast, the control group's

ratings increased only marginally, reaching 2.3-2.5. For example, confidence in performing morphological analysis rose from M = 2.1 to M = 4.4 **(**SD = 0.6**)** among experimental participants, compared to a rise from M = 2.0 to M = 2.3 **(**SD = 0.5**)** in the control group. Full descriptive statistics are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. *Self-Reported Confidence in Lexical Tasks*

Lexical Task	Group	Pre-Test (Mean)	Post-Test (Mean)	Gain	SD
Morphological Analysis	Experimental	2.1	4.4	+2.3	0.6
	Control	2.0	2.3	+0.3	0.5
Contextual Meaning Inference	Experimental	2.0	4.3	+2.3	0.5
	Control	2.1	2.5	+0.4	0.5

Furthermore, a moderately strong positive correlation was found between gains in confidence and actual test performance ($r \approx 65$, $p < 01$), reinforcing the conclusion that the intervention not only improved objective competence but also nurtured learner self-efficacy [9]. A comparative summary of effect sizes across all assessment dimensions-including lexical performance, pedagogical competence, and confidence-is consolidated in Table 4.

Table 4. *Summary of Effect Sizes Across Outcomes*

Outcome Measure	Cohen's d	Effect Size (Interpretation)
Lexical Test	≈1.3	Very Large
Pedagogical Performance	≈1.5	Very Large
Self-Confidence (Avg.)	≈1.2	Very Large

Importantly, no adverse events, technical failures, or participant withdrawals were reported during the study. Taken together, these empirical findings suggest that the structured lexical-analysis curriculum exerted a statistically robust and pedagogically meaningful impact on both the cognitive and affective domains of teacher development. The consistency of outcomes across multiple indicators underscores the intervention's comprehensive efficacy when compared with standard instructional models.

Discussion

The intervention demonstrated robust efficacy in developing lexical analysis skills essential for future philology educators. The experimental group significantly outperformed the control group across all measured dimensions, including lexical test scores, pedagogical performance, and self-reported confidence. The very large effect sizes (Cohen's $d > 1.0$) underscore not only statistical but also substantial practical significance. These results validate the premise that a focused, scaffolded instructional model-particularly one emphasizing lexical competence-can produce deep, transferable learning outcomes. This corroborates prior

findings from pedagogical research highlighting the effectiveness of vocabulary-focused, student-centered approaches in teacher education [10].

Several interrelated factors likely account for these pronounced gains. First, the course employed a blended learning design, integrating traditional seminars with interactive digital resources, including corpus tools, online concordancers, and gamified vocabulary platforms. Such hybrid models are widely recognized for increasing learner autonomy and deepening engagement. As Mishra and Koehler (2006) note in their Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge (TPACK) framework, optimal teacher learning arises when pedagogical techniques are tightly integrated with technological affordances and subject-matter content [10]. This theoretical model informed the architecture of our intervention, especially in promoting digital literacy alongside linguistic competence.

Secondly, the curriculum incorporated content-focused professional development, which has been shown to be more effective than generic instructional training. Rather than offering isolated vocabulary drills, our course structured lexical development within authentic pedagogical scenarios (e.g., peer-led vocabulary workshops, reflective tasks, and teaching simulations). This approach aligns with the conclusions of the Institute of Education Sciences (IES), which found that sustained, subject-specific teacher development is significantly more likely to yield measurable student outcomes [11]. By applying learned vocabulary techniques within real teaching contexts, participants experienced cognitive reinforcement through both reception and production modalities.

Another critical dimension was the cultivation of teacher self-efficacy in linguistic application. As Peterson and Jensen (2025) document in their review of K-12 settings, teacher confidence-especially in linguistically diverse environments-strongly predicts classroom effectiveness and adaptability [12]. In our study, participants not only gained functional skills in morphological analysis and semantic inference, but also reported significantly higher confidence levels in using and teaching vocabulary. This psychological component is crucial, as it influences a teacher's willingness to implement innovative methods and to model fluent, precise language use in real time.

Importantly, the course promoted experiential learning, moving beyond passive reception to active mastery. Participants formulated hypotheses about lexical meaning, explored usage patterns through corpora, and designed peer-teaching materials-activities that mirror authentic classroom decision-making. Such methods align with Girvan, Conneely, and Tangney's (2016) conception of extended experiential learning, where iterative reflection, collaboration, and guided practice foster long-term professional growth [13]. Through repeated engagement with vocabulary in varied roles-learner, analyst, instructor-students developed metacognitive insight into their own lexical development.

Equally significant was the use of collaborative digital projects, such as group-generated glossaries and thematic word banks, which supported reflection and cooperative engagement. As Cullen, Kullman, and Wild (2013) emphasize, online collaborative learning environments enhance language acquisition when they encourage peer negotiation, co-construction of meaning, and collective

responsibility [14]. These strategies not only strengthened the lexical knowledge base of participants but also introduced them to contemporary models of communicative pedagogy appropriate for 21st-century classrooms.

Finally, the pedagogical coherence of the intervention-specifically its alignment of technological tools, linguistic content, and instructional practice-reflects the principles of TPACK development, as further articulated by Angeli and Valanides (2009). They argue that sustainable teacher growth requires integrating all three dimensions into the learning environment in a deliberate and structured fashion [15]. This coherence explains the effectiveness of the intervention not only in cognitive terms but also in fostering holistic professional readiness.

Conclusion

This study offers compelling evidence that explicitly training pre-service philologists in lexical analysis substantially enhances both their linguistic competence and their pedagogical confidence. The intervention's strength lies in its multifaceted structure, combining explicit instruction in morphological parsing, corpus-informed vocabulary exploration, and digital task-based learning. These features allowed students to approach vocabulary as both a linguistic system and a pedagogical challenge.

Teacher educators should, therefore, incorporate specialized vocabulary modules that emphasize analytical depth, contextual nuance, and communicative relevance. Recommended strategies include instruction in word-formation processes, frequent engagement with digital corpora for authentic input, and interactive reinforcement via games, quizzes, or peer evaluations. Additionally, instructors may embed collaborative projects such as thematic glossaries and class-built lexical databases to foster reflective, social construction of meaning-practices shown to boost retention and motivation [14].

Crucially, programs must not isolate vocabulary work from broader educational aims. As shown, the most effective training models synchronize content, pedagogy, and technology-the central triad of the TPACK framework-thus preparing candidates for the linguistic and instructional demands of real classrooms [15]. Further research should explore the longitudinal effects of such interventions, particularly their transferability into in-service contexts and sustained influence on learner outcomes.

In sum, a coherent, research-informed lexical training curriculum represents a powerful tool for developing the next generation of philology teachers. Through integrating evidence-based methods, fostering reflective practice, and aligning lexical skills with pedagogical demands, institutions can better equip future educators for excellence in both language and instruction.

REFERENCES

[1] Shoynazarova V. The essence of lexical competence development in English language teaching // Development of Pedagogical Technologies in Modern Sciences. - 2024. - 3(3). - 55-58.

[2] Zeng H., Jia J., Xu X., Wray A. Vocabulary Instruction for English Learners: A Systematic Review Connecting Theories, Research, and Practices // Education Sciences. - 2025. - 15(3). - 262.

[3] Cai J. A comparison of blended and traditional learning methods for English vocabulary acquisition // Education Insights. - 2024. - 1(3). - 58-66.

[4] Ma Q., Fang W. Review of corpus tools for vocabulary teaching and learning //Journal of China Computer-Assisted Language Learning. - 2021. - 1(1). - 177-190.

[5] Talipova N. A. Compatibility of pedagogical technologies and speech culture: Innovative approaches in English language teaching // International Journal of Scientific Trends. - 2025. - 4(3). - 45-51.

[6] Meirbekova G., Meiirbekov A. The importance of speech culture in the professional culture of a future philologist // Reviews of Modern Science. - 2025. - (9). - 45-49.

[7] Yousefi M. H., Biria R. The effectiveness of L2 vocabulary instruction: a meta-analysis // Asian-Pacific Journal of Second and Foreign Language Education. - 2018. - 3. - 21.

[8] Marulis L. M., Neuman S. B. The effects of vocabulary intervention on young children's word learning: a meta-analysis // Review of Educational Research. - 2010. - 80(3). - 300-335.

[9] Shahzad K., Naureen S. Impact of teacher self-efficacy on student achievement // Bulletin of Education and Research. - 2017. - 39(1). - 53-71.

[10] Mishra P., Koehler M. J. Technological Pedagogical Content Knowledge: A framework for teacher knowledge // Teachers College Record. - 2006. - 108(6). - 1017-1054.

[11] Institute of Education Sciences (IES). Does content-focused teacher professional development work? Findings from Institute of Education Sciences studies // NCEE Evaluation Brief. - 2016. - (NCEE 2017-4010).

[12] Peterson J. M., Jensen M. T. Teacher self-efficacy in relation to cultural and linguistic diversity in K-12 settings: a systematic review // Frontiers in Education. - 2025.

[13] Girvan C., Conneely C., Tangney B. Extending experiential learning in teacher professional development // Teaching and Teacher Education. - 2016. - 58. - 129-139.

[14] Cullen R., Kullman J., Wild C. Online collaborative learning on an ESL teacher education programme // *ELT Journal*. - 2013. - 67(4). - 425-434.

[15] Angeli C., Valanides N. Advances in technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPCK) // Computers & Education. - 2009. - 52(1). - 154-168.

БОЛАШАҚ ФИЛОЛОГ ОҚЫТУШЫЛАРДЫҢ ЛЕКСИКАЛЫҚ ТАЛДАУЛАРЫНЫҢ КӘСІБИ ДАҒДЫЛАРЫН ДАМЫТУ

*Жаналина И.М.[1], Сапаргалиева Б.О.[2], Жүнісбаева А.С.[3]
*[1]әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
[2]Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
[3]Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Андатпа. Сапалы мұғалім даярлығы болашақ филолог мұғалімдердің сөздік талдау және сөзбен жұмыс жасау дағдыларын жүйелі түрде дамытуды қажет етеді, өйткені бұл қабілеттер олардың кәсіби лингвистикалық және педагогикалық құзыреттілігінің негізін құрайды. Бұл зерттеуде ағылшын филологиясы бойынша мұғалім дайындайтын оқу бағдарламасына қатысатын үшінші курс студенттерінің лексикалық талдау дағдыларын арттыруға бағытталған педагогикалық араласудың эмпирикалық бағасы берілген. Квазиэкспериментік әдіс аясында 100 студент кездейсоқ түрде екі топқа бөлінді: эксперименттік топ (n = 50), алты айлық құрылымдалған курсқа қатысты, және бақылау тобы (n = 50), стандартты оқытуды жалғастырды. Бағалау құралдарына стандартталған лексикалық талдау тесті, педагогикалық өнімділік бойынша сарапшылардың бағалауы және лексикалық тапсырмаларға деген сенімділікті өлшейтін өзіндік сауалнама кірді. Араласудан кейінгі нәтижелер эксперименттік топтың барлық көрсеткіштер бойынша бақылау тобынан едәуір жоғары жетістікке жеткенін көрсетті. Атап айтқанда, лексикалық тест нәтижелері эксперименттік топта 74%-ға, ал бақылау тобында тек 18%-ға артты ($t(98) = 10.5$, $p < 001$, $d \approx 1.2$), бұл айқын үлкен әсерді білдіреді. Сонымен қатар, сөздік қолдануға қатысты педагогикалық тапсырмаларды орындау мен сенімділік деңгейінде статистикалық тұрғыдан маңызды ілгерілеу байқалды ($p < 01$). Бұл қорытындылар студентке бағытталған, технологиялық құралдармен байытылған лексика оқыту тәсілдерінің тиімділігін растайды. Аралас оқыту форматы аясында морфологиялық талдау, контекстуалды түсіну және корпус негізінде жұмыс жүргізу лексикалық құзыреттілікті нығайтуда маңызды рөл атқарды. Зерттеу аутентті цифрлық ресурстарды, бірлескен сөздік зерттеулерді және метатілдік рефлексияны мұғалімдер даярлау бағдарламасына енгізудің педагогикалық маңыздылығын көрсетеді. Практикалық ұсыныстарға корпус құралдарын қолдану, құрылымдалған лексикалық оқыту және сенімділікті арттыру стратегияларын енгізу арқылы болашақ мұғалімдердің тілдік дәлдігі мен кәсіби дайындықтарын арттыру кіреді.

Тірек сөздер: лексикалық құзыреттілік, мұғалімдерді даярлау, корпус құралдары, сөздік оқыту, морфология, филология, аралас оқыту, педагогикалық тиімділік, өзін-өзі тиімді сезіну

РАЗВИТИЕ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНЫХ НАВЫКОВ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКОГО АНАЛИЗА БУДУЩИХ УЧИТЕЛЕЙ ФИЛОЛОГОВ

*Жаналина И.М.[1], Сапаргалиева Б.О.[2], Жүнісбаева А.С.[3]
*[1]Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби,
Алматы, Казахстан
[2]Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая,
Алматы, Казахстан
[3]Международный университет информационных технологий,
Алматы, Казахстан

Аннотация. Качественная подготовка учителей требует системного развития у будущих преподавателей филологии компетентности в лексическом анализе и оперировании словарным материалом, поскольку эти навыки составляют основу их профессиональной лингвистической и педагогической подготовки. В настоящем исследовании представлена эмпирическая оценка целенаправленного педагогического вмешательства, направленного на развитие навыков лексического анализа у студентов третьего курса, обучающихся по программе подготовки учителей английского языка. В рамках квазиэкспериментального дизайна 100 участников были случайным образом распределены на экспериментальную группу (n = 50), прошедшую шестимесячную программу по лексическому анализу, и контрольную группу (n = 50), продолжившую обучение по стандартной программе. Для оценки эффективности использовались стандартизированный тест на лексический анализ, экспертная оценка педагогической деятельности и самооценка уверенности в выполнении лексических задач. Результаты показали, что экспериментальная группа значительно превзошла контрольную по всем показателям. В частности, средний балл по тесту на лексический анализ увеличился на 74% в экспериментальной группе против 18% в контрольной ($t(98) = 10.5$, $p < 001$, $d \approx 1.2$), что свидетельствует о крупном эффекте. Также были зафиксированы статистически значимые улучшения в педагогическом применении лексики и уверенности участников в работе с лексическими стратегиями ($p < 01$). Полученные данные подтверждают предыдущие исследования, демонстрирующие эффективность технологий, ориентированных на учащегося, в обучении лексике. Интеграция морфологического анализа, контекстуального вывода и работы с корпусами в условиях смешанного обучения оказалась особенно продуктивной в развитии профессиональной лексической компетентности. Исследование подчёркивает педагогическую ценность использования аутентичных цифровых ресурсов, совместного освоения словарного материала и рефлексивной метаязыковой практики в программах подготовки учителей. Практические рекомендации включают внедрение корпусных заданий и методик повышения уверенности для формирования лингвистической точности и педагогической готовности будущих преподавателей.

Ключевые слова: лексическая компетентность, подготовка учителей, корпусные инструменты, обучение лексике, морфология, филология, смешанное обучение, педагогическая эффективность, самоэффективность

Received / Мақала түсті / Статья поступила: 08.05.2025.
Accepted / Жарияланға қабылданды / Принята к публикации: 26.12.2025.

Information about the authors:

Zhanalina Indira Maratzhanovna – PhD student, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: ms.zhanalina@mail.ru

Sapargalieva Bayan Oralkhanovna – doctor PhD, Abai Kazakh National Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: bayan_sapargaliyeva@mail.ru

Assel Zhunisbayeva – Assistant-professor, International Information Technology University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, e-mail: js.aasel@gmail.com

Авторлар туралы мәлімет:

Жаналина Индира Маратжанқызы – докторант, әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: ms.zhanalina@mail.ru

Сапаргалиева Баян Оралхановна – PhD, Абай атындағы Қазақ ұлттық педагогикалық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: bayan_sapargaliyeva@mail.ru

Жүнісбаева Әсел Серікқызы – Ассистент-профессор, Халықаралық ақпараттық технологиялар университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан, e-mail: js.aasel@gmail.com

Информация об авторах:

Жаналина Индира Маратжановна – докторант, Казахский национальный университет имени аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: ms.zhanalina@mail.ru

Сапаргалиева Баян Оралхановна – доктор PhD, Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: bayan_sapargaliyeva@mail.ru

Жүнісбаева Әсел Серікқызы – Ассистент-профессор, Международный университет информационных технологий, Алматы, Казахстан, e-mail: js.aasel@gmail.com