

15. Friesem Y. *Teaching truth, lies, and accuracy in the digital age: Media literacy as project-based learning* // *Journalism & Mass Communication Educator*. – 2019. – Vol. 74, № 2. – P. 185–198. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077695819829962>

16. Rohm A., Stefl M., Ward N. *Future proof and real-world ready: The role of live project-based learning in students' skill development* // *Journal of Marketing Education*. – 2021. – Vol. 43, № 2. – P. 204–215. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/02734753211001409>

17. Mosier G., Bradley-Levine J., Perkins T. *Students' perceptions of project-based learning within the new tech school model* // *International Journal of Educational Reform*. – 2016. – Vol. 25, № 1. – P. 2–15. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/105678791602500101>

18. Belagra M., Draoui B. *Project-based learning and information and communication technology's integration: Impacts on motivation* // *International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*. – 2018. – Vol. 55, № 4. – P. 293–312. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020720918773051>

19. Khan Z., Abid M. *Role of laboratory setup in project-based learning of freshmen electrical engineering in Pakistan* // *International Journal of Electrical Engineering & Education*. – 2017. – Vol. 54, № 2. – P. 150–163.

20. Mehta C. *Flipping out and digging in: Combining the flipped class and project-based learning to teach adult development* // *International Journal of Aging and Human Development*. – 2020. – Vol. 91, № 4. – P. 362–372. – DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0091415020919997>

IRSTI 14.35.09

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-5762.2026.89.1.022>

Abiyeva Zh.,^{1*}  Chaklikova A.² 

¹*Suleyman Demirel University, Almaty, Kazakhstan*

²*Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages,
Almaty, Kazakhstan*

FROM OUTCOMES TO PROCESSES: PORTFOLIO ASSESSMENT IN PRE-SERVICE ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHER EDUCATION

Abstract

Traditional assessment practices in higher education often emphasize outcomes while neglecting the learning process and the development of reflective and professional competencies. This limitation underscores the need for more authentic, process-oriented evaluation methods. The purpose of this study was to investigate the effectiveness of portfolio assessment in the course Linguodidactic Basis of Professional Activity of a Foreign Language Teacher at a Kazakhstani university, with a focus on how portfolios influence engagement, reflective learning, and the integration of theory into teaching practice. A qualitative case-study design, supported by descriptive quantitative analysis, was employed. The participants were 28 undergraduate students and two instructors. Data were collected from semi-structured interviews, portfolio artifacts, and rubric-based portfolio scores. The results of thematic analysis revealed four primary outcomes: (1) enhanced engagement and ownership of learning, (2) growth in reflective and metacognitive skills, (3) authentic application of theoretical knowledge in teaching practice, and (4) challenges related to time management and workload. Quantitative analysis showed that portfolio scores ranged from 64% to 98% ($M = 86\%$, $SD = 8.2$), with the highest results in developing teaching materials and the lowest in monitoring and evaluating learners. The key conclusion is that portfolio assessment supports constructive alignment between learning outcomes and competencies, fosters pedagogical reasoning, and promotes professional development. At the same time, variability in reflection depth and instructor workload highlights the need for additional scaffolding and support. Overall, the findings confirm that structured, criteria-based portfolios represent a practical and comprehensive tool for authentic assessment in teacher education.

Keywords: portfolio assessment, teacher education, reflective learning, authentic assessment, pedagogical competence.

Ж.Абиева,^{1*}  А.Чакликова² 

¹ Сүлейман Демирел Университет, Алматы қ., Қазақстан

² Абылай хан атындағы Қазақ халықаралық қатынастар және әлем тілдері университет,
Алматы қ., Қазақстан

НӘТИЖЕДЕН ҮДЕРІСКЕ: БОЛАШАҚ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІ МҰҒАЛІМДЕРІН ДАЙЫНДАУДА ПОРТФОЛИО АРҚЫЛЫ БАҒАЛАУ

Аңдатпа

Жоғары білім беру жүйесінде дәстүрлі бағалау тәжірибелері көбінесе нәтижелерге басымдық беріп, оқыту үдерісін, рефлексивтік және кәсіби құзыреттердің дамуын елемейді. Мұндай шектеулер оқу жетістіктерін шынайы әрі үдеріс-бағдарлы тұрғыдан бағалаудың қажеттілігін туындатады. Осы зерттеудің мақсаты – Қазақстандағы университеттегі Шет тілі мұғалімінің кәсіби қызметінің лингводидактикалық негіздері пәнінде портфолио арқылы бағалаудың тиімділігін анықтау, сондай-ақ портфолионың студенттердің оқу белсенділігіне, рефлексивтік дағдыларына және теорияны оқыту тәжірибесіне кіріктіруіне ықпалын зерделеу. Зерттеу сапалық жағдайлық зерттеу (case study) үлгісінде, сипаттамалық сандық талдаумен толықтырылып жүргізілді. Қатысушылар – 28 бакалавр студенті мен екі оқытушы. Мәліметтер жартылай құрылымданған сұхбаттардан, портфолио артефактыларынан және рубрикаға негізделген бағалау нәтижелерінен жиналды. Тақырыптық талдау төрт негізгі нәтижені көрсетті: (1) оқу үдерісіне тартылу мен иелік ету деңгейінің артуы, (2) рефлексивтік және метатанымдық дағдылардың дамуы, (3) теориялық білімді оқыту тәжірибесінде шынайы қолдану, (4) уақытты басқару мен жұмыс жүктемесіне байланысты қиындықтар. Сандық талдау қорытындысы бойынша портфолио бағалары 64%-дан 98%-ға дейін ($M = 86\%$, $SD = 8.2$) ауытқыды; ең жоғары көрсеткіш – оқу материалдарын әзірлеуде, ал ең төмені – оқушыларды бақылау және бағалауда байқалды. Зерттеудің негізгі қорытындысы: портфолио арқылы бағалау оқу нәтижелері мен құзыреттер арасындағы конструктивтік сәйкестікті қамтамасыз етіп, педагогикалық пайымдауды дамытады және кәсіби жетілуді қолдайды. Сонымен бірге, рефлексия тереңдігінің өзгермелілігі мен оқытушының жұмыс жүктемесі қосымша әдістемелік сүйемелдеудің қажеттілігін айқындайды. Жалпы алғанда, зерттеу нәтижелері құрылымдалған, өлшемшартқа негізделген портфолио мұғалімдерді даярлау үдерісінде шынайы бағалаудың пәрменді әрі кешенді құралы екенін дәлелдейді.

Түйін сөздер: портфолио арқылы бағалау, мұғалімдерді даярлау, рефлексивтік оқыту, шынайы бағалау, педагогикалық құзыреттілік.

Абиева Ж.,^{1*}  Чакликова А.² 

¹ Университет Сулеймана Демиреля, г.Алматы, Казахстан

² Казахский университет международных отношений и мировых языков
имени Абылай хана, г.Алматы, Казахстан

ОТ РЕЗУЛЬТАТОВ К ПРОЦЕССАМ: ОЦЕНИВАНИЕ С ПОМОЩЬЮ ПОРТФОЛИО В ПОДГОТОВКЕ БУДУЩИХ ПРЕПОДАВАТЕЛЕЙ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА

Аннотация

В системе высшего образования традиционные методы оценивания зачастую акцентируют внимание на конечных результатах, при этом недооценивая сам процесс обучения, развитие рефлексивных и профессиональных компетенций. Это ограничение формирует необходимость применения более аутентичных и процессно-ориентированных методов оценки. Цель данного исследования заключалась в изучении эффективности портфолио-контроля в курсе «Лингводидактические основы профессиональной деятельности учителя иностранного языка» в одном из казахстанских университетов. Особое внимание уделялось тому, как использование портфолио влияет на учебную вовлечённость студентов, развитие рефлексивных умений и интеграцию теории в педагогическую практику. Методология исследования основывалась на качественном кейсе, дополненном описательным количественным анализом. В исследовании приняли участие 28 студентов бакалавриата и два преподавателя. Данные были собраны с помощью полуструктурированных интервью, анализа артефактов портфолио и оценочных рубрик. Результаты тематического анализа выявили четыре ключевых направления: (1) рост вовлечённости и ответственности за процесс обучения, (2) развитие рефлексивных и метакогнитивных навыков, (3) аутентичное применение теоретических знаний в педагогической практике, (4) трудности с управлением временем и нагрузкой. Количественный анализ показал, что итоговые оценки портфолио колебались от 64% до 98% ($M = 86\%$, $SD = 8.2$); наивысшие результаты наблюдались при разработке учебных материалов, а наименьшие — при мониторинге и оценке достижений учащихся. Основной вывод заключается в том, что портфолио-контроль обеспечивает конструктивное согласование учебных результатов и формируемых компетенций, способствует

развитию педагогического мышления и профессиональному становлению будущих учителей. Вместе с тем вариативность глубины рефлексии и высокая нагрузка преподавателей указывают на необходимость дополнительного методического сопровождения. В целом, полученные результаты подтверждают, что структурированные и критериально выстроенные портфолио являются эффективным и комплексным инструментом аутентичного оценивания в системе подготовки учителей.

Ключевые слова: портфолио-контроль, подготовка учителей, рефлексивное обучение, аутентичное оценивание, педагогическая компетентность.

Introduction. Assessment plays a central role in higher education, shaping how students approach their studies and how instructors evaluate learning outcomes. In Kazakhstan, recent reforms to the education system have emphasized the need for transparent, valid, and formative assessment practices aligned with international standards. The State Program for the Development of Education and Science highlights assessment literacy and innovation in evaluation methods as critical priorities for enhancing educational quality and preparing graduates for professional practice [1,2].

In many higher education institutions, including teacher education programs, traditional assessment methods such as written tests, oral examinations, and end-of-course projects remain dominant. While these methods provide valuable information about student performance at specific points in time, they often fail to capture the learning process, the development of higher-order thinking skills, and the ability to apply knowledge in authentic contexts [3]. This limitation has prompted growing interest in alternative assessment approaches that offer a more comprehensive, process-oriented view of student achievement.

Among these alternatives, portfolio assessment has gained increasing attention in international educational research. Portfolios enable students to collect, organize, and reflect on their work over time, providing a richer and more authentic representation of their progress. Research indicates that portfolios can foster self-regulated learning, enhance reflective thinking, and provide evidence of both the process and product of learning. In teacher education, portfolios have also been associated with the development of professional identity and the integration of theory and practice.

Portfolio assessment is widely acknowledged as both a reflective and developmental tool that documents student learning over time. Rather than offering a fixed, universal definition, Feder and Cramer (2023) emphasize the flexibility and responsiveness of portfolios to instructional goals and learning contexts, while Domene-Martos, Palacios-Hidalgo, and Ruiz-Corbella (2024) highlight the importance of adapting portfolios to diverse teacher education settings. In its simplest form, a portfolio is a purposeful collection of evidence—written assignments, project work, observations, and self-reflections—that demonstrates the achievement of specific learning outcomes over time [6].

Portfolio assessment offers a rich array of pedagogical benefits that directly support the development of assessment literacy among pre-service teachers. A growing body of evidence indicates that portfolios meaningfully contribute to teacher preparation by promoting learner autonomy, critical thinking, and reflective assessment practices [7].

One of the most significant benefits is that portfolios foster critical thinking and metacognitive reflection. As learners construct their portfolios, they assess their own development, articulate progress over time, and identify strengths and weaknesses. These self-evaluative habits lay the foundation for ethical, evidence-informed assessment decisions—skills central to the development of assessment literacy [5, 8].

Portfolios also enhance learner autonomy and ownership, encouraging students to make meaningful decisions about what to include, how to organize their evidence, and how to interpret their growth. This aligns with the principles of assessment for learning and fosters the mindset required for learner-centered classroom assessment [9, 7].

Feder and Cramer (2023) explain that portfolios can serve different purposes depending on their design, timing, and intended audience, and Domene-Martos et al. (2024) further categorize them into developmental, showcase, assessment, and reflective types:

- Developmental portfolios focus on tracking progress and supporting metacognitive growth. These are often used for formative purposes.

- Best-work (showcase) portfolios emphasize performance and quality, highlighting the learner's strongest work—often used in evaluations.
- Assessment portfolios are linked to standards or competencies and are used to determine the extent to which learning outcomes are achieved.
- Reflective portfolios invite students to analyze their development, mistakes, and growth critically, fostering deeper insight into teaching and learning processes [10].

In many cases, portfolios are hybrid, blending developmental and evaluative functions. Their effectiveness depends largely on the clarity of purpose, the scaffolding provided by instructors, and the learner's commitment to honest reflection [4].

In the context of Kazakhstan, portfolio technology holds significant methodological value as it represents a shift from teacher-centered assessment of student preparedness toward fostering self-assessment and professional development. As Shmigirilova, Rvanova, and Tadzhigitov (2021) argue, portfolio work allows students to reconceptualize the teacher's role, affirm their chosen profession, evaluate their educational opportunities, and reflect on what they know, what they have learned, and what still requires improvement.

As an authentic assessment form, portfolios encourage student reflexivity and require students to position themselves not only as learners but also as future educators. The cognitively complex, structured assessment process using portfolios encourages instructors to engage students in defining assessment criteria, promotes the development of cognitive and metacognitive skills, and fosters an understanding of what it means to be a successful teacher. Moreover, students' involvement in evaluating their own work quality helps identify areas for growth [12].

The creation of professional achievement portfolios is a core element of professional development in Kazakhstan, documenting and showcasing the results of pedagogical activities. Portfolios include certificates, publications, methodological developments, and pedagogical research outcomes that help systematize achievements and stimulate reflective self-analysis. Participation in reflective practicums, involving collective discussion and joint problem-solving of pedagogical issues, supports the comprehensive development of professional reflection, formation of a stable professional position, and encourages continuous professional improvement [13].

Electronic portfolios, in particular, are viewed as powerful tools that foster creative and scientific self-awareness, internal motivation for professional activities, critical thinking, self-organization, and evaluation of achieved results, thereby maximizing the creative potential of future vocational teachers [14]. In Kazakhstani schools, the use of portfolios positively impacts students' motivation, self-analysis skills, and self-regulation in learning, despite requiring additional time and effort from both teachers and students [15].

Although portfolio assessment has gained considerable international recognition as a means of fostering authentic learning and reflection, in Kazakhstan, it is still in its early stages of development. Existing studies primarily highlight its value for professional growth, self-analysis, and documenting pedagogical achievements [11, 13, 14], yet few works examine its role as an assessment instrument in higher education. Moreover, there is limited empirical evidence on how portfolios are perceived by students and instructors or how they might contribute to more comprehensive evaluation practices. Against this backdrop, the present study examines the potential of portfolios not only as tools for professional self-development but also as mechanisms of authentic assessment within Kazakhstani universities.

Basic provisions. The purpose of this article is to investigate how portfolios function in higher education as tools of authentic assessment. The research problem stems from the limitations of traditional assessment methods, which tend to capture only final results while overlooking the processes of knowledge, skill, and ability formation. This study specifically examines how students and instructors in linguodidactic disciplines perceive the use of portfolios, and how these perceptions shape engagement, reflective learning, and the transfer of theoretical knowledge into practice. The analysis highlights both advantages (e.g., increased learner autonomy, analytical thinking, and authenticity of

evidence) and challenges (e.g., time demands and the need for clear guidelines). Based on these findings, the article argues that portfolios can provide a more comprehensive, process-oriented evaluation of learning outcomes and recommends their broader adoption within the educational practice of Kazakhstani universities.

Materials and Methods. This study adopted a qualitative case-study design, complemented by descriptive quantitative analysis, to explore the effectiveness of portfolio assessment in higher education. The focus was on how students and instructors experienced portfolio-based evaluation and how it supported learning, reflection, and the application of knowledge in authentic tasks [16].

Context and Participants. The research took place in the course “*Linguodidactic Basis of Professional Activity of a Foreign Language Teacher*” at Kazakh Ablai Khan University of International Relations and World Languages. Twenty-eight third-year EFL students and two course instructors participated. Participants were recruited purposively to ensure direct experience with creating, curating, and defending a semester-long portfolio. All participants gave informed consent.

Course Content. The course “*Linguodidactic Basis of Professional Activity of a Foreign Language Teacher*” at Abylaikhan Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages was organized in line with the state higher education standard and comprised 120 academic hours, distributed as follows: 30 hours of lectures, 15 hours of seminars, 30 hours of supervised independent work of students (SIWT), and 45 hours of independent work (SIW). To ensure systematic development of knowledge and skills, the content was structured into six thematic blocks, each representing a core dimension of foreign language teaching methodology:

1. Methods of foreign language teaching as a science.
2. Major methodological categories (aims and principles, content, methods, means);
3. Teaching linguistic aspects (grammar, vocabulary, phonetics);
4. Teaching communicative skills (listening, reading, speaking, writing);
5. Planning the learning process (long-, mid-, and short-term planning);
6. Control and assessment.

These blocks were distributed across the 15-week semester, with each week focusing on a specific methodological component and its associated portfolio tasks. The design followed a spiral principle: beginning with theoretical foundations (Weeks 1–3), progressing through teaching of linguistic and communicative aspects (Weeks 4–9), moving toward planning at different levels (Weeks 10–13), and culminating in assessment and final portfolio compilation (Weeks 14–15).

Portfolio technology was integrated directly into the syllabus, requiring students to complete authentic, practice-oriented tasks that produced concrete artifacts, such as lesson plans, task sets, alignment audits, and reflective notes. These artifacts collectively demonstrated both process and outcomes of learning, ensuring that students engaged not only with theoretical material but also with the application and evaluation of their professional competencies.

Table 1 presents the week-by-week alignment of thematic blocks, weekly foci, portfolio tasks, and expected artifacts. This structure enabled students to curate a cumulative portfolio that served simultaneously as (a) evidence of content mastery, (b) a tool for reflection and self-assessment, and (c) an authentic demonstration of professional readiness.

Table 1- A week-by-week portfolio task plan

Week	Thematic Block	Weekly Focus	Portfolio Task(s)	Artifacts to Submit
1	<i>Methods of FLT as a science</i>	Key paradigms & schools	Create a concept map of FLT methods; write a 300–400 words position note on when/why to combine methods.	Concept map (PDF/image); position note (doc)
2	<i>Major methodological categories</i>	Aims & principles	Build a “toolkit” table linking aims → principles → methods → means for one unit you might teach. Add a 200-word rationale.	Toolkit table; short rationale

3	<i>Major methodological categories</i>	Content & methods alignment	Analyze a textbook unit: identify aims, content coverage, chosen methods/means; propose two improvements.	Annotated textbook extract; 1-page improvement note
4	<i>Teaching linguistic aspects</i>	Grammar	Design a grammar lesson (objective, staging, tasks, materials). Include 3 controlled→guided→free practice tasks.	Lesson plan; task sheets; brief teacher notes
5	<i>Teaching linguistic aspects</i>	Vocabulary	Create a vocabulary lesson (target items, form–meaning–use). Add one assessment item for retention.	Lesson plan; materials; sample assessment item
6	<i>Teaching linguistic aspects</i>	Phonetics	Develop a 20-minute phonology activity set (segmental + suprasegmental). Record a short demo (in-class or simulated).	Activity pack; 3–5 min audio/video demo
7	<i>Teaching communicative skills</i>	Listening	Design pre-while-post listening tasks for one audio (≤4 min). Add comprehension questions by level (literal→inferential).	Task set; question sheet; audio source info
8	<i>Teaching communicative skills</i>	Reading	Prepare a reading lesson that includes tasks for skimming, scanning, making inferences, and vocabulary in context.	Lesson plan; task sheets; answer key
9	<i>Teaching communicative skills</i>	Speaking & Writing	Create one speaking task (pair/group, communicative outcome) and one writing task (genre + criteria). Include peer-feedback forms.	Task briefs; peer-feedback forms; scoring checklist
10	<i>Planning the learning process</i>	Long-term planning	Draft a <i>long-term plan</i> (unit/term scope & sequence, outcomes, assessment overview).	LTP document; scope-and-sequence grid
11	<i>Planning the learning process</i>	Mid-term planning	Develop a mid-term (module) plan using backward design, mapping tasks to outcomes and evidence.	Module plan; alignment map
12	<i>Planning the learning process</i>	Short-term planning	Write a detailed <i>short-term lesson plan</i> (timings, procedures, differentiation, materials).	STP lesson plan; materials pack
13	<i>Planning the learning process</i>	Coherence & revision	Conduct an <i>alignment audit</i> (long→mid→short). Revise one earlier plan and justify revisions (200–300 words).	Alignment checklist; revised plan; justification note
14	<i>Control and assessment</i>	Formative & summative	Create one <i>formative</i> tool (e.g., exit ticket/observation sheet) and one <i>summative</i> tool (e.g., quiz/performance task) with criteria. Pilot on sample work (real or mock) and note findings.	Two tools; criteria/rubric; scored samples; 1-page pilot note
15	<i>Control and assessment</i>	Compilation & reflection	Compile the <i>final portfolio</i> (all artifacts, contents page, cross-links). Add a 600–800-word reflective synthesis on learning, challenges, and next steps. (Optional: 5-minute oral defense.)	Final compiled portfolio (PDF/Folder); reflective synthesis; (optional) slides

Data Sources and Collection. Two complementary qualitative sources were used:

1. *Semi-structured interviews* with students and instructors captured perceived benefits, challenges, and the influence of the portfolio on engagement, reflective thinking, and authenticity of demonstrated skills. Interviews lasted 30–35 minutes, were audio-recorded with the participant's consent, and followed an interview guide that allowed for probing of emerging issues.

2. *Portfolio artifacts* (final submitted portfolios) provided documentary evidence of learning processes and products. Artifacts included the items listed above, as well as formative instructor feedback where applicable.

3. *Portfolio assessment scores* are assigned using a predefined rubric aligned with the course learning outcomes. Scores for each criterion and overall totals were recorded for quantitative analysis.

Data Analysis.

Qualitative analysis. Interview transcripts were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis as described by Braun and Clarke (2006) to identify patterns in engagement and ownership, reflective thinking, authentic demonstration of skills, and implementation challenges. Portfolios underwent

qualitative content analysis [18] to interpret the breadth and depth of application of the tasks — coding combined inductive categories with deductive sensitizing concepts derived from course outcomes. To enhance credibility, triangulation between interviews and portfolio content was employed, following the principles of Lincoln and Guba (1985).

Quantitative analysis. Portfolio scores were calculated across five criteria — Mastery of Theoretical Knowledge, Lesson and Assessment Planning Skills, Practical Application in Teaching, Development of Teaching Materials, and Monitoring and Evaluation of Learners. Each was rated on a 4-point scale, converted to percentages, and mapped to the university’s grading scale. Descriptive statistics (range, mean, standard deviation, and frequency distributions) were computed to identify patterns in performance and areas for improvement.

The selection of assessment criteria (Table 2) was driven by the need to align portfolio evaluation directly with the intended learning outcomes of the course, and to reflect internationally recognized principles of authentic assessment [3]. Since portfolios are designed to provide a holistic representation of a learner’s progress, the chosen criteria encompass a balanced combination of professional knowledge, practical teaching skills, and assessment competencies essential for future foreign language teachers.

Table 2 - Assessment Criteria

Criterion	Description	Indicators
<i>Mastery of Theoretical Knowledge</i>	Demonstrates understanding of normative documents, teaching methods, and modern technologies.	Accurate references to regulations; correct use of methodological terminology; integration of ICT tools in teaching design.
<i>Lesson and Assessment Planning Skills</i>	Ability to design lesson plans considering learners’ needs, age specifics, and curriculum goals.	Clear objectives; logical sequencing; relevant methods and tools of assessment; criterion-based evaluation strategies.
<i>Practical Application in Teaching</i>	Evidence of applying methods and techniques in simulated or real teaching contexts.	Detailed records of conducted lessons; alignment with communicative and cognitive principles; achievement of lesson objectives.
<i>Development of Teaching Materials</i>	Creation and adaptation of didactic resources for language learning.	Originality; appropriateness for target learners; effective integration into lesson structure.
<i>Monitoring and Evaluation of Learners</i>	Ability to track and interpret learners’ progress.	Use of valid and reliable assessment tools; meaningful interpretation of results; suggestions for improvement.

In sum, these five criteria collectively address the triad of *professional knowledge, pedagogical skills, and assessment competence* outlined in the Professional Standard of a Teacher, ensuring that the portfolio serves as a valid and comprehensive measure of student achievement in the course. Each criterion was rated on a 4-point scale (Table 3):

Table 3 - Scoring Rubric

Score	Description
4 – <i>Excellent</i>	Fully meets and often exceeds expectations; provides rich evidence of knowledge, skills, and competencies.
3 – <i>Good</i>	Meets expectations with minor inaccuracies or omissions.
2 – <i>Satisfactory</i>	Partially meets expectations; limited practical application.
1 – <i>Needs Improvement</i>	Does not meet expectations; incomplete or inaccurate work.

Final grades were calculated as the sum of all criterion scores, converted into a percentage, and mapped to the university’s grading scale:

A = 90–100%, B = 80–89%, C = 70–79%, D = 60–69%, F < 60%.

Trustworthiness and Ethics

Credibility was supported through member checking of thematic summaries with a subset of participants and peer debriefing on coding decisions. An audit trail of protocols, codebooks, and analytic memos was maintained to ensure dependability and confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Ethical approval was obtained from the university’s research ethics committee; participation was voluntary, data were anonymized, and participants could withdraw at any time.

Results. The findings indicate that the portfolio-based assessment served both as an evaluative instrument and as a learning-oriented framework, facilitating students’ professional development over time. Qualitative and quantitative evidence demonstrate generally positive learning outcomes, particularly in student engagement, reflective capacity, and the practical application of theoretical knowledge. However, the results also identify areas requiring additional instructional support, specifically in students’ assessment literacy and their ability to manage workload consistently throughout the semester. The following tables provide a structured overview of these results, integrating thematic analysis with descriptive statistics to offer a comprehensive representation of students’ performance and experiences.

Analysis of portfolio artifacts and student interviews revealed four interconnected themes:

1) enhanced engagement and ownership of learning, 2) growth in reflective and metacognitive skills, 3) authentic integration of theory and practice, and 4) challenges in time management and consistency of work quality.

Table 4 - Overview of Qualitative Themes Identified in Portfolio Analysis

Theme	Key Evidence	Illustrative Findings
Engagement and ownership	Student interviews; weekly submissions	Students described the portfolio as a “personal project” that sustained engagement throughout the semester.
Reflective and metacognitive growth	Weekly reflections; final synthesis entries	Students increasingly articulated rationales for methodological choices and referenced course theory.
Integration of theory and practice	Lesson plans; teaching materials; micro-teaching	Portfolio artifacts demonstrated alignment with communicative and cognitive principles.
Time management challenges	Instructor feedback: submission patterns	Uneven quality across weeks due to competing coursework demands.

As shown in Table 4, students described the portfolio as a “personal project” that fostered sustained engagement throughout the semester. The week-by-week structure of portfolio tasks, aligned closely with the course’s thematic progression, allowed them to see a clear trajectory in the development of their skills. Instructors reported noticeably higher levels of seminar participation than in previous cohorts assessed through traditional methods. Many students attributed this increased engagement to the sense of responsibility they felt for producing a coherent, high-quality body of work over time.

Evidence from both weekly reflections and final synthesis entries indicated a marked improvement in students’ capacity for reflective and metacognitive thinking. Participants not only described what they had done in lesson design and implementation, but also articulated the rationale behind their methodological choices, often referencing theoretical principles from the course. While some demonstrated a high level of critical self-evaluation—identifying misalignments between intended objectives and chosen activities—others remained largely descriptive in their reflections, suggesting varied levels of sophistication in reflective practice.

Portfolio artifacts consistently demonstrated that students could apply theoretical knowledge in authentic teaching contexts. Lesson plans, instructional materials, and assessment tools showed alignment with communicative and cognitive principles, thoughtful sequencing of activities, and appropriate integration of ICT resources. Instructors confirmed that these competences were also visible

in micro-teaching sessions, with 82% of students receiving a rating of “Good” or “Excellent” on the Practical Application in Teaching criterion.

Despite these strengths, both students and instructors identified time management as a recurrent challenge. Several students struggled to balance portfolio development with other coursework demands, resulting in uneven quality across weekly submissions. Instructors noted that early formative feedback often needed to address missing or incomplete components rather than refining deeper pedagogical elements.

Table 5 - Distribution of Final Portfolio Grades (N = 28)

Grade	Percentage of Students	Number of Students
A	46%	13
B	39%	11
C	11%	3
D	4%	1
F	0%	0

Quantitatively, final portfolio scores ranged from 64% to 98%, with a mean of 86% (SD = 8.2). According to the university grading scale (Table 5), 46% of students earned an A, 39% a B, 11% a C, and 4% a D; no failing grades were recorded.

Table 6 - Mean Scores by Assessment Criterion (4-point scale)

Assessment Criterion	Mean Score
Development of Teaching Materials	3.6
Lesson Planning and Sequencing	3.4
Practical Application in Teaching	3.5
Monitoring and Evaluation of Learners	3.1

As summarized in Table 6, the highest average scores were achieved for the Development of Teaching Materials criterion (M = 3.6/4), while Monitoring and Evaluation of Learners had the lowest mean score (M = 3.1/4), indicating that assessment literacy remains a relatively underdeveloped area for further growth.

Discussion. The results suggest that portfolio assessment in the *Linguodidactic Basis of Professional Activity of a Foreign Language Teacher* course effectively promoted engagement, reflective thinking, and the authentic application of theoretical concepts. The structured, scaffolded approach appears to have reduced the tendency for last-minute work, enabling students to build confidence in lesson planning and materials design progressively.

These findings align with Biggs and Tang’s (2011) concept of constructive alignment, as the portfolio criteria closely mirror the course’s intended learning outcomes and encourage the active integration of knowledge and practice. Students’ ability to incorporate ICT tools, design communicatively oriented lesson plans, and justify methodological decisions demonstrates how authentic assessments can capture complex professional competences often missed by traditional examinations.

The reflective components of the portfolio also contributed to professional growth, supporting Pastore’s (2023) findings that reflective portfolio tasks can strengthen ongoing professional development. However, the observed variability in reflection depth suggests a need for more targeted scaffolding, such as providing exemplars of critical reflection, to help students progress from descriptive accounts to analytical evaluations of their practice.

Lower performance in Monitoring and Evaluation of Learners points to an ongoing challenge in developing robust assessment literacy [15]. While most students could design valid formative tools, many found it difficult to interpret assessment data or adapt instruction accordingly. Embedding

iterative, feedback-driven cycles of assessment design and data analysis within the curriculum may address this gap.

From an instructional perspective, portfolios provided a rich source of formative and summative data, enabling nuanced feedback that extended beyond content accuracy to pedagogical reasoning. Nonetheless, the workload involved in providing detailed feedback, coupled with the need for consistency across instructors, presents a practical challenge. Strategies such as structured peer review, rubric-based self-assessment, and scheduled portfolio check-ins could help mitigate these pressures.

Although these findings derive from a single-cohort case study and thus cannot be generalized without caution, they offer a strong basis for further inquiry. Future research could investigate the longitudinal effects of competences developed through portfolio assessment, exploring how these competences transfer into professional teaching practice, or compare learning outcomes between portfolio-assessed cohorts and those evaluated through more traditional methods.

Conclusion. This study demonstrates that structured portfolio assessment can be a powerful tool for fostering meaningful learning in higher education, particularly within teacher education programs. The integration of weekly portfolio tasks supported sustained engagement, encouraged reflective and metacognitive practice, and enabled authentic application of theoretical knowledge in lesson planning, materials design, and assessment activities [3]. Quantitative results further highlighted strengths in the development of teaching materials, while identifying monitoring and evaluation of learners as an area for continued growth, pointing to the ongoing need to develop assessment literacy among pre-service teachers [15].

The findings align with the principles of authentic assessment and constructive alignment, confirming that portfolios provide a richer, more holistic picture of student competence compared to traditional examinations. While participants noted challenges related to workload management and variability in reflection depth, the overall benefits—encompassing enhanced pedagogical reasoning, ownership of learning, and integration of professional skills—underscore the value of portfolios in teacher preparation curricula.

Future research should explore longitudinal outcomes to determine how portfolio-based assessment influences classroom performance and professional practice over time. Additionally, incorporating structured guidance and iterative formative feedback may further strengthen reflective practice and assessment literacy. Overall, the study supports the broader adoption of portfolio assessment as a practice-oriented, comprehensive approach to evaluating student learning and professional development in higher education.

References:

1. Министерство образования и науки Республики Казахстан (2021).
2. Национальный доклад о состоянии и развитии системы образования Республики Казахстан (2020).
3. Biggs J., & Tang C. *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press, 2011
4. Feder E., & Cramer E.D. *Portfolios in teacher education: A systematic review of reflective practice and assessment. Journal of Education for Teaching*, 49(1), 2023. 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2022.2138684>
5. Domene-Martos S., Palacios-Hidalgo F.J., & Ruiz-Corbella M. *E-portfolios for reflection and assessment in teacher education: A systematic review. Teaching and Teacher Education*, 136, 2024. 104450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104450>
6. Касымова П. *Студенческое портфолио в контексте компетентностного подхода. Педагогика и психология*, 2(43), 2020. 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.2077-6861.17>
7. Puspawati I., Astuti R., & Priyanti N. *Language assessment literacy among EFL pre-service teachers: The role of reflective portfolios. TESOL Journal*, 15(1), 2024. e555. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.555>
8. Güngör F., & Güngör M. *Pre-service teachers' assessment literacy: The role of reflective portfolios. Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 32(1), 2023. 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-022-00653-1>
9. Sandoval-Ríos Y., Jiménez-González C., & Pérez-Rojas D. *Reflective practice and language assessment literacy: Insights from portfolio-based teacher education. Language Testing in Asia*, 15(1), 2025. 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00223-z>
10. Rojas Bruna C. *Reflective portfolios in EFL teacher training: Enhancing assessment literacy. Journal of Language and Education*, 11(1), 2025. 33–47.

11. Шмигирилова И.Б., Рванова А.С., Таджигитов А.А. Портфолио как средство оценки в подготовке будущего учителя математики. *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Педагогические науки*, 67(3),2021. 86–92. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-3.1728-5496.11>
12. Тұңғатова Н., Sözer M. A., Кошкинбаева Н. Модель формирования профессиональной идентичности будущего учителя начальных классов посредством рефлексивных технологий. *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Педагогические науки*, 86(2),2025. 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-5762.2025.86.2.012>
13. Курманбаева А.А., Жаппар К.З., Алдабергенкызы Л. Развитие творческого мышления будущих учителей в цифровую эпоху образования. *Вестник КазНПУ имени Абая. Серия: Педагогические науки*, 2(77),2023. 80–86. <https://doi.org/10.51889/4993.2022.77.85.008>
14. Ниязова А.М. Новые подходы к оценке учебных достижений учащихся общеобразовательных школ. *Вестник КазНУ. Серия: Педагогические науки*, 1 (44),2015
15. Ibrahim A., & Rakhshani S. Language assessment literacy in EFL teacher education: Perspectives and practices. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 33,2024. 85–100.
16. Creswell J.W., & Poth C.N. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage,2018
17. Braun V., & Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2),2006. 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
18. Schreier M. *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage2012
19. Lincoln Y.S., & Guba E.G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage,1985
20. Pastore S. Reflective portfolios in teacher education: Critical review and pedagogical perspectives. *Educational Research Review*, 38,2023. 100520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100520>

References:

1. Ministerstvo obrazovaniya i nauki Respubliki Kazakhstan (2021).
2. Nacional'nyj doklad o sostoyanii i razvitii sistemy obrazovaniya Respubliki Kazakhstan,2020.
3. Biggs J., & Tang C. (2011). *Teaching for quality learning at university* (4th ed.). Open University Press,2011
4. Feder E., & Cramer E.D. Portfolios in teacher education: A systematic review of reflective practice and assessment. *Journal of Education for Teaching*, 49(1),2023. 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02607476.2022.2138684>
5. Domene-Martos S., Palacios-Hidalgo F.J., & Ruiz-Corbella M. E-portfolios for reflection and assessment in teacher education: A systematic review. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 136, 104450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2023.104450>
6. Ibrahim A., & Rakhshani, S. (2024). Language assessment literacy in EFL teacher education: Perspectives and practices. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 33,2024. 85–100.
7. Kasymova R. Studencheskoe portfolio v kontekste kompetentnostnogo podkhoda. *Pedagogika i psikhologiya*, 2(43),2020. 128–136. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-2.2077-6861.17>
8. Puspawati I., Astuti R., & Priyanti N. (2024). Language assessment literacy among EFL pre-service teachers: The role of reflective portfolios. *TESOL Journal*, 15(1),2024. e555. <https://doi.org/10.1002/tesj.555>
9. Güngör F., & Güngör M. (2023). Pre-service teachers' assessment literacy: The role of reflective portfolios. *Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 32(1),2023. 45–60. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-022-00653-1>
10. Sandoval-Ríos Y., Jiménez-González C., & Pérez-Rojas D. Reflective practice and language assessment literacy: Insights from portfolio-based teacher education. *Language Testing in Asia*, 15(1),2025. 17. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-025-00223-z>
11. Rojas Bruna C. Reflective portfolios in EFL teacher training: Enhancing assessment literacy. *Journal of Language and Education*, 11(1),2025. 33–47.
12. Shmigirilova I.B., Rvanova A.S., Tadzhigitov A.A. Portfolio kak sredstvo ocenki v podgotovke budushchego uchitelya matematiki. *Vestnik KaZNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, 67(3),2021. 86–92. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2020-3.1728-5496.11>
13. Tungatova N., Sözer M.A., Koshkinbaeva N. Model' formirovaniya professional'noj identichnosti budushchego uchitelya nachal'nykh klassov posredstvom reflektivnykh tekhnologij. *Vestnik KaZNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, 86(2),2025. 133–143. <https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-5762.2025.86.2.012>
14. Kurmanbaeva A.A., Zhappar K.Z., Aldabergenkyzy L. Razvitie tvorcheskogo myshleniya budushchikh uchitelej v cifrovuyu ehpokhu obrazovaniya. *Vestnik KaZNPU imeni Abaya. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, 2(77),2023. 80–86. <https://doi.org/10.51889/4993.2022.77.85.008>
15. Niyazova A.M. (2015). Novye podkhody k ocenke uchebnykh dostizhenij uchaschchiksya obshcheobrazovatel'nykh shkol. *Vestnik KaZNU. Seriya: Pedagogicheskie nauki*, 1 (44),2015.
16. Ibrahim A., & Rakhshani S. Language assessment literacy in EFL teacher education: Perspectives and practices. *Language Teaching Research Quarterly*, 33,2024. 85–100.

16. Creswell J.W., & Poth C.N. *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (4th ed.). Sage, 2018
17. Braun V., & Clarke V. *Using thematic analysis in psychology. Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 2006. 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
18. Schreier, M. *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage, 2012
19. Lincoln Y.S., & Guba E.G. *Naturalistic inquiry*. Sage, 1985
20. Pastore S. *Reflective portfolios in teacher education: Critical review and pedagogical perspectives. Educational Research Review*, 38, 2023. 100520. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2022.100520>

МРНТИ 14.35.07

<https://doi.org/10.51889/2959-5762.2026.89.1.023>

Макимова Г.Т., ^{1*}  Бегалиева С.Б., ¹  Хасанова С.А.² 

¹Казахский Национальный Университет им. аль-Фараби, г.Алматы, Казакстан

²Казахский национальный педагогический университет имени Абая,
г.Алматы, Казакстан

ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ ДАЛЬНЕЙШЕГО РАЗВИТИЯ ЦИФРОВЫХ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ В ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКОМ ОБРАЗОВАНИИ

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается одна из наиболее актуальных проблем современного образования - перспективы развития цифровых технологий в сфере лингвистического обучения. Исследование направлено на осмысление возможностей цифровых инструментов, онлайн-платформ и интеллектуальных систем, которые постепенно трансформируют традиционные подходы к преподаванию иностранных языков и методике формирования языковой компетенции. Представлен аналитический обзор национальных и зарубежных инициатив, реализуемых в области цифровизации лингвистического образования, а также исследуется уровень восприятия и готовности преподавателей и студентов к использованию подобных технологий в учебном процессе.

Цель статьи заключается в выявлении направлений дальнейшего развития цифровых технологий, способствующих повышению эффективности и интерактивности языкового обучения. Для достижения поставленной цели применены методы сравнительного анализа, контент-анализа научных публикаций, а также опрос среди преподавателей и обучающихся языковых направлений в казахстанских вузах.

Эмпирическая часть исследования выполнена в формате 12-недельного педагогического эксперимента на базе Volashaq Mektebi (г. Алматы): смешанная цифровая модель показала более высокий прирост интегрального балла и снижение тревожности при устной коммуникации, сводные результаты отражены в Табл. 2.

Результаты исследования показали, что интеграция цифровых платформ, систем искусственного интеллекта, виртуальных и дополненных сред способствует повышению вовлечённости обучающихся, улучшению качества обратной связи и персонализации образовательных траекторий. При этом отмечены методические и организационные барьеры, требующие комплексного подхода к их преодолению. В заключении обозначены приоритетные направления совершенствования цифровой инфраструктуры и педагогических практик, обеспечивающих устойчивую эволюцию лингводидактической среды в Республике Казахстан.

Ключевые слова: цифровая трансформация, лингводидактика, языковое образование, онлайн-платформы, искусственный интеллект, смешанное обучение, национальное образовательное пространство.