# Main barriers to applying new methods and strategies to overcome them

**Kuvanova Iroda Kuralboy qizi**
*Master's Department, Jizzakh State Pedagogical University named after Abdulla Qodiriy, Jizzakh, Uzbekistan*

**Abstract.** This article analyzes the systemic, chronological, and psychological barriers — widely known as the "Implementation Gap" — in integrating the Integrated Methods Set (IMS) into the professional training of future English teachers in Uzbekistan. The study identifies heavy curricular workloads, strict time constraints, traditional assessment cultures, and severe cognitive overload as the primary challenges facing pre-service educators. To mitigate these hurdles, strategic solutions are proposed, including the optimization of digital multimodality as a cognitive scaffold, the implementation of dual-purpose rubrics, and the establishment of collaborative Professional Development Clusters.

**Keywords:** Integrated Methods Set (IMS), scaffolding, cognitive overload, time constraints, assessment paradox, digital multimodality, pre-service teachers.

## INTRODUCTION

The transition from theoretical pedagogical constructs to classroom reality is rarely a seamless process; rather, it is often hindered by what is known as the "Implementation Gap." While the Integrated Methods Set (IMS) offers a robust framework for balancing content and language, the practical application of such innovations faces significant structural and psychological hurdles. This gap exists between the idealized version of integrated teaching and the actual classroom performance of pre-service teachers.

As Fullan emphasizes, educational change is not a singular event but a complex, non-linear process that involves a "change in practice" at several levels: the use of new materials, the adoption of new teaching approaches, and the alteration of deeply held pedagogical beliefs. Fullan argues that many innovations fail not because they lack merit, but because the complexity of the change process is underestimated. For pre-service teachers, shifting from traditional, teacher-centered routines to a multidimensional synergistic matrix like the IMS requires a profound cognitive and behavioral shift that many are not yet prepared to sustain [1]. In the specific context of Uzbekistan's Higher Education Institutions (HEIs), these challenges are amplified by localized systemic factors. Makhkamova identifies that while national reforms mandate the modernization of foreign language teaching, the "professional-methodological competence" of future teachers is often constrained by a historical reliance on grammar-translation traditions and rigid curricular structures. The transition to integrated methods is frequently met with resistance due to the heavy workload of educators, a lack of specialized resources for English Medium Instruction (EMI), and a traditional assessment culture that prioritizes rote memorization over integrated proficiency [2].

Furthermore, the shift to the IMS model is inherently cognitively demanding for pre-service teachers. Traditional methods allow an educator to focus on a single domain—either the linguistic mechanics of English or the factual data of a subject. However, an integrated approach requires the teacher to manage multiple cognitive streams simultaneously: facilitating subject-matter comprehension, providing linguistic scaffolding, managing digital multimodality, and conducting formative assessment. This "split-attention effect" can lead to cognitive overload for novice teachers, who may revert to traditional, less effective methods as a defense mechanism against the complexity of the IMS

framework. Understanding these barriers is the first step toward developing the strategies necessary to bridge the implementation gap and ensure the sustainability of pedagogical innovation.

**MAIN BODY**

**Time and Curricular Rigidity as Structural Constraints.** In the hierarchical structure of pedagogical barriers, Time emerges as the most pervasive structural constraint. For pre-service teachers attempting to implement the Integrated Methods Set (IMS), time is not merely a chronological unit but a finite resource that dictates the depth of instructional quality. The primary conflict arises from the systemic pressure to achieve "content coverage" within the confines of a rigid academic calendar, a challenge that often forces educators to sacrifice interactive strategies in favor of traditional, lecture-based delivery.

As Coyle and Meyer articulate in their research on pluriliteracies, there is an inherent tension between the breadth of curriculum coverage and the depth of student learning. In integrated settings like CLIL or EMI, "deep learning" requires students to engage in cognitively demanding tasks that necessitate extensive scaffolding and negotiation of meaning [3]. However, when the curriculum is perceived as a checklist of topics to be "covered" before a summative examination, teachers often view time-intensive IMS components—such as Pedagogical Scaffolding and Digital Multimodality—as luxuries rather than necessities. This leads to a pedagogical compromise where surface-level content delivery is prioritized over the conceptual mastery and linguistic fluency envisioned by the IMS framework.

Furthermore, a rigid curriculum acts as a deterrent to the "adaptive teaching" required by the Strategy pillar of the IMS model. Scaffolding, by its very nature, is a flexible process; it requires the teacher to slow down, diagnose learner gaps, and provide temporary supports that are gradually removed [4]. In the context of Uzbekistan’s Higher Education, where syllabi are often centrally determined and time-bound, pre-service teachers feel a moral and professional obligation to stay on schedule. This "tyranny of the clock" creates a risk-averse environment where teachers avoid interactive strategies because they are unpredictable and consume more classroom minutes than a standard translation-based approach. Ultimately, the structural barrier of time suggests that without a parallel move toward curriculum flexibility, the IMS model remains difficult to implement at scale. If the success of a teacher is measured solely by the volume of content delivered rather than the quality of the "IMS Core" synthesis achieved, the implementation gap will persist. To overcome this, it is essential to redefine the curriculum not as a rigid path, but as a flexible framework that allows for the temporal "breathing room" necessary for integrated learning to take root.

**Scaffolding Demands and Cognitive Overload.** Beyond structural constraints, the internal difficulty of managing the "Strategy" pillar of the IMS model presents a significant psychological barrier. At the heart of this challenge is Scaffolding, a process that is frequently misunderstood as simple assistance rather than a sophisticated pedagogical intervention. For pre-service teachers, the primary barrier is the inability to calibrate the level of support required, leading to a phenomenon where the "scaffold" either becomes a permanent crutch that hinders student independence or is too flimsy to support meaningful cognitive growth. As Walqui and Bunch point out, "high-challenge" pedagogy requires a high level of "contingent scaffolding"—the teacher's ability to respond in real-time to student struggles [4]. However, many novice educators in Uzbekistan experience cognitive overload themselves while trying to maintain this balance. In an integrated classroom, the teacher must simultaneously monitor subject-matter accuracy and linguistic production. This dual focus often exhausts the teacher's working memory, making it difficult to maintain the Zone of Proximal Development (ZPD). According to Lantolf and Poehner, effective mediation within the ZPD is a high-level skill that requires "dynamic assessment"—constantly adjusting support based on the learner's immediate response [5]. For a pre-service teacher managing a large class, the sheer complexity of providing individualized mediation for thirty or more students often leads to a retreat into traditional "one-size-fits-all" instruction.

Furthermore, the barrier of "Over-Scaffolding" is a recurring issue. In an effort to ensure students understand the subject content, teachers may simplify the language to such an extent that the linguistic challenge is removed entirely. This prevents students from developing the academic language proficiency necessary for higher education. Conversely, a lack of scaffolding results in student frustration and disengagement. Without the "professional-methodological fluency" to navigate these extremes, pre-service teachers often perceive integrated methods as "too difficult" for their specific student demographic. Therefore, overcoming this barrier requires a move toward what the IMS model advocates: a systematic use of Digital Multimodality to automate some scaffolding tasks, thereby freeing the teacher's cognitive resources for more complex interactional mediation.

**The Assessment Paradox.** The final and perhaps most formidable barrier to the implementation of the IMS model is the systemic misalignment between innovative pedagogy and traditional evaluation frameworks. This phenomenon, often referred to as the "Assessment Paradox," occurs when teachers are encouraged to use integrated, interactive methods but are ultimately held accountable for student performance on standardized, summative examinations that focus on rote memorization or isolated linguistic skills. As emphasized by Black and Wiliam, the effectiveness of any pedagogical model is inextricably linked to its feedback loops. In the IMS framework, the Assessment pillar is designed to be formative and continuous—a "diagnostic loop" that informs the teacher's next strategic move [6]. However, in the current educational landscape of Uzbekistan, the prevalence of high-stakes testing often creates a "washback effect" that undermines these formative practices. Pre-service teachers, fearful that their students will fail standardized tests if too much time is spent on "integrated projects" or "collaborative tasks," often revert to "teaching to the test." This focus on summative outcomes discourages the very experimentation and data-informed adjustment that the IMS model requires for success.

Furthermore, there is a significant lack of practical rubrics capable of evaluating the dual mastery of language and content simultaneously. Traditional assessment cultures tend to separate these domains, grading a student either on their factual knowledge or their grammatical accuracy. This creates a barrier for pre-service teachers who, despite having the desire to use the IMS model, do not possess the tools to measure its outcomes effectively. Without integrated assessment tools, the "synergy" of the IMS Core remains invisible in official records. As Black and Wiliam argue, unless assessment is transformed from a terminal event into a perpetual diagnostic tool, the implementation of complex models like the IMS will be viewed by teachers as a risk rather than an opportunity for growth. Thus, the transition to integrated methods necessitates a parallel revolution in how student progress is measured and valued [6].

**Discussion and recommendations**

To bridge the implementation gap, the IMS model does not merely identify problems but offers a systematic set of strategies designed to make innovation sustainable within the constraints of Uzbekistan's Higher Education. These strategies focus on enhancing teacher agency through technological efficiency, collaborative professional development, and the integration of adaptive assessment tools.

1. **Strategic Deployment of Digital Multimodality:** The primary strategy for overcoming Time and Cognitive Load barriers is leveraging multimodality. As argued by Kessler, technology should not be an "add-on" but a labor-saving "Cognitive Scaffold" [7]. By utilizing AI-driven language assistants and interactive content platforms, pre-service teachers can automate the delivery of basic vocabulary support and content-drills. This automation effectively frees up the teacher's "cognitive bandwidth," allowing them to focus on high-level interaction and real-time mediation in the Zone of Proximal Development.
2. **Implementation of Dual-Purpose Rubrics:** Overcoming the Assessment Paradox requires the introduction of dual-purpose assessment tools. The IMS model advocates for specialized rubrics

that offer separate yet simultaneous feedback loops evaluating both linguistic progress and subject-matter conceptualization.

3. **Establishment of Professional Development Clusters:** To ensure these strategies are adopted organically, the creation of localized Professional Development Clusters is essential. Within these clusters, pre-service teachers engage in peer-mentoring, lesson analysis, and collaborative action research. This allows them to share successful IMS-based plans and troubleshoot systemic barriers in a risk-free, supportive environment.

**Conclusion**

By implementing these strategic interventions, the IMS model transforms from an unreachable theoretical ideal into a flexible, practical "Methodological Compass." It provides future language teachers with the structural resilience needed to navigate systemic rigidities, ensuring that the complexity of the English language remains a vehicle for—rather than a barrier to—academic excellence.

**REFERENCES**


[1] P. Black and D. Wiliam, *Inside the Black Box: Raising Standards Through Classroom Assessment*. London, UK: GL Assessment, 2018, 24 p.

[2] C. Blake, *Brave New Digital Classroom: Technology and Foreign Language Learning*. Washington, DC, USA: Georgetown University Press, 2020, 210 p.

[3] D. Coyle and O. Meyer, *Beyond CLIL: Pluriliteracies Teaching for Deeper Learning*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2021, 250 p.

[4] R. Ellis, *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching: Theoretical Principles and Usage*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2018, 400 p.

[5] M. Fullan, *The New Meaning of Educational Change*, 5th ed. New York, USA: Teachers College Press, 2016, 256 p.

[6] G. Kessler, *CALL Essentials: Principles and Practice in Language Teaching*. Washington, DC, USA: TESOL International Association, 2018, 240 p.

[7] J. P. Lantolf and M. E. Poehner, *The Routledge Handbook of Sociocultural Theory and Second Language Development*. New York, USA: Routledge, 2022, 450 p.

[8] J. P. Lantolf and S. L. Thorne, *Sociocultural Theory and the Genesis of Second Language Development*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2006, 390 p.

[9] G. T. Makhkamova, *Professional and Methodological Competence of Future English Teachers*. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan va Texnologiya, 2018, 160 p.

[10] A. Walqui and G. C. Bunch, *Amplifying the Curriculum: Designing Quality Learning Opportunities for English Learners*. New York, USA: Teachers College Press, 2019, 224 p.