

## **THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF PORTFOLIO PEDAGOGY: A REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

**Khikmatullo URAZBAEV**

Head of Global Education Department  
Westminster International University  
Tashkent, Uzbekistan

## **ТИЛ ПОРТФОЛИОСИ ТЕХНОЛОГИЯСИНING НАЗАРИЙ АСОСЛАРИ: АДАБИЁТЛАР ШАРҲИ**

**Ҳикматулло Уразбаев**

Глобал таълим кафедраси мудири  
Тошкентдаги халқаро Вестминстер университети  
Тошкент, Ўзбекистон

## **ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКИЕ ОСНОВЫ ТЕХНОЛОГИИ ЯЗЫКОВОГО ПОРТФОЛИО: ОБЗОР ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ**

**Хикматулло УРАЗБАЕВ**

Заведующий кафедрой глобального образования  
Вестминстерский международный университет  
Ташкенте, Узбекистан [kurazbaev@wiut.uz](mailto:kurazbaev@wiut.uz)

UDC (УЎК, УДК): 372.881.111.1

**For citation (иктибос келтириш учун,  
для цитирования):**

Urazbaev Kh. Theoretical foundations of portfolio pedagogy: a review of literature// Ўзбекистонда хорижий тиллар. — 2021. — № 3 (38). — Б. 93-113

<https://doi.org/10.36078/1624862230>

**Received:** April 23, 2021

**Accepted:** June 17, 2021

**Published:** June 20, 2021

Copyright © 2021 by author(s).

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution International License (CC BY 4.0).

<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>



**Open Access**

**Аннотация.** Портфолио технологияси нисабатан янги педагогик технология сифатида жаҳон миқёсида турли таълим тизимларида, контекст ва таълим босқичларида, хусусан, бошланғич таълимдан олий таълимгача, мутахассислар касбий тайёргарлигидан малака ошириш тизими контекстларида кенг қўлланилиб келинмоқда. Портфолио технологиясининг қулайликлари, жумладан, унинг тежамкорлиги, қулайлиги ва шахсга йўналтирилган таълимни қўллаши билан талаба ва ўқувчиларнинг билим, кўникма ва малакаларини баҳолашнинг, уларнинг мустақил таълим кўникмалари, ўз-ўзини баҳолаш ҳамда рефлексив фаолият малакаларини шакллантиришда бекиёс воситага айлантира олди. Мазкур тадқиқотда Ўзбекистон Республикаси олий таълим тизимида тил портфолиоси технологиясининг жорий қилиш мақсадида портфолио технологиясига оид мавжуд илмий адабиётларни таҳлил қилиш ва ушбу технологиянинг асосини ташкил қилувчи педагогик ва психологик қарашларни аниқлаш асосий мақсад сифатида олинди. Иккиламчи маълумотлар таҳлили ўз ичига хорихда ҳамда МДХ мамлакатларида нашр қилинган илмий ишларни олди. Адабиётлар таҳлили шуни кўрсатдики, портфолио технологиясининг педагогик ва психологик асосларини гуманизм, когнитивизм, метакогнитивизм ва конструктивизм назариялари ташкил қилиб, ушбу назарияларнинг ўз навбатида шахсга йўналтирилган таълим ўртасида яқин боғлиқлик мавжуд. Шахсга йўналтирилган таълим бўлса ўз навбатида Ўзбекистон Республикаси томонидан олиб борилаётган таълим сиёсатларида ҳам алоҳида аҳамиятга эга.

**Калит сўзлар:** таълим назариялари; когнитивизм; конструктивизм; портфолио; рефлексия; мустақил таълим; ўз-ўзини баҳолаш.

**Аннотация.** Технология портфолио, будучи относительно новой образовательной технологией, широко используется во всем мире в различных образовательных ситуациях, уровнях и контекстах: от начального до высшего образования, от профессиональной подготовки до карьерного продвижения специалистов. Особенности технологии портфолио, а именно ее удобство, экономическая эффективность и способность продвигать личностно-ориентированный подход к обучению и преподаванию, сделали ее широко используемым инструментом оценки достижений студентов, способствующим их навыкам самообразования, развитию самооценки и навыков рефлексивного мышления, что в конечном итоге привело их к лучшим возможностям профессионального развития и трудоустройства. Целью данного исследования явился обзор существующей литературы по теоретическим основам технологии портфолио в образовании и разработка методологии интеграции этой технологии в систему высшего образования Республики Узбекистан. Вторичные данные, проанализированные в исследовании, включали как работы западных ученых, так и ученых стран СНГ. Результаты вторичного анализа данных свидетельствуют о том, что технология портфолио в значительной степени опирается на такие теории обучения и психологии, как гуманизм, когнитивизм, метакогнитивизм и конструктивизм. Кроме того, исследование показывает, что существует тесная связь между вышеупомянутыми теориями обучения и личностно-ориентированными подходами к обучению, чему способствует нынешняя образовательная политика, проводимая правительством Узбекистана.

**Ключевые слова:** теории обучения; когнитивизм; конструктивизм; портфолио; рефлексия; автономия; самооценка.

**Abstract.** Portfolio pedagogy being a relatively new educational technology has been widely used around the world in various educational situations, levels and contexts: ranging from primary to higher, professional development to career promotion. Features of portfolio technology, namely its convenience, cost-efficiency, and capacity to promote learner centered approach to learning and teaching have made it a widely used tool in assessing students' achievements, facilitating their autonomy in learning, developing self-assessment, and reflective thinking skills, eventually leading them towards better employability opportunities. The aim of the given study was to review existing literature on theoretical foundations of portfolio technology in education and developing methodology of integrating the technology into higher education system of Uzbekistan. Secondary data analyzed in the study included both works of western scholars, CIS countries scholars and local scholars. Results of secondary data analysis indicate that the portfolio pedagogy heavily relies on such theories of learning as humanism, metacognitivism, and constructivism. In addition, the study indicates that there is a strong link between the above-mentioned theories of learning and learner-centered approaches to teaching, which is promoted by the current educational policies carried out by the government of Uzbekistan.

**Keywords:** learning theories; cognitivizm; constructivism; portfolio reflection; autonomy; self-assessment.

**Introduction.** Since educational institutions are supposed to prepare students to occupy active roles in the development of their own

lives and society, education is bound to create the grounds that can lead to these. Unlike traditional education, modern education nowadays emphasizes the acquisition of skills of learning how to learn, self-directed learning, and lifelong learning which aim to contribute to the sustainable achievement of societal goals. Integration into the global system of higher education and gradual adoption of international educational standards aimed at experiential rather than theoretical learning and teaching are among the priorities for Uzbekistan's higher education and were highlighted in the "Concept of Development of System of Higher Education of the Republic of Uzbekistan until 2030". Educational institutions' capability to react to society's requirements on workforce preparation while preserving its experience gained is of great importance. To achieve the goals put forward in the Concept of Development, educators and teacher-trainers should consider and reconsider approaches to teacher education, revisit teachers' roles in this process, develop and adopt modern learner-centered teaching and learning methods, and aids. In this regard portfolio pedagogy can be viewed as one of the tools or aids that may contribute to achieve goals set in the above-mentioned strategy. Although portfolio technology is a relatively new concept, the scopes of using portfolio in education are increasing day by day. Education system of Uzbekistan has been employing the technology of portfolio in in-service teacher education; however, so far, little extensive research on the application of portfolio pedagogy in education has been conducted and few scholars have referred to and defined the role of portfolio pedagogy. This is while the use of portfolio in education has received extensive attention in many other parts of the world, Western Europe in particular. Being a product of various humanistic approaches to teaching and learning, portfolio pedagogy's theoretical foundations are built around widely discussed theories of learning. Preliminary review of literature on portfolio pedagogy indicates that the pedagogy is mainly discussed within the perspectives of constructivism, metacognitivism and learner centered approach to learning.

History of investigating the theories of learning dates back to far past, when people started to question origins of knowledge and discussing it philosophically (38, 4). Thus, modern approaches to studying learning theories are not new and reflect peoples' desire to understand themselves, others, and the world around them (38, 4). Foundations of learning theories were laid on two trends in explaining the origins of knowledge: rationalism and empiricism. According to D. Schunk, rationalists understand knowledge as something achieved by reasoning, e.g., reflecting on something, which is sensed, while empiricists see the origins of knowledge in experience, e.g., learning about something by doing something. These two early forms of understanding of how knowledge is acquired later developed into more sophisticated learning theories, which play a central role in all areas of education.

J. Roberts distinguishes four main learning theories: behaviourism, humanism, constructivism, social constructivism, and metacognitivism. However, these learning theories may overlap and fulfill each other to some extent (34).

**Main Part.** One of the foremost learning theories that emerged in the 20<sup>th</sup> century was constructivism and is still considered to be a leading theory in explaining modern educational technologies and approaches. Constructivist philosophy puts forward that learning is viewed as a significant and indispensable part of learners' lives. K. Henson suggests that the constructivist theory of learning aims to explain how learning occurs (7, 3) from the learners' perspective. Learners are fascinated by the fact that learning involves seeking answers for important answers related to their lives and wellbeing. Every discovery of knowledge made by learners is accompanied by seeking meaning in these discoveries. In constructivism, learners' internal representation and construction of the external world is emphasized. Constructivists explain that learners' prior knowledge and expectations from the new input play an essential role in constructing new knowledge or meaning. Thus, new knowledge is acquired or constructed based only on previously obtained knowledge or experience, which is constantly reconstructed and rebuilt.

R. Yager and M. Lutz believe that the constructivist approach to learning emphasizes the importance of cognitive structures in schema building (48, 340). Schema building, as outlined in the literature, relies on knowledge construction based on background knowledge. Conscious reflection on gained skills and knowledge facilitates schema building that enables learners to unconsciously define and compare new knowledge construct against background knowledge construct. O.E. Vertinskaya defines constructivism as a learning model where learners build their knowledge based on their prior experiences and understanding of the world (51). They build their own subjective and relative reality, their philosophical systems, and models of the world. In other words, learners, while constructing new knowledge, rely on their previous pre-constructed schemas. They also do that in schema building, interaction with peers, teachers, and the surrounding environment play an essential role. This understanding of constructivism has led to coining a new form of constructivism: social constructivism. As the name suggests, social constructivism accentuates on the importance of social interaction in forming new knowledge or new realities.

Understanding learning from a constructivist perspective is built around understanding learning and teaching as an active process where learners are actively involved in knowledge construction rather than passive receivers of external input. In addition, constructivism highlights that each forms their understanding of reality based on their experience and world view. Therefore, for modern education, constructivism is of particular interest.

Emergence of humanistic approaches to understanding human psychology, specifically in learning and knowledge construction, predetermined a shift in language acquisition and learning approaches in the late 1980s and early 1990s and this in turn transitioned cognitive constructivist views to radical constructivism. The characteristic features of paradigm shift were the rejection of the teacher's role as a dominant knowledge builder, which emphasized the passive role of learners and one-way presentation of knowledge. Constructivist theory of teaching, which facilitates the creation of conditions for active participation of every learner in language skills formation, has come to the fore. To create those conditions works on creating series of complex social interaction processes, stimulation tasks aimed at creativity and hypothesis testing in learning. In this regard, constructivist view on knowledge construction, such as human being's ability to self-regulate and consider social context of learning, hypothesis testing, and achieving a compromise concerning knowledge construction were taken into account.

According to I. Kruze, in the 1970s constructivism started developing in three dimensions: methodological, radical, and social constructivism (53). She states that methodological constructivism emphasized studying justifications of modern natural sciences, which relied on describing reality towards the results of constructive human activity (53). For social constructivists, knowledge construction implied active social interaction of human beings. The fundamental distinction of radical constructivism, from the two above, was that human beings' memories do not reflect objective reality; instead, they construct their own reality (17).

Constructivism has had also greatly influenced psychological views on human learning. An understanding and integration of constructivist views on learning have been integrated to psychology of learning through such theories as metacognitivism and cognitivism. From a psychological perspective, metacognition is closely related to constructivism as it also deals with learners' internal construction of reality. However, unlike constructivism, a metacognitive theory of learning emphasizes on thinking and monitoring one's learning. In education and language education, metacognition is defined as “learners' theories of their own learning” (37, 360).

In light of the psychology of learning, metacognition is learners' understanding of self as a learner, their cognition of learning tasks, and learning strategies (45). Educational psychologists have tried to explain the processes involved in knowledge construction by dividing knowledge into types and forms. According to them, metacognition, being a complex process, entails knowledge formation in its three forms: declarative knowledge, procedural knowledge, and self-regulatory knowledge. Declarative knowledge involves understanding and cognition of oneself as a learner, understanding factors that impact

one's learning, memory, skills, knowledge about learning strategies, and resources needed to achieve specific educational goals. Procedural knowledge is mainly about having an idea about using learning strategies, resources in accomplishing learning tasks. Self-regulatory knowledge ensures completion of the task by knowing the conditions, applying learning strategies, and procedures in the process (5). Metacognition being part of cognitive psychology or cognitivist approach to learning, emphasizes that metacognition is the "knowledge about the value of applying cognitive strategies in learning" (47, 355). Authors such as P. Lightbown and N. Spada (20) and V. Cook (8) agree that metacognitive knowledge is learners' understanding of their mental processes in language learning. Acquisition of these understandings can be achieved through formal education or independent learning. J. Richards et al. suggest that metacognitive knowledge implies students' skills in understanding the complexity of tasks, which strategies to use in completing those tasks, and how to remember information better after completing learning tasks (32).

Metacognitive theory is an important concept that emphasizes the significance of reflection, learner autonomy, objective setting, and time management in learning processes. According to A. Hyde and M. Bizar, metacognition is learners' ability to think about their thinking, and depending on the outcomes introducing changes to the way they think (14). Thus, metacognition is a purposeful manipulation of our own metacognitive processes. Many authors agree that for students, especially younger students, metacognition is hard to achieve and they usually fail in thinking about their thinking. And this in turn leads to, as A. Hyde and M. Bizar state, students' failure in engaging with "self-planning, self-monitoring, self-questioning, self-reflecting, and self-reviewing" (14, 232).

Studies on the development of metacognition proposed three approaches to develop metacognition: 1) cognitive theory of instruction 2) humanistic theory of self-directed learning, and 3) socio-cultural theory of social interaction and mediation (1, 46).

The cognitive instruction approach to developing metacognition emphasizes learners' being the center of learning and engaging in learning processes. Moreover, it focuses more on developing learners' learning strategies. According to J. Roberts, humanistic theory recognizes people's autonomy and their individual needs (34). Furthermore, humanistic theory in teacher education views teacher-learner interaction as co-operative rather than dominant teacher process and emphasizes students' self-determination and self-agency in identifying their pace and extent of learning. For instance, during the classes, students can be counseled rather than taught and their ideas and views are as valuable as teachers' opinions. According to Singh and Richards, the socio-cultural theory of social interaction and mediation center on learning as situated social practice, which is

realized through discourse, mediation, and participation and provided by classroom teaching experience (6). K. Johnson believes that metacognition is shaped by the specific social activities in which learners engage (15). In this sense classroom where learning teaching takes place is a site where a group of people share the same beliefs, experience, and desires in becoming an effective learner, which creates a micro-community of people who can construct each other's knowledge.

Many scholars have studied practical realizations of metacognitive strategies in learning. Language teaching and learning is not an exception. R. Oxford, in his classification of metacognitive strategies for language learning, distinguishes the following strategies: centering learning, arranging and planning to learn, and evaluating learning (30). From this perspective language portfolio as a learning tool places learners in the center of learning, offers great opportunities that embrace strategies used in language learning and fosters the use of metacognitive learning strategies. Moreover, by using a portfolio, learners monitor their development over time and mirror their learning experience, think about the processes involved in learning and evaluate it, and set targets for further development.

As seen from the studies above, constructivism and metacognition go hand in hand and overlap each other to some extent. While constructivism places learners in the center of learning, metacognition explains that learners' ability to ponder their learning provides deep learning. Metacognition stresses the importance of learner strategies, self-reflection, self-responsibility, initiative, and goal setting in learning processes (46).

One of the main tools for realizing the constructivist and metacognitive approach to learning and teaching is reflective pedagogy. According to John Dewey, reflection is "the active, persistent, and careful consideration of any belief or supposed form of knowledge in the light of the grounds that support it and the further conclusions to which it tends" (12). According to S. Murphy, reflection is central to learning, and "learners, particularly active ones, reflect on their experiences and then experiment anew based on what they have learned." (28, 6) In addition, S. Murphy states that through reflection, learners get involved in an active learning cycle where they think about their experience and articulate it in written form. Thus, reflection can be regarded as a key to understanding one's learning.

From the above discussion of the learning theories, it is clear these learning theories place learners in the center of learning and derive from the humanistic view of learning. Application of the learning theories in teacher education takes the form of implicit presentation rather than explicit manifestation. Learning theories in teacher education programs may be infused into tasks, activities, course structure, module design, and active experimentation of the above theories. Integration of language portfolio use into language

teacher education can be theoretically justified from Experiential Learning Theory developed by David Kolb. In his experiential learning theory, Kolb places learners in the center of the learning cycle, which is carried out through active repetition of a learning cycle: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation (16, 24).

Kolb's theory can be regarded as a practical application of metacognitive and constructivist theories of learning. Kolb suggests that only by following the given cycles can learners internalize knowledge and reproduce the world in their minds. In other words, Kolb's theory can be simply viewed as learning by doing. However, despite its straightforwardness, Kolb's theory is backed up by complex learning theories such as cognitive psychology, information processing theory, and experimentalism. In terms of portfolio pedagogy, Kolb's experiential learning theory explains how users of portfolios reflect upon their language learning experiences and build and modify their abstract conceptualizations and use the prior experiences in future learning events and situations.

Moreover, in the broader scope, Kolb's Experiential Learning Cycle can also explain, especially in teacher education, how prospective teachers develop their understanding portfolio as an alternative tool for planning and designing learning in their teaching practices. This portfolio approach was confirmed by K. Mokhtari et al., whose research findings suggest that when used with future teachers in teacher education programs, teachers see portfolios not only as a tool for their learning but consider it for application in their teaching practices (26, 247). Prospective teachers, while using a portfolio, follow the steps in the cycle proposed by D. Kolb. Therefore, by using a portfolio, they are involved in a hands-on experience of using a portfolio (concrete experience). They reflect on their use of portfolio (reflective observation), build an understanding of how a portfolio is used (abstract conceptualization), and consequently employ it in their teaching practices (active experimentation).

Thus, as seen from the above mentioned, constructivism, metacognition, experiential study, and reflective pedagogy place learner in the center of learning and emphasize to explain learning from the learner's perspective. Learner-centered technologies are characterized by their anthropocentric, humanistic, and psychotherapeutic focus and aim at learners' versatility, autonomy, and creativity in development (63).

In many scholarly sources and studies related to language portfolio, learner autonomy, self-assessment, and reflection are central subject discussions. Western authors as D. Little, R. Perclova, E. Ushioda, V. Kohonen, E. Latkovska and L. Rutka (19), N. Lyons (22), D.D. Mansvelder-Longayroux, D. Beijaard, and N. Verloop (23). I.Mirici and S. Hergüner (25), K. Mokhtari D. Yellin, K. Bull



and D. Montgomery, D. Newby, R.C. Wade and D.B. Yarbroug (26), and Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS) authors as O. Miroshnikova (55), A.V. Sycheva (62), I.I. Kruze (54), T.M. Shahova (67), and E. Murasheva (57) present comprehensive investigation of potential benefits of language portfolios in developing students' autonomy in learning, developing their reflective thinking skills as well as self-assessment skills.

The concept of learner autonomy is closely linked to constructivist and metacognitive perspectives on teaching and learning. Moreover, in a learner-centered approach where learners are viewed as the center of learning, learner autonomy becomes a crucial skill for learners to become better, effective, and independent in their learning. It is undeniable that in the 21st century, language teaching has been more and more focused on helping students become independent in their learning journeys. In scholarly sources, there are many definitions of learner autonomy. While being favorite subject of investigation in education-related sciences, the topic of autonomy has been investigated in other fields of science as medicine, business, and organizational management. According to L. Dickinson, who was among the pioneers of studying and defining learner autonomy, defines the concept as learners' taking full responsibility for their learning and following those decisions made in the process of learning (13, 11). B. Kumaravadivelu claims that one of the leading factors in helping learners become successful is developing their self-regulation skills in learning (18). In their discussion of constructivism's relevance to learner autonomy, Duffy and Johnson argue that constructivism stresses the construction of knowledge not outside learners' minds; instead, it is constructed by their active participation in the learning process. This, puts forward, learning happens when there is active involvement of learners but not teachers. For this, learners should be initiative, resourceful, and have an internally driven desire to learn.

P. Wang states that the underlying theory behind learner autonomy is the theory of constructivist psychology (43). The world around us is full of meaning. By active experimenting, experiencing the external world and its realities, we construct our understanding of the world based on our pre-existing knowledge. This entails our initiative and actions in internalizing and interpreting the meaning possessed by the external world. This theory is also closely related to Lev Vygotsky's socio-cultural theory of learning, in which he suggested that only by socializing, learners build their replications of the world surrounding them, and this can happen only by their active participation, interaction, and socialization with the people, and artifacts that surround them.

P. Benson, in his summary of the concept of learner autonomy, classifies four types of approaches to fostering learner autonomy in learning foreign languages. They are resource-based approaches, learner-based approaches; classroom-based approaches; curriculum-

based approaches; and technology based-approaches (4). Resource-based approaches encourage learners' independent interaction with learning materials such as textbooks, dictionaries, handouts, and educational complexes. Technology-based approaches emphasize the active utilization of IT technologies such as computers, tablets, and other electronic and technical aids in language learning. Accordingly, we may conclude that technology of language portfolio, which entails the use of physical and electronic portfolio, fall under the umbrellas of resource-based approaches and technology-based approaches.

Another potential of portfolio pedagogy is discussed within the perspective of promoting self-assessment. Self-assessment in its nature is a realization of reflective thinking or metacognitive skills. Currently, self-assessment is regarded as one of the hot topics discussed by language teaching specialists, assessment, and testing experts worldwide. Many newly designed textbooks and materials intended for classroom and independent student-use try to employ actively or at least include some tasks or activities that develop learners' self-assessment skills. According to J.H. McMillan and J. Hearn, rationale for the use of self-assessment in language learning and teaching is informed by cognitive and constructivist, and metacognitive theories of learning and motivation (24, 42). L. Shepard asserts that self-assessment is closely connected to constructivism and metacognition in the way that self-assessment and self-monitoring are essential in constructing knowledge, because constructing new knowledge supposes discerning about the existing knowledge, correlating it to new knowledge, finding common traits, attributes that should be introduced to existing knowledge (40). Understanding self-assessment as a leading force in language learning has endorsed its implementation in many language learning, teaching and assessment policies and documents. For instance, Cambridge Language Assessment views self-assessment as a focal point for developing students' independent learning skills. Common European Framework of References contains special self-assessment grids (10, 26), which are supposed to be used in fostering life-long learning of languages and encouraging being independent in this process.

Self-assessment is viewed as an indispensable part of learner autonomy development. Developing autonomous learners, as Shepard points out, is hard to attain without self-assessment. Only by self-assessment, learners are able to find similarities and differences between their background knowledge and a new meaning of that knowledge. D. Schunk and E. Usher (39, 290) in his study on social-cognitive learning and self-monitoring implies that metacognition is a skill by which learners check their understanding of material, predict outcomes of learning, plan activities, manage time, and shift from one learning activity to another in order to improve or introduce corrections to their learning.

D. Little also defines self-assessment as an ongoing self-monitoring process, self-evaluation, identification, and implementation of instructional correctives in their learning (21). The theory of self-assessment establishes a close link between self-assessment and reflection. Since reflection in learning is viewed as thinking about one's prior learning experience, interpreting this experience, and making appropriate conclusions from this learning, only through self-assessment, we can judge our performance and consider necessary improvements or strategies that need to be introduced to our learning (Kolb's learning cycle).

Language Portfolio as a tool developed to communicate the philosophy of CEFR, heavily relies on and make connections to "can-do" statements" presented in the document. "Can-do" statement being a generic statement makes it possible to develop various statements related to language abilities, skills, and knowledge, which comes in handy, especially in self-assessing one's language skills. Effective use of "can-do" statements is done in the "Self-Assessment Checklist" of European Language Portfolios' Language Biography part. In his article on revisiting the functions and purposes of ELP, R. Schärer suggests that "self-assessment may lack face-validity and reliability in high-stakes situations, yet it is relevant in assessing opportunities, requirements, one's strengths, and the potential benefits of deciding whether, when and how to act in particular situations." (36, 150). In other words, self-assessment, which is done in the ELP, may not serve as a valid document in proving one's level of language proficiency, but it may serve as an effective tool in promoting language learning.

In many scholarly articles, methodological recommendations regarding portfolio pedagogy portfolio is seen as a tool that connect reflection, self-assessment, and autonomy into one common engine that encourages learners to be independent in their learning and become life-long learners.

Another function of a language portfolio, which was outlined in many scholarly sources, is developing reflective thinking skills of language learners. Reflection as a skill, commonly attributed as a psychological rather than educational concept, has been actively discussed and investigated in foreign language teaching and learning. Russian psychologist A. Buzeman was among the first scholars who suggested studying reflective practice theory within psychology (50). A. Bozeman's ideas concerning reflection and reflective practice were predominantly nurtured by L. Vygotsky's theories on child learning. A. Buzeman defines reflection as a process of internalizing real-life experiences (50).

In the West, John Dewey, a professor at Columbia University, was first to suggest that reflection is a process involved in all human learning (12). He also proposed that reflection should be an educational aim. In CIS countries' psychological thought, B.G.

Ananev, S.L. Rubinstein developed and comprehensively investigated the problem of reflective thinking (61).

In her studies related to psychological foundations of applying reflective thinking technologies in education, N. Khalilova states that reflection is one of the mechanisms of cognition, ensures the following in the educational process (65, 18):

1. Understanding predetermined learning goals and outcomes;
2. Comparing resources with the future learning accomplishments;
3. Motivating learning, finding logical connections between the learning materials and understanding the material;
4. Self-assessing learning outcomes, introduce changes or improvements to learning strategies;
5. Identify problematic points in learning and select appropriate methods for getting rid of those problems in the future;
6. Facilitating self-regulating and self-monitoring in the cycle of learning.

J. Dewey and other scholars who investigated reflective thinking's role believe that reflection is related to personal learning, and thus its role in learning should not be ignored. Reflective thinking entails recall of experience in learning, thinking about the self as a learner, and therefore regarded as a subject of studies on metacognition, self-assessment, and mental processes in learning. Scholars as A. Rieger et al. (33, 185), C. Corcoran, R. Leahy, (9, 32), C. Rodgers (35, 843), S. Afshar, and M. Farahani (41, 48) agree on the benefits of reflective thinking in pre-service teacher education and that it must be part of all teacher education programs because reflection enables prospective students to make sense of the theoretical material learned. In CIS countries, scholars as Y.V. Romanova (60, 301), T.A. Bondarenko (50), O.B. Modulina (56), and Z.M. Hutyk (66) investigated the role of reflective thinking skills development in preparing teachers for their future pedagogical practices.

Authors such as D. Wedelin and T. Adawi (44, 52) suggest that reflection is not a straightforward practice where students are involved automatically. On the contrary, reflection is a complex process that should be instilled in students through complex activities and scaffolding techniques. J. Moon (27, 65) asserts that factors such as learners' previous experience with reflective activities, language barriers students may have, and their understanding of reflection determine how much support students need in the process of acquiring reflective thinking skills.

In many related studies, portfolios have been discussed as an effective tool that scaffolds and fosters learners' reflective thinking skills. Recent studies on portfolio use in teacher education programs include P. Pereira, C. Parente, and V. da Silva (31), A. Almusharraf (2), K. Alzouebi (3), and A. Ni Dhiorbháin (29). All of the studies

focused on utilizing the portfolio as an alternative assessment tool and as a reflective thinking development tool. The studies report a positive influence of portfolios on reflective thinking. Language education specialists also report that the primary function of ELP is to nurture reflective thinking skills in its users and lead learners towards development as autonomous learners. Dalziel argues that involvement of metacognitive thinking and target language use in ELP represent "a driving force for the development of autonomy" (11, 182).

As seen from the above discussion of portfolio technology's pedagogical and psychological foundations, the underlying theoretical learning perspectives are built around theories, which see learners as the center of learning. Learner-centered approach to teaching supposes learners' autonomy in learning, which is reflected in learners' identification of learning objectives in selecting appropriate learning techniques and strategies. In the learner-centered approach, educators rely on learners' existing background knowledge in presenting the material and developing their skills, teachers act as facilitators and let learners' express themselves considering their emotional, cognitive condition, and moral values. In addition, learner-centered approach underlines developing learners' independent learning skills, instructing on how to select appropriate learning techniques, and redistribution of teachers' role in the learning process and limiting their role to facilitator, advisor, teacher. Regarding the content of teaching and learning materials, learner-centered technologies heavily rely on authenticity, especially in teaching and learning foreign languages. As L. Akhmedova states, "learner centered processes of teaching, develop the internal world of the young generation, scaffolds creative self-realization and self-determination of students; fosters their individual development, autonomous learning and self-education skills and facilitates development of subjective qualities of an individual (autonomy, and independence)" (49). The use of the portfolio pedagogy, apart from turning educators into highly qualified professionals, liberating them, acting as an alternative form of formal education, strengthens learners' role in the learning process and opens up new horizons for developing their creativity (58).

**Conclusion.** The perspectives mentioned above helped us formulating the tasks for studying the potential of implementing language portfolio pedagogy in language teacher education programs in Uzbekistan. The potential of language portfolio pedagogy should be investigated within the scope and link between constructivist, cognitive, and social perspectives of teaching and learning. Besides, language portfolio's potential should be considered through the prism of developing learning how to learn skills of learners, focusing on language portfolio's relevance to reflective thinking and autonomous learning skills. Furthermore, the language portfolio's potential may be considered from deepening the systemic level of knowledge and widening learner-centered teaching context. Besides, language

portfolio's potential must also be researched in terms of its fostering students' collaborative learning capacities to increase their motivation.

Review of the theoretical foundations of portfolio technology in education and its application in various contexts allow us to come up with the following conclusions:

— the potential of portfolio pedagogy in language education programs is discussed through the prism of its capacity in enabling student-teachers' past language learning experience to their future professional activity and transferring those skills to their future learners, relieving the challenging burden of students' adaptation to the completely different learning environment within higher education;

— psychological premises for the integration of portfolio technology into language teacher education is determined in portfolio's capacity to foster development of metacognitive skills of future teachers. Reflection being one of the most substantial aspects of metacognition plays a central role in teacher development and recognition of teachers' or any other professional self-efficacy and self-cognition. Moreover, reflection as discussed in the chapter considered to be connecting rod in developing learners' self-assessment skills which in its turn nurtures formation of autonomous learning skills. Autonomous learning skills, awareness of effective learning strategies, for their part, are fundamental for building life-long learning capacity of individuals.

The introduction of innovations to education and other related domains of society has laid the foundations for Uzbekistan to consider joining the Bologna Process, one of the tasks implied in Uzbekistan's Development Strategy for 2017–2027 (59). This process sets new requirements for educating autonomous and initiative citizens with a strong sense of responsibility, ready to make crucial decisions in their roles as societal actors and their own professional lives. These requirements put forward drastic changes in the educational paradigm and dictate necessities for implementing new technologies of teaching and nurturing competent society members.

### List of used literature

1. Abhakorn M. L. J. Investigating the use of student portfolios to develop students' metacognition in English as a foreign language learning //Journal of Language Teaching and Research. — 2014. — Vol. 5. — No. 1. — P. 46–55. DOI:[10.4304/jltr.5.1.46-55](https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.1.46-55)
2. Almusharraf A.M. Effect of E-Portfolio-Based Reflection-Enhancing Tasks on Female Saudi Student Teachers' Development of Reflective Practice With Respect to Lesson Planning and Teacher Research. — 2019, — No. 4, — P. 150–167 DOI:[10.5296/ijl.v11i4.15342](https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v11i4.15342)
3. Alzouebi K. Electronic portfolio development and narrative reflections in higher education: Part and parcel of the culture? //Education and Information Technologies. — 2020. — Vol. 25. — No. 2. — P. 997–1011. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1247081>

4. Benson P. Autonomy in language learning. Harlow: Longman. 2001. — P. 21–40. [https://www.pucsp.br/inpla/benson\\_artigo.pdf](https://www.pucsp.br/inpla/benson_artigo.pdf)
5. Bruning R. H., Schraw G. J., Ronning R. R. Cognitive psychology and instruction. – Prentice-Hall, Inc., One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, NJ 07458, 1999. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED439154>
6. Burns A. (ed.). The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education. – Ernst Klett Sprachen, 2009. [https://www.academia.edu/19807394/The\\_Cambridge\\_Guide\\_to\\_Second\\_Language\\_Teacher\\_Education\\_Edited\\_by](https://www.academia.edu/19807394/The_Cambridge_Guide_to_Second_Language_Teacher_Education_Edited_by)
7. Collins S. R. Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal, 2008. — Vol. 2. — No. 2. [https://www.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Teaching%20and%20Learning/TD.2.2\\_Collins\\_Applied\\_Constructivist\\_Theory.pdf](https://www.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Teaching%20and%20Learning/TD.2.2_Collins_Applied_Constructivist_Theory.pdf)
8. Cook V. Second language learning and language teaching. – Routledge, 2013. [https://www.routledge.com/rsc/downloads/Second\\_language\\_learning\\_and\\_language\\_teaching\\_styles.pdf](https://www.routledge.com/rsc/downloads/Second_language_learning_and_language_teaching_styles.pdf)
9. Corcoran C. A., Leahy R. Growing professionally through reflective practice //Kappa Delta Pi Record. — 2003. — Vol. 40. — No. 1. — C. 30–33.
10. Council of Europe. Council for Cultural Co-operation. Education Committee. Modern Languages Division. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment. – Cambridge University Press, 2001. — P. 26. // <https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf>
11. Dalziel F. A flexible approach to the use of the European Language Portfolio in higher education contexts //Language Learning in Higher Education. — 2012. — Vol. 1. — No. 1. — P. 179–194.
12. Dewey J. How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process. – Houghton Mifflin, 1933. <https://archive.org/details/howwethinkrestat00dewerich/page/n1/mode/2up>
13. Dickinson L., Wenden A. Special issue on autonomy //System. — 1995. — Vol. 23. — No. 2. — P. 11–21.
14. Hyde A. A., Bizar M. Thinking in context: Teaching cognitive processes across the elementary school curriculum. – Longman Pub Group, 1989. <https://archive.org/details/thinkingincontex0000hyde/page/n5/mode/2up>
15. Johnson K. E. Language teacher education. The Routledge handbook of English language teaching. — Routledge, 2016. — 610 p.
16. Kolb D. A. The process of experiential learning. Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development. — Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984. — P. 20–38. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235701029\\_Experiential\\_Learning\\_Experience\\_As\\_The\\_Source\\_Of\\_Learning\\_And\\_Development](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235701029_Experiential_Learning_Experience_As_The_Source_Of_Learning_And_Development)
17. König E., Zedler P. Theorien der Erziehungswissenschaft: Einführung in Grundlagen, Methoden und praktische Konsequenzen. – Deutscher Studien-Verlag, 1998. <https://docplayer.org/82418582-Theorien-der-erziehungswissenschaft.html>
18. Kumaravadivelu B. Rethinking global perspectives and local initiatives in language teaching //Language teachers and teaching: Global perspectives and local initiatives. — 2013. — Vol. — P. 317–323. <https://www.bkumaravadivelu.com/articles%20in%20pdfs/2013%20Afterword.pdf>
19. Latkowska E., Rutka L. The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) as a Means of Self-Assessment //Pedagoģija un Skolotāju Izglītība. — 2014. — Vol. 3. — P. 117–119.
20. Lightbown P. M., Spada N. How languages are learned 4th edition-Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers. — Oxford university press, 2013. — 304 p.
21. Little D. Learner autonomy, self-assessment and language tests: Towards a new assessment culture. //Independent language learning: Building on experience, seeking new perspectives. — 2011. — P. 25–39.

22. Lyons N. Reflection in teaching: Can it be developmental? A portfolio perspective //Teacher Education Quarterly. 1998. — P. 115–127. <https://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJELS/article/view/3117/0>
23. Mansvelder-Longayroux D. D., Beijaard D., Verloop N. The portfolio as a tool for stimulating reflection by student teachers //Teaching and teacher education. — 2007. — VOL. 23. — No. 1. — P. 47–62. [https://depts.washington.edu/comgrnd/ccli/papers/Mansvelder-Longayroux\\_et\\_al\\_PortfolioAsToolStimulatingReflectionByStudentTeachers-jy.pdf](https://depts.washington.edu/comgrnd/ccli/papers/Mansvelder-Longayroux_et_al_PortfolioAsToolStimulatingReflectionByStudentTeachers-jy.pdf)
24. McMillan J. H., Hearn J. Student self-assessment: The key to stronger student motivation and higher achievement //Educational Horizons. — 2008. — Vol. 87. — No. 1. — P. 40–49. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285278441\\_Student\\_self-assessment\\_The\\_key\\_to\\_stronger\\_student\\_motivation\\_and\\_higher\\_achievement](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285278441_Student_self-assessment_The_key_to_stronger_student_motivation_and_higher_achievement)
25. Mirici I. H., Hergüner S. A Digital European Self-Assessment Tool for Student Teachers of Foreign Languages: The EPOSTL //Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET. — 2015. — Vol. 14. — P. 1–10. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1057332.pdf>
26. Mokhtari K. et al. Portfolio assessment in teacher education: Impact on pre-service teachers' knowledge and attitudes //Journal of Teacher Education. — 1996. — Vol. 47. — No. 4. — P. 245–252. DOI:[10.1177/0022487196474002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487196474002)
27. Moon J. A. A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice. — Psychology Press, 2004. — 252 p.
28. Murphy S. M. Introduction: Reflection—in portfolios and beyond //The Clearing House. — 1998. — Vol. 72. — No.1. — P. 7–9.
29. Ní Dhiorbháin A. Exploring the potential of the European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) as a reflective tool in initial primary teacher education //Irish Educational Studies. — 2019. — Vol. 38. — No. 3. — P. 401–417.
30. Oxford R. Language learning strategies //New York. — 1990. — Vol. 3. <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/3328/?sequence=1>
31. Pires Pereira Í. S., Cristo Parente M. C., Vieira da Silva C. Guided portfolio writing as a scaffold for reflective learning in in-service contexts: a case study //Teacher Development. — 2016. — Vol. 20. — No. 5. — P. 614–630.
32. Richards J. et al. Longman dictionary of applied linguistics //RELC Journal. — 1986. — Vol. 17. — No.2. — P. 105–110.
33. Rieger A., Radcliffe B. J., Doepker G. M. Practices for developing reflective thinking skills among teachers //Kappa Delta Pi Record. — 2013. — Vol. 49. — No. 4. — P. 184–189.
34. Roberts J. Language teacher education. — Routledge, 2016. — 352 p.
35. Rodgers C. Defining reflection: Another look at John Dewey and reflective thinking. Teachers college record. — 2002. — Vol. 104. — No. 4. — P. 842–866.
36. Schärer R. Revisiting the principles and functions of the European Language Portfolio with a focus on tertiary education //Language Learning in Higher Education. — 2012. — Vol. 1. — No. 1. — P. 143–161.
37. Schraw G., Moshman D. Metacognitive theories //Educational psychology review. — 1995. — Vol. 7. — No. 4. — P. 351–371.
38. Schunk D. H. Learning theories an educational perspective sixth edition. — Pearson, 2012. — 252 p.
39. Schunk D. H., Usher E. L. Assessing self-efficacy for self-regulated learning //Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance. — 2011. — p. 282–297.
40. Shepard L. The role of classroom assessment in teaching and learning. — 2001. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247980405\\_The\\_Role\\_of\\_Classroom\\_Assessment\\_in\\_Teaching\\_and\\_Learning](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247980405_The_Role_of_Classroom_Assessment_in_Teaching_and_Learning)
41. Soodmand Afshar H., Farahani M. Inhibitors to EFL teachers' reflective teaching and EFL learners' reflective thinking and the role of teaching experience and academic degree in reflection perception //Reflective Practice. — 2018. — Vol. 19. — No. 1. — P. 46–67. DOI:[10.1080/14623943.2017.1351353](https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1351353)



42. Wade R. C., Yarbrough D. B. Portfolios: A tool for reflective thinking in teacher education? //Teaching and teacher education. — 1996. — Vol. 12. — No. 1. — P. 63–79.
43. Wang P. Constructivism and learner autonomy in foreign language teaching and learning: To what extent does theory inform practice //Theory and Practice in Language Studies. — 2011. — Vol. 1. — No. 3. — P. 273–277.
44. Wedelin D., Adawi T. Teaching mathematical modelling and problem solving- A cognitive apprenticeship approach to mathematics and engineering education. — 2014. — P. 49–55. DOI:[10.3991/ijep.v4i5.3555](https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v4i5.3555)
45. Wenden A. L. Metacognitive knowledge and language learning1 //Applied linguistics. —1998. — Vol. 19. — No. 4. — P. 515–537.
46. Winn W., Snyder D. Cognitive perspectives in psychology 112-142 //Handbook of research for educational communications and technology. New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillanm. 1998.
47. Woolfolk A. Educational Psychology: global edition. — Pearson, 2010. — 355 p.
48. Yager R. E., Lutz M. V. Integrated science: The importance of "how" versus "what"//School science and Mathematics. — 1994. — Vol. 94. — No. 7. — P. 338–346.
49. Ахмедова Л. VOL. Личностно-ориентированный подход к современному обучению и воспитанию студентов высших учебных заведений Республики Узбекистан. // Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan — 2016. — 4(12). — С. 255–259. <https://journal.fledu.uz/ru/lichnostno-orientirovannyj-podhod-k-sovremennomu-obucheniyu-i-vospitaniyu-studentov-vysshih-uchebnyh-zavedenij-respubliki-uzbekistan/>
50. Бондаренко Т. А. Педагогические условия формирования рефлексивной культуры у студентов. дисс. кандидата педагогических наук. 1999. — 191 с. <https://www.dissercat.com/content/pedagogicheskie-usloviya-formirovaniya-refleksivnoi-kultury-u-studentov> (04. 06. 2021)
50. Вертинская О. Э. Генезис конструктивистских тенденций в аналитической философии: дис. — Мурманск, 2005. — 180 с. — URL: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/genezis-konstruktivistskikh-tendentsii-v-analiticheskoi-filosofii> (04, 06. 2021)
51. Загвоздкин В.К. Метод портфолио – нечто больше, чем просто альтернативный способ оценки. — URL: <http://childpsy.ru/lib/articles/id/10448.php> (дата обращения: 28.02.2021).
52. Крузе И. И. Профессионально-ориентированный языковой портфель как интегральная технология иноязычного образования студентов-юристов. 2017. <https://www.dissercat.com/content/professionalno-orientirovannyi-yazykovoi-portfel-kak-integralnaya-tehnologiya-inoyazychnogo> (04.06.2021)
53. Крузе И. И. Языковой портфель как лингводидактическая технология иноязычного профессионально ориентированного обучения студентов. — М.: ЮНИТИ–ДАНА. 2016. — 135 с.
54. Мирошникова О. Х. Формирование профессионально-языковых компетенций в системе естественнонаучного образования на основе технологии языкового портфеля //Дисс. канд. пед. наук. — Ростов-на-Дону, 2008. <https://www.dissercat.com/content/formirovanie-professionalno-yazykovykh-kompetentsii-v-sisteme-estestvennonauchnogo-obrazovan/read>
55. Модулина О. Б. Формирование рефлексивной позиции педагогов в процессе курсовой подготовки. //Ярославский педагогический вестник. — 2008. — №. 2. — С. 52–56.
56. Мурашева Е. С. Потенциал языкового портфеля в формировании субъектности младших школьников. //Иностранные языки в школе. — 2014. — №. 7. — С. 44–49.
57. Полат Е.С. Новые педагогические технологии в системе образования. — М.: Academia, 2000. — 270 с.

58. ПФ-4947-сон 07.02.2017 Ўзбекистон Республикасини янада ривожлантириш бўйича ҳаракатлар стратегияси тўғрисида. — URL: <https://lex.uz/docs/3107036>
59. Романова Е. В. Модель рефлексии учебно-профессиональной деятельности в процессе обучения будущих учителей. //Проектирование и реализация образовательного процесса на основе ФГОС ВО. – 2016. — С. 300–303.
60. Степанов, С. Ю., И. Н. Семенов. Психология рефлексии: проблемы и исследования. Вопросы психологии. 1985. — С. 31–39. — URL: <https://publications.hse.ru/articles/78303563>
61. Сычева А. В. Инновационный подход к повышению профессиональной квалификации лингвиста-преподавателя в рамках требований общеевропейских компетенций. — Майкоп, 2004. — 197 с.
62. Тазутдинова Э. Х. Учебный портфолио в системе подготовки студента к будущей педагогической деятельности. — Казань. 2010. — 200 с.
63. Федотова, Е.Е. Теоретическая рефлексия динамики идентичности. URL: <https://psihter.ru/psihologiya-lichnosti/refleksiya> (дата обращения: 28.02.2021). [Fedotova, E.E. Teoreticheskaja refleksija dinamiki identichnosti. — URL: <https://psihter.ru/psihologiya-lichnosti/refleksiya> (data obrashhenija: 28.02.2021).]
64. Халилова Н. Рефлексив технологияларни таълим жараёнларига тадбиқ қилишнинг психологик асослари. — URL: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/uvchilarda-refleksiv-k-nikmalarni-shakllantirish-va-rivozhlantirish-zharayonlarini-takomillashtirish-modeli/viewer>
65. Хутыз З. М. Педагогическая рефлексия в деятельности педагога. //Science Time. — 2015. — №. 3 (15). — 560–564. <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pedagogicheskaya-refleksiya-v-deyatelnosti-pedagoga/>
66. Шахова Т. М. Формирование познавательных и регулятивных универсальных учебных действий средствами тематического и рефлексивного языкового портфеля //Ученые записки Забайкальского государственного университета. Серия: Профессиональное образование, теория и методика обучения. — 2013. — №. 6 (53). <https://socionet.ru/publication.xml?h=spz:cyberleninka:31895:14984859> (04. 06. 2021).

#### References

1. Abhakorn M. L. J. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2014, No. 1. pp. 46–55. DOI:[10.4304/jltr.5.1.46-55](https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.5.1.46-55)
2. Almusharraf A.M. *International Journal of Linguistics*, 2019, No. 4, pp. 150–167 DOI:[10.5296/ijl.v11i4.15342](https://doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v11i4.15342)
3. Alzouebi K. *Education and Information Technologies*, 2020, No. 2, pp. 997–1011. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1247081>
4. Benson P. *Autonomy in language learning*, Harlow: Longman. 2001, pp. 21–40. Available at: [https://www.pucsp.br/inpla/benson\\_artigo.pdf](https://www.pucsp.br/inpla/benson_artigo.pdf)
5. Bruning R. H., Schraw G. J., Ronning R. R. *Cognitive psychology and instruction*. – Prentice-Hall, Inc., One Lake Street, Upper Saddle River, NJ 07458, 1999, 433 p. Available at: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED439154>
6. Burns A. (ed.). *The Cambridge guide to second language teacher education*, Ernst Klett Sprachen, 2009. Available at: [https://www.academia.edu/19807394/The\\_Cambridge\\_Guide\\_to\\_Second\\_Language\\_Teacher\\_Education\\_Edited\\_by](https://www.academia.edu/19807394/The_Cambridge_Guide_to_Second_Language_Teacher_Education_Edited_by)
7. Collins S. R. *Transformative Dialogues: Teaching and Learning Journal*, 2008, No. 2. Available at: [https://twww.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Teaching%20and%20Learning/TD.2.2\\_Collins\\_Applied\\_Constructivist\\_Theory.pdf](https://twww.kpu.ca/sites/default/files/Teaching%20and%20Learning/TD.2.2_Collins_Applied_Constructivist_Theory.pdf)

8. Cook V. *Second language learning and language teaching*, Routledge, 2013. Available at: [https://www.routledge.com/rsc/downloads/Second\\_language\\_learning\\_and\\_language\\_teaching\\_styles.pdf](https://www.routledge.com/rsc/downloads/Second_language_learning_and_language_teaching_styles.pdf)
9. Corcoran C. A. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 2003, No. 1. pp. 30–33.
10. Council of Europe. *Council for Cultural Co-operation. Education Committee. Modern Languages Division. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: learning, teaching, assessment*, Cambridge University Press, 2001. Available at: <https://rm.coe.int/16802fc1bf>
11. Dalziel F. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 2012, No. 1., pp 179–194.
12. Dewey J. *How we think: A restatement of the relation of reflective thinking to the educative process*, Houghton Mifflin, 1933. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/howwethinkrestat00dewerich/page/n1/mode/2up>
13. Dickinson L., Wenden A. *Special issue on autonomy, System*, 1995, Vol. 23, No. 2, pp. 11–21.
14. Hyde A. A., Bizar M. *Thinking in context: Teaching cognitive processes across the elementary school curriculum*, Longman Pub Group, 1989. Available at: <https://archive.org/details/thinkingincontex0000hyde/page/n5/mode/2up>
15. Johnson K. E. *Language teacher education. The Routledge handbook of English language teaching*, Routledge, 2016, 610 p.
16. Kolb D. A. *The process of experiential learning. Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*, Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1984, pp. 20–38. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235701029\\_Experiential\\_Learning\\_Experience\\_As\\_The\\_Source\\_Of\\_Learning\\_And\\_Development](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/235701029_Experiential_Learning_Experience_As_The_Source_Of_Learning_And_Development)
17. König E., Zedler P. *Theorien der Erziehungswissenschaft: Einführung in Grundlagen, Methoden und praktische Konsequenzen*, Deutscher Studien-Verlag, 1998. Available at: <https://docplayer.org/82418582-Theorien-der-erziehungswissenschaft.html>
18. Kumaravadivelu B. *Rethinking global perspectives and local initiatives in language teaching*, 2013, pp. 317–323. Available at: <https://www.bkumaravadivelu.com/articles%20in%20pdfs/2013%20Afterword.pdf>
19. Latkowska E., Rutka L. *The European Portfolio for Student Teachers of Languages (EPOSTL) as a Means of Self-Assessment*, Pedagoģija un Skolotāju Izglītība, 2014, Vol. 3. pp. 117–119.
20. Lightbown P. M., Spada N. *How languages are learned 4th edition-Oxford Handbooks for Language Teachers*, Oxford university press, 2013, 304 p.
21. Little D. Learner autonomy, self-assessment and language tests: Towards a new assessment culture. //Independent language learning: Building on experience, seeking new perspectives, 2011, pp. 25–39.
22. Lyons N. *Reflection in teaching: Can it be developmental? A portfolio perspective*, Teacher Education Quarterly. 1998, pp. 115–127. Available at: <https://www.journals.aiac.org.au/index.php/IJELS/article/view/3117/0>
23. Mansvelder-Longayroux D. D., Beijjaard D., Verloop N. *Teaching and teacher education*, 2007, Vol.23, No. 1, pp. 47–62. Available at: [https://depts.washington.edu/comgrnd/ccli/papers/Mansvelder-Longayroux\\_et\\_al\\_PortfolioAsToolStimulatingReflectionByStudentTeachers-jy.pdf](https://depts.washington.edu/comgrnd/ccli/papers/Mansvelder-Longayroux_et_al_PortfolioAsToolStimulatingReflectionByStudentTeachers-jy.pdf)
24. McMillan J. H., Hearn J. *Educational Horizons*, 2008, Vol. 87, No. 1. pp. 40–49. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285278441\\_Student\\_self-assessment\\_The\\_key\\_to\\_stronger\\_student\\_motivation\\_and\\_higher\\_achievement](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/285278441_Student_self-assessment_The_key_to_stronger_student_motivation_and_higher_achievement)
25. Mirici I. H., Hergüner S. *Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology-TOJET*, 2015, Vol.14, pp. 1–10. Available at: <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1057332.pdf>
26. Mokhtari K. et al. *Journal of Teacher Education* 1996, Vol. 47, No. 4. pp. 245–252. DOI:[10.1177/0022487196474002](https://doi.org/10.1177/0022487196474002)

27. Moon J. A. *A handbook of reflective and experiential learning: Theory and practice*, Psychology Press, 2004, 252 p.
28. Murphy S. M. *The Clearing House*, 1998, Vol. 72, No.1. pp. 7–9.
29. Ní Dhiorbháin A. *Irish Educational Studies*, 2019, Vol. 38, No. 3, pp. 401–417.
30. Oxford R. *Language learning strategies*, New York, 1990, Vol. 3. Available at: <https://researchcommons.waikato.ac.nz/bitstream/handle/10289/3328/?sequence=1>
31. Pires Pereira Í. S., Cristo Parente M. C., Vieira da Silva C. *Teacher Development* 2016, Vol. 20, No. 5, pp. 614–630.
32. Richards J. et al. *RELC Journal*, 1986 Vol. 17, No. 2, pp. 105–110.
33. Rieger A., Radcliffe B. J., Doepker G. M. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, 2013 Vol. 49, No. 4, pp. 184–189.
34. Roberts J. *Language teacher education*, Routledge, 2016, 352 p.
35. Rodgers C. *Teachers college record*, 2002, Vol. 104, No. 4, pp. 842–866.
36. Schärer R. *Language Learning in Higher Education*, 2012, Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 143–161.
37. Schraw G., Moshman D. *Metacognitive theories*, *Educational psychology review* 1995 Vol. 7, No. 4, pp. 351–371.
38. Schunk D. H. *Learning theories an educational perspective sixth edition*, Pearson, 2012, 252 p.
39. Schunk D. H., Usher E. L. *Assessing self-efficacy for self-regulated learning, Handbook of self-regulation of learning and performance*, 2011, pp. 282–297. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203839010>
40. Shepard L. *The role of classroom assessment in teaching and learning*, 2001. Available at: [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247980405\\_The\\_Role\\_of\\_Classroom\\_Assessment\\_in\\_Teaching\\_and\\_Learning](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/247980405_The_Role_of_Classroom_Assessment_in_Teaching_and_Learning)
41. Soodmand Afshar H., Farahani M. *Reflective Practice*, 2018 Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 46–67. DOI: [10.1080/14623943.2017.1351353](https://doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2017.1351353)
42. Wade R. C., Yarbrough D. B. *Teaching and teacher education*, 1996, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 63–79.
43. Wang P. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2011 Vol. 1, No. 3, pp. 273–277.
44. Wedelin D., Adawi T. *Teaching mathematical modelling and problem solving- A cognitive apprenticeship approach to mathematics and engineering education*, 2014, pp. 49–55. DOI: [10.3991/ijep.v4i5.3555](https://doi.org/10.3991/ijep.v4i5.3555)
45. Wenden A. L. *Applied linguistics*, 1998 Vol. 19, No. 4, pp. 515–537.
46. Winn W., Snyder D. *Handbook of research for educational communications and technology*, New York: Simon and Schuster Macmillan, 1998, 549 p.
47. Woolfolk A. *Educational Psychology: global edition*, Pearson, 2010, 355 p.
48. Yager R. E., Lutz M. V. *School science and Mathematics*, 1994, Vol. 94, No. 7, pp. 338–346.
49. Akhmedova L.T. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 2016, No. 4(12), pp. 255–259. Available at: <https://journal.fledu.uz/ru/lichnostno-orientirovannyj-podhod-k-sovremennomu-obucheniyyu-i-vospitaniyyu-studentov-vysshih-uchebnyh-zavedenij-respubliki-uzbekistan/>
50. Bondarenko T. A. *Pedagogicheskie usloviya formirovaniya refleksivnoi kul'tury u studentov. diss. kandidata pedagogicheskikh nauk* (Pedagogical conditions for the formation of reflexive culture in students. diss. candidate of pedagogical sciences) 1999, 191 p. Available at: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/pedagogicheskie-usloviya-formirovaniya-refleksivnoi-kul'tury-u-studentov> (04. 06. 2021)
51. Vertinskaya O. E. *Genesis konstruktivistskikh tendentsii v analiticheskoi filosofii: dis. (The genesis of constructivist tendencies in analytical philosophy: dis)*, Murmansk, 2005, 180 p. Available at: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/genezis-konstruktivistskikh-tendentsii-v-analiticheskoi-filosofii> (04, 06. 2021)
52. Zagvozdkin V.K. *Metod portfolio – nechto bol'she, chem prosto al'ternativnyi sposob otsenki* (The portfolio method is something more than just an alternative

- method of evaluation), Available at: <http://childpsy.ru/lib/articles/id/10448.php> (28.02.2021).
53. Kruze I. I. *Professional'no-orientirovanniy yazykovoï portfel' kak integral'naya tekhnologiya inoyazychnogo obrazovaniya studentov-yuristov* (Professionally-oriented language portfolio as an integral technology of foreign language education of law students), 2017. Available at: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/professionalno-orientirovanniy-yazykovoï-portfel-kak-integralnaya-tekhnologiya-inoyazychnogo> (04.06.2021)
54. Kruze I. I. *Yazykovoï portfel' kak lingvodidakticheskaya tekhnologiya inoyazychnogo professional'no orientirovannogo obucheniya studentov* (Language portfolio as a linguodidactic technology of foreign language professionally oriented teaching of students), M.: YuNITI–DANA. 2016, 135 p.
55. Miroshnikova O. Kh. *Formirovanie professional'no-yazykovykh kompetentsii v sisteme estestvennonauchnogo obrazovaniya na osnove tekhnologii yazykovogo portfelya* (Formation of professional-language competencies in the system of natural science education on the basis of the technology of the language portfolio, Diss. kand. ped. nauk.), Rostov na- Danu, 2008. Available at: <https://www.dissercat.com/content/formirovanie-professionalno-yazykovykh-kompetentsii-v-sisteme-estestvennonauchnogo-obrazovan/read>
56. Modulina O. B. *Yaroslavskii pedagogicheskii vestnik*, 2008, No. 2. pp. 52–56
57. Murasheva E. S. *Inostrannye yazyki v shkole*, 2014, No. 7. pp. 44–49.
58. Polat E.S. *Novye pedagogicheskie tekhnologii v sisteme obrazovaniya* (New pedagogical technologies in the education system), M.: Academia, 2000, 270 p.
59. PF-4947-son 07.02.2017 *Uzbekiston Respublikasini yanada rivozhlantirish biiicha harakatlar strategiyasi tugrisida*. Available at: <https://lex.uz/docs/3107036>
60. Romanova E. V. *Model' refleksii uchebno-professional'noi deyatel'nosti v protsesse obucheniya budushchikh uchitelei* (The model of reflection of educational and professional activity in the process of training future teachers), Proektirovanie i realizatsiya obrazovatel'nogo protsessa na osnove FGOS VO, 2016, pp. 300–303.
61. Stepanov, S. Yu., I. N. Semenov. *Psixologiya refleksii: problemy i issledovaniya* (Psychology of reflection: problems and research), 1985, pp. 31–39. Available at: <https://publications.hse.ru/articles/78303563>
62. Sycheva A. V. *Innovatsionnyi podkhod k povysheniyu professional'noi kvalifikatsii lingvista-prepodavatelya v ramkakh trebovaniï obshcheevropeiskikh kompetentsii* (An innovative approach to improving the professional skills of a linguist-teacher within the framework of the requirements of Pan-European competencies), Maikop, 2004, 197 p.
63. Tazutdinova E. Kh. *Uchebnyi portfoliyo v sisteme podgotovki studenta k budushchei pedagogicheskoi deyatel'nosti* (Educational portfolio in the system of preparing students for future teaching activities), Kazan', 2010, 200 p.
64. Fedotova, E.E. *Teoreticheskaya refleksiya dinamiki identichnosti* (Theoretical reflection of the dynamics of identity). Available at: <https://psihter.ru/psihologiya-lichnosti/refleksiya> (data obrashcheniya: 28.02.2021).
65. Khalilova N. *Refleksiv tekhnologiyalarni ta"lim zharaenlariga tadbik kilishning psixologik asoslari* (Psychological foundations of the introduction of reflexive technologies into educational processes). Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/uvchilarda-refleksiv-k-nikmalarni-shakllantirish-va-rivozhlantirish-zharayonlarini-takomillashtirish-modeli/viewer>
66. Khuty Z. M. *Science Time*, 2015, No. 3 (15), pp. 560–564. Available at: <https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/pedagogicheskaya-refleksiya-v-deyatelnosti-pedagoga/>
67. Shakhova T. M. *Uchenye zapiski Zabaikal'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriya: Professional'noe obrazovanie, teoriya i metodika obucheniya* (Scientific Notes of the Trans-Baikal State University. Series: Professional education, theory and teaching methods), 2013, No. 6 (53). Available at: <https://socio.net.ru/publication.xml?h=spz:cyberleninka:31895:14984859> (04. 06. 2021).