THE MAIN COMPONENTS OF PEDAGOGICAL DIAGNOSTICS

Rustamova Adash Eshankulovna
PhD, associate professor, Samarkand state institute of foreign languages

Abstract: *While talking about pedagogical diagnostics in teaching foreign languages, the most important components should not be overlooked. That is the reason, the researcher tries to give some general and specific information about vital components of diagnostics.*

Key words: component, validation, diagnosis, feedback diagnosis, remediation

There are some components of pedagogical diagnostic: The initial component is diagnosis. The goal of diagnostic is to identify individual students' strengths and, more significantly, deficiencies in areas where the student has not yet fully mastered the skill. Diagnosis may be achieved by creating diagnostic assessments from the ground up in three steps: building the cognitive model, designing assessment instruments and the related Q-matrix, and using psychometric models for data analysis (de la Torre & Minchen, 2014). The cognitive model, which serves as the foundation for principled assessment design, provides the specification of traits to be measured as well as their interrelationship.

The second component is diagnostic feedback, which is intended to communicate and summarize diagnosis results to a number of stakeholders such as teachers, students, policymakers, and parents (Lee, 2015). It is typically presented in the form of a score report, which converts statistically complex assessment data into actionable information via both qualitative representations (e.g., vocal explanations of attribute mastery levels) and quantitative presentations (e.g., tables and graphs; Rankin, 2016). Using Zenisky and Hambleton's (2012) score report development approach, the feedback component in the integrated architecture of diagnosis sequences was developed in three stages: initial preparation, report production, tryout, and revision. Preparation include defining the goal of the score report, identifying the target audience, and conducting audience requirements evaluations. After meticulous preparation, the prototype report is created and reviewed internally by the expert panel in charge of the report's production and modification.

Remediation: The third component is concerned with remediation (or treatment/intervention), which refers to a collection of teaching and

learning activities aimed at addressing students' recognized shortcomings in the target domain qualities (Lee, 2015). Teachers are expected to use diagnostic assessment results into the curriculum in order to generate relevant material and tangible pedagogy in this component. Using Hill and McNamara's (2011) classroom-based assessment framework and Wang and Li's (2019) techniques for integrating teaching-learning-assessment, the remediation focuses on instructors' actions and includes four processes: planning, framing, conducting, and reflecting. Planning stresses teachers' decision-making process in comparing and selecting resources, activities, and instructional techniques that are consistent with learning objectives and diagnostic outcomes. This category contains information concerning the kind and nature of remedial instructional tasks, as well as the link between diagnostic results and teaching. Conducting describes the process of putting the educational plans into action in the classroom. Before the class, the bulk of educational activities are explicit, formal, and well-designed. Aside from teacher actions, the framework lists two more factors for their strong ties with remediation: instructors' beliefs and students' beliefs and uses of the diagnostic assessment. Teachers' beliefs are the fundamental theories of classroom teachers concerning the subject, the curriculum, pedagogical principles, and assessment techniques (Hill & McNamara, 2011). Teachers' impressions of CDA and the related feedback are found to have repercussions on each activity of planning, framing, conducting, and reflecting in the diagnostic setting (Doe, 2015). As a result, teachers should be probed on their ideas about diagnostic assessment and, if required, educated to provide them with the knowledge and abilities to properly integrate diagnostic assessment in the classroom. Students' beliefs and use of diagnostic assessment, which are closely related to learners' attitudes about how the assessment is conducted, interpreted, and used in the classroom, can be investigated in teacher-to-student, student-to-teacher, and student-to-student interactions (Rea-Dickins, 2006).

REFERENCES:

Alderson J.C., E.L. Haapakangas, A. Huhta, L. Nieminen, and R. Ullakonoja (2015). Reading in a second or foreign language is diagnosed. Routledge, New York and London.

Anderson, L. W., D. R. Krathwohl, P. W. Airasian, K. A. Cruikshank, R. E. Mayer, P. R. Pintrich,... Wittrock, M. C. (2001). A modification of Bloom's Taxonomy of Educational Objectives as a learning, teaching, and

assessment taxonomy G. T. L. Brown, T. M. O'Leary, and J. A. C. Hattie (2019). The asTTle case example of effective reporting for formative assessment. Score reporting research and applications, edited by D. Zapata-Rivera (pp. 107-125). Routledge, New York, USA.

Chen, H., and J. Chen (2016). Using the extended DINA model framework to retrofit non-cognitive-diagnostic reading assessment. 218-230 in Language Assessment Quarterly, 13(3).

Chen, J., and J. de La Torre (2014). A method for diagnostically modeling existing large-scale assessment data: The case of the international student assessment program in reading. 1967-1978, Psychology, 5(18).

T. Fan, J. Song, and Z. Guan. A theoretical framework and instructional strategies for incorporating diagnostic evaluation into curricula. Asia Lang Test 11, 2 (2021). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40468-020-00117-y