

Vol.5. Issue 10 page 12

Impact factor 9

Editorial Board Members

Dr. Hazim Jabbar Shah Ali

Country: University of Baghdad, Abu-Ghraib, Iraq. Specialization: Avian Physiology and Reproduction.

Dr. Khalid Nabih Zaki Rashed

Country: Dokki, Egypt.

Specialization: Pharmaceutical and Drug Industries.

Dr. Manzoor Khan Afridi Country: Islamabad, Pakistan.

Specialization: Politics and International Relations.

Seyyed Mahdi Javazadeh Country: Mashhad Iran.

Specialization: Agricultural Sciences. Dr. Turapova Nargiza Ahmedovna

Country: Uzbekistan, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Specialization: Art and Humanities, Education

Dr. Muataz A. Majeed

Country: INDIA

Specialization: Atomic Physics. Dr Zakaria Fouad Fawzy Hassan

Country: Egypt

Specialization: Agriculture and Biological

Dr. Subha Ganguly Country: India

Specialization: Microbiology and Veterinary Sciences.

Dr. KANDURI VENKATA LAKSHMI NARASIMHACHARYULU

Country: India.

Specialization: Mathematics. Dr. Mohammad Ebrahim

Country: Iran

Specialization: Structural Engineering

Dr. Malihe Moeini Country: IRAN

Specialization: Oral and Maxillofacial Radiology

Dr. I. Anand shaker Country: India.

Specialization: Clinical Biochemistry

Dr. Magdy Shayboub

Country: Taif University, Egypt Specialization: Artificial Intelligence

Kozikhodjayev Jumakhodja Hamdamkhodjayevich

Country: Uzbekistan

Senior Lecturer, Namangan State University

Dr. Ramachandran Guruprasad

Country: National Aerospace Laboratories, Bangalore, India.

Specialization: Library and Information Science.

Dr. Alaa Kareem Niamah

Country: Iraq.

Specialization: Biotechnology and Microbiology.

Dr. Abdul Aziz

Country: Pakistan

Specialization: General Pharmacology and Applied Pharmacology.

Dr. Khalmurzaeva Nadira - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Japanese Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Mirzakhmedova Hulkar - Ph.D., Associate professor, Head of the Department of Iranian-Afghan Philology, Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies

Dr. Dilip Kumar Behara

Country: India

Specialization: Chemical Engineering, Nanotechnology, Material Science and Solar Energy.

Dr. Neda Nozari Country: Iran

Specialization: Obesity, Gastrointestinal Diseases.

Bazarov Furkhat Odilovich

Country: Uzbekistan Tashkent institute of finance

Shavkatjon Joraboyev Tursunqulovich

Country: Uzbekistan Namangan State University

C/O Advanced Scientific Research,

8/21 Thamotharan Street,

Arisipalayam, Salem

Vol.5. Issue 10 page 13 Impact factor 9

Differentiated approach in teaching reading skills to the students of higher educational institutions

Ibragimov Rashid Nikolayevich Senior teacher at Tashkent state pedagogical university

Abstract: This article explores the differentiated approach in teaching reading, emphasizing its significance in catering to diverse learning needs within the classroom. Differentiation is defined as tailoring instruction to meet individual student needs, abilities, and interests. Key strategies discussed include flexible grouping, varied instructional materials, and targeted assessments that inform instructional decisions. The article highlights the importance of formative assessments in identifying students' reading levels and adapting lessons accordingly. Furthermore, it examines the role of technology and multimedia resources in enhancing engagement and comprehension for diverse learners.

Keywords: Differentiated approach, reading education, diverse learners, flexible grouping, formative assessment, instructional strategies, technology in education.

Differentiated approach, also called differentiation, is a process through which teachers enhance learning by matching student characteristics to approach and assessment. Differentiated approach allows all students to access the same classroom curriculum by providing entry points, learning tasks, and outcomes that are tailored to students' needs (Hall, Strangman, & Meyer, 2003). Differentiated approach is not a single strategy, but rather an approach to line that incorporates a variety of strategies.

Teachers can differentiate content, process, and/or product for students (Tomlinson, 1999). Differentiation of content refers to a change in the material being learned by a student. For example, if the classroom objective is for all students to subtract using renaming, some of the students may learn to subtract two-digit numbers, while others may learn to subtract larger numbers in the context of word problems. Differentiation of process refers to the way in which a student accesses material. One student may explore a learning center, while another student collects information from the web. Differentiation of product refers to the way in which a student shows what he or she has learned. For example, to demonstrate understanding of a geometric concept, one student may solve a problem set, while another builds a model.

When teachers differentiate, they do so in response to a student's readiness, interest, and/or learning profile. Readiness refers to the skill level and background knowledge of the child. Interest refers to topics that the student may want to explore or that will motivate the student. This can include interests relevant to the content area as well as outside interests of the student. Finally, a student's learning profile includes learning style (i.e., a visual, auditory, tactile, or kinesthetic learner), grouping preferences (i.e., individual, small group, or large group), and environmental preferences (i.e., lots of space or a quiet area to work). A teacher may

Vol.5. Issue 10 page 14

Impact factor 9

differentiate based on any one of these factors or any combination of factors (Tomlinson, 1999).

Implementation looks different for each student and each assignment. Before beginning approach, teachers should do three things:

- Use diagnostic assessments to determine student readiness. These assessments can be formal or informal. Teachers can give pre-tests, question students about their background knowledge, or use KWL charts (charts that ask students to identify what they already Know, what they Want to know, and what they have Learned about a topic).
- Determine student interest. This can be done by using interest inventories and/or including students in the planning process. Teachers can ask students to tell them what specific interests they have in a particular topic, and then teachers can try to incorporate these interests into their lessons.
- Identify student learning styles and environmental preferences. Learning styles can be measured using learning style inventories. Teachers can also get information about student learning styles by asking students how they learn best and by observing student activities. Identifying environmental preferences includes determining whether students work best in large or small groups and what environmental factors might contribute to or inhibit student learning. For example, a student might need to be free from distraction or have extra lighting while he or she works.

Teachers incorporate different approachal strategies based on the assessed needs of their students. Throughout a unit of study, teachers should assess students on a regular basis. This assessment can be formal, but is often informal and can include taking anecdotal notes on student progress, examining students' work, and asking the student questions about his or her understanding of the topic. The results of the assessment could then be used to drive further approach.

In conclusion, a differentiated approach to teaching reading is essential for addressing the diverse needs and abilities of students in today's classrooms. By recognizing that each learner brings unique strengths, challenges, and learning styles, educators can create tailored reading experiences that foster engagement, comprehension, and a love for literature. Implementing strategies such as flexible grouping, varied instructional materials, and personalized assessments allows teachers to meet individual needs while promoting overall literacy development. Ultimately, embracing differentiation not only enhances student achievement but also cultivates an inclusive environment where all learners can thrive and reach their full potential. As we continue to explore innovative teaching methods, the differentiated approach will remain a cornerstone of effective reading instruction.

Bibliography

- 1. Adlof, S. M., and Catts, H. W. (2015). Morphosyntax in poor comprehenders. Read. Writ. 28, 1051–1070. doi: 10.1007/s11145-015-9562-3
- 2. Aghaie, R., and Zhang, L. J. (2012). Effects of explicit instruction in cognitive and metacognitive reading strategies on Iranian EFL students' reading performance and strategy transfer. Instruct. Sci. 40, 1063–1081. doi: 10.1007/s11251-011-9202-5

Vol.5. Issue 10 page 15

Impact factor 9

- 3. Alharbi, M. A. (2015). Reading strategies, learning styles and reading comprehension: a correlation study. J. Lang. Teach. Res. 6, 1257–1268. doi: 10.17507/jltr.0606.13
- 4. Amadieu, F., Van Gog, T., Paas, F., Tricot, A., and Mariné, C. (2009). Effects of prior knowledge and concept-map structure on disorientation, cognitive load, and learning. Learn. Instr. 19, 376–386. doi: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2009.02.005
- 5. Anastasiou, D., and Griva, E. (2009). Awareness of reading strategy use and reading comprehension among poor and good readers. Ilkögretim Online 8, 283–297.
- 6. Anmarkrud and Bråten, I. (2009). Motivation for reading comprehension. Learn. Individ. Differ. 19, 252–256. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2008.09.002
- 7. Arslan, A. (2017). Investigation of secondary school students' reading anxiety and academic self-efficacy beliefs in terms of various variable. E-Kafkas J. Educ. Res. 4, 30–44. doi: 10.31458/iejes.399014
- 8. Baker, L., and Brown, A. L. (1984). "Metacognitive skills and reading," in Handbook of Reading Research. Vol. 1, eds P. D. Pearson, M. Kamil, R. Barr and P. Mosenthal (White Plains, NY: Longman), 353–394.
- 9. Berthiaume, K. S., Lorch, E. P., and Milich, R. (2010). Getting clued in: inferential processing and comprehension monitoring in boys with ADHD. J. Attent. Disord. 14, 31–42. doi: 10.1177/1087054709347197
- 10.Borenstein, M., Hedges, L. V., Higgins, J. P. T., and Rothstein, H. R. (2009). Fixed-effect versus random-effects models. Introduct. Meta-Analysis 77, 77–86. doi: 10.1002/9780470743386.ch13