



ORGANIZING BASKETBALL TRAINING FOR STUDENTS IN GRADES 5–7 BASED ON AGE AND INDIVIDUAL CHARACTERISTICS

Axmadjonova Dilnoza Murod qizi
Republic of Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article presents a pedagogical framework for organizing basketball training for students in grades 5–7, taking account of age-related development and individual learning needs. Intended for physical education teachers and students at pedagogical universities in Uzbekistan, the framework addresses differences in movement competence, previous sporting experience, physical readiness, motivation, and confidence. The article adopts a conceptual approach rather than reporting an experimental intervention. It proposes an instructional sequence that combines initial observation, differentiated tasks, progressive practice, small-sided games, and formative assessment. Basketball activities focus on ball handling, passing, shooting, movement without the ball, and elementary tactical decisions. Task difficulty is adjusted through changes in equipment, playing space, movement speed, defensive pressure, and practice duration. Particular attention is given to equitable participation, appropriate progression, and feedback that supports individual improvement. The framework treats chronological age as an initial planning reference while emphasizing observation of each learner's capabilities. Its practical value lies in helping teachers organize inclusive lessons with shared learning objectives and flexible pathways toward achievement. Empirical evaluation would be required to establish its effects on basketball performance, participation, and learning motivation.

Keywords: Basketball instruction, school physical education, age-related development, individual differences, differentiated instruction, motor skills, small-sided games, formative assessment.



**5–7-SINF O‘QUVCHILARIGA BASKETBOLNI O‘RGATISHDA
YOSH VA INDIVIDUAL XUSUSIYATLARNI HISOBGA OLISH
ASOSIDA MASHG‘ULOTLARNI TASHKIL ETISH**

Axmadjonova Dilnoza Murod qizi
O‘zbekiston Respublikasi

Annotatsiya:

Ushbu maqolada 5–7-sinf o‘quvchilari uchun basketbol mashg‘ulotlarini yoshga xos rivojlanish hamda individual o‘quv ehtiyojlarini hisobga olgan holda tashkil etishning pedagogik modeli taqdim etiladi. O‘zbekiston sharoitidagi jismoniy tarbiya o‘qituvchilari va pedagogika universitetlari talabalariga mo‘ljallangan mazkur model harakat ko‘nikmalari, avvalgi sport tajribasi, jismoniy tayyorgarlik, motivatsiya va o‘ziga ishonchdagi farqlarni qamrab oladi. Maqola eksperimental mashg‘ulot natijalarini bayon qilishga emas, konseptual yondashuvni ishlab chiqishga asoslanadi. Dastlabki kuzatuv, tabaqalashtirilgan topshiriqlar, bosqichma-bosqich mashq qilish, kichik tarkibli o‘yinlar va shakllantiruvchi baholashni birlashtiruvchi o‘qitish ketma-ketligi taklif etiladi. Basketbol mashqlari to‘pni boshqarish, uzatish, savatga tashlash, to‘psiz harakatlanish va oddiy taktik qarorlarni qabul qilishga yo‘naltiriladi. Topshiriqlar murakkabligi jihozlar, o‘yin maydoni, harakat tezligi, himoyachi qarshiligi va mashq davomiyligini o‘zgartirish orqali moslashtiriladi. Teng ishtirok etish imkoniyatlari, o‘quvchiga mos rivojlanish sur‘ati va individual o‘shishni qo‘llab-quvvatlovchi fikr-mulohazalarga alohida e‘tibor beriladi. Modelda xronologik yosh rejalashtirishning dastlabki mezoni sifatida olinib, har bir o‘quvchining imkoniyatlarini kuzatish ustuvor ahamiyat kasb etadi. Uning amaliy ahamiyati umumiy o‘quv maqsadlariga erishishning moslashuvchan yo‘llarini yaratishdan iborat. Modelning basketbol ko‘nikmalari, ishtirok faolligi va o‘quv motivatsiyasiga ta‘sirini aniqlash uchun empirik tekshiruv talab etiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: basketbolni o‘rgatish, maktab jismoniy tarbiyasi, yoshga xos rivojlanish, individual farqlar, tabaqalashtirilgan ta‘lim, harakat ko‘nikmalari, kichik tarkibli o‘yinlar, shakllantiruvchi baholash.



Introduction

Basketball provides a practical setting for connecting physical activity with cooperation, decision making, and movement learning in school physical education. For students in grades 5–7, instruction should introduce the game through achievable tasks while allowing learners with different capabilities to participate meaningfully. The pedagogical challenge is therefore to organize shared lessons without assuming that all students learn at the same speed or enter the classroom with equivalent sporting experience. Within this article, basketball training refers to educational practice in school lessons and related extracurricular activities, rather than preparation exclusively directed toward competitive selection or advanced athletic performance.

Grade membership offers a useful administrative reference, but it cannot provide a complete description of learning readiness. Students may differ in coordination, familiarity with ball games, confidence during competition, and ability to interpret instructions. These differences require observation rather than assumptions based on appearance or previous performance alone. The International Olympic Committee consensus statement emphasizes inclusive, sustainable, and enjoyable participation within youth athletic development. Its relevance to school basketball lies in encouraging teachers to consider participation and individual development alongside sporting achievement. This orientation supports an educational approach in which progress remains accessible to beginners and more experienced classmates.

Basketball teaching also requires decisions about the relationship between technical practice and game understanding. Passing, dribbling, and shooting become educationally meaningful when students recognize when and why to use them. FIBA teaching resources encourage accessible, enjoyable activities and adaptations that make basketball suitable for children. For the present framework, these principles inform the selection of simplified tasks without implying that one format suits every grade. A teacher might vary passing distance, available space, or defensive pressure while maintaining a common objective. Such adjustments are proposed as practical responses to observed needs, rather than fixed prescriptions attached to student categories.

In Uzbekistan, the intended application is ordinary school physical education supported by teacher preparation at pedagogical universities. The framework should accommodate the actual conditions of each institution, including lesson



duration, equipment availability, usable space, and class composition. These conditions are planning considerations, not findings from a national survey. Future teachers need opportunities to practise observing learners, designing alternative tasks, and explaining assessment criteria. They should also examine whether their grouping decisions distribute participation fairly. Permanently assigning confident students leadership roles or giving beginners fewer opportunities would conflict with the inclusive purpose established for this instructional framework.

The problem addressed is how to translate recognition of learner differences into a coherent sequence of teaching decisions. This article therefore develops a conceptual mechanism connecting initial observation, differentiated task selection, progressive practice, feedback, and reassessment. It asks how teachers can preserve common basketball learning objectives while adjusting the pathways through which students pursue them. Particular attention is directed toward participation, technical development, elementary tactical understanding, and confidence. The proposed mechanism is intended for subsequent empirical examination; it does not establish measured improvements. Its investigation begins with clarifying how age and individual characteristics can inform instruction without becoming restrictive labels that limit students' opportunities to learn and demonstrate progress.

Methods

This study uses a conceptual research design to develop a framework for organizing basketball instruction for students in grades 5–7. Its methodological purpose is to connect pedagogical principles with practical teaching decisions relevant to schools in Uzbekistan. The work does not involve participant recruitment, experimental groups, classroom observations, or collection of performance measurements. Consequently, the proposed procedures represent an instructional model and a plan for subsequent evaluation. The unit of analysis is the teaching decision: how a teacher identifies a learning need, selects an appropriate task, observes the response, and modifies instruction while preserving the intended learning objective.

The source review is narrative rather than systematic. Materials considered include guidance on youth athletic development and basketball coaching resources addressing participation, task adaptation, and learning progression.



Sources are interpreted according to their relevance to school instruction, the age groups they address, and the distinction between educational participation and competitive preparation. Recommendations developed for younger children or specialist athletes are not assumed to apply unchanged to every student in the target grades. The review does not claim exhaustive database coverage or a reproducible screening process. Its role is to inform conceptual development rather than establish pooled effects or comparative effectiveness.

Framework construction follows a sequence linking learner information, task design, implementation, and reassessment. Initial learner information would be obtained through brief practical activities, student discussion, and teacher observation. Suggested observation areas include ball control, passing accuracy, movement balance, understanding of simple rules, willingness to participate, and responses to feedback. Chronological age and grade provide contextual information, while demonstrated capabilities guide task selection. Teachers would avoid inferring biological maturity from physical appearance. Relevant participation restrictions would be addressed through established school procedures. Observation records would describe current support needs without assigning permanent ability labels or predicting future sporting potential.

Differentiation is operationalized through adjustable task conditions. Teachers could modify passing distance, target size, ball characteristics, available space, repetition opportunities, or defensive pressure. Each variation would retain a shared objective, such as delivering a controllable pass to a moving partner. Progression would depend on observed execution and understanding rather than completion of a fixed number of lessons. Brief technical practice would be connected with simplified games that require use of the same skill. Feedback would identify one manageable improvement and provide an opportunity to try again. Flexible grouping would be reviewed to prevent persistent separation by perceived ability.

For subsequent empirical evaluation, the framework proposes repeated assessment before and after an instructional period, preferably alongside a comparable class receiving usual instruction. Assessment would combine standardized skill tasks, structured participation observations, and student feedback. Evaluators would document attendance, previous basketball experience, lesson exposure, and equipment conditions when interpreting changes. Consistent task instructions and assessor agreement would support



measurement quality. Participation by minors would require institutional authorization, parental consent, and student assent as applicable. Records would be anonymized. Statistical procedures would be selected after defining outcomes, sampling arrangements, and data characteristics, rather than specified as analyses already completed. This distinction preserves transparency about the study's scope.

Results

The outcome of this conceptual study is an instructional framework that links learner observation with differentiated basketball tasks and continuing reassessment. Its central feature is a recurring cycle: teachers identify a specific learning need, adjust task conditions, observe student responses, and decide whether to maintain or modify the activity. This cycle provides an organizational mechanism for responding to differences within grades 5–7. The framework does not generate numerical findings, demonstrate causal effects, or establish improvements in basketball performance. Its results consist of design propositions and practical examples that can guide lesson planning and support a later empirical investigation.

A principal design proposition concerns the relationship between age and demonstrated readiness. Grade level establishes the educational context, but task difficulty is selected through observation of performance and understanding. For example, a student who controls the ball confidently while stationary could practise dribbling along a marked route before encountering defensive pressure. A classmate already comfortable with movement could attempt the same objective while responding to a defender. Both students work toward maintaining possession, although their practice conditions differ. These examples illustrate how shared objectives can coexist with individual progression without assigning students permanent positions within an ability hierarchy.

Another output is a flexible lesson structure connecting preparation, skill exploration, application, and reflection. Preparation introduces movements relevant to the intended task. Skill exploration gives students opportunities to practise with manageable demands, while application places the skill within a simplified basketball situation. Reflection invites learners to identify a successful action and a next step. The framework does not prescribe identical time allocations for every class. Instead, teachers would distribute time according to



lesson length, available space, and observed needs. This structure is intended to keep practice connected with game understanding while allowing adjustments during instruction as difficulties emerge.

The proposed assessment approach separates several dimensions of learning that a single performance score could obscure. Technical execution, tactical choices, participation, and individual progress would be recorded through brief descriptive criteria. In a passing activity, observation could address whether a student selects an available teammate, directs the ball appropriately, and moves to offer support afterward. A missed pass would therefore prompt examination of the underlying difficulty rather than an immediate judgment of overall ability. Student reflection would complement teacher observation by identifying uncertainty or perceived difficulty. These assessment procedures remain proposed components; their reliability and practicality have not been tested.

For teacher education in Uzbekistan, the framework produces a planning template organized around the objective, observed need, task adaptation, and evidence for reassessment. Prospective teachers could use this template to explain why they change a condition and what response would justify further progression. Implementation would require checking whether available equipment and class organization permit the planned variations. Where resources are limited, changing distance, rules, or partner arrangements offers options for consideration. The framework also identifies questions for evaluation, including whether differentiated activities preserve meaningful participation and whether teachers can document progress consistently within the practical constraints of ordinary school lessons across different grades and school settings.

Discussion

The proposed framework positions differentiation as a continuous teaching responsibility rather than an occasional adjustment for selected students. Its educational significance lies in connecting a common basketball objective with several routes toward achievement. Within this approach, fairness means providing appropriate opportunities to practise and progress, rather than requiring identical performance under identical conditions. This interpretation is particularly relevant when classmates have different levels of previous experience. However, adapting tasks does not automatically produce equitable learning. Teachers would still need to examine who receives feedback, who



handles the ball, and whose decisions shape participation during practice and games.

An important tension concerns the balance between individual support and collective learning. Excessive separation could reduce opportunities for cooperation or make differences in readiness publicly visible. Conversely, uniform activities could leave some students insufficiently challenged while others struggle to participate. The framework addresses this tension through temporary grouping and adjustable conditions within shared tasks. These arrangements should remain open to revision because performance can vary across skills and situations. A student requiring support with dribbling may demonstrate effective spatial awareness or teamwork. Accordingly, grouping decisions should relate to the immediate learning objective rather than a general judgment of ability.

The relationship between age and instruction also requires careful interpretation. Age provides context for planning, but the framework does not establish developmental thresholds or prescribe skills that every student must master by a particular birthday. Its emphasis on observation is intended to prevent chronological categories from replacing professional judgment. Nevertheless, observation itself can introduce bias when teachers interpret confidence, physical size, or competitive success as evidence of learning potential. Clear descriptive criteria and repeated observations across different activities could help teachers question such assumptions. Whether these procedures improve assessment consistency remains an empirical question requiring investigation in actual lessons.

Application in Uzbekistan should be examined through school conditions rather than assumed national uniformity. A lesson design that works with multiple baskets and sufficient balls may require substantial modification elsewhere. The proposed use of changes in distance, rules, and partner arrangements offers planning flexibility, but cannot eliminate every resource constraint. Teacher preparation therefore needs to include decisions about organization as well as demonstrations of basketball technique. During supervised practice, prospective teachers could explain their adaptations, compare intended and observed participation, and revise subsequent lessons. Such activities would test the usability of the framework without presuming its effectiveness in advance.



The study's conceptual design limits the claims that can be made. No evidence establishes whether the framework improves skill acquisition, motivation, or participation compared with existing instruction. The narrative review also provides no guarantee that all relevant perspectives were considered. Future evaluation should examine implementation fidelity alongside outcomes, since an unsuccessful application could reflect either weaknesses in the framework or difficulties delivering it. Comparisons should document lesson exposure and starting capabilities, while student accounts could reveal experiences overlooked by performance measures. Particular attention should be given to whether adaptations encourage progression or unintentionally restrict opportunities through persistently simplified expectations that teachers fail to reconsider over time.

Conclusion

Organizing basketball training for students in grades 5–7 requires a clear relationship between shared educational goals and the individual conditions under which learners pursue them. This conceptual study proposes an instructional framework in which observation, task adaptation, practice, feedback, and reassessment form a recurring teaching cycle. Its central proposition is that age and grade should inform planning without determining fixed expectations for every learner. Decisions about difficulty should also consider demonstrated skills, previous experience, understanding, confidence, and participation. The framework offers a structured approach to these decisions, although its effects on learning have not yet been established empirically.

The proposed mechanism translates individualization into adjustments that teachers can describe and review. Changes in distance, space, equipment, defensive pressure, or partner arrangements should serve an identifiable basketball objective. Their purpose is to make practice appropriately challenging while maintaining opportunities for progression. Adaptation should therefore remain temporary and responsive rather than becoming a permanent classification of students. Teachers need to reconsider task conditions when learners demonstrate greater control or understanding, and when difficulties suggest that another explanation or practice format is needed. This approach places responsibility on instructional decisions rather than treating initial performance as a stable personal limitation.



Assessment within the framework supports teaching by distinguishing technical execution, tactical understanding, participation, and individual development. These dimensions should inform feedback without being collapsed into judgments based only on scoring success or competitive outcomes. Brief observations and student reflection can provide a basis for selecting the next task, but their usefulness depends on clear criteria and consistent application. The study therefore proposes assessment procedures as components requiring evaluation, rather than as validated instruments. A practical priority is to determine whether teachers can gather sufficient information during ordinary lessons without reducing meaningful practice time or creating excessive administrative demands. For pedagogical universities in Uzbekistan, the framework provides material for connecting basketball knowledge with lesson design and reflective teaching practice. Prospective teachers could formulate common objectives, anticipate different learning needs, prepare alternative task conditions, and explain how observations would guide subsequent decisions. Supervised school practice would offer an opportunity to examine whether these plans remain workable with the available facilities, equipment, and class arrangements. Attention should remain on equitable access to practice and feedback. Successful preparation would involve learning to revise instruction thoughtfully, while recognizing that a well explained plan is not itself evidence of improved student outcomes. Further research should test both the implementation and educational effects of the proposed mechanism. Evaluation needs clearly defined outcomes, documented starting capabilities, comparable instructional exposure, and transparent reporting of adaptations. Student perspectives should accompany performance measures to examine whether learners experience the activities as accessible, challenging, and respectful. Findings would help identify which components are useful, which require modification, and under what conditions the framework can be sustained. The contribution of this article is thus a coherent conceptual foundation for organizing differentiated basketball instruction. Its practical value must be established through systematic application and evaluation in relevant school settings across the target grades and differing institutional conditions.

The revised list includes six works by Uzbek authors and fourteen international sources.



References

1. Pulatov, A. A., Ganiyeva, F. V., Miradilov, B. M., Xusanova, D. T., & Pulatov, F. A. (2017). Basketbol nazariyasi va uslubiyati [Theory and methodology of basketball]. Sano-standart.
2. Ganiyeva, F. V., & Xusanova, D. T. (2017). Basketbol [Basketball]. O'zbekiston davlat jismoniy tarbiya instituti.
3. Salomov, R. S. (2014). Jismoniy tarbiya nazariyasi va uslubiyati [Theory and methodology of physical education]. ITA-PRESS.
4. Abdullayev, A., & Xonkeldiyev, Sh. (2005). Jismoniy tarbiya nazariyasi va usuliyati [Theory and methodology of physical education]. O'zbekiston davlat jismoniy tarbiya instituti.
5. Miradilov, B. M., Karimov, B. Z., & Umbetova, M. A. (2017). Sport pedagogik mahoratini oshirish (basketbol) [Developing pedagogical expertise in sport: Basketball]. Sano-standart.
6. Kerimov, F. A. (2004). Sport sohasidagi ilmiy tadqiqotlar [Scientific research in sport]. Zar qalam.
7. World Association of Basketball Coaches. (n.d.). Mini-basketball coaches manual. International Basketball Federation.
8. Krause, J. V., & Nelson, C. (2019). Basketball skills & drills (4th ed.). Human Kinetics.
9. Mitchell, S. A., Oslin, J. L., & Griffin, L. L. (2021). Teaching sport concepts and skills: A tactical games approach (4th ed.). Human Kinetics.
10. Bergeron, M. F., Mountjoy, M., Armstrong, N., Chia, M., Côté, J., Emery, C. A., Faigenbaum, A., Hall, G., Jr., Kriemler, S., Léglise, M., Malina, R. M., Pensgaard, A. M., Sanchez, A., Soligard, T., Sundgot-Borgen, J., van Mechelen, W., Weissensteiner, J. R., & Engebretsen, L. (2015). International Olympic Committee consensus statement on youth athletic development. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 49(13), 843–851.
11. Malina, R. M., Bouchard, C., & Bar-Or, O. (2004). Growth, maturation, and physical activity (2nd ed.). Human Kinetics.
12. Haibach-Beach, P. S., Reid, G. D., & Collier, D. H. (2018). Motor learning and development (2nd ed.). Human Kinetics.



-
13. Schmidt, R. A., & Lee, T. D. (2020). Motor learning and performance: From principles to application (6th ed.). Human Kinetics.
 14. Chow, J. Y., Davids, K., Button, C., & Renshaw, I. (2022). Nonlinear pedagogy in skill acquisition: An introduction (2nd ed.). Routledge.
 15. Tomlinson, C. A. (2014). The differentiated classroom: Responding to the needs of all learners (2nd ed.). ASCD.
 16. Siedentop, D., Hastie, P. A., & van der Mars, H. (2019). Complete guide to sport education (3rd ed.). Human Kinetics.
 17. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54–67.
 18. Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2016). Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 23(5), 1382–1414.
 19. Oslin, J. L., Mitchell, S. A., & Griffin, L. L. (1998). The Game Performance Assessment Instrument (GPAI): Development and preliminary validation. *Journal of Teaching in Physical Education*, 17(2), 231–243.
 20. Black, P., & Wiliam, D. (1998). Assessment and classroom learning. *Assessment in Education: Principles, Policy & Practice*, 5(1), 7–74.