Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

METHODOLOGY FOR INDIVIDUALIZED MODELING OF THE LANGUAGE LEARNING ENVIRONMENT IN INCLUSIVE EDUCATION

Maqsuda Rajabova
Independent Researcher at Chirchik State Pedagogical University
Ma.radjabova77@gmail.com

Abstract

An inclusive classroom brings together learners who differ in language proficiency, communicative experience, learning pace, sensory abilities and need for pedagogical support; such diversity reveals the limitations of organising a language lesson around a single task and a single response format for everyone. The aim of the article is to provide a scholarly rationale for the content and the methodological mechanism of individual modelling of the language learning environment in inclusive education. The study is theoretical and conceptual in nature; integrative literature review, comparative analysis, conceptual generalisation and pedagogical modelling were applied. UNESCO‘s approach to inclusive education, the Universal Design for Learning (UDL) 3.0 guidelines, differentiated and adaptive instruction, and the action-oriented approach of the CEFR were compared with studies published in Uzbekistan. The analysis substantiates individual modelling not as the design of a separate, simplified programme for a learner, but as the process of adapting the conditions for reaching a shared communicative goal to the learner's actual needs. As a result of the study, a five-component dynamic model and a six-stage methodological cycle for its implementation are proposed.

Keywords: Inclusive education, language learning environment, individual modelling, special educational needs, Universal Design for Learning, differentiated instruction, adaptive learning, communicative competence, formative assessment.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

INKLYUZIV TA'LIM SHAROITIDA TIL O'RGANISH MUHITINI INDIVIDUAL MODELLASHTIRISH METODIKASI

Maqsuda Rajabova
Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti mustaqil izlanuvchisi
Ma.radjabova77@gmail.com

Annotatsiya
Inklyuziv sinfda til bilish darajasi, kommunikativ tajribasi, o'rganish sur'ati, sensor imkoniyatlari va pedagogik yordamga ehtiyoji turlicha bo'lgan o'quvchilar birga ta'lim oladi; bunday xilma-xillik til darsini barcha uchun bir xil topshiriq va yagona javob shakli asosida tashkil etishning cheklanganligini ko'rsatadi. Maqolaning maqsadi — inklyuziv ta'limda til o'rganish muhitini individual modellashtirishning mazmuni va metodik mexanizmini ilmiy jihatdan asoslash. Tadqiqot nazariy-konseptual xarakterga ega bo'lib, integrativ adabiyotlar tahlili, qiyosiy tahlil, konseptual umumlashtirish va pedagogik modellashtirish metodlaridan foydalanildi. UNESCOning inklyuziv ta'lim yondashuvi, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) 3.0, differensiallashtirilgan va adaptiv ta'lim hamda CEFR konsepsiyasi mahalliy tadqiqotlar bilan qiyoslandi. Natijada individual modellashtirish o'quvchiga soddalashtirilgan alohida dastur yaratish emas, balki umumiy kommunikativ maqsadni saqlagan holda unga erishish sharoitlarini o'quvchining real ehtiyojlariga moslashtirish jarayoni sifatida asoslandi. Tadqiqot natijasi sifatida besh komponentli dinamik model va uni amalga oshirishning olti bosqichli metodik sikli taklif etildi.

Kalit so'zlar: inklyuziv ta'lim, til o'rganish muhiti, individual modellashtirish, individual ta'lim ehtiyoji, Universal Design for Learning, differensiallashtirilgan ta'lim, adaptiv ta'lim, kommunikativ kompetensiya, formativ baholash.

Аннотация
В инклюзивном классе вместе обучаются учащиеся с разным уровнем владения языком, коммуникативным опытом, темпом усвоения, сенсорными возможностями и потребностью в педагогической поддержке; такое разнообразие обнаруживает ограниченность организации урока языка

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

на основе одинакового для всех задания и единой формы ответа. Цель статьи — научно обосновать содержание и методический механизм индивидуального моделирования среды изучения языка в условиях инклюзивного образования. Исследование носит теоретико-концептуальный характер; использованы методы интегративного анализа литературы, сравнительного анализа, концептуального обобщения и педагогического моделирования. Подход ЮНЕСКО к инклюзивному образованию, Universal Design for Learning (UDL) 3.0, дифференцированное и адаптивное обучение, а также деятельностная концепция CEFR сопоставлены с исследованиями отечественных авторов. В результате индивидуальное моделирование обосновано не как создание для учащегося отдельной упрощённой программы, а как процесс адаптации условий достижения общей коммуникативной цели к его реальным потребностям. В качестве результата исследования предложены пятикомпонентная динамическая модель и шестиэтапный методический цикл её реализации.

Ключевые слова: инклюзивное образование, среда изучения языка, индивидуальное моделирование, особые образовательные потребности, Universal Design for Learning, дифференцированное обучение, адаптивное обучение, коммуникативная компетенция, формирующее оценивание.

INTRODUCTION

In contemporary education, inclusion goes beyond simply placing a learner in a mainstream classroom. Even when a learner is physically present in the classroom, their participation in education remains limited if learning materials are inaccessible, tasks do not take their capabilities into account, or suitable ways of demonstrating their knowledge are unavailable. Therefore, the primary criterion for inclusive education is not the learner's presence in the classroom, but their meaningful participation in learning activities and access to opportunities for development. UNESCO (2020) interprets inclusive education as a systematic process aimed at recognizing learner diversity, identifying barriers to education, and reducing them.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

This issue becomes even more complex in language education. Language learning involves more than acquiring grammatical rules and vocabulary; it requires interconnected activities such as listening comprehension, reading, writing, speaking, and interaction. Thus, in a language lesson, learners draw not only on their linguistic knowledge but also on their abilities to hear, see, manage their attention, and express their responses. Consequently, difficulties in language lessons cannot be adequately explained solely by "low language proficiency."

Three typical situations illustrate this point. If information in a listening comprehension task is presented only in audio form, a learner with hearing difficulties is denied access to its content. If a task based on a complex visual chart is not provided in an alternative format, it becomes unnecessarily difficult for a learner with a visual impairment. If a learner who possesses linguistic knowledge but experiences significant anxiety when speaking spontaneously in front of the class is assessed only through an oral presentation, the result will not reflect their actual communicative potential. These situations demonstrate the need to view the problem not as a learner's "deficit," but as a question of the fit between the learner's capabilities and the learning environment.

Universal Design for Learning addresses this problem by designing education from the outset to be accessible and flexible for diverse learners. In its UDL 3.0 Guidelines, CAST (2024) emphasizes the need to provide multiple options for perceiving information, communicating, and expressing acquired knowledge: the aim is not to develop a separate curriculum, but to reduce barriers that hinder access to the common curriculum. Nevertheless, universal flexibility does not address every individual need: some learners require additional time, communicative scaffolding, assistive technology, or individualized support.

This is where the individualized modeling of the language learning environment becomes relevant. In this study, individualized modeling refers not to assigning a learner to a diagnostic or general category, but to identifying their current language capabilities, barriers to learning, communicative needs, and level of independence, and designing pedagogical conditions based on this information. The central question is not "How does this learner differ from others?" but "What conditions does this learner need to achieve the shared language learning objective?" Accordingly, the study aims to define the concept of individualized

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

modeling, identify its components, and provide a methodological rationale for the stages of their practical implementation.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

The theoretical framework of the analysis comprised five strands. In the first strand, drawing on UNESCO (2020), inclusion was interpreted as a systematic process involving the recognition of learner diversity and the identification and reduction of barriers arising in the educational process. In the second strand, the UDL 3.0 principles developed by CAST (2024) were examined, and options for perceiving information in different formats, using alternative methods of communication and expression, and accessing assistive tools were regarded as important factors in designing an individualized learning environment.

The third area of focus involved an analysis of the outcomes of differentiated instruction. Smale-Jacobse et al. (2019) define differentiation as a pedagogical approach aimed at adapting the content, process, and forms of support in teaching to meet diverse learning needs. Synthesizing research on various English language learners, Sedanza and Abatayo (2026) highlight both the positive potential of differentiation and the fact that outcomes depend on the specific pedagogical context. This indicates that merely assigning "different tasks" is insufficient; rather, any adaptation must be grounded in a diagnostic basis.

The fourth area addressed the issue of the "learner model" in adaptive learning. An analysis of 57 studies by Wang, Maeda, and Chang (2025) reveals that while tailoring the educational experience based on learner data is central to adaptive systems, the mechanisms for updating the model and linking it to adaptive assessment remain insufficiently explored. This conclusion underscores the need to view the individual learner model not as a static description, but as a pedagogical construct that evolves throughout the learning process. Regarding the fifth area, the objective component was analyzed based on the CEFR: the Council of Europe (2020) interprets the language learner as a "social agent" who performs real-world social tasks and views reception, production, interaction, and mediation as interconnected forms of communicative activity. Consequently, the outcome of individual modeling should be evaluated not merely by grammatical

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

or lexical indicators, but by the extent to which the learner can participate independently in real communicative activities.

Certain aspects of inclusive foreign language education in Uzbekistan have been the subject of recent research. Djurayeva and Khudoynazarova (2024) examined organizational forms, didactic methods, and motivation in teaching foreign languages to primary school children with special educational needs, demonstrating the necessity of alternating between whole-class, pair, group, and individual formats depending on the situation. Jurayeva and Yuldasheva (2025) analyzed issues of equal opportunity and accessibility in foreign language education, substantiating the need for a learner-centered environment. Seilkhanova and Khojabaeva (2026) focus on adapting instructional materials, didactic tasks, and assessment methods when organizing English language lessons for students with special educational needs. Meanwhile, Sharipova (2026) examines EFL textbooks for blind and visually impaired students in Uzbekistan through the lens of Universal Design for Learning (UDL), demonstrating that an over-reliance on visual elements limits access to the material.

Each of these studies addresses a specific aspect of the issue—whether it be equitable access, pedagogical adaptation, or material design. However, there is a lack of a sufficiently systematized model that integrates the student's individual language profile, specific educational barriers, communicative goals, pedagogical adaptations, and outcome-based remodeling into a unified methodological cycle. This research gap defines the direction of the study. The practical relevance of the topic is further reinforced by regulatory changes: Resolution No. 818 of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan, dated December 24, 2025, mandates support for the individual development of children with special educational needs, the organization of instruction based on individual education plans, and the development of an inclusive resource system.

Research Methods. The study is theoretical and conceptual in nature; no empirical experiments were conducted. Consequently, the results section presents a conceptual model developed through the synthesis of scientific literature rather than experimental data. Methods employed included integrative literature analysis, comparative analysis, conceptual generalization, and pedagogical modeling. The analysis proceeded as follows: the aforementioned theoretical

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

approaches and local studies were compared to identify recurring conceptual units—specifically, the student's current capabilities, obstacles, goals, pedagogical conditions, and monitoring. These units were then linked through cause-and-effect logic to formulate the components and stages of individual modeling.

RESULTS

The analysis revealed that equating "individual modeling" with merely assigning an "individual task" is methodologically insufficient. While differentiated exercises can represent a form of individualized approach, the pedagogical value of the adaptation remains unclear if the rationale behind the modification is not identified. For instance, difficulties in text comprehension may stem from vocabulary limitations, font style, complex instructions, prior knowledge gaps, or attention span issues—and each cause requires a distinct solution. On this basis, the individual modeling of a language learning environment is defined as the process of identifying a learner's existing linguistic capabilities and educational needs, determining factors that hinder their communicative activity, adapting conditions regarding materials, tasks, support, interaction, and assessment while maintaining the overall learning objective, and subsequently revising these conditions based on the results achieved.

The definition highlights three characteristics of individual modeling. First, the model does not categorize the learner into general groups such as "weak" or "strong," but rather describes their status within specific activities. Second, the adaptation preserves the overall learning objective as much as possible; modifications focus primarily on the path to achieving that objective. Third, the model is not a static document but a dynamic system that is updated as the learner progresses. Based on theoretical analysis, five interconnected components of an individual language learning environment have been identified (Table 1).

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Table 1. Model for the individual modeling of language learning in an inclusive environment.

Model component	Key diagnostic question	Pedagogical decision
Existing language capability	What can the student currently do independently using the language?	The baseline level and strengths are determined.
Educational needs and barriers	What factor is hindering their learning or communication?	The type of adaptation is selected to reduce barriers.
Individual communicative goal	What meaningful language activity should the student be able to perform at the next stage?	A specific developmental goal linked to the general curriculum is established.
Pedagogical conditions	What materials, support, tools, and forms of communication are needed to achieve the goal?	The learning environment is configured.
Monitoring and updating	Did the chosen support yield results, and which part of it is no longer needed?	Support is maintained or reduced, or the model is restructured.

These components are implemented in actual classroom practice through a six-stage methodological cycle.

The first stage is multi-source diagnostics. The process goes beyond merely determining a student's general "level"; it examines specific capabilities in listening comprehension, reading, writing, speaking, and interaction. The teacher employs short diagnostic tasks, observation, interviews, and self-assessment. Among two students sharing the same CEFR A2 level, one might excel in oral communication while the other is stronger in written tasks. Consequently, an individual model should rely on a specific profile of skills rather than a generic "A2 student" label.

The second stage is identifying learning barriers. Before concluding that "the student cannot perform the task," the teacher asks: "Which element of the task is hindering the demonstration of their knowledge?" A student who fails an audio task due to hearing difficulties might well be capable of understanding the text's content, yet the channel for accessing the information does not suit their needs. CAST (2024) identifies the creation of diverse pathways for perception and

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

expression as a means to mitigate precisely such barriers. Adaptation may take the form of subtitles, transcripts, visual aids, or assistive technology, but it must not compromise the learning objective.

The third stage involves setting an individual communicative goal. Individualization does not imply an automatic lowering of academic standards; the goal remains as close as possible to the general one, while the path to achieving it is adapted. For example, the task of "asking for a product in a shop, inquiring about the price, and communicating during the purchase" might be performed by one student through an independent dialogue, by another using key phrases, and by a third via written or alternative means of communication. In all cases, the core outcome—the target communicative activity—is preserved. This aligns with the CEFR approach, which views the learner as a social agent (Council of Europe, 2020).

The fourth stage is configuring the learning environment. The language learning environment is not limited to textbooks and the classroom; it encompasses a combination of learning materials, task instructions, time allocation, technological tools, the level of support, roles within pairs or groups, and the form of assessment. Consequently, adaptation is implemented at various levels: when working with a complex text, one student might be provided with key vocabulary in advance, another with a screen-reader-compatible digital version, and a third with graphic aids to facilitate comprehension. The issue of visual coherence in textbook materials, highlighted by Sharipova (2026), confirms that environment design constitutes a methodological factor distinct from language competence itself.

The fifth stage involves integrating the student into general communicative activities. The goal of individual modeling is not to isolate the student from classmates or keep them occupied with separate, solitary tasks. Since language develops through communication, individual support should facilitate the student's inclusion in the collective activity. For instance, when a group is creating a travel itinerary, one student might justify the route, another enters data into a table, a third formulates questions based on key phrases, and a student with communication difficulties expresses a decision using a digital tool—the tasks differ, yet the outcome is shared. Seilkhanova and Khojabaeva (2026) also

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

emphasize the necessity of creating a psychologically safe environment alongside the adaptation of materials and assessment methods.

The sixth stage involves formative monitoring and remodeling. An individual model should not remain static once created; support that is essential during the initial phase of a lesson may become superfluous later on. For instance, in speaking activities, the full "I think... because..." template is initially provided; this is subsequently reduced to mere keywords, and eventually, the student responds independently. Wang et al. (2025) highlight the importance of updating the learner model and linking it to outcomes in adaptive systems; from a pedagogical perspective, this implies that support must be gradually reduced as the student progresses, rather than becoming a permanent crutch.

Thus, the methodology operates in the following cycle: analyzing the learner → identifying obstacles → setting communicative goals → adapting the environment → organizing participation in joint activities → monitoring results and updating the model. Each new iteration of the cycle builds upon the previous outcome; consequently, formative assessment serves not merely as a means of assigning grades, but as a source of diagnostic information that guides subsequent pedagogical decisions.

DISCUSSION

A key feature of the proposed model is that it does not frame individualization as a "problem" residing within the student; rather, the object of pedagogical analysis is the compatibility between the student and the learning environment. This approach aligns with UNESCO's stance—linking inclusion to the identification and reduction of barriers—and with the UDL principle of proactively designing flexible environments (UNESCO, 2020; CAST, 2024). At the same time, individual modeling delves deeper than UDL into the level of specific pedagogical decisions: where universal provisions prove insufficient, additional configurations are selected for the individual student.

Nor can the model be equated simply with differentiated instruction. Differentiation typically entails varying content, processes, tasks, or support to address diverse needs within a group. Individual modeling, however, links the rationale for such differentiation to diagnostic data about the student and verifies

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

the effectiveness of the adjustments through ongoing monitoring. In other words, while differentiation answers the question "What can be changed?", individual modeling addresses "Why is this specific change necessary, how is it implemented, and did it yield results?" ...consolidates such questions into a unified framework (Smale-Jacobse et al., 2019; Sedanza & Abatayo, 2026).

The second key principle of the model is not to confuse equity with providing identical conditions for all students. Providing a student with a visual impairment a text compatible with a screen reader does not constitute assigning an "easy" task; rather, it creates an alternative means of access equivalent to the access another student gains through a printed text. Similarly, in a situation where the learning objective is not to assess pronunciation, allowing a student with speech difficulties to provide a written response does not undervalue their knowledge; instead, it enhances the appropriateness of the assessment. Jurayeva and Yuldasheva (2025) link the issue of equal opportunity in foreign language education specifically to fair access conditions tailored to diverse needs.

However, there is also a counter-risk associated with individualization: overprotecting the student. If an educator consistently simplifies tasks based on the assumption that "it is too hard" for the student, the student's potential for development is artificially curtailed. Therefore, the model must maintain a balance between support and high expectations, ensuring that adaptations reduce barriers to achieving the communicative goal without negating the goal itself. Scaffolding must be temporary and reduced as the learner's independence grows; CAST (2024) also places special emphasis on tiered support.

Digital technologies expand the possibilities for individualized instruction, yet technology itself does not constitute an individualized learning model. An adaptive platform relying solely on test scores may steer the learner toward tasks of consistently low complexity (Wang et al., 2025); therefore, technological adaptation must be validated through educator observation and learner feedback.

The proposed model does not disregard local research; rather, it integrates approaches such as tailoring lessons to individual needs (Djurayeva & Khudoynazarova, 2024), ensuring equitable access (Jurayeva & Yuldasheva, 2025), adapting materials and assessments (Seilkhanova & Khojabaeva, 2026), and designing accessible materials based on UDL (Sharipova, 2026) within a

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

logic of diagnosis, barriers, goals, conditions, and monitoring. This aspect constitutes the article's conceptual novelty.

A limitation of the study is that the model was developed at a theoretical-conceptual level and has not undergone empirical testing. Future research should test it in real EFL classrooms with students of varying ages and language proficiency levels to determine its impact on communicative outcomes, levels of participation, and learner autonomy.

CONCLUSION

The research findings demonstrated that interpreting the individual modeling of the language-learning environment within an inclusive setting merely as assigning separate or consistently simplified tasks to a student is methodologically limited. At the core of individual modeling lies not the student's "deficiency," but rather the alignment between their existing capabilities and the educational environment.

In this approach, the pedagogical process begins with identifying the student's actual language capabilities; subsequently, the hindering factors are determined, and an individual communicative goal—linked to the general curriculum—is established. To achieve this goal, materials, tasks, support mechanisms, modes of interaction, and assessment conditions are adapted. The resulting outcomes serve as the basis for subsequent decisions; thus, the model evolves from a static description into a continuously updated pedagogical cycle.

The proposed five-component model—comprising existing language capabilities, educational barriers, individual communicative goals, pedagogical conditions, and monitoring—systematizes the key decision points of individualization, while its six-stage implementation cycle enables the translation of diagnostic data into actual pedagogical actions during lessons. From this perspective, the quality of an inclusive language lesson is defined not by all students completing the exact same task, but by their meaningful engagement in shared communicative activities, their development based on their individual capabilities, and their ability—over time—to function more independently with less external support.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

References

1. CAST. (2024). Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0. Lynnfield, MA: CAST. https://udlguidelines.cast.org
2. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment — Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing.
3. Djurayeva, S. B., & Xudoynazarova, S. U. (2024). Inklyuziv ta'limda boshlang'ich sinf o'quvchilariga chet tilini o'qitish. Science and Innovation in the Education System, 3(13), 99–102. https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.sies.50990
4. Jurayeva, Z. S., & Yuldasheva, S. (2025). Equity and accessibility in foreign language training. Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal, 6(08), 362–367. https://doi.org/10.37547/mesmj-V6-I8-42
5. O'zbekiston Respublikasi Vazirlar Mahkamasi. (2025). Alohida ta'lim ehtiyojlari bo'lgan bolalarga sifatli ta'lim olish imkoniyatini yaratish, ularni jamiyatga integratsiya qilish va individual rivojlanishini qo'llab-quvvatlash chora-tadbirlari to'g'risida: 2025-yil 24-dekabrdagi 818-son qaror. Lex.uz.
6. Sedanza, M. A. C., & Abatayo, J. A. (2026). Beyond the average: A systematic review and meta-analysis of differentiated instruction for diverse English learners. Frontiers in Education, 11, 1906974. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2026.1906974
7. Seilkhanova, R. N., & Khojabaeva, G. E. (2026). Inclusive English language teaching: Features of working with students with special educational needs. Science Time, 4(2), 176–182. https://doi.org/10.66345/stj.v4i2.4964
8. Sharipova, Y. (2026). EFL textbooks for blind and visually impaired pupils in Uzbekistan: A Universal Design for Learning approach. Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan, 68(3), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.36078/1783401088
9. Smale-Jacobse, A. E., Meijer, A., Helms-Lorenz, M., & Maulana, R. (2019). Differentiated instruction in secondary education: A systematic review of research evidence. Frontiers in Psychology, 10, 2366. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02366

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 9, September, 2026
Website: usajournals.org
This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

10. UNESCO. (2020). Global Education Monitoring Report 2020: Inclusion and Education — All Means All. Paris: UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54676/JJNK6989
11. Wang, X., Maeda, Y., & Chang, H.-H. (2025). Development and techniques in learner model in adaptive e-learning system: A systematic review. Computers & Education, 225, 105184. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2024.105184