innovation for higher education institutions seeking to align with CEFR and national qualification standards (Malaka Talablari, 2021).

The theoretical foundation of this research aligns with Bloom's revised taxonomy (Anderson & Krathwohl, 2001), emphasizing cognitive progression from understanding to evaluation. It also draws from sociocultural and constructivist theories (Vygotsky, 1978), asserting that knowledge construction occurs through interaction and reflection. Collectively, this literature suggests that integrating content-rich, task-based instruction can cultivate the analytical, evaluative, and reflective skills essential for critical listening development in EFL learners.

Methodology

This study adopted a **mixed-methods design** to assess the effectiveness of CBLT–TBLT integration in developing critical listening. The experiment was conducted at the **Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages (NSIFL)** between February and September 2025. Participants included **42 second-year philology students**, divided into three groups of 14 each (EU-24, CU-24, BU-24), and **10 English instructors** who contributed through observation and survey feedback.

The research comprised **10 treatment lessons (40 total instructional hours)** implemented over **10 weeks**. Lessons were hosted on *listen2me.moodlecloud.com*, a Moodle-based platform containing authentic audio/video materials from TED Talks, BBC Learning English, and academic lectures. Students in the treatment group (CU-24) engaged in five self-directed assignments emphasizing metacognitive reflection, bias detection, and argument evaluation. The control group (BU-24) followed a traditional comprehension-focused syllabus.

Data collection included:

1. **Pre- and post-tests** (36-point scale) assessing analytical comprehension, evaluative reasoning, and reflection.
2. **Teacher and student surveys** capturing perceptions of instructional effectiveness.
3. **Observation notes** evaluating task engagement and strategy use.

Quantitative analysis involved mean comparisons and effect-size calculations (Cohen's d). Qualitative responses were coded thematically to identify perceived benefits and pedagogical challenges.

The **pre-test standard deviation (SD = 3.14%)** confirmed homogeneous baseline performance across the three groups (mean = 56.6%). After the 10-week intervention, the treatment group improved from **58.1% to 70%** (+12 percentage points), while the control group improved modestly from **53.2% to 59%**. The large effect size (d = 0.8) verified substantial learning impact attributable to the CBLT–TBLT approach. These outcomes validate the reliability of the experimental design and its alignment with previous mixed-methods research frameworks in applied linguistics.

Results and Discussion

The quantitative results clearly demonstrate the positive impact of CBLT–TBLT integration on students' critical listening development. The **treatment group (CU-24)** showed a notable mean improvement of 4.28 points, transitioning from lower-B1 to mid-B2 CEFR proficiency levels. In contrast, the control group exhibited only limited gains. The

narrow SD values across all groups indicated consistent progress, confirming the robustness of the intervention.

Qualitative data further supported these findings. Teacher surveys revealed that students displayed stronger motivation, collaboration, and reflective awareness. Learners reported increased confidence in identifying speaker bias, distinguishing factual claims from opinions, and articulating evidence-based arguments. Reflective journal entries indicated that the structured, task-based design enhanced self-regulation and strategic listening behaviors.

The discussion highlights that **CBLT provided meaningful, cognitively rich contexts**, while **TBLT operationalized critical engagement** through real-world listening challenges. This dual approach aligns with Goh and Vandergrift's (2012) model of metacognitive listening instruction, emphasizing planning, monitoring, and evaluating. Moreover, integrating digital materials through MoodleCloud enabled flexible access and multimodal learning, consistent with global trends in AI-assisted language education (Zawacki-Richter et al., 2019).

These findings suggest that CBLT–TBLT fosters both linguistic competence and critical reasoning. Students were not only able to comprehend authentic input but also analyze logic, credibility, and evidence within spoken texts. The study thus contributes to Uzbekistan's national agenda of enhancing language proficiency and critical thinking in higher education, illustrating how innovative pedagogy can align local curricula with international standards.

Conclusion and Limitations (200 words)

This study concludes that integrating **Content-Based** and **Task-Based Language Teaching** significantly enhances critical listening skills among EFL learners in higher education. The CBLT–TBLT framework, grounded in authentic content and reflective learning, enabled students to transition from passive comprehension to active analysis and evaluation. Empirical evidence from the Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages shows large, consistent gains across listening performance measures, confirming the model's pedagogical effectiveness.

However, several limitations should be noted. The research was restricted to one institution and a relatively small sample, limiting generalizability. The 10-week duration provided a snapshot of short-term gains but did not capture long-term retention. Additionally, while MoodleCloud facilitated digital access, AI-driven adaptive feedback systems were not fully implemented. Future studies should expand the sample size, include longitudinal assessment, and explore AI-supported analytics for individualized listening feedback.

Despite these constraints, the findings have strong implications for curriculum innovation in Uzbekistan. By integrating content- and task-based instruction with digital resources, educators can promote analytical comprehension, reflective awareness, and learner autonomy – key attributes for future-ready language professionals.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, L. W., & Krathwohl, D. R. (2001). *A taxonomy for learning, teaching, and assessing: A revision of Bloom's taxonomy of educational objectives*. Longman.

2. Brinton, D. M., Snow, M. A., & Wesche, M. B. (2017). *Content-based second language instruction*. University of Michigan Press.

3. Cross, J. (2017). Metacognition in second language listening. *Language Teaching, 50*(2), 190–206.

4. Ellis, R. (2018). *Task-based language teaching: Concepts, practices, and issues*. Cambridge University Press.

5. Field, J. (2008). *Listening in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press. Flowerdew, J., & Miller, L. (2013). *Lectures in a second language: Notes and strategies for success*. Routledge.

6. Goh, C. C. M., & Taib, Y. (2006). Metacognitive instruction in listening. *Language Teaching Research, 10*(1), 55–77.

7. Khodjakulova, N. (2024). Critical listening pedagogy in Uzbek higher education: A framework for reflective EFL practice. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Education Research, 8*(3), 211–230.

8. Larsen-Freeman, D., & Anderson, M. (2013). *Techniques and principles in language teaching* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

9. Liu, Y., & Chen, L. (2023). Integrating task-supported content-based listening instruction. *Language Learning Journal, 51*(4), 459–475.

10. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.

11. Rahimi, M., & Abednia, A. (2021). Developing critical EFL listening through content-based instruction. *System, 103*, 102654.

12. Rost, M. (2016). *Teaching and researching listening* (3rd ed.). Routledge.

13. Vandergrift, L., & Goh, C. C. M. (2012). *Teaching and learning second language listening: Metacognition in action*. Routledge.

14. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in society: The development of higher psychological processes*. Harvard University Press.

15. Zawacki-Richter, O., Marín, V. I., Bond, M., & Gouverneur, F. (2019). Systematic review of research on artificial intelligence applications in higher education. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education, 16*(1), 1–27.