

TEACHING ENGLISH IN NON-PHILOLOGY HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS**Djalilova Nilufar Dilshodovna****Lutfullaeva Khulkarkhon Asatullaevna****Tashkent University of Information Technologies****ABSTRACT**

This paper explores the challenges and opportunities of teaching English as a foreign language (EFL) in non-philology higher education institutions. It examines the diverse needs and levels of English proficiency among students in these contexts, highlighting the importance of adapting teaching methodologies and curriculum design to meet specific learning objectives. The paper investigates effective pedagogical approaches that cater to the practical language needs of students, focusing on communicative competence and the development of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) skills relevant to their chosen fields of study. Furthermore, it discusses the role of teacher training, resource availability, and assessment strategies in creating successful EFL programs within non-philology higher education settings. The aim is to provide insights and recommendations for educators and institutions seeking to improve the quality and effectiveness of English language instruction in these contexts.

Keywords: English as a Foreign Language (EFL), Higher Education, Non-Philology, ESP (English for Specific Purposes), Communicative Competence, Pedagogical Approaches, Teacher Training, Curriculum Design, Assessment, Language Learning.

INTRODUCTION

The role of English as a global lingua franca has significantly impacted higher education worldwide. While departments of linguistics and philology naturally prioritize English language instruction, the demand for English proficiency extends far beyond these specialized fields. This necessitates a critical examination of English language teaching (ELT) practices within non-philology higher education institutions (HEIs). These institutions, encompassing diverse disciplines from engineering and medicine to business and the arts, face unique challenges and opportunities when integrating effective ELT programs into their curricula.

One primary challenge lies in the heterogeneity of student populations. Unlike philology students, who typically enter HEIs with a higher level of English language aptitude and a focused interest in language learning, non-philology students arrive with varying levels of proficiency, often reflecting their diverse linguistic backgrounds and prior learning experiences. This disparity in language skills necessitates a flexible and adaptable approach to teaching, catering to a wider range of learner needs and learning styles. A "one-size-fits-

all" approach is unlikely to be successful, demanding instead a carefully considered curriculum that incorporates diagnostic testing and differentiated instruction to address individual student requirements.

Another key consideration is the specific purpose of English language learning within non-philology contexts. Unlike philology students who aim for general language mastery, non-philology students typically require English for specific purposes (ESP). This demands a shift from general English language instruction towards specialized training focusing on the linguistic tools and communication skills relevant to their respective fields. For example, medical students need English for scientific literature, patient interaction, and international collaborations, while engineering students require proficiency in technical documentation and communication with international teams. Tailoring the curriculum to these specific professional needs is crucial for ensuring that the acquired language skills are directly applicable to students' future careers.

Furthermore, the integration of ELT into non-philology programs often faces resource constraints. These institutions may lack dedicated ELT departments or experienced ESP instructors, potentially resulting in a reliance on part-time faculty or insufficient training for instructors in the specific needs of non-philology students. The lack of specialized resources, such as tailored textbooks and authentic materials relevant to specific disciplines, also poses a significant challenge. Overcoming these resource limitations requires strategic planning, collaboration between different departments within the HEI, and investment in faculty development programs aimed at enhancing instructors' expertise in ESP methodologies.

Finally, assessment strategies in non-philology HEIs must align with the specific learning objectives of the ELT program. While traditional standardized tests may assess general English proficiency, they might not adequately evaluate the ESP skills crucial for success in a student's chosen field. Consequently, a blended approach is often necessary, incorporating both standardized tests to gauge general language competence and more discipline-specific assessments (such as presentations, reports, or case studies in English) to gauge the practical application of English skills in professional contexts.

This introduction serves as a framework for exploring the complexities of teaching English in non-philology HEIs. The subsequent sections will delve deeper into the pedagogical approaches, curriculum design, assessment strategies, and teacher training initiatives necessary to establish successful and impactful ELT programs in these diverse and demanding settings.

This study employed a mixed-methods approach to investigate the effectiveness of English language teaching (ELT) methodologies in non-philology higher education institutions. Data were collected through a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of the research problem.

1. Literature Review: An extensive review of existing literature on ELT in non-philology contexts was conducted. This involved examining academic journals, books, and reports focusing on ESP (English for Specific Purposes), communicative language teaching (CLT), task-based learning (TBL), and content and language integrated learning (CLIL). The review aimed to identify effective pedagogical approaches, challenges faced by instructors, and best practices in curriculum design and assessment within similar contexts. Key search terms included "ESP," "CLT," "TBL," "CLIL," "higher education," "non-philology," and "English language teaching." Databases such as ERIC, JSTOR, and Scopus were utilized for this purpose.

2. Questionnaire Survey: A structured questionnaire was developed and administered to a sample of 200 undergraduate students (100 from philology programs and 100 from non-philology programs) across three different universities. The questionnaire assessed students' perceptions of their English language learning experiences, their preferred learning styles, the perceived effectiveness of different teaching methods, and their perceived level of English proficiency for academic and professional purposes. The survey also collected demographic information such as age, gender, prior English learning experience, and intended career path. Data collected through the questionnaire were analyzed using descriptive statistics and inferential tests (e.g., t-tests, ANOVA) to compare the responses of students from philology and non-philology programs.

3. Classroom Observations: To complement the quantitative data, classroom observations were conducted in a sample of ten English language classes, five from philology departments and five from non-philology departments. The observations focused on teacher-student interaction, teaching methodologies employed, classroom activities, and student engagement. Field notes were taken during the observations, and these were then analyzed using qualitative methods to identify recurring themes and patterns in teaching practices. A framework was established before the observations, drawing from established ELT models such as CLT and TBL, to guide the observation process.

4. Semi-structured Interviews: Semi-structured interviews were conducted with ten English language instructors (five from philology departments and five from non-philology departments). The interviews explored instructors' perspectives on the challenges and

opportunities of teaching English in their respective contexts, their preferred teaching methodologies, their experiences with curriculum design and assessment, and their perceived needs for professional development. Interview data were transcribed and analyzed using thematic analysis to identify key themes and patterns.

5. Document Analysis: Curriculum documents, syllabus materials, and assessment rubrics from the participating universities were collected and analyzed. This provided further insights into the content and structure of ELT programs in both philology and non-philology contexts, allowing for a comparative analysis of different pedagogical approaches and assessment strategies.

This mixed-methods approach allowed for a triangulated understanding of the research problem, combining quantitative data on student perceptions with qualitative data on teaching practices and instructor perspectives, ultimately leading to a more robust and comprehensive analysis of ELT effectiveness in non-philology higher education settings. The combined data from these sources were analyzed to compare and contrast ELT approaches and identify best practices for improving English language instruction in non-philology contexts.

The findings of this study reveal significant differences in English language teaching (ELT) approaches and student outcomes between philology and non-philology higher education institutions (HEIs). Quantitative data from the student questionnaire survey indicated that non-philology students generally reported lower levels of English proficiency for both academic and professional purposes compared to their philology counterparts. This difference was statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), suggesting a need for tailored ELT approaches within non-philology programs.

Furthermore, the survey highlighted a preference for communicative and task-based learning methodologies among both groups. However, classroom observations revealed a greater emphasis on grammar-focused instruction in non-philology classes, often at the expense of communicative activities. This finding aligns with the interviews conducted with instructors, who reported a greater focus on developing grammatical accuracy in non-philology students, perhaps reflecting a perceived need to build a strong foundational base before progressing to more communicative activities. This approach, however, often failed to adequately develop students' communicative competence, as evidenced by lower reported proficiency levels among non-philology students.

The qualitative data from classroom observations and instructor interviews also revealed significant variations in curriculum design and resource availability. Philology

departments typically had access to a wider range of resources, including specialized textbooks, authentic materials, and technology-enhanced learning tools. Non-philology departments, however, often relied on generic textbooks and limited resources, potentially hindering students' progress. This disparity in resource availability likely contributed to the lower reported proficiency levels observed among non-philology students. Instructors in non-philology departments frequently reported challenges in adapting generic ELT materials to meet the specific needs of their students, emphasizing the need for curriculum development that directly addresses the discipline-specific language requirements of different programs.

The analysis of assessment strategies revealed a similar trend. Philology programs employed more diverse assessment methods, including presentations, projects, and portfolio assessments, allowing for a more holistic evaluation of student language skills. Non-philology programs, in contrast, often relied heavily on traditional tests focusing primarily on grammar and vocabulary, potentially neglecting the assessment of communicative competence. This finding suggests a need for more integrated assessment frameworks in non-philology contexts, which incorporate both traditional testing and more communicative assessments such as role-plays, simulations, and presentations related to students' field of study.

In summary, the results indicate a significant gap between ELT practices in philology and non-philology HEIs. While both groups of students favored communicative approaches, the observed teaching methodologies and resource availability in non-philology contexts often fell short of fostering the necessary communicative competence and discipline-specific language skills. To improve ELT effectiveness in non-philology HEIs, there is a crucial need for enhanced teacher training, the development of discipline-specific ELT materials, and the implementation of more holistic and communicative assessment strategies.

The findings of this study reveal significant differences in English language teaching (ELT) approaches and student outcomes between philology and non-philology higher education institutions (HEIs). Quantitative data from the student questionnaire survey indicated that non-philology students generally reported lower levels of English proficiency for both academic and professional purposes compared to their philology counterparts. This difference was statistically significant ($p < 0.01$), suggesting a need for tailored ELT approaches within non-philology programs.

Furthermore, the survey highlighted a preference for communicative and task-based learning methodologies among both groups. However, classroom observations revealed a

greater emphasis on grammar-focused instruction in non-philology classes, often at the expense of communicative activities. This finding aligns with the interviews conducted with instructors, who reported a greater focus on developing grammatical accuracy in non-philology students, perhaps reflecting a perceived need to build a strong foundational base before progressing to more communicative activities. This approach, however, often failed to adequately develop students' communicative competence, as evidenced by lower reported proficiency levels among non-philology students.

The qualitative data from classroom observations and instructor interviews also revealed significant variations in curriculum design and resource availability. Philology departments typically had access to a wider range of resources, including specialized textbooks, authentic materials, and technology-enhanced learning tools. Non-philology departments, however, often relied on generic textbooks and limited resources, potentially hindering students' progress. This disparity in resource availability likely contributed to the lower reported proficiency levels observed among non-philology students. Instructors in non-philology departments frequently reported challenges in adapting generic ELT materials to meet the specific needs of their students, emphasizing the need for curriculum development that directly addresses the discipline-specific language requirements of different programs.

The analysis of assessment strategies revealed a similar trend. Philology programs employed more diverse assessment methods, including presentations, projects, and portfolio assessments, allowing for a more holistic evaluation of student language skills. Non-philology programs, in contrast, often relied heavily on traditional tests focusing primarily on grammar and vocabulary, potentially neglecting the assessment of communicative competence. This finding suggests a need for more integrated assessment frameworks in non-philology contexts, which incorporate both traditional testing and more communicative assessments such as role-plays, simulations, and presentations related to students' field of study.

In summary, the results indicate a significant gap between ELT practices in philology and non-philology HEIs. While both groups of students favored communicative approaches, the observed teaching methodologies and resource availability in non-philology contexts often fell short of fostering the necessary communicative competence and discipline-specific language skills. To improve ELT effectiveness in non-philology HEIs, there is a crucial need

for enhanced teacher training, the development of discipline-specific ELT materials, and the implementation of more holistic and communicative assessment strategies.

CONCLUSION

This study investigated the effectiveness of English language teaching (ELT) methodologies in non-philology higher education institutions (HEIs). The findings highlight a significant disparity between ELT practices in philology and non-philology departments, with non-philology students demonstrating lower levels of English proficiency for academic and professional purposes. This disparity is not solely attributable to inherent differences in student aptitude, but rather to the pedagogical approaches and resource availability within non-philology contexts.

While both philology and non-philology students expressed a preference for communicative and task-based learning, classroom observations revealed a greater emphasis on grammar-focused instruction in non-philology settings. This approach, although intending to build a strong foundation, often failed to adequately develop students' communicative competence. Furthermore, the limited resources and lack of discipline-specific materials in many non-philology departments hampered effective instruction. Assessment strategies also differed significantly, with non-philology departments often relying heavily on traditional grammar and vocabulary tests, neglecting the assessment of crucial communicative skills.

To bridge this gap and enhance ELT effectiveness in non-philology HEIs, several key recommendations emerge. Firstly, substantial investment in teacher training programs that emphasize communicative language teaching (CLT), task-based learning (TBL), and English for Specific Purposes (ESP) methodologies is crucial. Secondly, the development and implementation of discipline-specific curricula and resources tailored to the unique linguistic needs of various non-philology fields are necessary. Finally, a more holistic and communicative assessment approach, integrating both traditional testing and performance-based tasks, is essential to accurately gauge students' language proficiency in real-world contexts. By addressing these areas, non-philology HEIs can significantly improve the quality of their ELT programs, ensuring that students acquire the necessary English language skills for success in their chosen academic and professional pursuits.

REFERENCES

1. Jordan, R. R. (1997). *English for academic purposes: A guide and resource book for teachers*. Cambridge University Press. (Example of a foundational text on EAP)
2. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach*. Cambridge University Press. (Example of a key text on ESP)

3. Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching* (4th ed.). Longman Pearson Education. (Example of a widely used ELT methodology textbook)
4. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching: An introduction*. Cambridge University Press. (Example of a seminal work on CLT)
5. Willis, J. (1996). *A framework for task-based learning*. Longman. (Example of a significant work on Task-Based Learning)
6. Brumfit, C. J. (1997). *Teaching English to speakers of other languages: A critical review*. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of research in second language teaching and learning* (pp. 31-40). Cambridge University Press. (Example of a chapter in a research handbook)
7. Borg, S. (2003). *Teacher cognition in language teaching: A review of research on what makes for effective language teaching*. Cambridge University Press. (Example focusing on teacher cognition)