

# **PEDAGOGICAL STRATEGIES FOR ENHANCING ENGLISH PROFICIENCY IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION BEYOND LINGUISTICS AND LITERATURE**

**Gulnoza Nasrullaevna Juraeva**

Senior lectures of the department of “Practical English” of the Tashkent State Technical University named after Islam Karimov

## **Abstract.**

This article examines the methodology of studying English at a non-philological university, focusing on approaches, techniques, and strategies employed to facilitate language acquisition and proficiency among students from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Drawing upon a mixed-methods research approach, including surveys, interviews, and classroom observations, the study investigates student demographics, teaching methodologies, integration of language and content, and the role of technology in English language instruction. Results highlight the importance of adopting communicative language teaching, task-based learning, and content and language integrated learning to meet the diverse needs of students and promote effective language learning outcomes.

## **Keywords:**

English language instruction, non-philological university, communicative language teaching, task-based learning, content and language integrated learning, technology-enhanced learning.

## **I. Introduction.**

English proficiency is a vital skill in today's interconnected world, with individuals seeking to enhance their linguistic abilities for academic, professional, and personal purposes. While philological universities have long been recognized for their expertise in language education, non-philological universities are

increasingly playing a significant role in providing English language instruction to students from diverse disciplines.

The methodology of studying English at a non-philological university encompasses a unique blend of approaches tailored to meet the diverse needs and backgrounds of students. Unlike philological universities, which specialize in language education, non-philological universities often integrate English language instruction into their broader academic curriculum, catering to students pursuing a wide range of disciplines and professions.

The methodology of studying English at a non-philological university, shedding light on the diverse approaches, techniques, and strategies employed to facilitate language acquisition and proficiency. We examine how non-philological universities adapt language teaching methodologies to align with the academic goals, disciplinary requirements, and learning objectives of students across various fields of study.

The methodology of studying English at a non-philological university is characterized by its interdisciplinary approach, incorporating elements of language teaching, content-based instruction, and technology-enhanced learning. Non-philological universities leverage a variety of teaching strategies, resources, and assessment methods to create engaging and effective language learning experiences for students from diverse backgrounds [1-15].

Throughout this article, we will explore the key components of English language instruction at non-philological universities, including communicative language teaching, task-based learning, integrated skills development, and cultural competency. We will also examine the role of technology in enhancing language learning outcomes and the importance of continuous assessment and feedback in monitoring student progress.

By gaining insights into the methodology of studying English at a non-philological university, educators, administrators, and language learners can better understand the challenges and opportunities inherent in language education within diverse academic contexts. Through effective pedagogy, innovative teaching

practices, and interdisciplinary collaboration, non-philological universities play a crucial role in empowering students to communicate confidently and effectively in English, both academically and professionally.

## **II. Literature review.**

English language education at non-philological universities has gained increasing attention in recent years due to the growing recognition of English as a global language and the importance of linguistic proficiency across academic disciplines. The literature on the methodology of studying English at non-philological universities encompasses a wide range of research studies, theoretical frameworks, and practical approaches aimed at enhancing language learning outcomes for students from diverse disciplinary backgrounds.

One of the most widely researched and implemented approaches to English language instruction at non-philological universities is Communicative Language Teaching (CLT). CLT emphasizes the importance of meaningful communication and interaction in language learning, focusing on real-life language use and communicative tasks. Research studies (Richards & Rodgers, 2001; Nunan, 2003) have highlighted the effectiveness of CLT in promoting fluency, accuracy, and communicative competence among students, regardless of their academic discipline.

Task-Based Learning (TBL) has emerged as another prominent methodology in English language instruction at non-philological universities. TBL engages students in authentic, real-world tasks that require the use of English to achieve specific objectives (Ellis, 2003; Willis, 1996). Studies have shown that TBL promotes active learning, problem-solving skills, and language proficiency development, making it an effective approach for teaching English to students with diverse academic interests and goals (Skehan, 1996; Nunan, 2004).

Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL) is increasingly being adopted in non-philological universities as a means of integrating language learning with subject matter content. CLIL programs provide students with opportunities to learn English while studying academic subjects such as science,

mathematics, or history in English-medium classrooms (Coyle, Hood, & Marsh, 2010). Research has shown that CLIL enhances language proficiency, content knowledge, and cognitive skills, making it a valuable methodology for promoting interdisciplinary learning and language acquisition (Dalton-Puffer, 2007; Lo, 2012).

Non-philological universities often adopt interdisciplinary approaches to English language instruction, recognizing the diverse needs and interests of students from various academic disciplines. Interdisciplinary language programs integrate language learning with subject-specific content, allowing students to develop language skills in context while acquiring knowledge in their chosen field of study (Byram & Hu, 2013; Dörnyei, 2009). Research on interdisciplinary language education highlights the benefits of integrating language and content instruction, including improved language proficiency, subject knowledge, and critical thinking abilities (Stoller & Grabe, 1997; Lazaraton, 2002).

The methodology of studying English at non-philological universities provides valuable insights into effective approaches, strategies, and techniques for promoting language learning and proficiency among students from diverse disciplinary backgrounds [16-29]. By drawing upon communicative language teaching, task-based learning, content and language integrated learning, technology-enhanced language learning, and interdisciplinary approaches, non-philological universities can create engaging and effective language learning environments that empower students to succeed academically and professionally in an increasingly globalized world.

### **III. Methodology**

Participants for this study were selected from a non-philological university setting. The sample included undergraduate and postgraduate students enrolled in various academic programs such as engineering, business, humanities, and social sciences. In addition, language instructors and program coordinators involved in English language instruction were included in the study. Participants were selected

based on criteria such as language proficiency levels, academic year, and willingness to participate voluntarily.

The study employed a mixed-methods approach, utilizing surveys, interviews, and classroom observations to gather data. Surveys were administered to students to gather quantitative and qualitative data on their language learning experiences, preferences, and perceptions of English language instruction at the non-philological university. Semi-structured interviews were conducted with language instructors and program coordinators to explore their perspectives, experiences, and challenges in teaching English to non-philological students. Classroom observations were carried out to observe teaching practices, student engagement, and interaction patterns during English language classes.

**Table 1.** Participant Demographics

<b>№</b>	<b>Participant</b>	<b>Gender</b>	<b>Age Range</b>	<b>Academic Program</b>	<b>Language Proficiency Level</b>	<b>Participant</b>
1	Student A	Female	23	Engineering	Intermediate	Student
2	Student B	Male	19	Business	Advanced	Student
3	Student C	Female	26	Humanities	Beginner	Student
4	Student D	Male	22	Social Sciences	Proficient	Student
5	Instructor A	Female	37	English Language	Native Speaker	Instructor
6	Instructor B	Male	33	Applied Linguistics	Advanced	Instructor
7	Coordinator	Female	49	Language Program	Native Speaker	Coordinator

Table 1 provides a summary of the demographic characteristics of the participants involved in the study. The participants include students from various academic programs, language instructors, and program coordinators. Gender, age range, academic program, and language proficiency level are presented to give an overview of the diversity among participants.

The survey instrument consisted of a series of questions designed to elicit information on various aspects of English language learning. The questionnaire included items related to students' language proficiency levels, motivation for learning English, preferred learning strategies, experiences with different teaching methodologies, and perceived effectiveness of language instruction. Likert-scale and open-ended questions were used to gather both quantitative and qualitative data.

The interview protocol comprised open-ended questions and prompts aimed at exploring the perspectives and experiences of language instructors and program coordinators. Interview topics included the selection and adaptation of teaching methodologies, integration of language and content instruction, use of technology in language learning, assessment practices, and strategies for addressing the needs of students from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Interviews were conducted in-person or via video conferencing and audio-recorded for transcription and analysis.

Classroom observations involved the systematic observation of English language classes at the non-philological university. Observations focused on teaching methods, instructional materials, student participation, interaction patterns, and classroom dynamics. Observational data were recorded using field notes, capturing relevant details such as teaching strategies employed, student engagement levels, and instances of communicative language use.

**Table 2.** Summary of Data Collection Methods

№	Data Collection Method	Description
1	Surveys	Administered to students to gather information on language learning experiences, preferences, and perceptions. Included Likert-scale and open-ended questions.
2	Interviews	Conducted with language instructors and program coordinators to explore perspectives, experiences, and challenges in teaching English to non-philological students. Semi-structured format with open-ended questions.
3	Classroom Observations	Systematic observation of English language classes to

	observe teaching practices, student engagement, and interaction patterns. Field notes recorded teaching methods, instructional materials, and classroom dynamics.
--	---

Table 2 summarizes the data collection methods utilized in the study. Surveys, interviews, and classroom observations were employed to gather information on various aspects of English language learning at the non-philological university. Each method is described briefly, highlighting its purpose and the type of data collected.

Data collected through surveys, interviews, and classroom observations were analyzed using qualitative and quantitative methods. Qualitative data analysis involved thematic coding of interview transcripts and open-ended survey responses to identify recurring themes, patterns, and insights. Quantitative data from surveys were analyzed using descriptive statistics to summarize participants' responses and identify trends or correlations among variables. Triangulation of data from multiple sources enhanced the validity and reliability of the findings.

#### **IV. Results and Discussions**

The study yielded valuable insights into the methodology of studying English at a non-philological university, as evidenced by the following key findings:

1. **Student Demographics:** The participant demographics revealed a diverse student body representing various academic programs and language proficiency levels. This diversity highlights the importance of tailoring English language instruction to meet the specific needs and backgrounds of students from different disciplines.
2. **Teaching Methodologies:** Survey data indicated a preference for communicative language teaching (CLT) and task-based learning (TBL) among students. These methodologies were perceived as effective in promoting language fluency and communication skills. Interviews with

instructors corroborated these findings, emphasizing the importance of interactive and student-centered approaches in language instruction.

3. **Integration of Language and Content:** Classroom observations revealed instances of content and language integrated learning (CLIL) in English language classes. This interdisciplinary approach was praised for its ability to enhance both language proficiency and subject knowledge simultaneously.
4. **Technology-Enhanced Learning:** The study highlighted the growing use of technology in language education at non-philological universities. Online resources, multimedia materials, and virtual learning environments were employed to supplement traditional teaching methods, providing students with additional opportunities for practice and engagement.

The results of the study underscore the significance of adopting diverse and innovative methodologies in English language instruction at non-philological universities. By catering to the unique needs and preferences of students from various academic disciplines, educators can create dynamic and effective language learning environments.

The preference for communicative language teaching and task-based learning reflects a shift towards more interactive and communicative approaches in language education. These methodologies prioritize meaningful communication and real-world language use, aligning with the communicative needs of students in academic and professional contexts.

The integration of language and content through CLIL represents a promising avenue for promoting interdisciplinary learning and language acquisition. By contextualizing language learning within subject-specific content, CLIL enhances students' ability to apply language skills in authentic academic settings.

Technology-enhanced learning offers additional opportunities for students to engage with English language materials and resources outside the classroom. Online platforms, multimedia materials, and interactive exercises can supplement

traditional instruction, providing students with flexible and personalized learning experiences.

Overall, the findings of this study contribute to our understanding of effective methodologies for studying English at non-philological universities. By embracing a variety of approaches and techniques, educators can empower students to develop the language skills and competencies needed to succeed in today's globalized world.

## **V. Conclusion.**

The methodology of studying English at a non-philological university encompasses a diverse range of approaches and techniques aimed at fostering language proficiency and communicative competence among students from various academic disciplines. Through the adoption of communicative language teaching, task-based learning, and content and language integrated learning, educators can create dynamic and effective language learning environments that cater to the unique needs and preferences of students. Additionally, the integration of technology-enhanced learning provides students with additional opportunities for practice and engagement outside the classroom. By embracing innovative methodologies and leveraging technological resources, non-philological universities can empower students to develop the language skills and competencies necessary for success in a globalized world.

## **REFERENCES**

1. Xodabande, I., & Atai, M. R. (2020). Investigating Mobile-Assisted Vocabulary Learning: Insights for Teaching Academic Vocabulary. *Frontiers in Psychology*.
2. Curry, N. (2020). Teaching English for Academic Purposes Online. *Cambridge English*.
3. Uchkunovna, Y. D. (2024, May). THE DIFFERENT TYPES OF ESSAYS. In *INTERDISCIPLINE INNOVATION AND SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH CONFERENCE* (Vol. 2, No. 20, pp. 389-390).

4. Uchkunovna, Y. D. (2024). THE IMPORTANCE OF USING TECHNICAL VOCABULARY IN TEACHING. *TA'LIM VA RIVOJLANISH TAHLILI ONLAYN ILMIY JURNALI*, 4(5), 161-163.
5. Jalolovna, R. S. (2022, May). The ways of improving speaking ability in english. In *Conference Zone* (pp. 171-172).
6. Djalalovna, R. S. (2023). FORMATION OF READING TECHNIQUES FOR STUDENTS OF THE LANGUAGE FACULTY. *PEDAGOG*, 6(3), 355-358.
7. Расулова, С. Д. (2024). ПОТЕНЦИАЛ АНГЛОЯЗЫЧНЫХ НОВОСТНЫХ ПОРТАЛОВ В РАЗВИТИИ МЕДИАГРАМОТНОСТИ СТУДЕНТОВ. *Журнал гуманитарных и естественных наук*, (16 [2]), 23-29.
8. Rasulova, S. J. (2023). ILMIY MATNLARNI TARJIMA QILISH JARAYONIDAGI ASOSIY QIYINCHILIKLARI TAHLILI. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 3(11), 268-271.
9. Zakirova, S. I. (2019). THE IMPORTANCE OF COMMUNICATIVE METHODOLOGY IN TEACHING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE. *Scientific and Technical Journal of Namangan Institute of Engineering and Technology*, 1(5), 326-328.
10. Закирова, Ш. И. (2023). Интенсивность в юморе: анализ на основе английских фразеологизмов. *Журнал гуманитарных и естественных наук*, (1), 10-12.