

PHRASEOLOGY AS A REFLECTION OF THE CULTURAL AND HISTORICAL FEATURES OF A NATION

Bozorova Madina

**Senior Teacher of English at Samarkand state
Architectural and Construction University.**

Email: bozorovamadina478@gmail.com

Abstract:

In the context of globalization and the increasing dominance of English as the lingua franca of science, technology, and international business, the role of English in professional education has become more prominent than ever, including in non-philological fields such as engineering, medicine, law, economics, and computer science. This paper investigates the growing importance of English in the academic and professional training of students in these disciplines, where subject-specific knowledge must often be acquired, communicated, and applied through English. The study focuses on the linguistic needs of non-philological learners who require not only general English proficiency but also mastery of specialized terminology, academic discourse, and workplace communication skills relevant to their future careers.

Through a combination of needs analysis, literature review, and methodical evaluation of current practices, this research identifies key challenges faced by both learners and educators. These include limited exposure to English in practical, subject-related contexts, insufficient alignment between language instruction and professional requirements, and a lack of tailored instructional materials. The paper evaluates various methodological approaches to address these issues, including English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), project-based learning, and task-based instruction. Emphasis is placed on integrating authentic materials, interdisciplinary collaboration, and the use of digital tools to create more engaging and relevant learning experiences.

The findings underscore the necessity of a more targeted and contextualized approach to English language education in non-philological fields. The paper concludes with strategic recommendations for curriculum developers, language instructors, and policymakers to enhance the quality and relevance of English instruction in professional education, ultimately preparing students for success in an increasingly English-mediated global workforce.

Keywords: English for Specific Purposes (ESP), non-philological education, professional communication, language needs analysis, CLIL, task-based learning, curriculum design, interdisciplinary teaching, higher education, academic English

Introduction

In the 21st century, the global dominance of the English language has extended beyond its traditional domains of literature and linguistics into virtually every professional and academic field. As the principal medium of international communication, scientific discourse, digital interaction, and business negotiation, English has become a foundational skill for students across all disciplines, including those outside the realm of philology. The rise of globalization, cross-border education, international collaboration, and the digital economy has reinforced the role of English not merely as a foreign language but as a core component of professional literacy (Crystal, 2003; Graddol, 2006).

Historically, language instruction in higher education has focused on students majoring in language and literature studies, while students in disciplines such as medicine, engineering, economics, and information technology received minimal or generic language training. However, this dichotomy is increasingly unsustainable. Professionals in non-philological fields are now expected to read technical documentation in English, publish research in international journals, participate in conferences, and collaborate with foreign counterparts. Consequently, the need to incorporate English instruction that is tailored to specific disciplinary and career contexts—commonly referred to as English for Specific Purposes (ESP)—has become a pressing pedagogical issue (Dudley-Evans & St John, 1998).

Despite the growing recognition of English as a critical skill in non-philological fields, many institutions of higher education still rely on outdated curricula that do not adequately reflect the linguistic and communicative demands of modern professions. Language courses are often overly theoretical, focused on grammar and general vocabulary, and disconnected from students' academic and career trajectories. As a result, students graduate with insufficient ability to use English effectively in their fields, impeding their access to global knowledge, employment opportunities, and scholarly engagement.

This situation calls for a comprehensive re-evaluation of how English is taught to students in non-linguistic disciplines. Such a reevaluation must begin with a detailed analysis of learners' specific language needs, followed by the development of pedagogical approaches that align with the realities of their academic and professional lives.

Significance of the Study

This study is significant for several reasons. First, it contributes to the growing body of research on ESP and English-medium instruction (EMI), particularly in non-Anglophone contexts. Second, it provides practical insights for language educators, curriculum designers, and policymakers seeking to bridge the gap between language education and the demands of the labor market. Third, by focusing on non-philological students, the study addresses a population that is often overlooked in language education research, despite representing the majority of students in most universities.

Research Aims and Objectives

The primary aim of this paper is to explore the role of English in professional education for students in non-philological fields and to identify effective methods for teaching English in such contexts. Specific objectives include:

- To analyze the language needs of students in various non-philological disciplines.
- To evaluate current practices and challenges in English language teaching (ELT) for non-philological learners.
- To review and compare methodological approaches, including ESP, CLIL, and task-based learning.
- To propose recommendations for designing and implementing more effective, context-sensitive English instruction in professional education.

The Globalization of English in Professional Domains

The expansion of English as a global language has been driven by a number of interrelated factors. These include the dominance of English-speaking countries in global trade, the proliferation of English-language academic publishing, the widespread use of English in information technology, and the rise of international education systems that use English as the primary medium of instruction (Phillipson, 2009; Jenkins, 2015).

In non-philological domains, English functions as a tool for accessing international knowledge, collaborating on cross-border projects, and participating in global markets. For example, engineers must read technical manuals and patent documentation in English, economists rely on international case studies and financial reports, and healthcare professionals access the latest research through English-language journals. Without proficiency in English, students and professionals in these fields face significant barriers to academic and professional advancement (Hyland, 2006).

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and Needs-Based Instruction

The concept of ESP emerged in the 1960s as a response to the growing demand for English instruction tailored to the specific needs of learners in technical and professional fields. Unlike general English, which emphasizes broad communicative competence, ESP focuses on the genres, vocabulary, and discourse practices relevant to specific contexts (Hutchinson & Waters, 1987).

ESP is guided by the principle of “needs analysis,” which involves identifying the linguistic and communicative tasks that learners are likely to encounter in their fields. Based on this analysis, instructors can design courses that provide learners with the tools they need to succeed in academic and workplace environments. Needs analysis also helps determine which language skills—reading, writing, speaking, or listening—should be prioritized in instruction (Basturkmen, 2010).

Research has shown that ESP courses can significantly improve learners’ motivation and language proficiency, particularly when instruction is closely aligned with students’ academic majors or professional goals (Belcher, 2009). However, the successful implementation of ESP requires collaboration between language instructors and subject specialists, as well as institutional support for interdisciplinary curriculum development.

CLIL and EMI in Higher Education

Another approach to integrating English into professional education is through **Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL)** and **English-Medium Instruction (EMI)**. CLIL involves teaching academic subjects through the medium of English, thereby combining language learning with subject knowledge. EMI, which refers more broadly to the use of English to teach content courses in higher education, has gained traction in many countries as universities seek to attract international students and enhance their global rankings (Wilkinson, 2013; Doiz et al., 2013).

Both CLIL and EMI present opportunities and challenges. On the one hand, they offer students increased exposure to academic English and the opportunity to develop bilingual or multilingual competence. On the other hand, they require high levels of linguistic and pedagogical competence from both students and instructors. Research suggests that without adequate language support, EMI and CLIL can disadvantage students, particularly those from non-English-speaking backgrounds (Macaro et al., 2018).

Therefore, successful implementation of CLIL and EMI in non-philological fields must be accompanied by support structures, including language enhancement courses, academic writing workshops, and faculty training programs.

Teaching English to students in non-linguistic disciplines poses a number of challenges, both pedagogical and institutional. These include:

- **Diverse Proficiency Levels:** Students in the same class often have vastly different levels of English proficiency, making it difficult to design instruction that meets everyone's needs.
- **Lack of Motivation:** Some students view English as irrelevant to their field or as an additional burden on top of their core coursework.
- **Limited Resources:** Many institutions lack appropriate teaching materials that reflect the professional and academic realities of non-philological students.
- **Insufficient Teacher Training:** English instructors may lack familiarity with the content of students' disciplines, making it difficult to teach subject-specific language.

Addressing these challenges requires innovative pedagogical strategies, institutional investment, and a commitment to interdisciplinary collaboration.

Methodological Innovations and Best Practices

Recent years have seen the emergence of several promising methodologies for teaching English in professional contexts. These include:

- **Task-Based Language Teaching (TBLT):** In this approach, learners engage in real-world tasks that reflect professional scenarios, such as writing a business email, giving a presentation, or conducting a meeting.
- **Project-Based Learning (PBL):** Students work on long-term projects that integrate language learning with discipline-specific content, such as designing a business plan or conducting a scientific experiment.
- **Use of Authentic Materials:** Incorporating texts, videos, and case studies from students' fields helps create a more engaging and relevant learning environment.
- **Technology-Enhanced Learning:** Digital platforms, online simulations, and language learning apps offer new possibilities for personalized and flexible learning.

These methods have been shown to increase learner engagement and improve outcomes, particularly when combined with a strong needs analysis and ongoing assessment (Ellis, 2003; Long, 2015).

The Role of Interdisciplinary Collaboration

An essential factor in the success of English instruction for non-philological students is collaboration between language instructors and content-area specialists. By working together, these professionals can co-design curricula, co-teach courses, and develop materials that accurately reflect the discourse practices of different fields. Such collaboration also ensures that language instruction is not isolated from students' broader academic experience, but integrated into their overall education (Björkman, 2011).

The implementation of English in professional education varies widely depending on national policies, institutional priorities, and cultural attitudes toward language learning. In some countries, English is promoted as a strategic asset for economic development and internationalization. In others, there is resistance to EMI due to concerns about linguistic imperialism, the marginalization of local languages, or the quality of instruction.

Therefore, any attempt to reform English language education must be sensitive to the local context and involve all stakeholders, including administrators, faculty, students, and policymakers (Kirkpatrick, 2014).

As education systems around the world undergo rapid transformation, several emerging trends are reshaping how English is taught and integrated into non-philological disciplines. One such trend is the **digitization of language learning**, which allows greater access to online courses, discipline-specific modules, and language-learning apps that cater to technical vocabulary and field-related communication. Platforms like Coursera, edX, and FutureLearn offer specialized courses on scientific writing, business communication, and technical English, often co-developed with universities and professional organizations (Godwin-Jones, 2018).

Another significant trend is the **internationalization of university curricula**, where institutions seek to align their academic programs with global standards by increasing the number of courses taught in English. This has led to the expansion of EMI programs, even in countries where English is not an official language. While this trend opens doors for international collaboration and mobility, it also places pressure on students and faculty to develop sufficient proficiency in English, often without adequate institutional support (Galloway & Rose, 2015).

In multilingual and multicultural countries, the role of English becomes even more complex. It often exists alongside a national language (used in domestic administration and everyday life) and local languages (used in communities or ethnic groups). In such contexts, English functions as a **third or additional language**, which can both empower and marginalize

learners depending on their access to quality instruction and resources (Hornberger & Skilton-Sylvester, 2000).

For students in non-philological fields, this multilingual environment may either enhance language acquisition (through exposure to code-switching and multilingual practices) or hinder it (if English is seen as elitist or disconnected from their sociocultural identity). Therefore, any policy or pedagogical model for integrating English into professional education must be sensitive to linguistic diversity, promoting inclusion and equity while also addressing global communicative demands.

Although considerable research has been conducted on English for Specific Purposes and EMI, much of the literature focuses on either philological students or institutional policy perspectives. Less attention has been paid to the **actual classroom experiences, challenges, and needs** of students in non-linguistic disciplines, especially in underrepresented regions or developing educational systems. Furthermore, there is limited comparative research on how different methodological approaches perform in real-world educational contexts, where constraints like class size, teacher training, and curriculum rigidity often limit ideal implementations.

This study aims to fill this gap by providing a multidimensional analysis that considers learner perspectives, institutional limitations, pedagogical models, and socio-cultural contexts. In doing so, it offers not just theoretical insights but **practical recommendations** for stakeholders who shape the future of English language education in professional and interdisciplinary environments.

Conclusion

The introduction of English into professional education for non-philological students is not merely a linguistic undertaking—it is a strategic, economic, cultural, and academic imperative in the 21st-century global context. As English continues to solidify its status as the lingua franca of science, technology, business, and diplomacy, the ability to operate in English has transformed from a supplementary skill into a core competency required for academic and career success across all disciplines.

However, the expansion of English into non-linguistic fields cannot rely on traditional language instruction methods that focus on general vocabulary, grammar drills, or literary analysis. Students in engineering, medicine, law, economics, and other professional domains require targeted, discipline-specific language instruction that prepares them to read technical literature, write academic and professional documents, engage in field-relevant discussions, and

collaborate internationally. The gap between what current English language programs offer and what students actually need highlights a pressing challenge in higher education that demands thoughtful, research-informed intervention.

The emergence of English for Specific Purposes (ESP), Content and Language Integrated Learning (CLIL), and English-Medium Instruction (EMI) demonstrates a growing awareness of this challenge. These approaches represent shifts toward more functional, context-sensitive, and student-centered methodologies. When implemented effectively, they can significantly increase learner motivation, language acquisition, and career readiness. Yet these methods also present challenges—particularly when educators lack training in ESP, when resources are limited, or when institutions impose EMI without adequate language support.

Another key insight is the importance of **needs analysis** in curriculum design. Without a deep understanding of learners' academic and professional language needs, even well-intentioned instructional programs may fail to produce meaningful outcomes. Thus, the integration of English into professional education must begin with comprehensive, discipline-specific research and stakeholder collaboration—including faculty, students, administrators, and language experts.

Furthermore, the expansion of English instruction in non-philological fields must not occur in a vacuum. It must be harmonized with broader educational goals, national language policies, and the cultural and linguistic diversity of learners. English should be positioned not as a threat to local languages and identities but as an additional resource for participating in a globalized knowledge economy. This calls for a **balanced, multilingual approach** that respects linguistic rights while embracing the opportunities afforded by English proficiency.

Ultimately, the role of English in professional education represents a crossroads between local realities and global demands, between traditional pedagogy and innovative methods, and between linguistic competence and professional excellence. By rethinking how we teach English to non-philological students—and by doing so through the lenses of research, collaboration, and contextual relevance—we can better prepare future professionals to navigate complex, multilingual, and international environments.

This research, therefore, seeks not only to analyze the existing challenges but to provide **practical recommendations** that support more effective and inclusive English language education across disciplines. The next chapters will delve deeper into the theoretical underpinnings of ESP and EMI, examine real-world teaching practices, and offer strategies for aligning language instruction with the evolving needs of non-linguistic professionals.

References

1. Basturkmen, H. (2010). *Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Belcher, D. (2009). *English for Specific Purposes in Theory and Practice*. University of Michigan Press.
3. Björkman, B. (2011). *English as a lingua franca in higher education: Implications for EAP*. *Ibérica*, 22, 79-100.
4. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
5. Doiz, A., Lasagabaster, D., & Sierra, J. M. (2013). *English-Medium Instruction at Universities: Global Challenges*. Multilingual Matters.
6. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based Language Learning and Teaching*. Oxford University Press.
8. Graddol, D. (2006). *English Next*. British Council.
9. Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centered Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. Routledge.
11. Jenkins, J. (2015). *Global Englishes: A Resource Book for Students* (3rd ed.). Routledge.
12. Kirkpatrick, A. (2014). *English as a Medium of Instruction in Asian Education*. In N. Murray & A. Scarino (Eds.), *Dynamic Ecologies* (pp. 15-28). Springer.
13. Long, M. H. (2015). *Second Language Acquisition and Task-Based Language Teaching*. Wiley-Blackwell.
14. Macaro, E., Curle, S., Pun, J., An, J., & Dearden, J. (2018). *A systematic review of English medium instruction in higher education*. *Language Teaching*, 51(1), 36–76.
15. Phillipson, R. (2009). *Linguistic Imperialism Continued*. Routledge.

16. Wilkinson, R. (2013). *English-Medium Instruction at a Dutch University: Challenges and Pitfalls*. In A. Doiz et al. (Eds.), *English-Medium Instruction at Universities* (pp. 3–24). Multilingual Matters.
17. Bozorova, M. (2023). Task-based language learning. *Science and Innovation*, 2(B3), 494-496.