

DEVELOPING ENGLISH TEACHING METHODOLOGY FOR ESP STUDENTS BASED ON BLENDED LEARNING TECHNOLOGIES

Giyasova Umida

Associate Professor, PhD, English Language Department, National Pedagogical University named after Nizami

DOI: [https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i04.S.I\(4\).pp449-454](https://doi.org/10.63001/tbs.2026.v21.i04.S.I(4).pp449-454)

KEYWORDS

English for Specific Purposes; blended learning; English teaching methodology; digital learning; professional communication; learner autonomy; assessment

Received: 20/09 /2026

Accepted :07/10/2026

Published: 17/10/2026

Abstract

This article examines a methodology for teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) through blended learning technologies. The purpose is to outline how classroom interaction and online learning can be integrated around students' academic and professional communication needs. The study uses theoretical analysis, comparison of pedagogical approaches, and conceptual modelling. It proposes a framework comprising needs analysis, measurable learning outcomes, authentic professional materials, online preparation, classroom application, digital consolidation, and reflective assessment. The framework emphasizes learner autonomy, teacher facilitation, accessibility, and alignment between tasks and outcomes. It also proposes indicators for evaluating implementation, including task completion, language performance, participation, and learner feedback. As the article is conceptual, its model requires piloting and empirical evaluation in different ESP disciplines before claims about effectiveness can be made.

1. Introduction

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) aims to prepare learners to use English in academic, occupational, and professional situations connected with their future careers. Unlike general English instruction, ESP requires teachers to consider learners' target situations, disciplinary vocabulary, professional genres, and communicative tasks. Depending on their field, students may need to interpret technical texts, write reports, deliver presentations, participate in meetings, explain procedures, or communicate with international colleagues. Effective methodology therefore connects

language development with realistic professional purposes.

Blended learning combines face-to-face instruction with planned online learning. It can provide flexible access to materials, allow students to prepare before lessons, support additional practice, and make feedback more continuous. Nevertheless, the use of a learning platform alone does not guarantee educational improvement. Digital activities must complement classroom work and contribute to explicit learning outcomes. If online tasks simply duplicate worksheets,

they may increase workload without improving learning.

In Uzbekistan, scholars such as N. Azizxo'jayeva, R. Ishmuhamedov, A. Abduquodirov, N. Muslimov, and B. Xodjayev have contributed to discussions of pedagogical technologies, professional competence, and educational improvement. Their work offers a local pedagogical foundation for designing purposeful learning environments. In ESP courses, these principles can be applied by aligning digital activities with students' future professional communication needs.

The purpose of this article is to propose a conceptual methodology for teaching English to ESP students through blended learning technologies. It addresses three questions: which principles should guide the integration of classroom and online learning; how can professional language tasks be organized across both environments; and what indicators can be used to evaluate the proposed methodology?

2. Methods

This article employs a theoretical and analytical research design. It does not report an experiment, questionnaire, or original statistical dataset. The methodology was developed through literature analysis, comparative analysis, needs-oriented

conceptual analysis, and instructional design modelling.

First, pedagogical literature was reviewed to identify principles associated with educational technology, competence development, learner-centred instruction, and foreign-language teaching. Second, classroom-centred and blended approaches were compared to distinguish purposeful integration from the simple transfer of materials to a digital platform. Third, common ESP requirements were considered, including professional vocabulary, reading for information, genre awareness, oral interaction, and workplace writing. Fourth, an instructional model was constructed to connect outcomes, classroom tasks, online activities, feedback, and assessment.

The model was considered against five criteria: relevance to professional language needs; coherence between online and face-to-face tasks; accessibility and usability; opportunities for interaction and feedback; and alignment of assessment with learning outcomes. It is designed to be adapted to business, engineering, information technology, tourism, education, and other professional fields. Specific content should be selected after investigating learners' proficiency, target situations, and digital access. Because no empirical data were

collected, the results are conceptual and should be validated in practice.

3. Results

The analysis produced a six-component methodology for blended ESP instruction.

****3.1. Needs analysis and outcomes.****

Course design should begin with an examination of learners' language levels, professional goals, and typical communication situations. Teachers may use diagnostic tasks, interviews, questionnaires, and samples of professional texts. Outcomes should be observable and practical. For example, students may be expected to summarize a technical text, explain a process, write a professional email, or deliver a short presentation to a defined audience.

****3.2. Authentic professional materials.****

Materials should reflect the language and genres learners may encounter in their field. Examples include reports, manuals, professional emails, case studies, presentations, diagrams, and recorded workplace conversations. Materials can be adapted or scaffolded where necessary. Vocabulary should be taught in context and connected to communicative functions rather than memorized as isolated lists. Teachers should explain how register, tone,

organization, and terminology vary across professional situations.

****3.3. Online preparation before class.****

Students can review short videos, vocabulary sets, readings, listening clips, or brief comprehension checks before a lesson. Preparation tasks should be manageable and directly connected to classroom activities. Online responses help teachers identify misconceptions and decide which topics require additional explanation. Clear instructions, estimated completion time, and accessible file formats make preparation more equitable.

****3.4. Face-to-face application.****

Classroom time should prioritize interaction and tasks that benefit from immediate guidance. These may include role-plays, simulations, case discussions, collaborative problem-solving, peer review, and presentations. Students apply language encountered online to professional situations requiring clarification, negotiation, and teamwork. The teacher facilitates interaction, monitors language use, and gives focused feedback.

****3.5. Online consolidation and feedback.****

After class, learners may revise a report, record a short presentation, participate in a discussion forum, or complete a professional writing task. Digital tools can support

repeated practice and make progress visible. Feedback should focus on a manageable set of criteria: task achievement, clarity, organization, vocabulary, grammatical control, and appropriateness for the intended audience. Students should have an opportunity to revise work after receiving feedback.

****3.6. Assessment and reflection.****

Assessment should combine diagnostic, formative, and summative procedures. A learning portfolio can include drafts, vocabulary records, recorded speaking tasks, revised writing, and self-reflection. Students can compare early and later work, identify useful learning strategies, and set goals for improvement. Criteria should be shared in advance and correspond directly to the course outcomes.

The proposed cycle is: diagnose needs; define outcomes; prepare online; apply in class; consolidate online; assess and reflect. It is iterative rather than strictly linear. Assessment results may require teachers to adjust content, pacing, groupings, or the amount of online support. The framework also requires contingency planning for students who have limited internet access or unsuitable devices. Downloadable materials, low-bandwidth resources, and equivalent offline tasks can reduce barriers to participation.

4. Discussion

The framework treats blended learning as a pedagogical design rather than a technological add-on. Its central principle is alignment: online preparation, classroom interaction, follow-up practice, and assessment should reinforce the same professional communication outcomes. When online tasks duplicate classroom worksheets, students may experience extra work without clear benefit. Purposeful preparation, by contrast, can free classroom time for complex interaction and guided practice.

The teacher's role remains central. Digital resources can expand access and support independent practice, but they cannot automatically identify students' needs or guarantee meaningful feedback. Teachers must select relevant resources, monitor participation, respond to learning difficulties, and make sure that tasks are accessible. Professional development may be needed to help teachers design digital tasks, evaluate online work, and balance technology with direct interaction.

Blended learning can support learner autonomy by giving students some control over the pace and timing of study. However, autonomy should be developed progressively. Clear instructions, realistic

deadlines, checklists, model answers, and regular feedback can help students plan their work. Without guidance, some learners may postpone online tasks or become uncertain about expectations. A balanced design combines independent work with structured support.

ESP instruction must preserve professional authenticity. Language accuracy is important, but students also need to accomplish professional purposes. Assessment should therefore consider whether a message achieves its purpose, whether information is organized clearly, and whether language is appropriate for the audience. Grammar and vocabulary should be evaluated in relation to communication rather than in isolation. Authentic tasks also help students understand why a particular language form or genre matters in their future work.

Implementation should be evaluated using both quantitative and qualitative indicators. Quantitative evidence may include task completion, participation, submission rates, and performance on comparable assessments. Qualitative evidence may include student reflections, teacher observations, and feedback on the relevance of materials. Neither type is sufficient alone: high platform activity does not necessarily demonstrate learning, while a test score may

not reveal barriers to access or learner experience.

The article has limitations. It proposes a conceptual model and does not provide experimental evidence that the sequence improves achievement. The model should be piloted in actual ESP courses and adapted to discipline, proficiency level, class size, available technology, and teacher workload. Future research could compare learner performance before and after implementation, examine participation patterns, and gather student and teacher feedback. Such studies could identify which combinations of online and classroom activities are most effective for particular professional contexts.

5. Conclusion

This article has proposed a methodology for teaching English to ESP students through blended learning technologies. The framework connects needs analysis, professional materials, online preparation, face-to-face application, digital consolidation, and assessment. Its value depends not on the number of technologies used but on the coherence of learning activities and their relevance to professional communication.

For implementation, teachers should begin with a needs analysis, define measurable

outcomes, select accessible digital tools, and ensure that classroom tasks build on online preparation. Assessment should combine language performance with task achievement, feedback, and reflection. Universities and schools should also consider students' access to devices and connectivity when designing online requirements.

The framework offers a basis for course planning and further research. Its practical value should be established through piloting, systematic observation, and evaluation of learner outcomes across different ESP disciplines.

References

- [1] Azizxo'jayeva, N. N. (2003). *Pedagogik texnologiya va pedagogik mahorat*. Toshkent: Fan.
- [2] Ishmuhamedov, R. J., Abduqodirov, A., & Pardaev, A. (2008). *Ta'limda innovatsion texnologiyalar*. Toshkent: Iste'dod.
- [3] Muslimov, N. A., va boshq. (2015). *Kasb ta'limi o'qituvchilarining kasbiy kompetentligini shakllantirish texnologiyasi*. Toshkent.
- [4] Xodjayev, B. X. (2017). *Umumiy pedagogika nazariyasi va amaliyoti*. Toshkent: Sano-standart.
- [5] Turg'unov, S. T., va boshq. (2008). *Umumiy o'rta ta'lim muassasalarini boshqarishda menejmentning asosiy tushunchalari*. Toshkent.
- [6] Quronov, M. (2008). *Milliy tarbiya*. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat.
- [7] Garrison, D. R., & Kanuka, H. (2004). *Blended learning: Uncovering its transformative potential in higher education*. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 7(2), 95–105.
- [8] Graham, C. R. (2006). *Blended learning systems: Definition, current trends, and future directions*. In C. J. Bonk & C. R. Graham (Eds.), *The Handbook of Blended Learning: Global Perspectives, Local Designs* (pp. 3–21). Pfeiffer.
- [9] Hutchinson, T., & Waters, A. (1987). *English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- [10] Nation, I. S. P., & Macalister, J. (2010). *Language Curriculum Design*. Routledge.