



Linguodidactic Criteria For Selecting A Minimum Of English Terminology For Students Of Non-Philological Educational Programmes

**Zarifa Khudoyorovna
Shamirzayeva**

Researcher, Chirchik State Pedagogical University,
Uzbekistan

E-mail: zarifashamirzayeva@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In this article, the linguodidactic criteria that should be used to select an English terminological minimum for students who are enrolled in educational programs that are not related to philology are discussed. In this study, theoretical approaches to terminology selection in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) are analysed, and the viewpoints of prominent academics are summarised. Following the completion of the analysis, a set of criteria that includes linguistic, didactic, and methodological aspects is proposed. The linguistic requirements include things like systematicity, authenticity, and the frequency of usage; the didactic criteria include things like communicative value, compliance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), and professional relevance; and the methodological criteria center on progression, integration, practical orientation, and replication. By providing a scientific basis for selecting terminology that contributes to the development of students' professional communicative ability and improves the efficacy of ESP education, the criteria that have been given offer a scientific basis for its selection.

Keywords:

terminological minimum, English for Specific Purposes (ESP), linguodidactic criteria, terminology, lexical minimum, professional communication, non-philological education, sports terminology, communicative competence, CEFR, vocabulary selection, foreign language teaching

The demand for English language instruction that is professionally orientated in educational programs that are not related to philology has significantly increased as a result of globalisation processes, the expansion of international academic cooperation, and the growing need to ensure the competitiveness of specialists in the global labour market. Within the context of the modern higher education system, the English language is recognised not only as a medium of communication in general, but also as an instrument that is necessary for efficient professional practice, access to scientific information, and participation in worldwide professional communication. As a consequence of this, the instruction of

terminology that is specialised to a certain field has emerged as one of the most important aspects of teaching foreign languages.

The success of acquiring terminological vocabulary in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) is largely dependent on the selection of the terminological minimum that is included into the educational process. This decision should be based on scientific evidence. The terms that are considered to be the most necessary, high-frequency, and communicatively significant within a specific field of specialisation are included in the terminological minimal vocabulary. For the purpose of determining its content, it is necessary to take into account the linguistic

qualities of terms, as well as their potential for didactic implementation, their professional relevance, and the communicative requirements of the learners. However, linguodidactic criteria for constructing a terminological minimum for students of non-philological educational programs have not yet been effectively systematised. This is despite the fact that the topic of selecting terminological vocabulary has received a substantial amount of attention in research that have been dedicated to ESP technique. The absence of a unified scientific approach to the selection of instructional materials frequently leads in the arbitrary inclusion of terminology, an increase in cognitive load, and an insufficient development of learners' professional communicative skill. This is a consequence of the absence of such an approach.

A linguodidactic approach to the selection of the terminological minimum requires the integrated examination of pedagogical and linguistic aspects. This is a prerequisite for the method. An approach like this makes it feasible to construct a terminological minimum by taking into consideration the semantic accuracy of terms, the frequency with which they are used, the professional significance of the terms, the communicative value of the terms, the correspondence to the instructional objectives, and the levels of language ability experienced by the learners. By doing so, this, in turn, helps to the enhancement of the methodological efficiency of building professional communicative competence in English.

The objective of this article is to provide a theoretical basis for the linguodidactic criteria that were used in selecting the English terminological minimum for students of educational programs that are not related to philology, as well as to describe the essential principles that govern the actual application of these criteria. Linguodidactic criteria are understood to be a set of scientific and pedagogical principles that serve as the foundation for selecting, organising, and teaching language units. These language units include lexical items, terminology, grammatical structures, and other linguistic elements that

are utilised in the process of teaching a foreign language.

In their study, Harold E. Palmer and Michael West emphasised that the frequency of word occurrence is the major criterion that should be considered when determining a lexical minimum. According to their point of view, the lexical items that are used the most frequently should be taught first since they have the most communicative value when it comes to authentic language use [1].

Charles Kay Ogden, the person who came up with the idea of Basic English, established that it is possible to select a limited core vocabulary that is sufficient for communication in both ordinary and professional settings. The development of lexical minimum theory was subsequently significantly impacted by this technique, which was thereafter referred to as [2].

There are a number of factors that should be considered when selecting lexical items, according to Paul Nation's argument. These factors include frequency, usefulness, coverage, the needs of learners, and instructional goals. Furthermore, he emphasises that the selection of vocabulary in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) classes ought to be precisely matched with the professional needs of the students [3]. It is the contention of Tom Hutchinson and Alan Waters that the selection of terminological units in English for Speakers of Other Languages (ESP) ought to be founded on the outcomes of Needs Analysis. They believe that the language that is chosen should make it possible for students to carry out the communicative tasks that will be necessary for them to complete in their future professional activities [4].

Tony Dudley-Evans and Maggie Jo St John suggest that the selection of lexical material for English for Specific Purposes (ESP) courses ought to primarily be focused on the content of the professional area, authentic texts, and occupational communication circumstances [5]. They maintain that this is the most effective way to select lexical material.

Olha Yaroshenko developed an algorithm for selecting a lexical minimum for engineering students and proposed the following criteria: alignment with the curriculum, compliance with

the CEFR proficiency levels, professional orientation, communicative value, frequency of occurrence, and an appropriate balance between active and passive vocabulary [6].

The necessity of including statistical, linguistic, and methodological criteria into the process of selecting a terminological minimum is demonstrated by Sh. Urunova. It is the author's opinion that the terminological minimum should give students with a sufficient supply of professional vocabulary to enable them to grasp scientific articles that pertain to their area of expertise and to effectively participate in professional communication [7].

S. V. Grinev divides the needs for terms into three distinct categories, based on the findings of an investigation of terminological studies. Formal (syntactic) requirements are included in the first group. These requirements include conformity to language standards, conciseness, the possibility for word development, and terminological stability. The second group consists of semantic requirements, which include things like the lack of synonymy, fullness of meaning, semantic consistency, and the absence of ambiguity. The third group of needs is comprised of pragmatic requirements, which include universal acceptability and use, internationalisation, and conformance with the requirements of modern scientific and technical development [8].

G. M. Khodjimatova lists the following characteristics as crucial for selecting a terminological minimum: relevance to the field of specialisation, frequency of use, thematic significance, communicative necessity, systematicity, educational and methodological appropriateness, and practical value. These criteria are listed in the order of importance.[9] These criteria ensure that the phrases chosen are closely related to professional activities, that they are widely used in scientific and educational sources, that they are needed for professional communication, and that they match to the level of academic and professional preparation that students have.

In the current study, the criteria for selecting a terminological minimum are organised into linguistic, didactic, and methodological categories. This is accomplished by drawing

upon the theoretical underpinnings that were described before.

The linguistic criteria that are considered include systematicity, the affiliation of terms with a particular terminological system, the semantic and paradigmatic relationships between the terms, the professional relevance of the terms as reflected in the representation of key concepts of the sports discipline, the frequency of occurrence in sports textbooks, scientific literature, and authentic sources, and authenticity, which refers to the use of terms in actual professional and international sports communication.

Didactic criteria include communicative relevance, which ensures that the selected terms meet the professional communication needs of students; compliance with the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), which ensures that terminology is selected according to learners' language proficiency levels (A1–B2); learnability, which takes into account students' age and language proficiency; and professional significance, which determines whether or not the selected terms are necessary for future occupational activities.

Methodological criteria include progression, in which terminology is chosen in accordance with the principle of moving from simple to complex and from general to specialised concepts; integration, in which terminology is taught through the four language skills (reading, writing, listening, and speaking); practical orientation, which ensures that terms can be applied in authentic professional situations; and repetition, which facilitates vocabulary retention through systematic use in a variety of exercises and communicative tasks for the purpose of enhancing vocabulary retention.

It has been demonstrated through the examination of theoretical and methodological literature that the selection of an English terminological minimum need to be founded on linguodidactic principles that are supported by scientific evidence, rather than on the arbitrary inclusion of professional vocabulary. According to the findings, in order to be considered a successful terminological minimum, it is necessary to concurrently satisfy linguistic,

didactic, and methodological requirements. Methodological criteria facilitate gradual acquisition, integration with language skills, and practical application in authentic communicative contexts. Linguistic criteria ensure the systematic organization, semantic precision, authenticity, and frequency of terminology. Pedagogical criteria guarantee correspondence to learners' language proficiency, communicative needs, and professional relevance. Additionally, linguistic criteria ensure that terminology is used in a coherent manner. A thorough framework for selecting terminology that supports the development of students' professional communicative ability in English is provided by the system of criteria that has been developed. Furthermore, these criteria have the potential to serve as a methodological foundation for the development of ESP curricula, the creation of instructional materials, the compilation of terminological glossaries, and the development of exercise systems for students who are enrolled in non-philological educational programs, particularly those who specialise in sports. The empirical validation of the proposed criteria through experimental teaching and the formulation of discipline-specific terminological minimums for diverse sectors of higher education may be the topic of research that will be conducted in the future.

References

1. West M. A General Service List of English Words. – London: Longman, 1953. – 584 p.
2. Ogden C. K. Basic English: A General Introduction with Rules and Grammar. – London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1930. – 224 p.
3. Nation I. S. P. Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 477 p.
4. Hutchinson T., Waters A. English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 183 p.
5. Dudley-Evans T., St John M. J. Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. – 301 p.
6. Yaroshenko O. V. Principles of Lexical Minimum Selection for Teaching General Technical English to Engineering Students // Advanced Education. – 2018. – No. 10. – P. 72–79.
7. Urunova Sh. Selection of Terminological Minimum in Teaching English for Specific Purposes // Proceedings of the International Scientific and Practical Conference. – 2025. – P. 215–220.
8. Гринев-Гриневиц С.В. Введение в терминоведение. – М.: Московский лицей, 1993. – 309 с.
9. Ходжиматова Г.М. Научные основы обучения терминологической лексике русского языка в неязыковом вузе: автореф. дис. ... д-ра пед. наук. – Душанбе, 2011. – 42 с.