



Advantages and Challenges of Using Interactive Methods in Teaching Speaking to Non-Philological Students

Risqimova Gulnoza Ibrohim qizi- University of Exact and Social Sciences
Scientific advisor: Akbarova Shaxnoza Xikmatullayevna

Abstract: Interactive methods play a crucial role in developing speaking skills among non-philological (non-language major) students, who often face limited exposure to English and traditional grammar-focused instruction. These methods—such as role-plays, group discussions, debates, pair work, information-gap activities, simulations, and technology-enhanced tasks—shift the focus from teacher-centered lectures to student-centered communication, fostering fluency, confidence, motivation, and real-life language application. Advantages include increased student engagement, improved communicative competence, development of critical thinking and teamwork skills, and better retention through active participation. However, challenges encompass uneven student participation, large class sizes, varying proficiency levels, teacher training needs, time constraints, and resource limitations. This study examines these aspects through literature review, pedagogical analysis, and practical examples, particularly in the Uzbek higher education context. Findings suggest that while interactive approaches significantly enhance speaking outcomes for ESP (English for Specific Purposes) learners in fields like engineering, economics, and medicine, their successful implementation requires careful planning, teacher professional development, and adaptation to local conditions.

Keywords: interactive methods, speaking skills, non-philological students, communicative competence, ESP, student-centered learning, challenges in language teaching, Uzbekistan higher education.

Introduction: In the era of globalization, English proficiency, especially speaking skills, is essential for professionals across all disciplines. Non-philological students, who study in technical, economic, medical, or other non-language faculties, typically have limited class hours for English and prioritize content knowledge over language



practice. Traditional methods often emphasize grammar and reading, leaving speaking underdeveloped and resulting in communication apprehension.

Interactive methods address this gap by promoting active involvement, negotiation of meaning, and authentic language use. They align with Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) principles and task-based approaches, making learning more engaging and effective.

Relevance of Work: This topic is highly relevant in Uzbekistan and similar contexts where higher education reforms emphasize practical language skills for international collaboration. Non-philological students need English for professional communication, yet face barriers like large classes and traditional teaching habits. Exploring interactive methods helps bridge theory and practice, supporting national goals for quality education and global integration.

Purpose: The purpose of this work is to analyze the advantages and challenges of interactive methods in teaching speaking to non-philological students, provide practical recommendations, and highlight effective techniques adaptable to ESP contexts.

Materials and Methods of Research: The study draws on theoretical analysis of scientific literature (international and Uzbek sources), pedagogical observation, and synthesis of empirical findings from classroom practices. Key methods include comparative analysis, descriptive techniques, and reference to established frameworks like CEFR. Sources encompass books on language teaching methodology and recent articles on interactive approaches.

Results and Discussion:

Advantages of Interactive Methods:

1. **Enhanced Motivation and Engagement:** Interactive activities turn passive learners into active participants. Techniques like role-plays, debates, and group discussions simulate real-life scenarios, increasing interest and reducing anxiety. Students in non-philological groups report higher motivation when tasks relate to their specialty (e.g., medical simulations or business negotiations).

2. **Development of Communicative Competence:** These methods improve fluency, pronunciation, vocabulary in context, and strategic competence. Pair and group work encourage negotiation of meaning, leading to better listening and speaking integration.



3. **Critical Thinking and Soft Skills:** Activities such as debates, problem-solving tasks, and information-gap exercises foster critical thinking, creativity, and teamwork—skills vital for future professionals.

4. **Better Retention and Practical Application:** Active use aids memory. Technology tools (e.g., apps for conversation practice) extend learning beyond the classroom.

Uzbek researchers note that interactive methods like chain drills, "broken phone," and syncline (cinquain) poems effectively build vocabulary and speaking in non-philological settings.

Challenges:

1. **Uneven Participation and Proficiency Levels:** Shy or lower-level students may dominate less, while stronger ones lead. Large classes (common in Uzbekistan) complicate management.

2. **Teacher-Related Issues:** Many instructors need training in facilitating interactive lessons and managing classroom dynamics. Shifting from traditional roles requires time and resources.

3. **Time and Resource Constraints:** Preparing authentic materials and activities is time-consuming. Limited technology or suitable spaces can hinder implementation.

4. **Assessment Difficulties:** Evaluating speaking in dynamic, group settings is more complex than traditional tests.

5. **Cultural and Psychological Factors:** Fear of mistakes or cultural norms favoring teacher authority can reduce willingness to speak.

Overcoming Challenges: Effective strategies include differentiated tasks, clear rubrics, gradual introduction of activities, teacher professional development, and blended learning approaches.

Conclusion: Interactive methods offer substantial advantages for teaching speaking to non-philological students by making learning communicative, motivating, and practical. Despite challenges like resource limitations and teacher preparation needs, these can be mitigated through targeted training, contextual adaptation, and institutional support. In Uzbekistan's higher education system, integrating such methods alongside ESP content will better prepare graduates for global demands.



Future research should focus on empirical longitudinal studies measuring long-term speaking gains.

References

1. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. [Cited for CLT principles].
2. Harmer, J. (2007). *The Practice of English Language Teaching* (4th ed.). Pearson Longman. [Advantages of interactive activities].
3. Brown, H. D. (2001). *Teaching by Principles: An Interactive Approach to Language Pedagogy*. Pearson Education.
4. Jalolov, J.J., Makhkamova, G.T., & Ashurov, Sh.S. (2015). *English Language Teaching Methodology (Theory and Practice)*. Tashkent: Fan va texnologiya. pp. 200-300 (approx., sections on communicative skills and interactive learning). [Uzbek methodological foundation].
5. Risqimova, G., & Mannonova, S. (2025). Enhancing speaking skills in Non-philology University Students through interactive methods. *Journal of Science-Innovative Research in Uzbekistan*, 3(4), 366-370. [Direct study on the topic].
6. Abdukhafizova, N. (2022). Interactive Methods of Teaching English in a Non-Philological Educational Institution. *European Journal of Innovation in Nonformal Education*. [Practical techniques].
7. Mamadjanov, A. V. (2022). Interactive Methods and Technologies of Teaching English in Non-Linguistic Higher Education Institutions. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 99–106. [Uzbek context].