

TEACHING ENGLISH IN ACADEMIC LYCEUMS

Anvarov Abbosbek Azamjon o'g'li

Place of work: Academic Lyceum under Andijan State Pedagogical Institute

Position: teacher

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18669577>

Abstract. Teaching English in academic lyceums requires a methodology that balances exam-oriented outcomes with deeper communicative competence and academic language development. In the Uzbek context, academic lyceums typically serve as an upper-secondary bridge toward university study, so English instruction must support both general proficiency and subject-oriented literacy: reading academic texts, producing structured writing, participating in discussions, and using learning strategies independently.

Keywords: academic lyceums; English language teaching; CEFR; academic literacy; communicative competence; assessment.

INTRODUCTION

Academic lyceums are often positioned as a “launch pad” for higher education, which makes English teaching in these institutions a special case. The classroom is not only about everyday communication (“ordering food” English) but also about study skills, academic language, and readiness for university-style learning. In practice, this means learners must develop the ability to work with longer texts, infer meaning from context, present ideas logically, and write in organized paragraphs—skills that do not appear automatically just because students can fill grammar gaps. A well-run lyceum English program therefore treats language as a tool for thinking and learning, not only as a subject to memorize. In Uzbekistan, national policy has also emphasized strengthening foreign language education and aligning it with internationally recognized frameworks, which raises expectations for measurable proficiency outcomes.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A practical methodology for academic lyceums begins with alignment to outcomes and descriptors. Using CEFR as a reference helps teachers define what “progress” looks like in speaking, listening, reading, and writing, and it encourages balance: a student should not reach B1 grammar on paper while remaining A2 in real communication. CEFR materials emphasize communicative competence and “can-do” performance, which is especially relevant for lyceum learners preparing for university communication tasks—summarizing texts, participating in seminars, and producing written assignments. In Uzbekistan, the foreign language reform agenda has also referenced improving the overall system of language learning, which makes standards-based planning more than a personal preference—it becomes an institutional requirement [1].

Once outcomes are clear, the second foundation is academic literacy, not just general English. Academic lyceum students need systematic work with (1) academic vocabulary (high-frequency academic words and topic-specific terminology), (2) reading strategies (skimming, scanning, inference, identifying argument structure), and (3) writing structures (topic sentences, cohesion devices, paragraph unity, and simple referencing habits). One effective approach is a weekly cycle that combines a thematic text (science, society, education, technology) with a speaking task and a short writing product. For example, students read a

500–700-word text, identify the author’s claim and supporting reasons, discuss the topic in pairs using structured prompts, then write one paragraph that mirrors the text’s logic (claim → reasons → example). Over time, this builds a “reasoning habit” in English: learners stop producing random sentences and start constructing meaning. This is crucial in lyceums because students are not training for casual conversation only—they are training for academic communication. The role of curriculum guidance is important here; for instance, curricula linked to national standards and CEFR commonly emphasize integrated skills and communicative outcomes rather than isolated grammar lessons [2-3].

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The third foundation is communicative grammar and functional language, meaning grammar is taught as a tool to perform tasks. Academic lyceum learners still need accuracy—especially for exams—but accuracy grows best when it is connected to real language functions: explaining cause and effect, comparing alternatives, describing trends, and expressing opinion politely. Instead of teaching “conditionals” as a separate chapter, a teacher can design a mini-project such as “Study Habits Experiment”: students predict outcomes (“If I revise daily, I will...”) and report results using target structures, then present findings. Grammar feedback is then immediate and meaningful: errors are corrected because they block clarity, not because “Unit 7 says so.” This methodology also reduces the classic lyceum problem: students who can do grammar tests but freeze when asked a question [4].

A fourth foundation is differentiation—because academic lyceums rarely have perfectly uniform groups. Differentiation does not require separate lesson plans for every student; it requires layered tasks. For the same reading text, advanced learners can write a short critique or summary with connectors (“however,” “therefore”), while developing learners complete a guided outline or sentence frames. In speaking, one group can debate with evidence, while another uses structured dialogue cards. Importantly, differentiation should not label students as “weak” or “strong”; it should offer multiple entry points with the same intellectual topic. Lyceum-level teaching also benefits from “spiraling”: key skills (summarizing, paragraph writing, discussion) return repeatedly with increasing complexity rather than appearing once and disappearing like a guest who never helps wash the dishes.

The fifth foundation is assessment for learning [5]. In academic lyceums, testing pressure is real, so the solution is not to abandon tests but to make assessment productive. Teachers can use short rubrics aligned with CEFR-style descriptors: fluency, interaction, coherence, range of vocabulary, and accuracy. After each speaking activity, students receive one strength and one target improvement (“Your ideas were clear; next time use linking words”). For writing, rapid feedback cycles work well: one draft, focused correction on two criteria (for example, cohesion and verb tense consistency), then a revised final version. This approach makes progress visible and reduces “feedback fatigue.” Digital tools can support this process (recording speaking tasks, collecting drafts), but only if they serve learning goals rather than becoming shiny distractions.

CONCLUSION

Teaching English in academic lyceums works best when the program is built on five pillars: outcomes aligned to clear proficiency descriptors, academic literacy as a core priority, grammar taught through meaningful functions, differentiation through layered tasks, and formative assessment with fast feedback cycles. In this model, English is not merely a subject to pass—it becomes a working instrument for study, argument, and academic communication.

If teachers treat lyceum learners like future university students—capable of reasoning, presenting, and revising—the results are typically stronger than any “extra worksheet campaign.” The secret is simple: stop training students to recognize English, and start training them to *use* English with purpose.

Adabiyotlar, References, Литературы:

1. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 260 p. – URL: <https://rm.coe.int/common-european-framework-of-reference-for-languages-learning-teaching/16802fc1bf> (accessed: 03.02.2026).
2. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PQ-1875 “On measures for the further improvement of the system for learning foreign languages” (10.12.2012). – URL: <https://www.lex.uz/en/docs/7557210> (accessed: 03.02.2026).
3. Global Partnership for Education. Education Sector Plan of Uzbekistan 2019–2023. – 2019. – URL: <https://www.globalpartnership.org/node/document/download?file=sites%2Fdefault%2Ffiles%2F2019-04-gpe-esp-uzbekistan.pdf> (accessed: 03.02.2026).
4. British Council Uzbekistan. ESP Curriculum (English). – 2022. – URL: https://www.britishcouncil.uz/sites/default/files/esp_curriculum_engl.pdf (accessed: 03.02.2026).