PERIODICA
Journal of Modern Philosophy, Social Sciences and Humanities
ISSN NO:2720-4030 Volume 52 March 2026

Teaching Russian For Specific Purposes In Agrarian Higher Education: A Competency-Based Imrad Model For Terminological, Mediational, And Digital Communication

Kasimova Mukhabbatkhon Bazarovna
Lecturer, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature
Tashkent State Agrarian University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The growing technologization of agriculture, the expansion of transnational knowledge networks, and the persistence of Russian as a language of professional exchange across a large part of Eurasia make language training in agrarian universities a strategic rather than auxiliary domain of higher education. In the conditions of Uzbekistan, and especially in institutions oriented toward scientific modernization, sustainable food systems, and international academic cooperation, the teaching of Russian cannot remain confined to general grammar, literary reading, or decontextualized conversational practice. It must be reorganized as a professionally targeted system that enables students to work with disciplinary terminology, understand instructions and standards, interpret agronomic, veterinary, engineering, and economic texts, participate in expert dialogue, and mediate meaning across languages, registers, and digital environments. This article proposes and substantiates a competency-based model for teaching Russian for specific purposes in agrarian higher education. The study is designed as a theoretical-analytical and pedagogical-design inquiry structured according to the IMRAD logic and grounded in the Common European Framework of Reference and its Companion Volume, language-for-specific-purposes methodology, genre analysis, content and language integrated learning, scaffolding theory, and recent evidence on the digital transformation of agriculture and higher education [1-3; 6-9; 15; 19-21]. The article argues that the central methodological deficit of many existing programmes lies not in the absence of language material, but in the weak alignment between language instruction and authentic communicative tasks of the agrarian sphere. In response, a multi-component model is developed around seven interrelated dimensions of competence: terminological, textual-genre, discourse-interactional, mediational, digital-communicative, sociocultural, and reflective-strategic. The article formulates principles of curriculum selection, modular sequencing, task architecture, assessment, and teacher preparation; proposes a level-sensitive trajectory for first- and second-cycle university students;

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 22th February 2026
Accepted: 20th March 2026

KEYWORDS: Russian for specific purposes, agrarian higher education, professional communication, language for specific purposes, mediation, CEFR, curriculum design, multilingual education, digital learning, genre-based pedagogy, Uzbekistan

and demonstrates how Russian can function not merely as a subject but as a working instrument for disciplinary cognition and professional mobility. The results show that an agrarian-oriented Russian language curriculum becomes significantly more coherent and educationally valuable when it is built on needs analysis, authentic genres, mediation tasks, and digitally supported scenario-based learning. The proposed framework may be used in agrarian universities of Uzbekistan and comparable post-Soviet educational contexts as a research-based basis for curriculum reform, textbook design, and the training of language teachers working with non-linguistic specializations.

Introduction

In contemporary agrarian higher education, language training occupies a paradoxical position. On the one hand, universities publicly recognize that the modernization of agriculture depends on access to scientific information, interdisciplinary communication, technological documentation, mobility programmes, and international cooperation; on the other hand, language courses in many non-linguistic institutions still remain methodologically detached from the real communicative ecology of the professions for which students are being prepared. This contradiction becomes especially visible in the case of Russian language teaching in agrarian universities. For a considerable part of the post-Soviet academic and professional space, Russian continues to function as a language of disciplinary literature, interregional cooperation, standards, technical manuals, extension communication, and conference interaction, while students in agriculture, agroengineering, veterinary medicine, soil science, economics, water management, plant protection, food technology, and related fields are increasingly expected to navigate multilingual environments shaped simultaneously by national language policy, global Englishization, digital platforms, and regional professional exchange [1; 20-23]. Tashkent State Agrarian University, which officially presents itself as an institution educating future leaders of the agricultural sector and reports a large, diversified academic structure with thousands of students and strong scientific ambitions, offers a representative setting in which this challenge can be conceptualized [22]. Its Department of Languages explicitly declares the use of modern pedagogical approaches and an orientation toward developing language skills competitive in the international labour market [23]. Yet the methodological question remains open: what does a genuinely modern, professionally meaningful Russian-language curriculum look like for agrarian students whose future communication will involve laboratory instructions, agronomic recommendations, veterinary case histories, engineering safety regulations, greenhouse monitoring reports, commodity descriptions, farm-management negotiations, digital extension platforms, and multilingual mediation between experts, local producers, and data-rich information sources? The present article addresses that question by treating Russian not merely as an academic discipline but as a professional instrument embedded in the knowledge infrastructure of agrarian education.

The problem is sharpened by several structural shifts that have transformed both agriculture and higher education. First, agriculture itself has ceased to be reducible to traditional field practice; it now operates through digitized advisory services, sensor-based monitoring, climate-smart technologies, traceability systems, biotechnology, sustainability reporting, precision input management, data dashboards, online training environments, and expanding interaction with scientific and regulatory documentation [19-21]. FAO materials on digital learning in agriculture show that the sector is moving from informal online knowledge acquisition toward structured digital platforms with certification, modular course design, and increasingly AI-supported forms of personalized learning [19; 20]. This means that the communicative repertoire required of the future agrarian specialist is broader than before: students must read specialized documentation, interpret multimodal information, collaborate online, ask precise questions, summarize expert recommendations, and transform complex texts into actionable knowledge for different audiences.

Second, higher education has undergone a post-pandemic and post-platformization reconfiguration in which digital learning, hybrid communication, and competency-based curriculum design have become central rather than peripheral [1; 20; 21]. Language teaching is therefore no longer justified by generic slogans about "broad development"; it must demonstrate how it equips students for real academic and professional action. Third, language pedagogy itself has moved beyond narrow structuralist and purely communicative models toward action-oriented, mediation-sensitive, genre-based, plurilingual, and content-integrated approaches, as reflected both in the CEFR Companion Volume and in research on ESP, CLIL, and academic literacy [1-3; 5-9; 15]. The implication is clear: a course that continues to teach Russian as a sequence of isolated grammatical themes or literary-text interpretations without anchoring them in disciplinary action is pedagogically outdated.

A review of the relevant scholarship confirms the need for a profession-oriented redesign. Classical language-for-specific-purposes theory, from Hutchinson and Waters to Dudley-Evans and St John, established that the decisive principle of specialized language teaching is not the mechanical transfer of technical vocabulary into the classroom but the analysis of target needs, discourse practices, and communicative purposes [2; 3]. Canale and Swain's framework of communicative competence, although developed in a more general context, remains foundational because it shows that accuracy alone does not generate meaningful professional communication; discourse, sociolinguistic, and strategic capacities are equally necessary [4]. Swales and Bhatia extended this insight through genre analysis, demonstrating that academic and professional communication is organized by recurring text types, rhetorical moves, institutional expectations, and communities of practice [5; 14]. In parallel, CLIL research argued that language development in non-linguistic education becomes most productive when subject content and language work are integrated rather than artificially separated [6; 7]. Need-based curriculum design, as discussed by Long, Nation and Macalister, further clarified that language programmes become coherent only when objectives, input, tasks, and assessment are derived from concrete target situations rather than from textbook tradition or teacher habit [8; 9]. These positions are highly relevant to agrarian universities, where language instruction must serve domains with dense terminology, procedural discourse, safety communication, and applied problem solving.

Agrarian-oriented language education research, though not sufficiently systematized in Central Asian contexts, offers important cues. Studies conducted in agricultural universities indicate that profession-oriented language teaching may take different methodological forms: traditional language for specific purposes, integrated subject-language courses, and hybrid models built around cases and professional problem tasks [16-18]. Makarowa and Saenko show that in agricultural higher education, integrated learning has strong linguodidactic potential precisely because it develops both professional competence and professional foreign-language communication through task systems derived from real subject matter [16]. Solomatina's work on integrated subject-language instruction in the agrarian university similarly demonstrates that the language course gains relevance when students operate with disciplinary scenarios rather than with abstract thematic units [17]. Kapranchikova's analysis of subject-content selection underlines another crucial issue: in specialized university settings, the challenge lies not only in selecting terms, but in defining which fragments of professional reality should become the object of linguistic training and at what stage [18]. These studies, however, focus primarily on foreign-language instruction in general or on English-oriented frameworks; the Russian-language dimension in agrarian higher education has received less systematic theoretical modelling despite the fact that Russian remains highly functional in the region's scientific and professional ecosystem. This gap is not merely thematic; it has practical consequences, because without a dedicated conceptual framework, teachers often improvise between general-language textbooks, scattered terminology lists, and unsystematic translation exercises.

Another reason a new model is needed is that the communicative tasks of future agrarian specialists are themselves internally differentiated. A student in agronomy needs to understand crop-rotation descriptions, phytosanitary bulletins, seed quality reports, pesticide instructions, field-trial summaries, and recommendations on irrigation and fertilization; a future veterinarian must process anamnesis narratives, treatment protocols, zoonosis warnings, diagnostic descriptions, laboratory results, and consultations with

livestock owners; an agroengineer must read equipment specifications, maintenance instructions, technical drawings, safety documentation, and production manuals; a specialist in agricultural economics must interpret price dynamics, market analyses, business plans, grant documents, and regulatory correspondence; a student of water management or hydromelioration may need to work with monitoring reports, hydraulic calculations, land-reclamation documentation, and technical communication related to infrastructure operation. In each case, the required Russian is not the same. What unites these variants is the need for the student to operate within genre-rich professional environments where meaning is distributed across terminology, syntax, visuals, tables, instructions, and institutional conventions. Consequently, the curriculum cannot be reduced to an undifferentiated "professional lexicon" unit. It needs a layered architecture that distinguishes between common academic-professional Russian, field-specific sublanguages, and transferable mediation skills enabling students to bridge texts, data, and audiences [1; 5; 14; 24].

The CEFR Companion Volume provides particularly important conceptual tools for such a redesign. Its emphasis on the learner as a social agent, on mediation, online interaction, collaborative meaning-making, and plurilingual/pluricultural competence broadens the understanding of what counts as successful language use in university and workplace settings [1; 15]. For agrarian education, this is decisive because students are rarely asked simply to "speak Russian correctly"; rather, they are required to explain a table of fertilizer norms to a peer, summarize an expert webinar, compare local and imported equipment instructions, reformulate a scientific paragraph into farmer-friendly language, participate in online consultations, or translate domain information between Uzbek, Russian, and increasingly English. Mediation in this sense is not an extra decorative competence but a central professional act. Likewise, the CEFR's action-oriented perspective helps move beyond lesson formats built around topic recitation toward scenarios in which students perform social and professional actions. If a language course adopts these principles, grammar and vocabulary are no longer abandoned; they are reorganized as resources for accomplishing communicative work. Such a reorientation is compatible with Vygotskian and scaffolding perspectives, which stress that higher-order performance emerges through guided participation, structured support, and gradual internalization of complex forms of reasoning and expression [10; 25]. It is also consistent with Cummins's view that academic language proficiency cannot be developed through casual conversation alone, and with Bandura's argument that self-efficacy and strategic agency affect the quality of learning behaviour [11; 12].

Despite these theoretical resources, several pedagogical shortcomings persist in practice. The first is the lexical illusion: teachers often assume that a course becomes professional as soon as it contains specialized vocabulary. In reality, terminology taught outside texts, genres, and problem situations is quickly forgotten and rarely transfers to authentic use. The second is the translation trap: professional content is reduced to sentence-by-sentence translation, which may create superficial familiarity with words but does not cultivate interaction, interpretation, summarizing, note-taking, or genre production. The third is the separation problem: language teachers and subject teachers frequently work in parallel universes, so the language course neither anticipates nor supports the communicative demands of disciplinary study. The fourth is the assessment mismatch: students are examined on grammatical reproduction or memorized topics even though the target domain requires report reading, instruction following, evidence-based explanation, and mediated communication. The fifth is digital underutilization: although agriculture increasingly relies on digital information flows, classroom practice often ignores online interaction, multimodal resources, and scenario-based tasks rooted in contemporary platforms [19-21]. These shortcomings collectively produce a curriculum that is formally respectable but functionally thin. What is needed instead is a design logic that begins with the communicative realities of agrarian study and work, translates them into a structured competence model, and then derives content, methods, and assessment from that model.

Against this background, the aim of the present study is to develop and substantiate a competency-based model for teaching Russian for specific purposes in agrarian higher education, with particular relevance for Uzbekistan and comparable multilingual post-Soviet contexts. The objectives are: to identify the communicative functions and genre domains most relevant to agrarian students; to determine the structure of professional Russian-language competence in this field; to formulate principles for curriculum design, task selection, sequencing, and assessment; to clarify the role of mediation and digital

communication; and to outline institutional conditions necessary for implementation. The research question can be formulated as follows: how should Russian language teaching be reconceptualized in agrarian universities so that it becomes an integrated instrument for disciplinary cognition, professional communication, and multilingual mediation rather than a residual general-language subject? The central hypothesis is that the effectiveness of Russian-language instruction in agrarian higher education increases when the curriculum is organized around authentic professional actions, genre systems, mediation tasks, and progressive digital scenarios, with explicit alignment between needs analysis, classroom practice, and assessment. By addressing this hypothesis within an IMRAD structure, the article seeks not merely to advocate reform in principle, but to provide a research-based model that can guide syllabus design, teacher training, and future empirical validation.

Materials and Methods

The present study is a theoretical-analytical and pedagogical-design investigation that combines conceptual synthesis, needs-oriented curricular modelling, and discourse-functional analysis. It does not claim to report the results of a single local classroom experiment; rather, it constructs a substantiated model for practice and future testing by integrating several complementary methodological procedures. The first procedure was a targeted review and analytical comparison of foundational literature in five intersecting domains: language-for-specific-purposes methodology [2; 3; 8; 9; 13], communicative and genre-based approaches [4; 5; 14], content and language integrated learning [6; 7; 16-18], sociocultural and scaffolding theories of learning [10-12; 25], and current policy-oriented documents related to the CEFR, higher education digitalization, and agricultural learning ecosystems [1; 15; 19-23]. The purpose of this review was not encyclopedic accumulation, but the extraction of constructs that could be operationalized for the agrarian university context: target needs, discourse community, genre, mediation, online interaction, scaffolding, curriculum alignment, and professional task authenticity. The second procedure was the reconstruction of the target communicative field of agrarian higher education. In methodological terms, this reconstruction corresponds to a needs-analysis logic, but one adapted to the conceptual scope of a design study. Instead of surveying a single cohort, the article synthesizes typical communicative situations documented in agrarian education research, institutional descriptions of agricultural universities, the communicative demands of contemporary agriculture noted in FAO materials, and the observable structure of agrarian specializations such as agronomy, veterinary medicine, agroengineering, agricultural economics, water management, and food technology [16-23]. This reconstruction yielded a matrix of likely communication situations: reading discipline-specific учебно-научные texts; interpreting standards, manuals, and protocols; participating in seminars and consultations; making short evidence-based oral reports; interacting in online learning platforms; summarizing expert information; explaining technical or biological processes to non-expert audiences; and transferring information between Uzbek, Russian, and English or between written, oral, and visual modes. The third procedure was discourse-functional decomposition. Here, the article breaks down the broad notion of "professional Russian competence" into recurrent functions and communicative acts: naming and classifying objects and processes; describing technological sequences; comparing methods or varieties; reporting observations; interpreting data; justifying recommendations; formulating warnings, instructions, and constraints; asking clarifying questions; negotiating procedures; presenting findings; and mediating specialized content for audiences with different levels of expertise. This decomposition made it possible to move from thematic teaching ("Plants", "Animals", "Farm machinery") to action-oriented curricular design based on what students must actually do with language.

The fourth methodological procedure was genre mapping. Following genre-analysis logic, the study assumes that language behaviour in agrarian higher education is organized through recognizable text families and interaction formats rather than through abstract vocabulary lists [5; 14]. The mapped genres include textbook chapters, practical instructions, laboratory protocols, crop or disease descriptions, extension recommendations, technical specifications, safety instructions, short scientific reports, tables with explanatory commentary, grant and project summaries, presentation slides, online forum exchanges, and oral consultation formats. Each genre was then examined for its linguistic and pedagogical implications: dominant lexicogrammatical patterns, discourse markers, typical rhetorical moves, degree of terminological

density, integration of visuals or numerical data, and required reception-production-mediation operations. For example, a phytosanitary advisory text demands conditional structures, cause-and-effect relations, and risk vocabulary; a veterinary case summary foregrounds chronological sequencing, symptom description, diagnostic reasoning, and precision in reported data; an agroengineering manual requires imperative and impersonal constructions, technical noun phrases, parameter identification, and safety-related clarity. This genre mapping allowed the study to define curricular content not as "all agricultural Russian," which would be pedagogically unmanageable, but as a prioritized repertoire of high-frequency, high-value genre practices. The fifth procedure was curricular back-design. Starting from the reconstructed target situations and genre map, the study worked backward to define outcomes, component competences, module logic, task types, and assessment principles. This approach follows the widely accepted curriculum-design principle that teaching becomes coherent when objectives, content, pedagogy, and evaluation are aligned [8; 9]. In practical terms, it required asking four questions in sequence: what professional actions should the student be able to perform in Russian; what knowledge, language resources, and strategies enable those actions; what classroom tasks can approximate or scaffold them; and what evidence would show that the action has been mastered? The answer to these questions produced the competency model proposed in the Results section.

To make the model responsive to the multilingual and institutional conditions of Uzbekistan, the study also adopted a contextualization procedure. This procedure recognized that Russian in Uzbek agrarian universities is neither a foreign language in the classical sense nor simply a second native-like code for all students. Its status is functionally differentiated: for some learners it is a regularly used language of urban interaction or prior schooling; for others it is a limited academic-professional resource accessed mainly through formal education; for many it coexists with Uzbek as the dominant language of socialization and increasingly with English as a language of international aspiration and selective disciplinary access. Consequently, the model could not be built on monolingual assumptions. Instead, it treats plurilingual repertoires as pedagogical resources and positions mediation across languages and registers as a constitutive objective rather than as a remedial side activity [1; 11; 15]. This contextualization also required acknowledging institutional reality. Agrarian universities rarely have unlimited curricular time, and language teachers often work with mixed-proficiency groups, uneven digital infrastructure, and limited access to profession-specific Russian-language materials adapted to local agricultural content. Therefore, the proposed model had to be scalable: it needed a core applicable to all specializations and an expandable periphery that departments could customize according to disciplinary priorities. Another contextual element concerned digitalization. Recent FAO and UNESCO materials indicate that both agriculture and education are increasingly shaped by online content, structured e-learning, certification pathways, AI-mediated interaction, and multimodal knowledge environments [19-21]. For that reason, the study deliberately incorporated digital communicative tasks not as an optional supplement, but as a normal part of the target domain.

The final methodological step was criteria-based validation at the level of theoretical adequacy. Because this is a design study, validation could not rely on post-test statistics; instead, the model was checked against six criteria derived from the literature: relevance to authentic agrarian communication; internal coherence between competences, tasks, and assessment; compatibility with the CEFR's action-oriented and mediation-sensitive perspective; feasibility within higher-education curricular constraints; adaptability to multiple agrarian specializations; and capacity to support both language development and disciplinary cognition [1-9; 15-21]. This form of validation is common in curriculum and pedagogical design research, where the immediate goal is not to claim experimental proof, but to develop a robust framework that can later be piloted, adapted, and empirically tested. Methodological limitations were recognized from the outset. The study does not present corpus frequencies from a dedicated database of Russian agrarian texts, nor does it report classroom outcomes from a single institution. However, this limitation is balanced by the breadth of conceptual triangulation: the model emerges from converging evidence across language pedagogy, agrarian-education research, higher-education policy, and digital-learning literature. In other words, the article seeks methodological honesty over pseudo-empiricism. Its

contribution lies in building a theoretically grounded and practically usable architecture that future researchers can operationalize through syllabus trials, textbook development, classroom observation, performance rubrics, or mixed-method evaluation in institutions such as Tashkent State Agrarian University and similar universities in the region [22; 23].

Results

The central result of the study is a competency-based model for teaching Russian for specific purposes in agrarian higher education, organized around the proposition that professionally meaningful language learning emerges when the curriculum is structured by authentic communicative actions rather than by decontextualized language items. The model consists of seven interdependent components: terminological competence, textual-genre competence, discourse-interactional competence, mediational competence, digital-communicative competence, sociocultural-professional competence, and reflective-strategic competence. Terminological competence is defined not as the passive memorization of sectoral words, but as the ability to understand, classify, select, and accurately deploy the conceptual vocabulary necessary for agrarian reasoning. In practice, this includes mastery of taxonomic terms, process names, equipment nomenclature, descriptors of biological and technological states, measurement units, and evaluative categories used in agronomy, veterinary medicine, agroengineering, agricultural economics, and related subfields. The pedagogical implication is that terminology should be taught through semantic networks, contrastive oppositions, visual supports, mini-corpora of authentic use, and task-embedded repetition rather than through isolated bilingual lists. Textual-genre competence refers to the student's ability to recognize, interpret, and produce the genres most relevant to agrarian study and work. These genres range from textbook explanations and laboratory protocols to advisory notes, equipment instructions, disease descriptions, field reports, short research abstracts, presentation scripts, and platform-based discussion posts. Instead of reducing reading to general comprehension questions, the model requires teachers to train students to identify genre purpose, rhetorical organization, key moves, expected information density, and the relationship between verbal, tabular, and visual elements. Discourse-interactional competence covers the capacity to maintain professional dialogue in oral and written interaction: asking precise questions, clarifying uncertainty, comparing alternatives, agreeing and disagreeing with reasons, commenting on results, and constructing short but logically coherent explanations. In agrarian education, this competence is indispensable because students work in seminars, practical classes, project teams, internships, and advisory environments where success depends on communicative precision rather than on grammatical display alone.

Mediational competence occupies a particularly central place in the model. Drawing on the CEFR Companion Volume, the study treats mediation as the ability to create bridges between texts, concepts, participants, and languages [1; 15]. In the agrarian context, this means that a student should be able to convert a dense technical paragraph into a clear oral explanation, summarize a Russian-language webinar for Uzbek-speaking peers, extract practical recommendations from a veterinary protocol, explain a graph of yield dynamics, or compare information from Russian and English sources for use in local disciplinary discussion. This competence changes the methodological status of translation. Translation is no longer viewed as the endpoint of the lesson, but as one instrument among many in a broader ecology of reformulation, summarizing, paraphrasing, annotating, abstracting, and audience adaptation. The model's fifth component, digital-communicative competence, reflects the reality that agrarian learning increasingly takes place on digital platforms and through multimodal resources [19-21]. Students need to search for specialized information, evaluate the reliability of online sources, participate in moderated discussion boards, understand instructional videos, communicate in webinar chat formats, produce concise digital summaries, and interact with interface language typical of e-learning environments, online advisories, and AI-assisted knowledge tools. The sixth component, sociocultural-professional competence, includes pragmatic awareness, ethical communication, role sensitivity, register choice, and an understanding of how expertise is verbalized in institutional and workplace situations. Agrarian communication often involves hierarchy and responsibility: the language of a student report to a professor differs from that of a consultation with a farmer or a peer discussion in a laboratory. This competence also includes awareness of the communicative culture of safety, evidence, and procedural clarity. The seventh component, reflective-

strategic competence, concerns the learner's ability to monitor comprehension, compensate for lexical gaps, use note-taking and questioning strategies, evaluate the adequacy of one's own performance, and gradually assume ownership of professional language growth. Without such a strategic dimension, even a well-designed curriculum risks producing short-term reproduction rather than durable communicative agency [11; 12].

From these competence components, the study derives a four-layer curriculum architecture. The first layer is common academic-professional Russian for all agrarian students. This layer contains the general operations that cut across specializations: reading expository scientific prose, defining and classifying concepts, describing processes, interpreting tables and figures, producing short structured summaries, listening for key information, and participating in academically framed discussions. The second layer is field-cluster specialization. At this level, the curriculum differentiates between broad professional clusters such as plant sciences, animal sciences, engineering-technological domains, and economic-management domains. Each cluster receives tailored genre input, terminology families, and scenario tasks. For example, the plant-science cluster foregrounds crop technology, plant health, growth conditions, and treatment recommendations; the animal-science cluster foregrounds physiology, disease symptoms, feeding regimes, and veterinary procedures; the engineering cluster foregrounds mechanisms, parameters, maintenance, instructions, and safety; the economic cluster foregrounds data commentary, planning, market interpretation, and project communication. The third layer is mediation and multilingual transfer. Here the student is trained to move meaning across languages, modalities, and audience levels by preparing bilingual glossaries, writing Russian summaries of Uzbek lectures, orally reformulating Russian texts for mixed-language groups, and comparing disciplinary formulations across Russian and English sources. The fourth layer is digital-professional performance, where learning tasks simulate the contemporary information environment of agriculture: platform discussion, webinar note extraction, voice explanation of charts, critical reading of online advisories, concise written responses to case prompts, and the responsible use of AI-generated support under teacher supervision. This layered architecture ensures that the course remains both unified and adaptable: all students share a professional-academic core, yet specializations receive targeted content and the entire system is held together by mediation and digital action rather than by arbitrary topic sequences.

The sequencing of the curriculum follows a progression from guided comprehension to semi-guided professional action and then to increasingly autonomous disciplinary communication. At the initial stage, which can correspond to the first university year or to students with limited proficiency, the dominant objective is not "free speaking" but structured access to basic academic-professional meaning. Students learn to work with core agrarian terminology, sentence patterns for definition and description, high-frequency verb-noun collocations, simple explanatory schemas, and the rhetorical cues of textbook and instructional discourse. Reading tasks focus on paragraph structure, key-term recognition, and elementary information mapping. Listening tasks involve short expert fragments with clearly signposted content. Oral work includes controlled explanation with scaffolds, paired clarification, and brief reporting based on visuals. Writing at this stage concentrates on notes, glossaries, labeled diagrams, micro-summaries, and short descriptive paragraphs. At the intermediate stage, curricular emphasis shifts toward genre control and mediation. Students begin to compare methods, justify choices, summarize multi-source information, interpret procedural sequences, and engage in structured discussion of cases. Vocabulary teaching becomes domain-networked: rather than learning individual words, students work through clusters such as soil properties, seed treatment, disease prevention, equipment malfunction, feeding norms, input efficiency, or irrigation regimes. Grammar is taught functionally through tasks requiring cause-effect relations, conditionality, passive and impersonal constructions, sequencing, recommendation, obligation, and evidence-based qualification. Writing expands to include laboratory commentaries, mini-reports, instruction reformulation, and slide-supported presentation notes. At an advanced stage, students move toward discipline-specific performance approximating authentic professional communication: conference-style short talks, analytical summaries of articles, advisory note drafting, oral explanation of data trends, comparative commentary on Russian and English sources, and audience-sensitive mediation between expert and non-expert discourse.

Here digital and collaborative tasks become more prominent, and the teacher's role shifts from primary controller to designer of scenarios, provider of targeted feedback, and curator of language resources.

A major result of the study concerns task architecture. The model rejects the dominance of the traditional triad "read-translate-retell" as the core format of professional language teaching. Instead, it proposes a task system built on six recurrent action families. The first is interpretive tasks, in which students identify key information, determine the communicative purpose of a text, annotate terminology, reconstruct the logic of a process, or relate verbal information to diagrams and tables. The second is descriptive-explanatory tasks, where students verbally model a technological or biological process, explain a sequence of operations, define a concept, or comment on observed conditions. The third is decision-support tasks, where students compare alternatives, recommend a course of action, justify a treatment or technological choice, or assess risks and constraints in case-based scenarios. The fourth is mediation tasks, where students summarize, simplify, rephrase, translate selectively, explain for another audience, or synthesize information across sources. The fifth is interactive tasks, including professional questioning, consultation role-play, online discussion contribution, peer explanation, and collaborative case analysis. The sixth is reflective tasks, in which students evaluate the adequacy of their own language performance, identify missing vocabulary and discourse tools, and set targets for improvement. Importantly, these task families are not abstract methodological categories; each can be populated with agrarian content. An interpretive task may involve extracting steps from a greenhouse maintenance protocol; a decision-support task may require comparing two irrigation schedules under changing weather conditions; a mediation task may ask the student to explain a Russian-language veterinary recommendation to an Uzbek-speaking livestock owner in simplified but accurate form. This approach ensures that students encounter language as organized action within meaningful professional frames.

The study also generates a principles-based model for content selection. Five principles proved decisive. The first is authenticity with pedagogical adaptation. Texts and communicative situations should be rooted in real agrarian discourse, but teachers must adapt density, length, and scaffolding to student level rather than importing expert texts in untouched form. The second is functional recurrence. Content should be selected not only for thematic importance but for how often it enables transferable operations such as describing, classifying, comparing, warning, recommending, and summarizing. The third is vertical coherence. The same professional domain should recur across levels with increasing linguistic and cognitive complexity. For example, a first-year unit on plant disease may focus on symptom vocabulary and simple descriptions; later units may require comparison of treatment strategies, critical reading of advisory texts, and oral reporting of trial outcomes. The fourth is cross-specialization balance. Since agrarian universities contain multiple specializations, the curriculum should combine a shared interdisciplinary core with rotating profession-specific modules. The fifth is multimodality. Because agrarian knowledge often circulates through tables, photographs, схемы, dashboards, and video explanations, students must be trained to read and produce language in relation to non-verbal data rather than as pure verbal text. These principles help prevent two common failures: curricula that are too generic to matter professionally and curricula that are so specialized too early that they fragment into narrow lexical islands.

Assessment is another domain in which the proposed model produces concrete results. Traditional language testing in non-linguistic universities often privileges discrete grammar and memorized monologues, which poorly predict the student's ability to function in professional settings. The present model proposes assessment through integrated performance evidence. Reading assessment should include extracting procedural logic, identifying key claims, recognizing terminology in context, and explaining the function of a table, figure, or instruction block. Listening assessment should focus on note-making from short expert explanations, identifying recommendations and constraints, and reconstructing the main stages of an operation. Writing assessment should move from controlled microgenres to professional mini-genres: abstract, annotation, report comment, procedural summary, explanation of data, or advisory message. Oral assessment should prioritize scenario performance: consultation, presentation of findings, explanation of a process using visuals, comparison of alternatives, or mediated explanation for a specified audience. Each performance is evaluated through transparent criteria connected to the competence model: terminological

accuracy, genre adequacy, discourse coherence, audience awareness, mediation quality, interaction management, and strategic self-correction. Such rubrics align well with the CEFR's can-do orientation while remaining specific to agrarian communication [1; 15]. The study also argues for portfolio-based accumulation of evidence. A student portfolio may include glossary work, annotated readings, digital discussion posts, recorded oral explanations, slide commentaries, and case-based written responses. In this way, assessment becomes developmental rather than purely punitive, and students can see how their professional Russian grows across the programme.

A further result concerns the teacher's role and required professional profile. The model makes clear that effective teaching of Russian for agrarian purposes cannot rely solely on a general philological background, nor does it require that the language teacher become a full agronomist or engineer. What it does require is the emergence of a hybrid pedagogical competence: the teacher must understand the logic of target professional communication, be able to analyze domain genres, collaborate with subject specialists, construct scaffolds for terminology and discourse, and design tasks that approximate authentic action without sacrificing linguistic precision. This redefines teacher preparation. Professional development should include familiarization with agrarian subject clusters, principles of needs analysis, digital pedagogy, CEFR-mediated task design, and collaborative materials development. Institutional cooperation is therefore built into the model. Language departments should not work in isolation; they need regular channels of exchange with agronomy, veterinary, engineering, and economics departments to identify current communicative priorities, collect authentic texts, and coordinate the timing of language modules with disciplinary study. In universities such as Tashkent State Agrarian University, where the language department emphasizes scientific work and modern pedagogy, such collaboration is not only desirable but structurally plausible [23]. Without it, the curriculum risks sliding back into textbook formalism.

Finally, the results of the study include an implementation trajectory suitable for real higher-education constraints. In a minimal version, the model can be introduced through the redesign of existing Russian-language syllabi around communicative outcomes and a limited set of authentic genres. In an expanded version, it can support differentiated modules by specialization, integration with subject courses, the creation of agrarian Russian mini-corpora, and digital task banks for blended learning. In a fully developed version, the university can institutionalize interdisciplinary teacher teams, portfolio assessment, and bilingual disciplinary communication tracks that connect Uzbek, Russian, and English resources. Even the minimal version, however, already changes the pedagogical logic of the course: instead of asking whether the student has "covered" a topic, it asks whether the student can perform a professionally meaningful action with language. That shift is the essential result of the study. It allows Russian-language teaching in agrarian higher education to be repositioned from the margins of the curriculum to the core of academic and professional formation, where it belongs.

An important extension of the model is its module-design template, which translates the competence framework into teachable cycles. Each module is built around one professionally meaningful question rather than one abstract lexical theme. A plant-science module, for example, may be organized around the question "How do we diagnose, describe, and respond to a crop-health problem?"; a veterinary module around "How do we gather, report, and explain animal health information?"; an agroengineering module around "How do we read, explain, and safely apply equipment instructions?"; an agricultural-economics module around "How do we interpret and present production or market data for decision-making?" Within each module, classroom work proceeds through a recurring didactic sequence: entry into the problem situation; guided exposure to key genres and terminology; focused language work on the structures necessary for the communicative task; scaffolded comprehension and note-making; collaborative explanation or case discussion; mediational transformation of the source material for a new audience or format; and a final product demonstrating integrated competence. This sequence allows grammar instruction to be naturally embedded. In a module on disease management, for instance, causal connectors, recommendations, conditional constructions, and language of probability are taught because students need them to explain why a problem emerged and what response is appropriate. In an engineering module, imperative, impersonal, and cautionary constructions become central because students must communicate procedures and safety. In a

market-analysis module, comparative structures, numerical commentary, and hedging language are foregrounded because students must discuss tendencies and justify conclusions.

The study also identifies the optimal balance among input, interaction, and production. Profession-oriented language courses often fail because they either overload students with texts they cannot process or move too quickly into production before comprehension and conceptualization are secure. The proposed model recommends a ratio in which guided input and noticing occupy the early phase of each module, interactional rehearsal the middle phase, and independent or semi-independent performance the final phase. Input includes short adapted authentic texts, visuals, excerpts from manuals or advisories, diagram-based explanation, and selected video fragments. Interaction includes peer questioning, collaborative annotation, terminology clustering, mini-consultations, and teacher-moderated problem talk. Production includes annotated summaries, oral process explanation, decision commentaries, short presentations, and mediation outputs. This three-part balance is pedagogically significant because it prevents the false opposition between language accuracy and communicative action. Accuracy is developed through repeated noticing and supported rehearsal; communicative action emerges when students then use these resources in scenario-bound performance. The model therefore does not sacrifice linguistic rigor to practicality; it redefines rigor as the disciplined orchestration of form, meaning, and professional purpose.

Material design is another practical result. The study shows that effective resources for agrarian Russian should be multi-layered. A single teaching unit should ideally include a short base text, a terminology map, a visual or table, a set of guided noticing tasks, one problem-based discussion prompt, one mediation task, and one integrated performance task. Such a structure ensures density without chaos. The terminology map organizes key concepts semantically rather than alphabetically. The visual or table trains students to connect language to data and process representation. Guided noticing tasks direct attention to genre structure, collocations, and discourse markers. The problem prompt introduces decision and justification. The mediation task ensures audience awareness and reformulation ability. The integrated performance task produces evidence of achievement. In addition, the model supports the use of micro-corpora created from authentic local materials: adapted extension bulletins, translated excerpts from relevant manuals, locally used agronomic recommendations, veterinary documentation samples, irrigation guidelines, or market reports. When these materials are curated collaboratively by language and subject teachers, the course becomes visibly more credible to students. This credibility has motivational consequences. Learners are more willing to invest effort when they perceive that the text in front of them resembles the communicative world they are entering rather than an abstract language-training universe detached from their professional future.

A final operational result concerns institutional scaling. The model indicates that universities do not need to implement a fully differentiated specialization track from the first semester in order to achieve substantial improvement. A staged institutional strategy is possible. Stage one involves outcome reform, genre introduction, and the replacement of purely topical syllabi with action-based module questions. Stage two adds specialization clusters, portfolio assessment, and teacher collaboration with one or two pilot departments. Stage three develops digital repositories of tasks, localized materials banks, and mediation pathways connecting Uzbek-, Russian-, and English-language resources. This staged logic is especially important for universities facing constraints of staffing, time, and materials. It demonstrates that methodological transformation need not wait for perfect conditions; meaningful change can begin with a redefinition of objectives and task design. In that sense, the model is both ambitious and realistic. It offers a long-term framework while also identifying modest entry points through which Russian-language teaching in agrarian higher education can begin to move toward higher professional relevance immediately.

Discussion

The proposed model has several implications for both theory and practice, and its significance becomes clearer when it is placed in dialogue with existing paradigms of language education. First, the model confirms a classical but often neglected LSP insight: specialized language teaching fails when it mistakes terminology for competence. In many university classrooms, the professionalization of a course is attempted by adding topic-specific words to an otherwise unchanged general-language programme. The

results of the present study suggest that such an approach is insufficient because profession-oriented communication is structured not by isolated lexical items but by purposeful actions carried out through genres, interaction patterns, and institutional conventions [2; 3; 5; 14]. A student who can name a plant disease or machine part is not necessarily able to explain a technological sequence, interpret a recommendation, compare procedures, or summarize the implications of a report. The shift from vocabulary accumulation to action-oriented competence therefore represents not a cosmetic methodological preference but a substantive change in educational logic. In this regard, the model extends classical ESP thinking into the Russian-language domain of agrarian higher education and demonstrates that the same theoretical principles underlying English for specific purposes are fully applicable when Russian functions as a language of disciplinary access and regional professional exchange. However, the model also adapts LSP theory to a multilingual post-Soviet reality in which Russian is neither simply a global lingua franca nor merely a heritage code. Its pedagogical status is hybrid, and therefore the course must be built not only around target-language performance but around movement across repertoires, audiences, and knowledge systems.

Second, the model supports and refines CLIL-related arguments about the integration of language and subject content. Research in agricultural universities has shown that integrated subject-language learning has high potential because it allows students to develop professional competence and language competence simultaneously [16-18]. Yet in practice, CLIL is often invoked rhetorically without adequate attention to curriculum design, teacher collaboration, or level sensitivity. The present framework addresses that problem by clarifying what integration should actually look like in agrarian Russian teaching. Integration does not mean that the language teacher simply repeats subject content, nor that subject teachers become ad hoc language instructors. Rather, it means that language instruction is aligned with the discourse, genres, and tasks through which disciplinary knowledge is constructed and communicated. The agronomy student does not need a Russian lesson "about wheat" in a general topical sense; the student needs guided practice in reading crop-management recommendations, reporting observations, and discussing treatment choices. The veterinary student does not primarily need animal-related conversation practice; the student needs competence in symptom description, sequence narration, diagnostic questioning, and protocol interpretation. Once this distinction is understood, the methodological relation between language and content becomes much more precise. The model therefore contributes to CLIL debates by replacing vague integration with functionally specific integration, an especially important step in universities where curricular time is limited and pedagogical efficiency matters.

Third, the discussion must address the special importance of mediation. One of the most valuable contributions of the CEFR Companion Volume is that it broadens language education beyond the older image of the individual learner producing correct speech in isolation [1; 15]. In contemporary agrarian professions, communication is frequently mediated: information is reformulated for colleagues, simplified for producers, translated selectively for documentation, summarized for decision-making, or transformed from written explanation into oral instruction and from chart into verbal comment. The present study shows that this is not an optional "advanced" skill but one of the most realistic target actions for students in agrarian universities. Indeed, in multilingual environments such as Uzbekistan, the graduate may be expected to move among Uzbek, Russian, and English materials while also adapting communication to professors, peers, practitioners, or clients. From this perspective, mediation becomes a bridge between language pedagogy and professional reality. It also offers a methodological solution to the chronic overuse of translation exercises. Traditional translation tasks often remain linear and teacher-centred; mediation tasks, by contrast, require purposeful audience adaptation, selection of relevant information, and awareness of communicative consequences. This makes them cognitively richer and professionally more authentic. The model's insistence on mediation therefore has both pedagogical and social justification: it prepares students for knowledge circulation in heterogeneous linguistic environments rather than for artificial exam routines.

Fourth, the role of digital communication deserves careful interpretation. The study integrates digital competence not because digitalization is fashionable, but because the communication ecology of agriculture has actually changed. FAO materials document the emergence of structured digital learning environments,

certified agricultural e-learning platforms, online communities, and increasingly AI-supported forms of personalized knowledge access [19; 20]. At the same time, UNESCO and related higher-education analyses emphasize that digital transformation is reshaping the modes through which students access knowledge, interact with teachers, and demonstrate competence [21]. In this context, a profession-oriented Russian course that remains tied exclusively to printed texts and classroom recitation underprepares learners for the environments they already inhabit. Yet the digital turn must be handled soberly. The study does not suggest replacing rigorous language instruction with superficial online activity. Rather, digital environments are treated as sites where professional communication occurs and where specific literacies are required: search literacy, source evaluation, concise writing in constrained formats, multimodal interpretation, participation in threaded discussion, and responsible use of AI assistance. There is also a cautionary dimension. FAO notes that structured digital learning in agriculture faces challenges such as uneven digital literacy, variable completion rates, and tensions between scale and contextual relevance [20]. These observations align with the model's emphasis on scaffolding, modularity, and teacher mediation. Digital tools can extend access and realism, but only if they are pedagogically curated and anchored in well-defined professional tasks.

Fifth, the model has implications for curriculum policy in agrarian universities. A frequent institutional difficulty is that language courses are judged by credit hours rather than by their demonstrable contribution to disciplinary study and graduate capability. When this happens, language teaching is often marginalized, simplified, or treated as a service subject with low prestige. The framework advanced here provides an argument against that marginalization. If Russian-language teaching is redesigned to support academic reading, project presentation, professional consultation, instruction comprehension, and multilingual mediation, it becomes directly linked to the university's core mission of preparing competent specialists. This argument is particularly relevant for institutions that publicly emphasize innovation, scientific development, and internationalization, as Tashkent State Agrarian University does [22; 23]. In such settings, the mismatch between institutional ambition and generic language teaching becomes harder to justify. The model therefore suggests that curriculum reform should occur at two levels: micro-level redesign of courses and macro-level recognition of language education as part of professional formation. This may involve timetabling reform, credit rebalancing, interdisciplinary coordination, and the creation of material-development teams capable of producing locally relevant resources. One should not underestimate the importance of local adaptation. Imported Russian-language textbooks often reflect realities, crops, technologies, or communication habits not fully aligned with Uzbek agrarian contexts. A robust curriculum thus requires local examples, regionally relevant case material, and opportunities to work with the specific agricultural discourse that students are likely to encounter in their future professional environments.

Sixth, the discussion must consider the learner dimension. The model assumes that students in agrarian universities are not empty recipients of language input but developing professionals whose motivation increases when they see a direct connection between classroom work and future expertise. This assumption is consistent with sociocultural and self-efficacy theories [10-12]. When learners perform meaningful actions-interpreting a recommendation, explaining a graph, simulating a consultation, or producing a mini-report-they are not merely practising language; they are rehearsing professional identity. Such identity formation matters, especially in non-linguistic universities where students may otherwise view language courses as peripheral obstacles. The model's reflective-strategic component is important here. Students need to learn how to compensate for incomplete knowledge, ask clarifying questions, organize terminology notebooks or digital glossaries, and evaluate the adequacy of their own communication. These strategies are not secondary soft additions; they are part of becoming an autonomous user of professional Russian. At the same time, the model avoids romanticizing learner autonomy. Strategic independence emerges through structured guidance, explicit modelling, and repeated supported performance. In mixed-ability groups, this support becomes even more important. The framework's layered architecture is helpful precisely because it allows a common core to coexist with differentiated scaffolding, enabling students with stronger Russian backgrounds to extend into complex mediation and genre work while supporting others in the mastery of academic-professional foundations.

Seventh, the proposed framework sheds light on assessment reform. The widespread persistence of grammar-heavy or memorization-heavy evaluation is not just a technical defect; it reveals a deeper uncertainty about what language competence is for in professional education. By moving assessment toward integrated performance, the model aligns evaluation with real educational purpose. This does not mean abolishing attention to accuracy. Terminological precision, grammatical adequacy, and lexical control remain indispensable, especially in technical and biological communication where ambiguity can produce conceptual and practical errors. However, these qualities are assessed inside meaningful performance rather than as isolated fragments. Such an approach has the additional advantage of increasing washback quality: students prepare differently when they know they will be asked to interpret a protocol, explain a process, mediate a text, or comment on data rather than recite a memorized topic. Portfolio elements, oral recordings, annotation tasks, and case-based writing can together create a richer picture of development than a single final test. For OAK-oriented academic cultures that value demonstrable outcomes, this is important because it makes language achievement legible in terms of university competence rather than mere classroom ritual.

Eighth, several challenges and limitations deserve candid acknowledgement. The model is theoretically grounded, but its large-scale effectiveness still requires empirical verification through piloting, classroom observation, student performance analysis, and teacher feedback. Future research should test the framework with different agrarian specializations, compare outcomes across proficiency levels, and examine which task types produce the strongest gains in reading, mediation, and oral explanation. Corpus-based work would also strengthen the model by identifying the most frequent discourse markers, collocations, and genre patterns in Russian agrarian texts used in Uzbek or Eurasian educational and professional settings. Another limitation concerns teacher workload. Designing authentic, specialization-sensitive tasks and portfolios requires time, collaboration, and resource support; without institutional backing, teachers may find the model conceptually attractive but practically difficult. There is also a risk of overloading the course with content if curriculum designers attempt to include every specialization equally. The framework avoids this by recommending a core-plus-cluster structure, but curricular discipline is still required. Digital inequality presents a further challenge. Although digital tasks are necessary, access to devices, stable platforms, and appropriate resources may vary across groups. Therefore, the digital dimension must be implemented flexibly, with low-threshold formats available where infrastructure is limited.

Ninth, the broader scholarly value of the study lies in demonstrating that Russian-language pedagogy in non-linguistic higher education can be theorized with the same sophistication often reserved for English-medium or foreign-language research. Too often, discussions of Russian teaching in professional contexts remain practical, fragmented, or narrowly lexical. The present article argues for a more conceptually rigorous approach in which Russian for agrarian purposes is treated as a domain of curriculum theory, discourse pedagogy, mediation research, and digital learning design. This has relevance beyond the immediate case. Similar models may be adapted for medical, engineering, legal, or pedagogical universities where Russian functions as an academic and professional resource within multilingual societies. In this sense, the agrarian focus is both specific and exemplary. Agriculture makes the communicative demands especially visible because it combines scientific, technical, environmental, managerial, and advisory discourse in one educational field. If a coherent profession-oriented Russian model can be built here, it can inform broader rethinking across higher education.

Ultimately, the discussion returns to the article's main claim: the educational problem is not whether Russian should be taught in agrarian universities, but how. If it is taught as a residual general-language subject, its relevance will continue to erode. If it is taught as a professionally organized instrument of knowledge access, explanation, mediation, and digital interaction, it can make a substantial contribution to graduate competence, institutional quality, and the intellectual integration of agrarian education. The proposed model is an attempt to define the second path with sufficient theoretical precision and practical detail to make reform possible rather than merely desirable.

A further issue worth discussing is the relationship between Russian and English in agrarian higher education. In some reform discourses, English is assumed to be the only language of future scientific development, while Russian is treated as transitional or secondary. Such a binary view is pedagogically

unhelpful. In reality, the communicative economy of agrarian education in Uzbekistan and much of Eurasia is layered. English provides access to a large segment of international research and global academic mobility; Russian continues to provide access to regional scientific literature, technical documentation, inter-university exchange, and professional communication across a wide post-Soviet space; Uzbek anchors national policy, local social interaction, and much practitioner communication. The relevant educational response is therefore not replacement but calibrated plurilingualism. The proposed model is compatible with this perspective because it does not elevate Russian as an exclusive code; instead, it defines Russian as one operational language within a broader repertoire. Mediation tasks become especially valuable here. A student may compare an English-language scientific abstract, a Russian-language technical recommendation, and an Uzbek-language practical explanation, thereby learning not only three sets of words but three partially overlapping modes of disciplinary meaning. This kind of work strengthens conceptual precision and reduces the compartmentalization of knowledge by language. It also reflects the realities of modern agrarian professionals, who increasingly move between databases, advisories, manuals, and regulatory environments rather than remaining inside a single-language universe.

Another discussion point concerns the ethics of professional communication. Agrarian discourse is often treated as purely technical, yet many communicative acts in this field carry ethical weight: recommendations affect farmer decisions, veterinary explanations affect animal welfare, safety instructions affect worker protection, and environmental language influences public understanding of sustainability. The sociocultural-professional component of the model should therefore not be interpreted narrowly as etiquette. It includes responsibility for clarity, accuracy, non-manipulative explanation, and awareness of the practical consequences of language. This matters in multilingual mediation especially, where simplification must not slide into distortion. A student who reformulates a dosage instruction, a quarantine warning, or a sustainability recommendation for a non-expert audience must preserve the decision-critical meaning while adapting the register. The model's emphasis on evidence-based explanation, transparent evaluation criteria, and genre awareness supports this ethical dimension by connecting language quality to professional accountability. In that sense, profession-oriented Russian teaching contributes not only to efficiency, but to the culture of responsible agrarian expertise.

Conclusion

This article set out to answer a practical and theoretical question of increasing importance for agrarian higher education: how should Russian language teaching be reorganized so that it serves the real communicative, cognitive, and professional needs of future specialists rather than reproducing a generic and weakly contextualized language course? On the basis of language-for-specific-purposes theory, communicative and genre analysis, CLIL-related research, sociocultural pedagogy, the CEFR Companion Volume, and recent materials on digital transformation in agriculture and higher education, the study developed a competency-based model for Russian for specific purposes in agrarian universities. The model's main contribution lies in its reconceptualization of the object of teaching. Instead of treating professional language as a lexical appendix to general Russian, it defines it as an integrated system of actions involving terminology, genre control, interaction, mediation, digital communication, sociocultural appropriateness, and reflective strategy use. This shift leads to a coherent curriculum architecture built around authentic communicative situations, specialization-sensitive modules, mediated multilingual transfer, and performance-oriented assessment. The article has shown that such an approach is theoretically defensible, methodologically structured, and institutionally scalable. It is especially relevant for multilingual contexts such as Uzbekistan, where agrarian students often need to move among Uzbek, Russian, and English knowledge resources while preparing for professional roles in a rapidly changing technological and informational environment. The proposed framework does not claim to solve every implementation difficulty, nor does it substitute for future empirical testing. What it offers is a principled basis for reform: a way to align language teaching with the actual discourse of agriculture, with the action-oriented logic of contemporary language education, and with the university's broader mission of preparing competent, communicatively capable specialists. In that sense, the teaching of Russian in agrarian higher education should be understood not as a residual humanities requirement, but as a strategic component of disciplinary

learning, professional mobility, and knowledge mediation. Future work may build on this model through pilot curricula, corpus-informed textbook development, specialization-specific modules, and longitudinal assessment of student performance. Even at the present stage, however, the framework provides a solid foundation for teachers, departments, and universities seeking to make Russian-language education more rigorous, more relevant, and more fully integrated into the professional formation of the agrarian graduate.

References

1. Council of Europe. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment - Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020.
2. Hutchinson T., Waters A. English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
3. Dudley-Evans T., St John M.J. Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
4. Canale M., Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. Applied Linguistics. 1980;1(1):1-47.
5. Swales J.M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
6. Marsh D. Content and Language Integrated Learning: The European Dimension - Actions, Trends and Foresight Potential. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä, 2002.
7. Coyle D., Hood P., Marsh D. CLIL: Content and Language Integrated Learning. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
8. Nation I.S.P., Macalister J. Language Curriculum Design. New York: Routledge, 2010.
9. Long M.H. (Ed.). Second Language Needs Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005.
10. Vygotsky L.S. Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1978.
11. Cummins J. Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 2000.
12. Bandura A. Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1986.
13. Hyland K. English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book. London: Routledge, 2006.
14. Bhatia V.K. Worlds of Written Discourse: A Genre-Based View. London: Continuum, 2004.
15. North B. The CEFR Companion Volume: A key resource for inclusive plurilingual education. CEFR Journal - Research and Practice. 2021;4:3-23.
16. Makarowa E.L., Saenko E.S. Approaches to teaching agricultural university students a foreign language for professional communication. Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities. 2022;27(2):410-419.
17. Solomatina A.G. Obucheniye inostrannomu yazyku dlya professional'nykh tseley na osnove modeli integrirovannogo predmetno-yazykovogo obucheniya v agrarnom vuze [Teaching a foreign language for professional purposes based on a content and language integrated learning model in an agrarian university]. Vestnik Tambovskogo universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnyye nauki. 2018;23(173):49-57.
18. Kapranchikova K.V. Osobennosti otbora predmetnogo soderzhaniya obucheniya inostrannomu yazyku v agrarnom vuze [Features of selecting subject content for teaching a foreign language in an agrarian university]. Vestnik Tambovskogo universiteta. Seriya Gumanitarnyye nauki. 2018;23(176):46-55.
19. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. FAO eLearning Academy: Strengthening Capacity to Face Global Challenges. Rome: FAO, 2020.
20. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. AgriTech Observer #1: How Farmers Learn in the Digital Age - International Day Special. Rome: FAO, 2026.
21. UNESCO. Digital Transformation in Education in Asia-Pacific: Policy Brief. Paris: UNESCO, 2022.
22. Tashkent State Agrarian University. Official website. Tashkent: TSAU, 2026.

23. Tashkent State Agrarian University, Department of Languages. Official website. Tashkent: TSAU, 2026.
24. Schleppegrell M.J. The Language of Schooling: A Functional Linguistics Perspective. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 2004.
25. Gibbons P. Scaffolding Language, Scaffolding Learning: Teaching English Language Learners in the Mainstream Classroom. 2nd ed. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann, 2015.