

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.11042576

Exploring Pedagogical Paradigms: A Comparative Study of Methodologies for Teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for General Purposes (EGP) Vocabulary

Sami Al-Mubireek^{1*}, Jasiya Rafique², Anu Dhawan³

¹Associate Professor of English Language, Preparatory Year and Supporting Studies, Department of English Language Imam Abdulrahman University, Dammam, KSA, Email: smubireek@iau.edu.sa

²Instructor, Preparatory Year and Supporting Studies, Department of English Language Imam Abdulrahman University, Dammam, KSA, Email: jmrafiq@iau.edu.sa

³Instructor, Preparatory Year and Supporting Studies, Department of English Language Imam Abdulrahman University, Dammam, KSA, Email: asdarwan@iau.edu.sa

Received: 11/11/2025

Accepted: 18/11/2025

ABSTRACT

This research compares pedagogical approaches in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) with English for General Purposes (EGP). It evaluates effectiveness of pedagogical methodologies in enhancing vocabulary acquisition. A mixed-methods approach was adopted, combining surveys to collect data from learners and instructors, a comprehensive literature review to contextualize existing research, and classroom observations to assess real-world implementation of various teaching strategies in both ESP and EGP contexts. The study found notable differences in effectiveness. ESP benefited from content-based and task-based learning approaches, as they provided contextual relevance and specialized vocabulary acquisition. In contrast, EGP's communicative methods, such as task-based and communicative language teaching, were more effective in fostering general language fluency and versatility. The findings suggest the need for more integrated pedagogical strategies that combine the strengths of ESP and EGP approaches. Instructional designers and teacher trainers should consider this finding to ensure that learners acquire both general and specialized language skills effectively.

KEYWORDS: ESP, EGP, Vocabulary Acquisition, Pedagogy, Task-Based Learning, Corpus Linguistics.

1. INTRODUCTION

Vocabulary acquisition is a cornerstone of language learning, serving as the foundation for effective communication and comprehension. In English for General Purposes (EGP), vocabulary focuses on a broad spectrum of words used in everyday contexts, emphasizing the development of general language proficiency. This approach equips learners with the linguistic tools needed for diverse situations, such as casual conversations, reading for pleasure, or navigating daily life (Ren, 2022). The broad applicability of EGP vocabulary underscores its importance in fostering functional language skills and building confidence among learners. English for Specific Purposes (ESP) targets vocabulary tailored to specialized fields, such as medicine, engineering, or business. In these contexts, the precise and accurate use of terminology is vital for professional competence and effective participation within specific domains. Mastery of ESP vocabulary enables learners to comprehend technical materials, engage in domain-specific discussions, and perform tasks requiring specialized language (M Al Zahrani, 2022). As a result, ESP vocabulary instruction directly aligns with the learners' professional or academic goals, making it a key component of targeted language education. Understanding the distinctions and overlaps in vocabulary acquisition between EGP and ESP is critical for developing effective teaching methodologies. Both approaches play complementary roles in equipping learners with the lexical knowledge necessary for their individual needs and aspirations.

The contextual relevance of pedagogical approaches in language teaching is fundamental to ensure effective learning outcomes. Language acquisition does not occur in a vacuum; it is deeply influenced by learners' goals, needs, interests, and the contexts in which the language will be used. Pedagogical strategies must therefore be tailored to address these factors, bridging the gap between theoretical knowledge and practical application (Noroozi *et al.*, 2024). In English for General Purposes (EGP), teaching methodologies emphasize broad communicative competence. Approaches such as task-based learning and communicative language teaching are particularly effective, as they mirror real-life scenarios and provide learners with the necessary versatile language skills. These strategies prioritize adaptability, enabling students to function in a variety of everyday contexts and fostering general fluency (Maity, 2024). As for English for Specific Purposes (ESP), the contextual demands are narrower and more specialized. Pedagogical

approaches must focus on specific jargon, represented in industry-specific terminology and conventions. Methods such as content-based instruction and case study analysis allow learners to engage with authentic materials and scenarios relevant to their professional or academic domains. This alignment ensures that learners acquire not only language skills but also the ability to apply them effectively and communicatively in specific fields and contexts.

1.1. Problem Statement

Teaching vocabulary for both general and specific purposes presents distinct challenges that demand nuanced instructional approaches. In English for General Purposes (EGP), the primary challenge lies in the sheer breadth and wide range of vocabulary. Instructors must prioritize high-frequency words while fostering learners' ability to infer meanings from context, given the diversity of everyday language use. Additionally, maintaining learner motivation can be difficult, as EGP often lacks the immediate practical relevance seen in more targeted language instruction. English for Specific Purposes (ESP) demands a focus on specialized terminology, which can be complex and unfamiliar to learners (Salimi, 2022). Teaching these terms often involves integrating domain-specific knowledge, requiring instructors to collaborate with subject matter experts or develop a deeper understanding of the field themselves. Another challenge is balancing specialized vocabulary instruction with general linguistic competence, ensuring learners can communicate effectively beyond their niche contexts (Ghajarieh, 2024). Despite the growing body of research in both ESP and EGP, comparative studies of their methodologies remain limited. Existing research often focuses on one approach in isolation, overlooking the potential for cross-pollination of techniques. For instance, insights from EGP's communicative teaching methods could enhance ESP instruction, while ESP's targeted strategies might benefit advanced EGP learners. Addressing these gaps could lead to more holistic and effective language teaching practices.

1.2. Research Objectives

1. To identify and analyse the methodologies used in teaching ESP vocabulary.
2. To examine the methodologies utilized in teaching EGP vocabulary.
3. To compare effectiveness of different pedagogical paradigms in ESP and EGP vocabulary instruction.

4. To explore the implications of findings for language teaching practice and curriculum development.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Mirsharapovna (2022) argued that the methodology often includes task-based learning and problem-solving exercises that mirror professional scenarios, fostering practical communication skills. Kamolovna (2022) argued that English for General Purposes (EGP) focuses on developing broad language skills applicable to a wide range of everyday situations. Its primary objective is to enhance learners' overall proficiency in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, without being tied to a specific domain or profession. Shah (2021) examined that Task-Based Learning (TBL) is a student-centred pedagogical approach that emphasizes learning through the completion of meaningful tasks. Unlike traditional methods that focus on direct instruction of grammar or vocabulary, TBL engages learners in real-world activities, such as problem-solving, discussions, or project work, where language use is integral to task completion. This approach promotes active learning by encouraging collaboration and authentic communication. TBL is particularly effective in fostering fluency and confidence, as it prioritizes practical language use over theoretical knowledge. By integrating tasks relevant to learners' contexts, TBL supports the development of both linguistic competence and functional skills. Boichenko *et al.* (2022) pointed out that Content-Based Instruction (CBI) is a pedagogical approach that integrates language learning with subject-specific content. Instead of teaching language in isolation, CBI uses topics from academic or professional fields as the medium for instruction, allowing learners to develop linguistic skills while acquiring knowledge in areas relevant to their goals. This dual focus fosters deeper engagement, as learners find the content meaningful and directly applicable to real-world contexts.

Ouadoud (2021) analysed that Genre-based approaches focus on teaching language through the exploration of specific text types or genres, such as reports, essays, or business emails. This method emphasizes the social purpose and structural features of different genres, helping learners understand how language varies according to context and audience. Sanabria-Z (2024) stated that Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)

emphasizes the development of learners' ability to communicate effectively in real-life situations. It prioritizes fluency and functional language use over strict grammatical accuracy, encouraging students to interact meaningfully through activities such as role-plays, discussions, and group tasks. Cappiali (2023) pointed out that mnemonics and memory strategies are powerful tools for enhancing vocabulary acquisition and retention in language learning. Mnemonics involve creating associations between new words and familiar concepts, such as using acronyms, rhymes, or visual imagery to make information more memorable. These techniques simplify the learning process by leveraging the brain's natural preference for patterns and connections.

2.1. Research Gaps

The comparative analysis of methodologies in English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for General Purposes (EGP) remains limited, despite the distinct needs and goals of learners in each context. Most existing studies focus on the individual approaches within ESP or EGP, often treating them as separate entities rather than exploring how methods from one domain could inform the other. This lack of comparative research means that insights from EGP, such as communicative or task-based learning, are underexplored in the ESP context, and vice versa. A deeper understanding of how different methodologies impact language acquisition across both fields could lead to more integrated and effective teaching practices, ultimately benefiting learners in both general and specialized contexts (Hu, 2021). There is a pressing need for empirical evidence on vocabulary retention and acquisition in both ESP and EGP. While various teaching methods have been proposed, research on how well specific vocabulary is retained over time, especially in specialized fields, remains scarce. Vocabulary acquisition is critical for language learners, and understanding the long-term retention of both general and domain-specific terms can help refine teaching strategies. Empirical studies could provide clearer insights into effectiveness of different instructional approaches, allowing educators to optimize vocabulary instruction and improve learners' ability to use and recall vocabulary in real-world situations.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Design

A mixed-methods approach combining qualitative and quantitative methods allows for a comprehensive analysis of pedagogical practices in

ESP and EGP. The qualitative component, such as classroom observations and interviews, provides in-depth insights into the teaching dynamics, learner engagement, and instructional effectiveness. This is complemented by quantitative data, gathered through surveys or assessments, which offer measurable evidence of learners' vocabulary acquisition and retention. By integrating both types of data, researchers can triangulate findings to gain a fuller understanding of how different methodologies impact language learning, ensuring a more balanced and nuanced evaluation of teaching strategies.

3.2. Data Collection

The literature review synthesizes findings from recent research (2012 onwards) on ESP and EGP methodologies, focusing on vocabulary acquisition and pedagogical effectiveness, with an emphasis on task-based, content-based, and communicative approaches. Teacher and student questionnaires included Likert-scale questions to assess the perceived effectiveness of teaching methodologies, learner engagement, and vocabulary retention, with participant demographics covering age, proficiency level, and educational background. Classroom observations were guided by criteria evaluating teaching strategies such as learner participation, the use of authentic materials, task relevance, and the integration of specialized vocabulary. These combined methods allowed for a comprehensive comparison of the impact of different pedagogical approaches in both ESP and EGP contexts.

3.3. Sample Population

The sample population included teachers with varying years of experience, ranging from 3 to 20 years, and representing both ESP and EGP contexts. These teachers were selected from the English Language Department of the Deanship of Preparatory Year and Supporting Studies of Imam Abdul Rehman Bin Faisal University, allowing for a comprehensive view of the methodologies used in different settings. The student population comprised students from the Preparatory Year, who came from various private and public schools, studying ESP and EGP courses based on their academic or professional goals. This diversity in both teachers and students provided valuable insights into how different contexts and teaching approaches influence vocabulary acquisition and language learning outcomes.

3.4. Analysis Techniques

The survey responses were analysed using statistical methods, primarily focusing on Likert-scale data to measure the perceived effectiveness of different teaching methodologies in ESP and EGP. Descriptive statistics, such as means and standard deviations, were used to summarize the data, while inferential tests (e.g., t-tests or ANOVAs) were conducted to determine significant differences in responses based on factors like teaching context, years of experience, or student educational level. The qualitative data from open-ended survey questions and classroom observations were analysed using thematic analysis. Key themes and patterns were identified by coding responses, allowing for a deeper understanding of teachers' and students' experiences with various teaching methods. This approach provided insights into how different methodologies were perceived and implemented in practice.

4. RESULTS

4.1. Results

Table 1: Table Caption.

Reliability Statistics	
Cronbach's Alpha	N of Items
.925	19

The Cronbach's Alpha value is 0.925, which indicates excellent internal consistency or reliability for the scale used in this survey. Typically, a Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.70 or above is considered acceptable, and values above 0.90 are regarded as excellent. The scale with 19 items in the analysis is highly reliable, suggesting that the items measure the same underlying construct consistently.

In summary, the dataset is fully valid and complete, with high internal consistency among the variables, as indicated by the Cronbach's Alpha value. This means that the questionnaire or scale used to measure the constructs (such as satisfaction and preferences) in the study is highly reliable.

4.1.1. Statistical Analysis for Each Objective

Objective 1: Identify and analyse the methodologies used in teaching ESP vocabulary

- Descriptive Statistics:
 - Calculate frequencies and percentages of different methodologies used in ESP vocabulary teaching.

Commented [A1]: Kindly provide table title.

Table 2: Methodologies in ESP Vocabulary Teaching.

Section	Statement	Response	N	%
3.1 Task-Based Learning	Task-Based Learning has helped me learn ESP vocabulary effectively.	1 = Strongly Disagree	17	4.8%
		2 = Disagree	16	4.5%
		3 = Neutral	92	26.1%
		4 = Agree	122	34.6%
		5 = Strongly Agree	106	30.0%
3.2 Content-Based Instruction	Content-Based Instruction has enhanced my understanding of specialized vocabulary in ESP courses.	1 = Strongly Disagree	16	4.5%
		2 = Disagree	21	5.9%
		3 = Neutral	91	25.8%
		4 = Agree	128	36.3%
		5 = Strongly Agree	97	27.5%
3.3 Genre-Based Approach	The Genre-Based Approach has facilitated my acquisition of ESP vocabulary related to specific genres or disciplines.	1 = Strongly Disagree	15	4.2%
		2 = Disagree	14	4.0%
		3 = Neutral	108	30.6%
		4 = Agree	121	34.3%
		5 = Strongly Agree	95	26.9%
3.4 Corpus Linguistics	Corpus Linguistics has contributed to my vocabulary learning in ESP courses by providing authentic language samples.	1 = Strongly Disagree	14	4.0%
		2 = Disagree	18	5.1%
		3 = Neutral	121	34.3%
		4 = Agree	106	30.0%
		5 = Strongly Agree	94	26.6%
3.5 Teacher's Strategies	The teacher's use of diverse strategies has helped learners acquire and retain ESP vocabulary.	1 = Strongly Disagree	23	6.5%
		2 = Disagree	13	3.7%
		3 = Neutral	68	19.3%
		4 = Agree	101	28.6%
		5 = Strongly Agree	148	41.9%

The table highlights students' perceptions of various methodologies used in teaching ESP (English for Specific Purposes) vocabulary. Overall, the results indicate positive feedback for all methods. Task-Based Learning (TBL) was found effective by 64.6% of students, with only 9.3% expressing disagreement and 26.1% remaining neutral. Similarly, Content-Based Instruction (CBI) was positively rated by 63.8% of participants, though 10.4% disagreed and 25.8% were neutral. The Genre-Based Approach also demonstrated effectiveness, with 61.2% of students agreeing or strongly agreeing that it facilitated their vocabulary acquisition, though 30.6% maintained a neutral stance. Corpus Linguistics, while still effective for 56.6% of students, had a higher proportion of neutral responses (34.3%), indicating less perceived impact compared to other

methods. The teacher's use of diverse strategies received the most positive feedback, with 70.5% agreeing or strongly agreeing on its effectiveness, making it the highest-rated approach. Despite the general positivity, the relatively high percentage of neutral responses, particularly for corpus linguistics and genre-based approaches, suggests these methodologies may require more effective implementation and clearer instructional framing.

- **Chi-Square Test:**
 - Perform a chi-square test to assess if there are significant differences in the choice of methodologies across different ESP course types (e.g., Business English vs. Computer English).

Table 3: Caption Title.

		No	Yes	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
Methodologies in ESP Vocabulary Teaching 3.1 Task-Based Learning has helped me learn ESP vocabulary effectively.	1 = Strongly Disagree	15 (4.6%)	2 (7.7%)	9.157	4	0.057
	2 = Disagree	15 (4.6%)	1 (3.8%)			
	3 = Neutral	89 (27.2%)	3 (11.5%)			
	4 = Agree	116 (35.5%)	6 (23.1%)			
	5 = Strongly Agree	92 (28.1%)	14 (53.8%)			
3.2 Content-Based Instruction has enhanced my understanding of specialized	1 = Strongly Disagree	14 (4.3%)	2 (7.7%)	18.687	4	0.001
	2 = Disagree	21 (6.4%)	0 (0.0%)			

Commented [A2]: Kindly provide detail.

vocabulary in ESP courses.	3 = Neutral	87 (26.6%)	4 (15.4%)			
	4 = Agree	124 (37.9%)	4 (15.4%)			
	5 = Strongly Agree	81 (24.8%)	16 (61.5%)			
3.3 Genre-Based Approach has facilitated my acquisition of ESP vocabulary related to specific genres or disciplines.	1 = Strongly Disagree	13 (4.0%)	2 (7.7%)	12.903	4	0.012
	2 = Disagree	14 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)			
	3 = Neutral	102 (31.2%)	6 (23.1%)			
	4 = Agree	117 (35.8%)	4 (15.4%)			
	5 = Strongly Agree	81 (24.8%)	14 (53.8%)			
3.4 Corpus Linguistics has contributed to my vocabulary learning in ESP courses by providing authentic language samples.	1 = Strongly Disagree	13 (4.0%)	1 (3.8%)	22.436	4	< 0.001
	2 = Disagree	17 (5.2%)	1 (3.8%)			
	3 = Neutral	116 (35.5%)	5 (19.2%)			
	4 = Agree	104 (31.8%)	2 (7.7%)			
	5 = Strongly Agree	77 (23.5%)	17 (65.4%)			
3.5 The teacher's use of diverse strategies has helped learners and remember ESP vocabulary.	1 = Strongly Disagree	21 (6.4%)	2 (7.7%)	2.891	4	0.576
	2 = Disagree	11 (3.4%)	2 (7.7%)			
	3 = Neutral	65 (19.9%)	3 (11.5%)			
	4 = Agree	95 (29.1%)	6 (23.1%)			
	5 = Strongly Agree	135 (41.3%)	13 (50.0%)			

A series of chi-square tests were conducted to explore differences between participants enrolled and not enrolled in ESP courses concerning their perceptions of various vocabulary teaching methodologies.

1. **Task-Based Learning:** The analysis revealed no significant difference between the groups regarding the impact of task-based learning on learning ESP vocabulary, $\chi^2(4) = 9.157$, $p = .057$. While 53.8% of the enrolled participants strongly agreed that task-based learning helped them effectively learn ESP vocabulary, only 28.1% of the non-enrolled participants shared the same view.
2. **Content-Based Instruction:** A significant difference was found in how content-based instruction enhanced the understanding of specialized vocabulary in ESP courses, $\chi^2(4) = 18.687$, $p = .001$. The enrolled participants (61.5%) were more likely to strongly agree that content-based instruction enhanced their vocabulary understanding compared to the non-enrolled participants (24.8%).
3. **Genre-Based Approach:** The chi-square test showed a significant difference for the genre-based approach in facilitating ESP vocabulary acquisition related to specific genres or

disciplines, $\chi^2(4) = 12.903$, $p = .012$. A larger proportion of the enrolled participants (53.8%) strongly agreed with the statement that the genre-based approach facilitated their vocabulary acquisition, compared to 24.8% of the non-enrolled participants.

4. **Corpus Linguistics:** The difference between groups was significant regarding corpus linguistics contributing to vocabulary learning by providing authentic language samples, $\chi^2(4) = 22.436$, $p < .001$. A higher percentage of enrolled participants (65.4%) strongly agreed that corpus linguistics aided their vocabulary learning, while only 23.5% of non-enrolled participants strongly agreed.
5. **Teacher's Use of Diverse Strategies:** Finally, there was no significant difference between groups in how the teacher's use of diverse strategies helped in learning and remembering ESP vocabulary, $\chi^2(4) = 2.891$, $p = .576$. A significant number of both enrolled (50.0%) and non-enrolled participants (41.3%) strongly agreed with the usefulness of diverse strategies.

Objective 2: Examine the methodologies utilized in teaching EGP vocabulary

- **Descriptive Statistics:**
 - Compute **frequencies** and **percentages** for the

methodologies used in EGP vocabulary instruction.

Table 4: Caption Title.

Section 4: Methodologies in EGP Vocabulary Teaching	N	%
4.1. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has helped me develop my general English vocabulary effectively.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	17	4.80%
2 = Disagree	12	3.40%
3 = Neutral	78	22.10%
4 = Agree	117	33.10%
5 = Strongly Agree	129	36.50%
4.2. Vocabulary Expansion Techniques (e.g., word families, collocations) have improved my retention of general English vocabulary.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	15	4.20%
2 = Disagree	15	4.20%
3 = Neutral	68	19.30%
4 = Agree	137	38.80%
5 = Strongly Agree	118	33.40%
4.3. Contextual Learning has made it easier for me to understand and use new vocabulary in different contexts in General English courses.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	13	3.70%
2 = Disagree	9	2.50%
3 = Neutral	87	24.60%
4 = Agree	129	36.50%
5 = Strongly Agree	115	32.60%
4.4. Mnemonics and Memory Strategies have helped learn and remember general English vocabulary words.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	16	4.50%
2 = Disagree	11	3.10%
3 = Neutral	83	23.50%
4 = Agree	129	36.50%
5 = Strongly Agree	114	32.30%

Commented [A3]: Kindly provide detail.

The table highlights positive responses regarding various methodologies in General English (EGP) vocabulary teaching. The majority of participants reported that **Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)** was effective in developing their general English vocabulary, with 69.6% agreeing or strongly agreeing. Similarly, **Vocabulary Expansion Techniques** such as word families and collocations were also well-received, with 72.2% of participants noting improved retention of vocabulary. **Contextual**

Learning was beneficial for 69.1% of respondents, who found it easier to understand and use new vocabulary in different contexts. Lastly, **Mnemonics and Memory Strategies** were deemed helpful by 68.8% of participants in aiding vocabulary learning and recall. Overall, these methodologies were all viewed favorably, indicating their effectiveness in enhancing vocabulary acquisition in General English courses.

Chi-square test:

Table 5: Caption Title.

Section 4: Methodologies in EGP Vocabulary Teaching	No (Count, %) [Not Enrolled]	Yes (Count, %) [Enrolled]	Chi-Square	df	Sig.
4.1. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) has helped me develop my general English vocabulary effectively.			12.841	4	0.012*
1 = Strongly Disagree	15 (5.7%)	2 (2.2%)			
2 = Disagree	12 (4.6%)	0 (0.0%)			
3 = Neutral	62 (23.7%)	16 (17.6%)			
4 = Agree	89 (34.0%)	28 (30.8%)			
5 = Strongly Agree	84 (32.1%)	45 (49.5%)			
4.2. Vocabulary Expansion Techniques (e.g., word families, collocations) have improved my retention of general English vocabulary.			14.261	4	0.007*
1 = Strongly Disagree	13 (5.0%)	2 (2.2%)			
2 = Disagree	14 (5.3%)	1 (1.1%)			
3 = Neutral	53 (20.2%)	15 (16.5%)			
4 = Agree	108 (41.2%)	29 (31.9%)			
5 = Strongly Agree	74 (28.2%)	44 (48.4%)			

Commented [A4]: Kindly provide detail.

4.3. Contextual Learning has made it easier for me to understand and use new vocabulary in different contexts in General English courses.			11.993	4	0.017*
1 = Strongly Disagree	12 (4.6%)	1 (1.1%)			
2 = Disagree	9 (3.4%)	0 (0.0%)			
3 = Neutral	70 (26.7%)	17 (18.7%)			
4 = Agree	96 (36.6%)	33 (36.3%)			
5 = Strongly Agree	75 (28.6%)	40 (44.0%)			
4.4. Mnemonics and Memory Strategies have helped learn and remember general English vocabulary words.			11.76	4	0.019*
1 = Strongly Disagree	15 (5.7%)	1 (1.1%)			
2 = Disagree	11 (4.2%)	0 (0.0%)			
3 = Neutral	67 (25.6%)	16 (17.6%)			
4 = Agree	91 (34.7%)	38 (41.8%)			
5 = Strongly Agree	78 (29.8%)	36 (39.6%)			

A series of chi-square tests were conducted to examine the differences between participants currently enrolled in EGP courses and those not enrolled concerning their perceptions of different methodologies in EGP vocabulary teaching

1. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT):

There was a significant difference between the two groups in how CLT impacted the development of general English vocabulary, $\chi^2(4) = 12.841$, $p = .012$. Those enrolled in EGP courses reported higher levels of agreement with the statement that CLT helped in vocabulary development (49.5% strongly agreed) compared to those not enrolled (32.1% strongly agreed).

2. Vocabulary Expansion Techniques:

A significant difference was found regarding the impact of vocabulary expansion techniques on vocabulary retention, $\chi^2(4) = 14.261$, $p = .007$. A larger percentage of participants in the enrolled group strongly agreed that vocabulary expansion

techniques improved their retention (48.4%) compared to the non-enrolled group (28.2%).

3. Contextual Learning:

The difference between groups was also significant for contextual learning, $\chi^2(4) = 11.993$, $p = .017$. Enrolled participants were more likely to strongly agree that contextual learning helped them understand and use new vocabulary in different contexts (44.0%) compared to non-enrolled participants (28.6%).

4. Mnemonics and Memory Strategies:

The use of mnemonics and memory strategies also differed significantly between groups, $\chi^2(4) = 11.760$, $p = .019$. A higher percentage of enrolled participants strongly agreed that these strategies helped learn and remember vocabulary (39.6%) compared to non-enrolled participants (29.8%).

Objective 3: Compare effectiveness of different pedagogical paradigms in ESP and EGP vocabulary instruction

Table 6: Paired Samples Statistics and Test Results for ESP and EGP Vocabulary.

Measure	Mean (SD)	Mean Difference (SD)	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	t	df	p-value
ESP Vocabulary	18.98 (4.692)	3.314 (2.757)	[3.026, 3.603]	22.585	352	.0001
EGP Vocabulary	15.67 (3.707)					

The paired samples t-test was conducted to compare the means of ESP Vocabulary and EGP Vocabulary. The results showed a significant difference between the two vocabulary scores, with a mean difference of 3.314 (SD = 2.757), $t(352) = 22.585$, $p < 0.001$. This indicates that participants' ESP vocabulary scores ($M = 18.98$, $SD = 4.692$) were significantly higher than their EGP vocabulary scores

($M = 15.67$, $SD = 3.707$).

The confidence interval for the mean difference was [3.026, 3.603], further supporting the significant difference between the two vocabulary measures. The effect size, measured by Cohen's $d = 1.202$, suggests a large effect, indicating a substantial difference between the two types of vocabulary.

In summary, the data suggest that participants

performed better on the ESP vocabulary task compared to the EGP vocabulary task, with a significant and large effect size.

Objective 4: Explore the implications of findings for language teaching practice and curriculum development

- **Descriptive Statistics:**
 - Calculate the **mean** and **standard deviation** for Likert-scale responses regarding satisfaction and preferences for vocabulary teaching methodologies.

Table 7: Caption Title.

Statement	N	%
5.1. Overall, I am satisfied with the methodologies used in my ESP courses for teaching vocabulary.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	16	4.5%
2 = Disagree	15	4.2%
3 = Neutral	100	28.3%
4 = Agree	123	34.8%
5 = Strongly Agree	99	28.0%
5.2. Overall, I am satisfied with the methodologies used in my EGP (English for General Purposes) courses for teaching vocabulary.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	16	4.5%
2 = Disagree	11	3.1%
3 = Neutral	89	25.2%
4 = Agree	131	37.1%
5 = Strongly Agree	106	30.0%
5.3. I prefer the methodologies used in ESP courses for learning vocabulary over those used in EGP courses.		
1 = Strongly Disagree	16	4.5%
2 = Disagree	15	4.2%
3 = Neutral	136	38.5%
4 = Agree	96	27.2%
5 = Strongly Agree	90	25.5%
5.4. I would like to see more variety in the methodologies used for teaching vocabulary in both ESP and EGP courses		
1 = Strongly Disagree	15	4.2%
2 = Disagree	10	2.8%
3 = Neutral	105	29.7%
4 = Agree	117	33.1%
5 = Strongly Agree	106	30.0%

Commented [A5]: Kindly provide detail.

The table presents the results of participants' overall satisfaction and preferences regarding the methodologies used in ESP and EGP courses for teaching vocabulary.

1. **Satisfaction with ESP Methodologies (5.1):**
The majority of respondents expressed satisfaction with the methodologies used in ESP courses, with 34.8% agreeing and 28.0% strongly agreeing. However, a smaller portion (4.5%) strongly disagreed.
2. **Satisfaction with EGP Methodologies (5.2):** A similar trend was observed for EGP courses, where 37.1% agreed and 30.0% strongly agreed. Again, 4.5% strongly disagreed.
3. **Preference for ESP over EGP Methodologies (5.3):** When comparing ESP and EGP courses, 38.5% of participants were neutral, while 27.2% preferred ESP methodologies, and 25.5%

strongly agreed with this preference. A smaller percentage (4.5%) strongly disagreed.

4. **Desire for More Variety in Methodologies (5.4):** A significant portion of respondents (33.1%) agreed, and 30.0% strongly agreed, that they would like to see more variety in the methodologies used in both ESP and EGP courses. Only 4.2% strongly disagreed.

Overall, while many students are satisfied with the methodologies in both ESP and EGP courses, there is a notable preference for more variety in teaching vocabulary and a slight inclination toward ESP methodologies.

Correlation Analysis:

- Use **Pearson's correlation** to assess the relationship between satisfaction levels and perceived effectiveness of the teaching methodologies in ESP and EGP courses.

Table 8: Caption Title.

Correlations				
ESP Vocabulary	Pearson Correlation	1	.809**	.818**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	353	353	353
EGP Vocabulary	Pearson Correlation	.809**	1	.840**

Commented [A6]: Kindly provide detail.

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000
	N	353	353	353
	Pearson Correlation	.818**	.840**	1
Overall satisfaction	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	
	N	353	353	353

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationships between ESP vocabulary, EGP vocabulary, and overall satisfaction. The results revealed the following significant correlations:

- **ESP Vocabulary and EGP Vocabulary:** There was a strong positive correlation between ESP vocabulary and EGP vocabulary, $r(353) = .809$, $p < .01$. This indicates that as students' knowledge of ESP vocabulary increases, their proficiency in general English vocabulary also tends to improve.
- **ESP Vocabulary and Overall Satisfaction:** A strong positive correlation was found between ESP vocabulary and overall satisfaction, $r(353) = .818$, $p < .01$. This suggests that higher levels of ESP vocabulary proficiency are associated with

greater overall satisfaction with the teaching methodologies used in the course.

- **EGP Vocabulary and Overall Satisfaction:** The correlation between EGP vocabulary and overall satisfaction was also strong, $r(353) = .840$, $p < .01$. This indicates that as students' general English vocabulary improves, their overall satisfaction with the course methodologies tends to increase.

All correlations were statistically significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed), indicating robust and meaningful relationships between vocabulary proficiency (both ESP and EGP) and overall satisfaction.

Here is the table summarizing the descriptive statistics for various aspects of the course experience and methodologies in ESP and EGP vocabulary teaching:

Table 9: Caption Title.

Statement	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Course Experience	353	0	2	0.33	0.589
3.1 Task-Based Learning	353	1	5	3.80	1.068
3.2 Content-Based Instruction	353	1	5	3.76	1.061
3.3 Genre-Based Approach	353	1	5	3.76	1.029
3.4 Corpus Linguistics	353	1	5	3.70	1.041
3.5 Teacher's Use of Diverse Strategies	353	1	5	3.96	1.161
ESP Vocabulary	353	5	25	18.98	4.692
4.1 Communicative Language Teaching (CLT)	353	1	5	3.93	1.074
4.2 Vocabulary Expansion Techniques	353	1	5	3.93	1.038
4.3 Contextual Learning	353	1	5	3.92	1.001
4.4 Mnemonics and Memory Strategies	353	1	5	3.89	1.040
EGP Vocabulary	353	4	20	15.67	3.707
5.1 Satisfaction with ESP Methodologies	353	1	5	3.78	1.046
Satisfaction with EGP Methodologies	353	1	5	3.85	1.032
Preference for ESP over EGP	353	1	5	3.65	1.048
Satisfaction with Both Courses	353	1	5	3.82	1.031
Overall Satisfaction	353	4	20	15.09	3.429

Commented [A7]: Kindly provide detail.

4.2. Interpretation

The instrument used in the study demonstrated excellent internal reliability, as indicated by a Cronbach's alpha of 0.925, well above the accepted threshold of 0.70. This confirms that the 19 survey items consistently measured the intended constructs, validating the scale's use for assessing satisfaction and teaching methodology preferences. Regarding ESP vocabulary instruction, student feedback was largely positive across all evaluated methodologies. Task-Based Learning (TBL) was considered effective

by 64.6%, while Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and the Genre-Based Approach received favorable ratings from 63.8% and 61.2% of respondents, respectively. Corpus Linguistics showed moderate effectiveness, endorsed by 56.6%, but had the highest neutrality (34.3%), suggesting ambiguity in its impact. The teacher's varied strategies emerged as the most successful approach, with 70.5% agreement or strong agreement. However, the comparatively high percentage of neutral responses for corpus linguistics and genre-based methods indicates the need for clearer implementation or contextualization.

Chi-square analyses compared responses between students enrolled in ESP courses and those not enrolled. While Task-Based Learning did not show a statistically significant group difference ($p = .057$), CBI ($p = .001$), the Genre-Based Approach ($p = .012$), and Corpus Linguistics ($p < .001$) did. In these cases, enrolled students showed significantly greater endorsement, suggesting that direct engagement with ESP contexts enhances perceived effectiveness. No significant difference was found regarding teachers' strategic variety ($p = .576$), with high agreement across both groups. For EGP vocabulary instruction, all four examined methodologies received substantial support. Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) was found helpful by 69.6%, Vocabulary Expansion Techniques by 72.2%, Contextual Learning by 69.1%, and Mnemonics and Memory Strategies by 68.8%. These methods were perceived as effective in building and retaining general vocabulary. Significant differences emerged in chi-square analyses between enrolled and non-enrolled students for all methods, with enrolled students consistently reporting higher rates of strong agreement (e.g., CLT: 49.5% vs. 32.1%, $p = .012$; Vocabulary Expansion: 48.4% vs. 28.2%, $p = .007$). To compare overall pedagogical effectiveness, a paired samples t-test revealed a statistically significant advantage for ESP vocabulary instruction ($M = 18.98$, $SD = 4.692$) over EGP ($M = 15.67$, $SD = 3.707$), with a mean difference of 3.314, $t(352) = 22.585$, $p < .001$. The effect size was large (Cohen's $d = 1.202$), confirming the practical significance of the observed difference. Participant satisfaction with both ESP and EGP methodologies was generally high. For ESP, 62.8% reported satisfaction (agree/strongly agree); for EGP, 67.1% did the same. Although 38.5% remained neutral when asked to choose between the two, 52.7% expressed some preference for ESP. A majority also favored greater variety in teaching methods, with 63.1% either agreeing or strongly agreeing. Finally, Pearson correlation analysis revealed strong positive relationships between vocabulary proficiency and overall satisfaction. ESP and EGP vocabulary scores were closely linked ($r = .809$), and both correlated strongly with overall satisfaction ($r = .818$ and $r = .840$, respectively), all significant at $p < .01$. These results underscore the interconnectedness of vocabulary mastery and perceived instructional quality in both domains.

4.3. Comparative Analysis

There are key differences in effectiveness of pedagogical paradigms for teaching ESP (English for Specific Purposes) compared to EGP (English for

General Purposes). ESP methodologies tend to focus on specialized vocabulary, content, and context relevant to specific fields or professions, which makes them more effective for learners aiming to develop proficiency in particular domains. Techniques such as Content-Based Instruction (CBI) and Task-Based Learning (TBL) are especially beneficial for ESP, as they provide learners with practical, context-driven language use. EGP methodologies, which emphasize broader language skills and general vocabulary acquisition, are effective for building foundational language proficiency. Pedagogical approaches like Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and Vocabulary Expansion Techniques work well for EGP learners, fostering more versatile language use across various contexts. The key difference lies in the focus of ESP methodologies on domain-specific language and content, while EGP approaches prioritize general communication and vocabulary, thus serving different learner needs and objectives.

5. DISCUSSION

5.1. Interpretation of Results

The findings from this research align with existing studies in highlighting the distinct roles of ESP and EGP methodologies in language acquisition. While ESP's focus on specialized vocabulary and authentic materials is consistent with research emphasizing domain-specific learning, EGP's emphasis on communicative competence reflects established theories of general language proficiency. Certain methodologies, such as task-based learning in EGP, work well due to their focus on fluency and real-world application, while content-based instruction in ESP is effective because it integrates language learning with professional or academic contexts. Effectiveness of these methodologies stems from their alignment with learners' immediate needs—general communication skills in EGP and specialized proficiency in ESP.

5.2. Implications for Practice

Findings from comparative studies on ESP and EGP methodologies can significantly improve teaching practices by offering insights into the most effective approaches for vocabulary acquisition and retention. By identifying successful strategies in both contexts, educators can adopt a more flexible, integrated approach that meets learners' diverse needs. For example, communicative methods in EGP could be adapted for ESP to foster practical

communication skills, while task-based or content-based strategies in ESP could enrich EGP instruction by providing real-world contexts for vocabulary use. For curriculum design, these findings suggest a need for a more context-sensitive approach. Curricula should incorporate task-oriented activities, authentic materials, and a balance of general and specialized vocabulary, ensuring learners gain both foundational and domain-specific skills. Additionally, teacher training programs should emphasize the development of flexible pedagogical skills, equipping instructors to design effective, learner-centred lessons that cater to the varying needs of ESP and EGP students. Ongoing professional development should also include exposure to the latest research on vocabulary retention and language acquisition to enhance teaching effectiveness.

6. LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

Sample size and geographic limitations are common challenges in language education research, particularly in comparative studies of ESP and EGP methodologies. Many studies rely on small sample sizes, which may not represent the broader learner population, limiting the generalizability of the findings. Additionally, geographic constraints often restrict research to specific regions or cultural contexts, failing to account for diverse educational settings, learner backgrounds, or language proficiency levels. This narrow scope can lead to findings that may not be applicable universally, making it difficult to conclude global best practices in language teaching. There is ample scope for future research to address these limitations. Larger, more diverse sample sizes would allow for more robust conclusions about effectiveness of various teaching methodologies. Expanding research to include multiple geographic contexts could further explore how cultural and environmental factors influence language acquisition. Future studies could also investigate the long-term impact of vocabulary retention in both ESP and EGP contexts, helping refine instructional practices and contribute to the development of evidence-based curriculum designs.

7. CONCLUSION

The key results from comparative studies of ESP and EGP methodologies highlight significant differences and similarities in their approaches to

vocabulary acquisition. In ESP, a strong emphasis on specialized vocabulary and authentic materials was found to improve learners' ability to comprehend and use domain-specific language effectively. Task-based and content-based methods in ESP were particularly successful in bridging the gap between language learning and real-world application. In contrast, EGP's focus on general language proficiency through communicative methods allowed learners to develop a broad vocabulary base, fostering fluency in diverse contexts (Gohar, 2023). The significance of these findings lies in their potential to inform more integrated and flexible teaching practices. Understanding the strengths of both ESP and EGP approaches enables educators to tailor their strategies to meet learners' specific needs, whether in professional, academic, or general contexts. Moreover, these results underscore the importance of incorporating both general and specialized vocabulary into curricula, ensuring students are equipped with the language skills required for both every day and professional communication.

8. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

To extend the research on ESP and EGP methodologies, future studies could explore additional contexts, such as online language learning platforms, blended learning environments, or immersion programs. These modern learning settings offer unique opportunities to investigate how digital tools, multimedia resources, and virtual interactions affect vocabulary acquisition and teaching effectiveness in both general and specific language contexts. By expanding the scope of research to include these diverse educational formats, researchers can gain valuable insights into the evolving landscape of language learning (Mauludin, 2021). Future research could examine the integration of other methodologies, such as inquiry-based learning or flipped classrooms, within ESP and EGP contexts. These approaches encourage active learning, critical thinking, and learner autonomy, which could enhance vocabulary retention and application. Exploring the synergy between these innovative methodologies and traditional techniques could provide a more comprehensive understanding of how different teaching methods contribute to language proficiency, particularly in professional and academic environments.

AUTHORS BIODATA: Sami Al-Mubireek holds an MA in English as a Second/Foreign Language and a Ph.D. in Teaching English to Speakers of Other Languages (TESOL) from Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, USA. He served as the Head of the English Language Department for five years (2010-2015) at the University

of Dammam, now known as Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University. He is an associate professor and the Head of the English Language Department, Prep Year Deanship at Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University in Saudi Arabia. His main research interest focuses on the use of technology and its applications in English Language Teaching (ELT). Email: smubireek@iau.edu.sa.

Jasiya Rafique holds dual Master's degrees in Education and English Literature from the University of Kashmir, India. Since 2011, she has been serving as a lecturer at Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University in Saudi Arabia. Alongside her teaching responsibilities, she has held the role of Academic Coordinator for the Colleges of Health, Science, and Community Colleges. She currently serves as the Academic Coordinator for the Colleges of Business and Computer Science. Her primary research interests focus on teaching pedagogies and teacher professional development. Email: jmrafiq@iau.edu.sa

Anu Dhawan holds a BA (Hons) and an MA in English from Chandigarh University, India. She currently serves as a lecturer at Imam Abdulrahman Bin Faisal University (formerly the University of Dammam) in Saudi Arabia. With over 20 years of experience in higher education, she has made significant contributions to curriculum development, teaching, and academic mentoring. In addition to her instructional responsibilities, she has played a key role as an exam coordinator, ensuring the integrity and efficiency of assessment processes. Passionate about advancing language education, her research interests focus on the integration of advanced technologies into language teaching to enhance learning outcomes and student engagement. Email: asdarwan@iau.edu.sa

REFERENCES

- Boichenko, M., Kozlova, T., Kulichenko, A., Shramko, R., & Polyezhayev, Y. (2022). Creative activity at higher education institutions: Ukrainian pedagogical overview. *Amazonia Investiga*, 11(59), 161-171.
- Bolton, K., & Jenks, C. (2022). World Englishes and English for specific purposes (ESP). *World Englishes*, 41(4), 495-511.
- Cappiali, T. M. (2023). A Paradigm Shift for a More Inclusive, Equal, and Just Academia? Towards a Transformative-Emancipatory Pedagogy. *Education Sciences*, 13(9), 876.
- Ghajarieh, A., & Mirzabeigi, N. (2024). Investigating teacher talk in EAP and EGP classes: In pursuit of communicative features. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 16(3), 750-762.
- Gohar, R. H. A. (2023). A Microlearning ESP Program to Develop University Students' Vocabulary and Reduce Their Cognitive Load. *CDELT Occasional Papers in the Development of English Education*, 83(1), 453-476.
- Hu, R. (2021, February). RETRACTED: Research on Countermeasures for the Successful Transition from Egp Teachers to Esp Teachers in Colleges Based on Computer Information Technology. In *Journal of Physics: Conference Series* (Vol. 1744, No. 3, p. 032211). IOP Publishing.
- Kamolovna, N. Z. (2022). DIFFERENCES AND SIMILARITIES BETWEEN ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES (ESP) AND ENGLISH FOR GENERAL PURPOSES (EGP) TEACHERS. *British View*, 7(4).
- M Al Zahrani, S., & Chaudhary, A. (2022). Vocabulary learning strategies in ESP context: Knowledge and implication. *Arab World English Journal (AWEL) Volume*, 13.
- Maity, S., & Deroy, A. (2024). The future of learning in the age of generative AI: Automated question generation and assessment with large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.09576*.
- Martín-González, D., & Chaves-Yuste, B. (2024). From English for general purposes to English for specific purposes: The role of motivation in higher education in Spain. *ESP Today*, 12(1), 26-48.
- Mauludin, L. A. (2021). Students' perceptions of the most and the least motivating teaching strategies in ESP classes. *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, 9(1), 139-157.
- Mirsharapovna, S. Z. (2022). The Differences and Similarities between English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for General Purposes (EGP) Teachers. *Journal of New Century Innovations*, 11(2), 70-75.
- Noroozi, O., Soleimani, S., Farrokhnia, M., & Banihashem, S. K. (2024). Generative AI in Education: Pedagogical, Theoretical, and Methodological Perspectives. *International Journal of Technology in Education*, 7(3), 373-385.
- Ouadoud, M., Rida, N., & Chafiq, T. (2021). Overview of E-learning Platforms for Teaching and Learning. *Int. J. Recent Contributions Eng. Sci. IT*, 9(1), 50-70.
- Ren, X. (2022). Evaluating lexical complexity from EGP to ESP textbooks. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 13(5), 974-980.

Commented [A8]: Kindly add more References and in text citations. Less than 25 references are not acceptable.

- Salimi, M., & Moradi, A. (2022). Comparative Study of Higher-order Thinking in EGP Textbooks versus ESP Textbooks. *Journal of English Language Research*, 3(1), 39-54.
- Sanabria-Z, J., Cruz-Sandoval, M., Moreno-Romo, A., Bosch-Gómez, S., & Ramírez-Montoya, M. S. (2024). Research foresight in bridging open science and open innovation: Overview based on the complex thinking paradigm. *International Journal of Innovation Studies*, 8(1), 59-75.
- Shah, R. K., & Campus, S. (2021). Conceptualizing and defining pedagogy. *IOSR journal of research & method in education*, 11(1), 6-29