

---

## A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF INTERFIXED UNITS IN PEDAGOGICAL DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Berdiyev S.S

EFL And ESL Instructor, Denau Institute Of Entrepreneurship And Pedagogy, Uzbekistan

**ABSTRACT:** This study compares the semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed units in English and Uzbek within pedagogical discourse. Interfixed units, integral to effective communication in educational contexts, are critical in conveying nuanced meanings, facilitating teacher-student interactions, and supporting knowledge transmission. By examining their use across English and Uzbek, this research aims to uncover the cultural and linguistic factors that shape the semantics of these units and influence their pragmatic function in teaching settings. The findings provide insights into the cultural and linguistic distinctions between English and Uzbek educational discourse, offering implications for bilingual education and cross-linguistic understanding.

**KEYWORDS:** comparative analysis, interfixed units, pedagogical discourse, semantic features, pragmatic features, English, Uzbek, educational communication, bilingual education, cross-linguistic comparison.

### INTRODUCTION

Interfixed units in language serve as powerful tools to encapsulate specialized meanings within academic and pedagogical discourse. English and Uzbek, despite their structural differences, both use interfixed morphology to create meaningful terminologies in education. In academic and pedagogical discourse, specific linguistic units help in constructing terminology that conveys technical, instructional, and procedural knowledge essential to the field. Interfixed units—morphological structures connecting words or roots with specific affixes—are instrumental in creating these terminologies, offering new insights into meaning and function across different languages. English and Uzbek, representing two typologically distinct languages, utilize interfixed units in pedagogical contexts with varying emphasis on semantics (the study of meaning) and pragmatics (contextual meaning in use). This paper addresses how interfixed units contribute to the meaning and functional use of pedagogical terms in both languages.

This scientific work aims to analyze the semantic functions of interfixed units in English and Uzbek pedagogical contexts, to investigate pragmatic implications, specifically how these units convey cultural and contextual nuances, to contribute to cross-linguistic studies on morphology in specialized domains, such as educational discourse.

Scholarly work on interfixes has primarily focused on their morphological role in linguistic compounding and their functional significance in specialized fields (Booij, 2005; Plag, 2003). Booij (2005) highlights the value of interfixes in Dutch and German, showing their potential to facilitate

the seamless blending of root words while maintaining a focus on syntactic cohesion. While extensive studies exist on European languages, there is limited research on how interfixed units function in agglutinative languages like Uzbek, which differs significantly in morphological structure from English.

In English, interfixed units are used to create terms that support standardized meanings in educational discourse, aligning with educational linguistics theories that underscore the importance of terminological precision (Crystal, 2010). According to Crystal (2010), interfixed forms contribute to educational language by enhancing clarity and transferability, allowing terms like "teacher-student" or "learner-centered" to gain cross-cultural traction. Plag (2003) further points out that English's morphological flexibility enables the creation of specific, standardized pedagogical terms that ensure clarity across contexts.

Uzbek, on the other hand, reflects a distinct cultural and educational paradigm through its interfixed units. Research by Abdullaev (2018) on Central Asian linguistic structures indicates that agglutinative languages like Uzbek often encode additional layers of meaning and respect through interfixed morphology, particularly in fields related to education and social hierarchy. Uzbek interfixed units, therefore, convey culturally specific connotations, often embedding hierarchical respect, which contrasts with the relatively neutral tone of English educational language.

## METHODOLOGY

A qualitative comparative analysis was conducted, examining interfixed terms from English and Uzbek educational literature. The corpus included glossaries from English teacher training resources and Uzbek pedagogical textbooks, which allowed for a systematic examination of interfixed units and their respective semantic and pragmatic roles.

English Corpus: Educational terms were sourced from journals and training materials in English, focusing on terminologies that include interfixed units for specific pedagogical concepts.

Uzbek Corpus: Uzbek terms were drawn from pedagogical texts and educational glossaries, with an emphasis on interfixes in terms that carry distinct social or relational meanings.

According to Booij (2005), semantics in compounding morphology relies heavily on the meanings that individual components bring to the compound. In English, interfixed pedagogical terms like "learner-centered" are semantically transparent, designed to convey straightforward relationships between educational elements. This semantic transparency supports the global use of English as a medium for educational discourse, ensuring terms remain accessible across regions (Crystal, 2010).

In Uzbek, the semantic characteristics of interfixed terms reveal more localized meanings. Terms like "o'qituvchi-o'quvchi" (teacher-student) are not only compounds but also convey a deeper relational significance. Linguists like Abdullaev (2018) emphasize that in Uzbek, educational terms often embed relational hierarchies, indicating both the structure of the relationship and respect for roles within the educational hierarchy. This additional semantic layer reflects Uzbek's collectivist and respect-oriented culture, which values interpersonal dynamics in educational contexts.

Pragmatics, as Levinson (1983) describes, involves the contextual aspects of language use. English interfixed units such as "student-focused" carry a neutral pragmatic tone that aligns with a universalized model of education. According to Plag (2003), the pragmatic effect of English educational terms is to standardize meaning, making them applicable across different cultural and regional educational systems without specific cultural overtones.

In contrast, Uzbek's interfixed units often carry implicit pragmatic meanings tied to social values. Abdullaev (2018) argues that Uzbek pedagogical terms emphasize relational context and respect, particularly evident in terms like "ustoz-o'quvchi" (mentor-student). This reflects a pragmatics of respect, which aligns with Uzbek social norms in educational discourse, where the teacher-student relationship is culturally revered and often mirrors broader societal values.

The findings suggest that English educational discourse prioritizes clarity and neutrality through interfixed units, supporting a globalized approach to teaching and learning. This approach aligns with what Crystal (2010) describes as the "internationalization of academic language," which seeks standardization to facilitate widespread comprehension. Uzbek, with its emphasis on respect and relational hierarchy, presents a contrasting model in which interfixed terms are culturally embedded, reflecting a pedagogy that places high value on interpersonal roles and social norms.

For educational linguistics, this study highlights the significance of understanding interfixed units within the cultural and social context of language use.

For cross-linguistic studies, the comparison between English and Uzbek adds a layer of understanding on how different languages approach terminology in specialized domains, especially in fields like education where social hierarchy and cultural values are influential. The study of interfixed units in English and Uzbek pedagogical discourse reveals significant differences in how languages encode meaning and contextual cues. English interfixed units emphasize clarity and universality, supporting a globalized educational framework. Uzbek, on the other hand, uses interfixes to incorporate social respect and relational dynamics, aligning with a collectivist approach to pedagogy. Future studies may expand this research to other languages and explore the impact of globalization on pedagogical terminology in Uzbek and similar languages.

## REFERENCES

1. Parpibayeva, M. Z. Q. (2023). Educational Discourse in Uzbek and English: A Comparative Analysis (Literature Review). *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences*, 1(01), 74-77.
2. Nizomova, M. B. (2022). Problems of systematization of pedagogical terms and concepts in the scientific and pedagogical theory of comparable languages. *American journal of philological sciences*, 2(03), 1-6.
3. Baratboyevna, N. M. (2021). Polysemantic features of pedagogical terms in English and Uzbek translation. *Current research journal of philological sciences*, 2(12), 21-25.

4. Khudayberdieva, Z. (2024). Comparative Analysis of Phraseological Units in the English and Uzbek Languages. *Builders Of The Future*, 4(04), 312–315. <https://doi.org/10.37547/builders-v4-i4-67>
5. Canagarajah, S. (Ed.). (2013). *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. Routledge.
6. Tukhtamatova, U.B. Comparative Analysis of Linguocultural Features of English and Uzbek Proverbs and Sayings Verbalizing the Concept of Laziness. *Journal of Asian and African Social Science and Humanities*, 2019.
7. BARATBOYEVNA, N. M. Features of the Formation and Development of Ecological Terms in Languages. *Journalnx*, 6(06), 55-57.
8. Umarova, Nargiza Rustamovna & Yigitaliyeva, Shohsanam. The Realization of the Concept of Goodness in English and Uzbek Proverbs. *PhilPapers*, 2021.
9. Ganieva, Dilafruz Khasanovna. Three Levels of Access in the Semantic Group of “Educational Process Participants” in Uzbek and English Languages. *European Journal of Philological Sciences*, 2020.
10. Soqiyeva, Shirin Shokirovna. A Study of the Pragmatic-Semantic Features of Pronominal Reference Units in English and Uzbek Languages. *Journal of Comparative Linguistics*, 2021.
11. Abdugapparovna, Nafisa Inagamova. Linguocultural and Semantic Features of English and Uzbek Proverbs. *PhilPapers*, 2021.