TEACHING ENGLISH LOANWORDS IN UZBEK LANGUAGE CLASSES: AN INTEGRATIVE APPROACH

Dinara Saitkhanova Ruslanovna
Associate professor, PhD, Tashkent University of Applied Sciences, Tashkent, Uzbekistan
dinara.saitkhanova@mail.ru
https://orcid.org/0009-0004-1227-8154
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24090601

Abstract. This article explores ways to improve the methodology for teaching the meaning and use of English loanwords in Uzbek language classes through an integrative approach. It examines the pedagogical potential of teaching the semantic characteristics of English loanwords, their adaptation to Uzbek, and their appropriate use across communicative contexts and registers. Particular attention is paid to integrating knowledge of Uzbek, English, information technology, and media literacy to enrich students' vocabulary and develop their linguistic and communicative competence. The article provides methodological recommendations for incorporating contextual analysis, comparative activities, problem-based tasks, authentic media texts, and project-based learning into classroom instruction.

Keywords: English loanwords, Anglicisms, Uzbek language teaching, integrative approach, contextual teaching, linguistic competence.

Introduction: Language contact contributes to vocabulary development by introducing words that reflect new technologies, social practices, and forms of communication. English loanwords are increasingly encountered in Uzbek digital communication, education, advertising, and professional discourse. Words such as blog, marketing, onlayn, and startap provide useful material for examining how borrowed vocabulary acquires meaning and functions within Uzbek. Their familiarity, however, does not necessarily indicate that learners understand their contextual meanings, stylistic characteristics, or possible Uzbek equivalents.

Teaching English loanwords in Uzbek language classes therefore requires attention to both lexical knowledge and communicative appropriateness. Students need to understand what a borrowed word means, how it combines with other words, and when its use serves a particular communicative purpose. They should also be able to distinguish between established terminology and expressions whose meaning can be conveyed more clearly through an Uzbek alternative.

An integrative approach offers a framework for addressing these objectives. It connects Uzbek language instruction with English, media literacy, and subject knowledge while maintaining a clear focus on Uzbek language learning outcomes. Within this framework, loanwords become resources for developing semantic awareness, critical reading, and effective communication.

This article discusses the methodological principles of teaching English loanwords through an integrative approach and proposes classroom activities that connect vocabulary analysis with meaningful language use. The discussion is conceptual and methodological; the effectiveness of the proposed activities requires subsequent classroom investigation.

Main part: Teaching borrowed vocabulary should begin with the distinction between a word's origin and its current function in the receiving language. Knowing that a word comes from English does not fully explain its meaning in Uzbek. A borrowed item may retain a specialized meaning, acquire additional associations, or occur in a narrower range of contexts than its English source.

For this reason, teachers should introduce loanwords through complete texts and communicative situations. A word encountered in an advertisement may carry a persuasive function, whereas the same word in an educational text may serve an explanatory purpose. Comparing these contexts helps students identify both the core meaning of the word and the intentions associated with its use.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

Lexical analysis should also address grammatical integration. Students can examine how borrowed words take Uzbek suffixes and participate in Uzbek sentence structures. For example, forms such as “bloglar” and “blogni” allow learners to connect the study of loanwords with previously acquired knowledge of number and case. Such activities demonstrate that borrowed vocabulary functions within the grammatical system of Uzbek.

An integrative approach requires a purposeful connection between learning areas. Each interdisciplinary element should support a specific language objective. English can help learners explore the source meaning of a loanword, while Uzbek language instruction develops their ability to explain and use it in coherent speech and writing. Media literacy contributes strategies for evaluating the word’s function in public communication.

Three principles are particularly relevant. The first is contextualization: vocabulary should be studied in texts that make its meaning and purpose identifiable. The second is comparison: students should examine relationships between English source words, their borrowed forms, and relevant Uzbek equivalents. The third is practical application: learners should use the vocabulary to complete communicative tasks and justify their lexical choices.

These principles encourage students to move beyond memorizing definitions. They support an understanding of how word choice depends on audience, subject matter, and communicative purpose.

The selection of loanwords should reflect learners’ age, language proficiency, and communicative needs. Priority can be given to words that students encounter regularly in educational materials, digital platforms, and everyday interactions. Excessively specialized vocabulary may require substantial explanation without contributing directly to the lesson’s objectives.

Materials should include sufficient context to support interpretation. Short news reports, advertisements, educational announcements, and carefully selected social media posts can provide opportunities for examining contemporary usage. Teachers should check the accuracy and suitability of these texts before using them in class.

A balanced selection should contain examples in which loanwords communicate a necessary concept and examples in which an Uzbek expression may be clearer. This enables students to evaluate vocabulary choices without assuming that borrowing is always preferable or always undesirable. Instruction can be organized into five connected stages.

Students read a short text, identify possible English borrowings, and explain their initial understanding. The teacher uses their responses to determine which meanings require clarification.

Interpreting meaning. Learners examine contextual clues, consult appropriate dictionaries, and formulate definitions in Uzbek. Where relevant, they compare the borrowed meaning with the English source meaning.

Comparing alternatives. Students consider possible Uzbek equivalents and discuss whether substitution preserves the intended meaning, register, and clarity. They recognize that lexical equivalence may depend on context.

Applying vocabulary. Learners write announcements, revise advertisements, or prepare short explanations for a particular audience. They select loanwords or Uzbek alternatives according to the task’s purpose.

Reflecting on choices. Students explain why they used or replaced particular words. This stage makes their reasoning visible and encourages more deliberate vocabulary use.

For example, a text-editing task can ask learners to revise a short announcement containing several English loanwords. Students decide which items are appropriate for the intended readership and which require replacement or explanation. The educational value lies in the justification of these decisions as well as the revised text. Assessment should examine learners’ ability to interpret and use vocabulary in context. Definition-based exercises can check initial understanding, but broader tasks are needed to assess communicative competence. Relevant criteria include semantic accuracy, grammatical correctness, stylistic appropriateness, clarity, and the ability to justify lexical choices.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

Portfolio assessment can document development through annotated texts, vocabulary records, and successive drafts. Peer feedback can also help learners recognize expressions that appear familiar to the writer but remain unclear to the reader.

Further methodological improvement requires classroom evidence. Teachers can compare students' initial and final performances using equivalent contextual tasks and clearly defined assessment criteria. Such investigation would help establish which activities contribute most effectively to accurate understanding, appropriate usage, and sustained vocabulary learning.

Conclusion: Teaching English loanwords in Uzbek language classes involves developing learners' understanding of meaning, grammatical integration, and contextual appropriateness. An integrative approach connects these objectives with English language knowledge, media literacy, and practical communication.

The proposed methodology combines contextual analysis, comparison with Uzbek equivalents, text editing, and reflective vocabulary use. Its central aim is to help students make informed lexical choices and communicate clearly with different audiences. Successful implementation depends on suitable teaching materials, explicit learning objectives, and assessment that considers both understanding and application. Further classroom research is needed to evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed approach and refine it for different learner groups.

References

1. Coyle, D., Hood, P., & Marsh, D. (2010). CLIL: Content and language integrated learning. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009024549.
2. Görlach, M. (Ed.). (2002). An annotated bibliography of European Anglicisms. Oxford University Press.
3. Nation, I. S. P. (2022). Learning vocabulary in another language (3rd ed.). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009093873.
4. Saitkhanova Dinara Ruslanovna. Training in continuous education system: methodology and modern approaches. (2023). European International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies, 3(06), 103-105. https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.eijmrms.22662
5. Schmitt, N., & Schmitt, D. (2020). Vocabulary in language teaching (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
6. Thomason, S. G. (2001). Language contact: An introduction. Edinburgh University Press. edinburghuniversitypress.com
7. Saitkhanova, D. (2026). AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN TEACHING ENGLISH LOANWORD. BG pulse journal, 2(10), 1189-1193.
8. Saitkxanova D. Integrating Local History Materials into English Language Teaching for Non-Linguistic Students //Journal of" Social Sciences: Theory and Practice". – 2026. – Т. 1. – №. 1. – С. 53-58.
9. Khaydarova, R. N. A., Botirova, D. B., Rasulova, N., Tulkunovna, Z. O. R., Saitkhanova, D. R., & Kamalova, S. R. The Role of Critical Thinking and Soft Skills in Enhancing the Social Activity of Female Students.
10. Abdujabarova, K. X., Khanbabaeva, S. R., Xakimova, M. X., Azimova, M. A., Khojamuratova, G. S., & Maxsudbekova, N. D. (2026). INNOVATIVE METHODS OF USING READING AND LISTENING COMPREHENSION METHODOLOGY IN DEVELOPING STUDENTS'COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH. ACTA INNOVATIONS, 505-512.
11. Abdujabborova K. H. Q., Saidova Z. U. TECHNOLOGY OF USING COMMUNICATION EXERCISES TO DEVELOP READING SKILLS IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LESSON //Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences. – 2024. – Т. 4. – №. 24. – С. 11-15.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.