BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg

AN ANALYSIS OF CURRENT PRACTICES IN TEACHING ENGLISH LOANWORD

Dinara Saitkhanova
PhD, Associate professor, Tashkent University of Applied Sciences, Uzbekistan
dinara.saitkhanova@mail.ru
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23507732

Abstract. This article examines current practices in teaching English loanwords in Uzbekistan's educational context, focusing on methodological issues related to explaining their meanings and developing their appropriate use in speech. The discussion addresses the presentation of loanwords in teaching materials, their semantic characteristics, pronunciation, spelling, and relationship with Uzbek equivalents. Particular attention is given to contextualized instruction involving English loanwords used in information technology, mass communication, and everyday interaction. The article considers the pedagogical importance of explaining differences between the original English meanings and the meanings established in Uzbek. It also discusses instructional approaches that take learners' age and language proficiency into account, incorporate practical activities, and develop the ability to use loanwords appropriately.
Keywords: English loanwords, educational context of Uzbekistan, lexical competence, semantic adaptation, pronunciation and spelling, contextualized teaching, appropriate language use.

Introduction: Language contact creates opportunities for the exchange of vocabulary across linguistic communities. English-origin words are particularly relevant to discussions of information technology, business, media, and digital communication, where new concepts often circulate internationally alongside their names. When these words enter another language, their pronunciation, spelling, grammatical behaviour, and meaning may undergo adaptation. Teaching them therefore requires attention to both their English origins and their use within the receiving language.

In the Uzbek context, English loanwords provide a useful connection between vocabulary learning and the language encountered in everyday communication. Words such as marketing, blog, and online can serve as starting points for discussing how borrowed vocabulary expresses new concepts and interacts with existing Uzbek resources. However, familiarity with a word does not necessarily imply a precise understanding of its meaning or appropriate use. Learners may recognize an expression in digital content while remaining uncertain about its spelling, pronunciation, stylistic suitability, or relationship with an Uzbek equivalent.

A distinction is necessary between teaching English vocabulary and teaching English-origin words used in Uzbek. The former involves acquiring lexical items as part of the English language system, whereas the latter concerns understanding borrowed items within Uzbek discourse. These objectives overlap, but they are not identical. A borrowed word may develop a narrower, broader, or otherwise modified meaning in the receiving language. Its pronunciation and grammatical behaviour may also follow Uzbek patterns. Consequently, presenting the original English definition alone may not adequately explain how the word functions in Uzbek.

The identification of English loanwords also requires methodological care. Some English-origin items may enter Uzbek through an intermediary language, while others may appear

temporarily in advertisements or online texts without becoming established borrowings. Loanwords should therefore be distinguished from occasional foreign-language insertions and code-switching. This distinction helps determine which items are appropriate for systematic instruction and prevents the assumption that every English expression encountered in Uzbek communication has the same linguistic status.

An analysis of current teaching practices needs to consider how these distinctions are represented in educational materials and classroom activities. Relevant questions include whether loanwords are introduced through isolated translations or meaningful contexts, whether their adapted meanings are explained, and whether learners practise using them in suitable communicative situations. Attention should also be paid to the treatment of spelling, pronunciation, word formation, and Uzbek alternatives. These dimensions provide a framework for evaluating instructional practice without reducing vocabulary learning to memorization.

The present article addresses the teaching of English loanwords in Uzbekistan, focusing on their presentation, explanation, and practical application in educational contexts. It considers the relationship between linguistic adaptation and instructional choices, with particular attention to semantic understanding and appropriate usage. The discussion aims to establish analytical criteria for examining current practices and to outline methodological approaches that connect loanword instruction with learners' lexical competence and communicative needs.

Materials and methods: The article adopts a qualitative descriptive approach to examining the teaching of English loanwords in Uzbekistan. The methodological framework combines lexical analysis with an examination of instructional content. It focuses on how English-origin words used in Uzbek are presented, explained, and incorporated into learning activities. The following framework identifies the materials and procedures required for the analysis; empirical findings depend on its application to a documented sample.

Relevant materials include textbooks, teaching guides, classroom worksheets, and educational glossaries used in Uzbek-language and English-language instruction. Selected examples from media and digital communication can provide supplementary contexts for examining usage. Educational materials should be selected according to their relevance to the target learner group, publication date, and inclusion of English-origin lexical items. The educational level and subject area of each source should be recorded to ensure that comparisons account for differences in instructional purpose.

Loanwords are identified through their English origin and their use within Uzbek discourse. Where etymological information is available, direct borrowing is distinguished from borrowing through an intermediary language. Established loanwords are also differentiated from occasional English insertions, proper names, and instances of code-switching. Ambiguous cases should be recorded separately rather than assigned a borrowing status without supporting evidence.

The lexical analysis considers each item's meaning, spelling, pronunciation, grammatical adaptation, and relationship with Uzbek equivalents. Particular attention is given to differences between the source-language meaning and the meaning conveyed in Uzbek contexts. Items may be grouped by semantic domain, including information technology, business, media, and everyday communication. This classification supports comparison of the vocabulary selected for instruction and the contexts in which it is introduced.

The instructional analysis examines whether loanwords are presented through translation, definitions, contextual examples, comparison with Uzbek alternatives, or practical activities. Tasks are classified according to their learning objectives, such as recognition, comprehension, pronunciation, spelling, and productive use. The analysis also considers whether materials explain

stylistic suitability and provide opportunities for learners to apply vocabulary in meaningful communication. A common coding framework should be used across all sources to make the interpretation consistent and traceable.

The study's methodological limitations concern the relationship between instructional materials and actual classroom practice. Materials can indicate what learning opportunities are provided, but they cannot independently establish how teachers use them or how effectively learners acquire the vocabulary. Conclusions about teaching effectiveness therefore require additional evidence, such as classroom observations, teacher interviews, or learner assessments. In the absence of such data, the analysis should remain focused on the characteristics and pedagogical potential of the materials examined.

Results and discussion: The analytical framework identifies several dimensions relevant to evaluating the teaching of English loanwords in Uzbekistan: lexical selection, semantic explanation, pronunciation and spelling, contextual presentation, and opportunities for productive use. As no documented sample of teaching materials or learner data is provided, the discussion presents an interpretive analysis rather than measured findings about the prevalence or effectiveness of particular classroom practices.

A central issue concerns the distinction between recognizing a loanword and understanding its meaning. Familiarity through advertising, social media, or digital platforms may help learners identify a word, but it does not establish that they can define it accurately or use it appropriately. Instruction therefore needs to connect recognition with conceptual understanding. For example, teaching marketing through a single equivalent such as "advertising" can obscure the broader range of activities associated with the concept. A contextual explanation can help learners distinguish related terms and avoid treating them as interchangeable.

Another important dimension is the relationship between the original English meaning and the meaning established in Uzbek usage. Borrowing does not necessarily preserve every meaning of the source-language word. A lexical item may acquire a specialized meaning or occur in a more restricted range of contexts in the receiving language. Consequently, an English dictionary definition and an Uzbek usage example serve different instructional purposes. Comparing them can help learners understand semantic adaptation while avoiding the assumption that an English-origin word functions identically in both languages.

Pronunciation and spelling also require a clear distinction between learning English and discussing borrowed vocabulary in Uzbek. In an English lesson, the pronunciation target relates to the English word and the chosen instructional variety. In an Uzbek-language lesson, attention may instead concern the conventional written form and its integration into Uzbek speech. Confusing these objectives can lead to inconsistent explanations. Teachers should make the learning target explicit and address source-language pronunciation separately from the conventions governing the borrowed item in Uzbek.

The treatment of Uzbek equivalents raises questions of meaning, register, and communicative suitability. A borrowed word and an Uzbek alternative may overlap without being appropriate in every context. Their comparison should therefore consider the intended audience, subject matter, and degree of specialization. Tasks that ask learners to select and justify a term in a particular sentence can develop more precise lexical judgment than activities requiring an equivalent without contextual information.

Contextual presentation offers a useful basis for integrating these dimensions. Short news extracts, advertisements, workplace dialogues, and digital instructions can illustrate how a loanword combines with surrounding words and contributes to a message. However, authentic

examples require careful selection because they may contain inconsistent spelling, temporary foreign-language insertions, or unclear usage. Their educational value depends on guided analysis. Learners can examine what a word means in the passage, whether an alternative is suitable, and how the expression would function in another communicative situation.

Productive activities can extend this analysis beyond recognition. Writing a short announcement, explaining a digital service, or revising a passage containing unnecessary or ambiguous borrowings allows learners to demonstrate understanding through use. Assessment can examine semantic accuracy, spelling, contextual suitability, and the ability to explain lexical choices. These criteria provide a more informative account of vocabulary development than recognition scores alone.

The discussion also highlights a methodological boundary: the presence of a definition or activity in a textbook indicates an instructional opportunity, but it does not demonstrate successful learning. Evaluating effectiveness requires evidence from classroom interaction and learner performance. Similarly, claims about the current state of loanword instruction across Uzbekistan require a clearly defined sample covering relevant educational levels and settings. The analytical dimensions outlined here can guide such research and support the development of materials that connect linguistic knowledge with appropriate vocabulary use.

Conclusion: Teaching English loanwords in Uzbekistan requires attention to their linguistic adaptation and communicative functions in Uzbek. Knowledge of a borrowed word involves more than recognition or memorization of a translation; it includes understanding its contextual meaning, spelling, grammatical behaviour, and relationship with Uzbek alternatives. A clear distinction between teaching English vocabulary and teaching English-origin words used in Uzbek is therefore essential for establishing appropriate instructional objectives.

The discussion supports an approach that combines contextual explanation, semantic comparison, and practical language activities. Learners should have opportunities to examine authentic examples, compare alternative expressions, and justify their vocabulary choices. Assessment should address semantic accuracy and contextual suitability alongside spelling and pronunciation, with criteria aligned to the language being taught.

The article provides a framework for examining instructional materials rather than empirical conclusions about teaching practices throughout Uzbekistan. Further research using a documented sample of materials, classroom observations, and learner assessments is needed to establish how loanwords are taught and which approaches support their acquisition most effectively. Such evidence can inform the development of teaching resources that strengthen lexical competence and encourage precise, appropriate language use.

References

1. Nation, I. S. P. Learning Vocabulary in Another Language / I. S. P. Nation. – 2nd ed. – Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2013.
2. Haugen, E. The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing / E. Haugen // Language. – 1950. – Vol. 26, No. 2. – P. 210–231.
3. Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook / ed. by M. Haspelmath, U. Tadmor. – Berlin ; New York : De Gruyter Mouton, 2009. – XXI, 1081 p.
4. Saitkxanova, D. (2026). Integrating Local History Materials into English Language Teaching for Non-Linguistic Students. Journal of" Social Sciences: Theory and Practice", 1(1), 53-58.
5. Sarvara, A., & Dinara, S. (2024). TEACHING LEARNING FOR A SUSTAINABLE FUTURE. Eurasian Journal of Academic Research, 4(7S), 16-17.

6. 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.
7. Kamola Abdujabarova. Developing students' communicative competence in English based on news. (2025). International Journal of Political Sciences and Economics, 8(8), 62-65. https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.ijpse.135104
8. Abdujabarova K. (2026). O'qish va tinglash orqali jurnalistlar nutqini rivojlantirish (ingliz tili misolida). Бюллетень педагогов Нового Узбекистана, 4(9), 14-16. https://www.in-academy.uz/index.php/YOPA/article/view/57520
9. Kamola Husniddinkizi Abdujabarova. Assessing Students' Reading Comprehension (Journalism as an Example). (2024). Intersections of Faith and Culture: American Journal of Religious and Cultural Studies (2993-2599), 2(12), 8-11. https://grnjournal.us/index.php/AJRCS/article/view/6271
10. Kamola Abdujabarova. ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY REQUIREMENTS AND PRACTICAL NEEDS IN THE FIELD OF MODERN MEDIA. (2025). Академические исследования в современной науке, 4(48), 135-138. https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.arims.134793
11. Abdujabarova Kamola Khusniddin Kizi THE ROLE OF AUDIO-VIDEO MATERIALS IN DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION // ORIENSS. 2022. № Special Issue 20. URL: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/the-role-of-audio-video-materials-in-developing-intercultural-communication
12. Abdujabarova K. (2023). Analysis of Speaking Methods in Teaching Foreign Languages. Journal of Higher Education and Academic Advancement, 1(1), 219-223. https://doi.org/10.61796/ejheaa.v1i1.183