

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Teaching the Russian Language to Future Specialists in International Relations of Uzbekistan

Bakiyeva Marxamat Pulatovna

Associate professor at Tashkent International University of Financial Management and Technologies, Uzbekistan

VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue04 2026

PAGE: 211-215

Copyright © 2026 European International Journal of Pedagogics, this is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-Share Alike 4.0 International License. Licensed under Creative Commons License a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

Abstract

This article examines the teaching of the Russian language to future specialists in international relations of Uzbekistan in the context of multilingual higher education, professional communication, and the growing demands of diplomacy and international cooperation. The relevance of the topic is determined by the fact that Russian continues to function as one of the major languages of regional communication in Central Asia and remains important for diplomatic dialogue, interstate documentation, expert exchange, and access to academic and analytical sources. The purpose of the study is to determine the methodological foundations, content priorities, and pedagogical conditions for effective Russian-language training of students majoring in international relations in Uzbekistan. The study is theoretical and analytical in nature and is based on conceptual analysis, comparative interpretation, and synthesis of works on language education, professionally oriented teaching, multilingualism, and diplomatic communication. The findings show that Russian-language teaching for future international-relations specialists should be organized not as a general philological course, but as a professionally oriented system that integrates communicative, discursive, intercultural, analytical, and pragmatic components. It is concluded that the effectiveness of such training depends on the alignment of instruction with CEFR-oriented outcomes, multilingual educational realities in Uzbekistan, and the communicative needs of diplomacy, negotiation, protocol, expert discussion, and document-based work.

KEY WORDS

Russian language, international relations, professionally oriented language teaching, Uzbekistan, multilingual education, diplomatic communication, CEFR, higher education.

INTRODUCTION

The training of future specialists in international relations is inseparable from the development of advanced communicative competence in several languages. In the modern diplomatic and analytical sphere, language is not only a medium of communication but also an instrument of negotiation, interpretation, representation, institutional participation, and access to expertise. For students in international relations programs in Uzbekistan, Russian retains

a significant role because it functions as a language of regional academic exchange, intergovernmental communication, media discourse, and a considerable body of political, legal, and analytical literature. At the same time, higher education in Uzbekistan develops within a multilingual framework in which the state language, native languages, Russian, and foreign languages interact in educational and professional domains. UNESCO materials on multilingual education and

reporting on Uzbekistan both indicate that the country's education system has long included multilingual practices, while the broader international framework increasingly treats multilingual competence as a resource rather than an obstacle.

The professional relevance of Russian for future international-relations specialists also follows from the logic of multilateral diplomacy. The United Nations continues to treat multilingualism as an enabler of multilateral diplomacy, and Russian remains one of the official UN languages. This gives the study of Russian an applied value that goes beyond general linguistic proficiency. For future specialists in international relations, competence in Russian supports work with official statements, analytical texts, multilateral documents, public diplomacy materials, and communication across the post-Soviet and broader Eurasian space. The problem, however, is that language teaching in higher education often remains insufficiently differentiated by professional field. In such conditions, there is a need to rethink Russian-language instruction for international-relations students as a professionally oriented, discourse-based, and competence-centered system.

The purpose of this article is to analyze the methodological foundations of teaching the Russian language to future specialists in international relations of Uzbekistan and to identify the pedagogical conditions that increase the effectiveness of such training. The article proceeds from the assumption that professionally oriented Russian-language teaching should be based on the integration of language competence, intercultural sensitivity, diplomatic discourse, genre awareness, and analytical reading.

This study is theoretical and analytical. The source base includes official international documents on multilingualism and language education, especially the CEFR Companion Volume and United Nations documents on multilingualism, as well as scholarly works on professionally oriented Russian-language teaching, teaching diplomatic discourse, and language training in higher education. The CEFR Companion Volume was used because it offers an action-oriented and descriptor-based framework for language education, which is particularly valuable when designing outcomes for professional communication. UN documents were used because they clarify the institutional significance of multilingual competence in international work. Russian-language scholarly sources were included because they

address the specific methodology of professionally oriented Russian instruction for students preparing for work in diplomacy and international relations.

The main methods were conceptual analysis, comparative interpretation, and synthesis. Conceptual analysis was used to distinguish general language training from professionally oriented language teaching in the field of international relations. Comparative interpretation made it possible to connect CEFR-based language education, multilingual policy discourse, and Russian-language methodological research. Synthesis was then used to formulate a coherent model of Russian-language teaching for future specialists in international relations in Uzbekistan. Since the study focuses on theoretical substantiation rather than empirical classroom experimentation, this methodology is appropriate for clarifying principles, content, and expected outcomes.

The analysis shows that the teaching of Russian to future specialists in international relations should be understood as professionally oriented language education rather than as a continuation of general secondary-language instruction. Its main pedagogical essence lies in aligning language learning with the communicative situations, genres, and cognitive operations that define the future profession. This means that students must acquire not only grammar and vocabulary, but also the ability to interpret political texts, summarize expert positions, conduct formal dialogue, use diplomatic etiquette, understand institutional phraseology, and produce coherent oral and written speech in contexts of professional responsibility. Research on professionally oriented Russian-language teaching emphasizes precisely this shift from general language competence toward specialized communication and field-relevant discourse.

A major result of the analysis is that the communicative needs of international-relations students are structurally different from those of students in philology or general humanities. Their language use is strongly linked to official speech, negotiation discourse, international law terminology, foreign policy commentary, analytical note-writing, academic debate, and protocol communication. This makes the action-oriented model of language teaching especially productive. The CEFR Companion Volume broadens the conceptualization of language education and provides descriptors that support mediation, interaction, reception, and production, all of which are essential for future specialists in international relations. In practice, this means that Russian-language teaching should be

organized around real communicative tasks such as summarizing diplomatic statements, comparing policy positions, preparing briefs, participating in round-table discussion, and interpreting politically sensitive vocabulary in context.

Another important result is that multilingualism in Uzbekistan should be treated as a pedagogical resource in Russian-language teaching, not as a barrier. UNESCO guidance on multilingual education consistently supports approaches that build on the learner's existing language repertoire, while reporting on Uzbekistan indicates longstanding multilingual educational practices. For international-relations students, this means that Russian can be taught in interaction with Uzbek and foreign languages, especially English, through contrastive semantics, terminology mapping, discourse comparison, and translation-based mediation tasks. Such an approach is particularly relevant in international-relations education because future specialists often have to move between languages, registers, and institutional contexts rather than function monolingually.

The analysis further shows that professionally oriented Russian-language teaching should be discourse-centered. In the field of international relations, successful communication depends not only on lexical knowledge but also on mastery of discourse conventions. Diplomatic discourse is marked by precision, restraint, formulaic politeness, pragmatic ambiguity in some contexts, and a high degree of institutional and cultural sensitivity. UN guidance on official writing and multilingualism demonstrates the continuing importance of clarity, concision, and functional precision in international communication. Consequently, Russian-language teaching for international-relations students should include sustained work with diplomatic statements, communiqués, speeches, memoranda, press briefings, international news analysis, and expert commentary. Students must learn not only what words mean, but how institutional meaning is organized in Russian professional speech.

A further result concerns the role of professionally oriented reading. Future specialists in international relations work extensively with documents, analytical materials, and policy texts. Therefore, reading in Russian should not be limited to comprehension of isolated passages. It should be analytical and strategic. Students should be trained to identify argument structure, distinguish factual information from evaluation, trace modality and implication, summarize large texts,

compare positions across sources, and extract decision-relevant content. Research on professional-language instruction in Russian points to the need for work with scientific and professional styles, while scholarship on training international-relations students highlights the role of diplomatic text and field-specific discourse. In pedagogical terms, this means that reading becomes both a language activity and a professional-thinking activity.

The study also indicates that oral communication deserves special methodological attention. International-relations specialists must often speak in formal yet flexible ways, respond under time pressure, and maintain communicative tact. Russian-language training should therefore include role-based simulations of negotiations, briefings, consultations, interviews, and conference participation. In such tasks, students develop fluency together with pragmatic appropriateness. The goal is not theatrical imitation of diplomacy, but the formation of professional speech behavior. Because multilingualism is treated at the UN as an enabler of diplomacy, language teaching for future international-relations specialists must focus on speech as action, not only as knowledge.

Another significant result is that effective Russian-language teaching in this field requires an intercultural dimension. International-relations communication is always embedded in value systems, institutional cultures, rhetorical conventions, and historical contexts. Russian-language education for these students should therefore include discourse etiquette, forms of address, implicit norms of public communication, and comparative analysis of communicative styles. This is especially important in Uzbekistan, where multilingual and multicultural communicative experience forms part of students' lived educational reality. In such conditions, language teaching becomes a form of intercultural competence building, not merely linguistic correction. UNESCO's multilingual education guidance and Council of Europe frameworks both support this broader understanding of language education.

The results of the analysis make it possible to define the main pedagogical conditions for effective Russian-language teaching to future specialists in international relations of Uzbekistan. First, the course should be professionally oriented from the beginning, with content selected from international-relations domains rather than generic themes. Second, the learning outcomes should be descriptor-based and

measurable, in line with CEFR-style progression in reception, interaction, production, and mediation. Third, instruction should integrate Russian with the multilingual language repertoire of students. Fourth, the course should rely on authentic texts and professionally modeled communicative tasks. Fifth, assessment should measure communicative performance in profession-related situations rather than only grammar reproduction. These conditions follow logically from the convergence of modern language education principles and the specific professional profile of international-relations training.

The findings suggest that the teaching of Russian to future specialists in international relations in Uzbekistan should be repositioned at the intersection of language education, professional training, and multilingual policy. This is particularly important because the current global and regional environment increases the demand for specialists who can operate across several communicative systems. In Uzbekistan, multilingual educational realities create favorable conditions for this, but only if methodology is consciously adapted. When Russian is taught as a general academic subject detached from diplomatic and analytical practice, its professional potential remains underused. When it is taught as a language of regional expertise, official communication, and professional mediation, it becomes a strategic component of international-relations education.

The discussion also shows that professional orientation should not lead to a narrow technicist approach. Language in international relations is never purely instrumental. It carries cultural memory, institutional nuance, ideological tone, and pragmatic positioning. Therefore, the methodology should preserve the humanistic dimension of language education while focusing on applied outcomes. This balance is consistent with multilingual education guidance from UNESCO and with the broader orientation of the CEFR Companion Volume, which expands language education beyond grammar and static proficiency toward social action, mediation, and plurilingual competence.

A further implication concerns assessment. Traditional testing often privileges grammatical correctness over communicative adequacy. For international-relations students, however, what matters is whether they can summarize a policy position accurately, interpret institutional language, participate in formal discussion, and write concise, well-structured professional texts. This suggests that assessment in Russian-

language courses for such students should be scenario-based and discourse-based. It should include brief analytical writing, oral commentary, role-mediated interaction, document summary, and interlingual mediation. This conclusion follows directly from the action-oriented model of language learning and from the communicative logic of professional international activity.

The study demonstrates that teaching the Russian language to future specialists in international relations of Uzbekistan requires a professionally oriented, discourse-centered, and multilingual methodology. Russian remains pedagogically and professionally relevant because it functions as an important language of regional communication, diplomacy, documentation, academic exchange, and analytical discourse. Its effective teaching in this field depends on moving beyond general language instruction toward a model that integrates communicative action, intercultural awareness, analytical reading, professional writing, oral interaction, and multilingual mediation.

The article also shows that the most effective model for such instruction is one aligned with CEFR principles, adapted to the multilingual educational environment of Uzbekistan, and built around authentic tasks of international-relations communication. In this model, Russian is not simply a subject of study but a means of professional participation. Consequently, language education for future specialists in international relations should be designed as a strategic component of higher education, supporting diplomatic competence, analytical literacy, and regional communicative mobility.

REFERENCES

1. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume. – Strasbourg : Council of Europe, 2020. – 185 p.
2. Strategic Framework on Multilingualism. – New York : United Nations, 2024. – 22 p.
3. Multilingualism in the United Nations system / Joint Inspection Unit. – New York ; Geneva : United Nations, 2020. – 86 p.
4. Resolution adopted by the General Assembly on 12 December 2024. Multilingualism / United Nations General Assembly. – New York : United Nations, 2024. –

A/RES/79/93 A–B.

5. A Handbook for Writers of the United Nations. – New York : United Nations, 2024. – 248 p.
6. Languages matter: Global guidance on multilingual education. – Paris : UNESCO, 2025. – 72 p.
7. Follow-up of CONFINTEA VI: Reporting template for national progress reports. Uzbekistan. – Hamburg : UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning, 2012. – 24 p.
8. National Report of the Republic of Uzbekistan / UNESCO Institute for Lifelong Learning. – Hamburg : UIL, 2008. – 32 p.
9. Недосугова, А. Б. Профессионально ориентированная подготовка по русскому языку будущих специалистов-международников из стран СНГ / А. Б. Недосугова // Русский язык за рубежом. – 2021. – № 4. – С. 58–66.
10. Даняров, Б. Х. Профессионально ориентированное обучение русскому языку студентов с узбекским языком обучения / Б. Х. Даняров // Педагогика. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2022. – № 6. – С. 102–108.
11. Чигина, Н. В. Методика профессионально-ориентированного обучения иностранному языку студентов неязыкового вуза / Н. В. Чигина // Мир науки, культуры, образования. – 2021. – № 5. – С. 210–213.
12. Решетникова, В. В. Профессионально ориентированное обучение научному стилю речи в курсе русского языка как иностранного / В. В. Решетникова // Русский язык за рубежом. – 2021. – № 5. – С. 44–51.
13. Лукина, Н. А. Профессионально-ориентированное обучение как фактор повышения качества подготовки специалиста / Н. А. Лукина // Современные проблемы науки и образования. – 2018. – № 6. – С. 87–92.
14. Жаппар, К. З. Русский язык как средство профессиональной коммуникации в образовательном пространстве / К. З. Жаппар // Вестник высшей школы. – 2020. – № 9. – С. 61–67.
15. Hamgokova, N. Zh. Professional orientation in teaching Russian as a foreign language in higher education / N. Zh. Hamgokova // Higher Education Today. – 2021. – No. 7. – P. 74–79.