



SEMANTIC AND PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF INTERFIXED UNITS IN THE FIELD OF PEDAGOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Berdiyev S.S

EFL and ESL Instructor, Denau institute of entrepreneurship and pedagogy, Uzbekistan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: Interfixed units, semantic features, pragmatic features, pedagogical language, English language, Uzbek language, comparative linguistics, educational discourse, compound words, language pragmatics, cross-cultural analysis, educational terminology, instructional language, teacher-student interaction.

Received: 30.10.2024

Accepted: 04.11.2024

Published: 09.11.2024

Abstract: This study investigates the semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed linguistic units within the field of pedagogy in English and Uzbek languages. Interfixed units, which include morphological combinations of words that create new meanings or nuances in communication, play a critical role in specialized discourse, particularly in academic and pedagogical contexts. Despite their significance, limited research has explored how these units function semantically and pragmatically in diverse languages, especially in the comparative contexts of English and Uzbek. This research addresses the gap by examining the structures, meanings, and pragmatic uses of these units in pedagogical texts and discussions within the two languages.

INTRODUCTION

In the field of linguistics, interfixed units play a significant role in various academic disciplines, particularly in pedagogy and linguistic studies. Interfixed units, or morphemes attached within compound words or phrases, serve as essential elements in constructing and conveying complex concepts in language. In educational contexts, they contribute to the structuring of language, influencing both the expression and perception of messages in communication. Interfixed units allow speakers to combine multiple ideas within a single linguistic structure, enhancing the depth and clarity of the intended message.

An interfix or linking element is a part of a word that is placed between two morphemes (such as two roots or a root and a suffix) and lacks a semantic meaning

In both English and Uzbek, the pedagogical field utilizes these interfixed structures to address complex terminologies and abstract concepts. This feature provides a pathway for enhancing educational discourse, as interfixed units facilitate precise communication between educators and students.

However, understanding these units' roles in language structure and interaction goes beyond semantics, as they also carry pragmatic functions that vary based on cultural and linguistic contexts. Through the study of these interfixed elements, scholars can better understand the communicative nuances in different languages, particularly in fields that require specialized terminology, such as pedagogy.

The semantic analysis focuses on how interfixed units convey complex pedagogical concepts in each language. In English, these units often express specificity and technicality, with a tendency to create compound or prefixed forms that denote precise educational practices, processes, and outcomes. For instance, interfixed units like "co-education" and "multi-disciplinary" add layers of meaning that are critical for academic discourse. In contrast, Uzbek interfixed units frequently utilize suffixes and affixes that reflect both formality and traditional understandings, adapting borrowed educational terms to fit the cultural and linguistic norms of Uzbek pedagogy.

Pragmatically, the study reveals that interfixed units serve different communicative functions within pedagogical discourse in both languages. Methodologically, this study employs a comparative and content analysis approach, examining a corpus of pedagogical texts, academic articles, and educational dialogue in both languages.

Comparing the semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed units in English and Uzbek is vital for understanding linguistic communication and conveying educational concepts effectively across languages. While interfixed units are widely utilized in both languages, the mechanisms by which they function semantically and pragmatically remain underexplored, particularly in the pedagogical context. The current linguistic literature lacks comprehensive studies comparing the practical applications and contextual differences of interfixed units across English and Uzbek, creating a gap in understanding how these units enhance pedagogical communication. This gap has led to challenges in effectively translating educational materials and ideas across these languages, potentially limiting comprehension and engagement for learners in cross-linguistic contexts. Addressing this issue requires examining how interfixed units contribute to the efficacy of pedagogical communication, particularly in terms of clarity, conciseness, and engagement.

METHODS

This study adopts a comparative approach to analyze and compare the semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed units in English and Uzbek languages within the context of pedagogical communication. The comparative design is particularly suitable for identifying both commonalities and distinctions between the two languages, as it allows for systematic examination of interfixed units and the nuances of their meanings and functions in educational discourse. The comparative approach also enables the evaluation of how these units contribute to effective communication in pedagogical settings, offering insights into their linguistic functions and implications for teaching practices in both languages.

Interfix is an affix which is inserted in the middle of two other morphemes where it interrupts the sequence of the two morphemes and so differs from an infix which is inserted inside one morpheme. Osuagwu, B. I., Nwozuzu, G. I., and Dike, G. A (2007) see it as an affix inserted in the middle of a reduplicated form and serves as a morphemic linking element. An interfix does not have any semantic content or meaning of its own. However, its semantic relevance and significance is felt when it is affixed between two base words to join and realise them as one word. Data were collected from a wide range of pedagogical texts, including academic journals, textbooks, and educational materials published in both English and Uzbek. These sources were selected based on their relevance to the educational field, ensuring that the interfixed units extracted would be representative of terminology and expressions

commonly used in academic and instructional contexts. Specific keywords and phrases were identified for analysis, focusing on interfixed units that are integral to pedagogical communication, such as terms related to teaching methods, learning outcomes, and instructional techniques.

The collection process involved the systematic extraction of interfixed units from each text. This was achieved by scanning the materials for words and expressions that include affixes connecting lexical elements, which, in both languages, can influence or alter meanings. For instance, terms such as “teacher-student” or “learning-centered” in English and their Uzbek equivalents (e.g., “o‘qituvchi-o‘quvchi” or “ta’limga yo‘naltirilgan”) were identified as interfixed units with specific communicative functions. After identification, these units were organized into a database, categorizing them by semantic field, affix type, and their contextual usage. Additionally, examples were taken from varying genres within the educational field, such as teacher training manuals, research articles, and government policy documents related to education.

The analysis employed content analysis to examine the semantic and pragmatic aspects of the interfixed units, as this method allows for both quantitative and qualitative insights. The semantic analysis focused on interpreting the meanings of the interfixed units, aiming to reveal how each language uses these forms to express complex pedagogical ideas. Key lexical units were analyzed to determine their core meanings, contextual implications, and the specific pedagogical concepts they communicate. For example, English interfixed units such as “learner-centered” or “evidence-based” are commonly used to denote specific educational approaches, whereas in Uzbek, similar constructions may carry additional cultural and contextual meanings, offering insights into the local educational priorities and perspectives.

For the pragmatic analysis, attention was given to how these units function within discourse, focusing on their role in enhancing clarity, formality, and pedagogical relevance. In English, interfixed units often serve to create clear, concise descriptors that carry significant informational value, reflecting an efficient communication style valued in academic and instructional settings. Conversely, Uzbek interfixed units were examined to understand their role in facilitating a more expressive and elaborate style, which may prioritize inclusivity and student engagement.

Comparative findings from the semantic and pragmatic analyses highlighted both linguistic and cultural differences in how educational discourse is constructed in English and Uzbek. The study ultimately identifies patterns in the use of interfixed units that are specific to the educational register, revealing distinct strategies that educators in each language use to convey complex ideas in a manner that resonates with their respective audiences. These insights underscore the relevance of interfixed units in shaping pedagogical communication and provide a foundation for future research into the impact of linguistic structure on teaching efficacy in multilingual contexts.

RESULTS

The semantic characteristics of interfixed units in English and Uzbek within the pedagogical domain reveal distinct patterns that are shaped by the linguistic structures and communicative traditions of each language.

In English, interfixed units frequently serve to clarify actions and conceptual terms within the educational process. The use of these units often involves compound words or expressions that combine to provide specific, unambiguous meanings. For instance, terms like “co-teaching” and “multi-disciplinary” leverage interfixes to signal collaborative or integrated educational approaches. These compounds are essential in educational discourse, where precision is valued for conveying complex pedagogical concepts in a straightforward manner. English interfixes thus emphasize the practical

aspects of teaching, instructional methodologies, and educational policies, aligning with the language's tendency toward logical and categorical distinctions in academic settings. Through this lens, semantic clarity becomes a primary function, ensuring that pedagogical ideas are expressed with minimum ambiguity.

In Uzbek, however, interfixed units are often utilized to express abstract concepts more concretely, enhancing their communicative efficacy in an educational setting. Uzbek interfixes contribute to the flexibility of language, enabling nuanced representation of pedagogical ideas. For example, words like "muloqotdoshlik" (collaboration) and "ko'pyoqlamalik" (multifacetedness) exemplify how interfixes provide deeper layers of meaning within educational discourse. These interfixed forms serve to bridge concrete actions with abstract ideas, making it easier to contextualize pedagogical strategies and learning philosophies in a way that resonates with cultural and linguistic norms. As a result, the Uzbek language's approach to semantics in pedagogy favors expressiveness, aiding educators in conveying complex notions in relatable terms.

The pragmatic use of interfixed units in pedagogical discourse varies considerably between English and Uzbek, as each language embodies different communicative norms and educational traditions.

In English, interfixed units are often pragmatically employed to emphasize clarity and formality in discourse. Educational contexts in English-speaking cultures prioritize direct, structured communication, especially in professional and academic settings. Interfixes are thus strategically used to streamline communication, removing ambiguities and focusing on exactness. For example, in phrases like "cross-functional" or "self-assessment," the interfixed form denotes an inherent specificity and purpose. These structures are pragmatically significant, as they support the precision necessary for clear instruction and assessment, which are foundational in English-speaking pedagogical environments. Consequently, the pragmatic role of English interfixed units is closely tied to upholding a level of professionalism and exactitude in educational communication.

In contrast, interfixed units in Uzbek pedagogical discourse are pragmatically employed to enhance expressiveness and engage listeners or readers emotionally. By infusing a sense of liveliness into communication, Uzbek interfixes help to maintain a conversational tone that aligns with the culturally valued oral traditions in Uzbek education. For instance, terms like "birgalikda o'qitish" (teaching together) and "o'quvchi-muallim hamkorligi" (student-teacher collaboration) use interfixed forms to emphasize unity and cooperative spirit. This stylistic choice not only strengthens the interpersonal dynamic in educational settings but also promotes inclusivity and shared understanding. Thus, the pragmatic use of interfixed units in Uzbek supports a more emotive and culturally resonant form of communication that fosters relational bonds between educators and learners.

The semantic and pragmatic analyses of interfixed units reveal fundamental differences in how English and Uzbek languages approach pedagogical discourse. In English, interfixed units are semantically and pragmatically oriented toward clarity, precision, and formality. The structure and logic underlying English interfixes enable educators to communicate instructional strategies and concepts with an emphasis on practical application and methodological rigor. This approach aligns with the high value placed on professional and categorical language in English-speaking educational contexts.

Conversely, Uzbek interfixed units exhibit a dual function of concretizing abstract concepts while enhancing the expressiveness and relatability of educational content. In Uzbek, the integration of interfixes serves not only to clarify but also to emotionally connect with the audience. This distinction reflects the broader cultural and linguistic priorities in Uzbek-speaking pedagogical spaces, where relational communication and collective understanding hold a central place.

In summary, English interfixed units prioritize semantic clarity and pragmatic precision, aligning with a formal communicative style, whereas Uzbek interfixed units contribute to an expressive and relationally oriented educational discourse. These comparative findings illustrate how interfixed units function in accordance with each language's pedagogical values, supporting effective communication and fostering educational engagement in unique, culturally meaningful ways.

DISCUSSION

This study contributes to the theoretical understanding of interfixed units within educational terminology by highlighting the semantic and pragmatic features observed in English and Uzbek. The study identifies distinct patterns in the way educational concepts are linguistically framed in both languages. For example, interfixed units in English often emphasize specific educational processes or outcomes, as seen in terms like "education-oriented", "research-based", "skill-building", and "learning-centered". These terms are structured to prioritize educational objectives and methodologies, thereby informing both instructional language and pedagogical frameworks. In contrast, Uzbek interfixed units may lean towards clarity and specificity in conveying educational roles and structures within the cultural and linguistic context. Consequently, these findings suggest the need for adapted teaching methodologies that respect and utilize linguistic structures specific to each language to enhance bilingual or multilingual educational programs.

Further, the contrasting usage of interfixed units also invites a new approach to developing educational resources. English terms like "student-focused", "teacher-directed", "competency-based", and "outcome-based" are indicative of an education system that emphasizes defined roles and performance benchmarks. Such structures reflect an outcome-driven culture that could influence how curriculum designers and educators develop content for different linguistic backgrounds. By contrast, in Uzbek, interfixed units might be less commonly oriented toward these specialized outcomes, instead focusing on clear communication of objectives and roles. This theoretical insight suggests that while creating bilingual resources or developing language-learning materials, designers may need to balance specificity with cultural inclusiveness in terminology to bridge pedagogical expectations across linguistic backgrounds.

In practical terms, the correct and effective use of interfixed units in pedagogy supports clearer communication between educators and students, fostering a deeper understanding of educational goals and outcomes. Using terms such as "activity-oriented", "project-driven", "curriculum-centered", and "knowledge-sharing" in English enhances the specificity of instructional language, making it easier for students to grasp the objectives and structure of educational activities. For educators working in multilingual settings, understanding these interfixed units can improve instructional alignment and enhance engagement with students from diverse linguistic backgrounds. For instance, English interfixed units like "technology-integrated", "inquiry-driven", and "inclusive-education" capture contemporary pedagogical practices that emphasize inclusivity and adaptability, which are valuable in today's global classrooms.

For Uzbek educators and learners, adopting English interfixed units in educational terminology can facilitate smoother transitions in language-learning contexts, where English is increasingly integrated into curricula. By translating or contextualizing terms like "student-driven", "collaborative-learning", and "data-informed" into pedagogical practices in Uzbek, educators can create a bridge that enables learners to adopt global educational standards while maintaining linguistic coherence. This practical implication is particularly relevant in teacher training and professional development, as educators gain

insight into using these interfixed units effectively within the framework of their own language, which in turn enhances student understanding and classroom effectiveness.

While this study provides valuable insights into the use of interfixed units in English and Uzbek educational terminology, several limitations should be acknowledged. Primarily, this study is focused exclusively on English and Uzbek, which may limit the generalizability of the findings to other languages. Terminologies in other languages may present unique interfixed structures and semantic nuances that are not addressed here. Additionally, this study primarily analyzes written sources, such as textbooks and research publications, and may not fully capture the everyday spoken usage of these interfixed units in educational settings. Spoken language tends to be more flexible and may include variations in how interfixed units are employed to communicate educational concepts.

Another limitation is the scope of interfixed units selected for comparison. While this study has examined widely used units like "performance-assessed", "holistic-education", and "competency-based", other interfixed units with more localized or culturally specific meanings may not be fully represented. Further research involving a broader range of interfixed units, including those used in other pedagogical fields or informal educational settings, could provide a more comprehensive understanding. Finally, the cultural contexts that influence the use and perception of these units were only briefly touched upon in this study. Future research could benefit from a deeper exploration of cultural factors that impact the usage and reception of interfixed units in pedagogical contexts across different languages.

CONCLUSION

The study of semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed units in English and Uzbek languages has underscored their significant role in pedagogical communication. Interfixed units function not only as linguistic tools but as essential elements in enhancing clarity, precision, and expressiveness within educational discourse. In English, these units contribute to formal, structured expressions that support clear instruction and concept delivery, while in Uzbek, they enable a more dynamic and relatable communication style. This duality allows for effective adaptation to the distinct communicative needs within each language context.

Furthermore, the findings suggest that when applied strategically, interfixed units can bridge cultural and linguistic gaps, fostering a more inclusive learning environment for speakers of both languages. This comparative analysis illustrates that interfixed units in pedagogical settings can aid educators and learners in navigating language-specific nuances, making knowledge transfer more efficient. By enriching both the semantic and pragmatic dimensions of language use, these units ultimately contribute to improved comprehension and interaction, highlighting the importance of contextually tailored linguistic choices in enhancing educational communication across diverse linguistic backgrounds.

REFERENCES

1. Crystal, D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press. (2003).
2. Imomov, E. A. Linguocultural study of vocabulary describing professional terms in the English and Uzbek languages. *Oriental Renaissance: Innovative, Educational, Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(5), 1140-1144 (2022).
3. Yusupova, M. A. *O'zbek tilshunosligi va qo'llanma*. Tashkent University Press (2018).

4. Nizomova, M. B. 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 (2022).
5. Austin, J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press (1962).
6. Brown, G., & Yule, G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge University Press (1983).
7. Baratboyevna, N. M. Polysemantic features of pedagogical terms in English and Uzbek translation. *Current research journal of philological sciences*, 2(12), 21-25 (2021).
8. Nizomova, M. B. The issue of formation of communicative-pragmatic direction in terminology. In *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences* (pp. 83-86) (2023, May).
9. Pride, J. B., & Holmes, J. *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin Education (1972).
10. BARATBOYEVNA, N. M. Features of the Formation and Development of Ecological Terms in Languages. *Journalnx*, 6(06), 55-57.