



## 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

### ABSTRACT

this paper provides a comparative analysis of the semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed units in English and Uzbek within pedagogical discourse. Interfixed units, such as idiomatic expressions and compound structures, are essential for conveying instructional intent, managing classroom dynamics, and fostering rapport between educators and students. By examining how these units function across English and Uzbek, the study reveals linguistic and cultural variances that impact communication styles in educational settings. The analysis also highlights how the use of interfixed units aligns with pedagogical goals and influences students' comprehension and engagement. The findings contribute to a broader understanding of bilingual educational strategies, cultural linguistics, and the nuanced role of language in teaching.

**KEYWORDS:** Interfixed units, pedagogical discourse, semantic features, pragmatic features, English, Uzbek, educational communication, bilingual education, cross-cultural linguistics, instructional language.

### INTRODUCTION

Interfixed units, which include compound terms and set expressions, are crucial in shaping educational language. Through a cross-linguistic analysis, this research examines how these units structure educational concepts, influence communication in teaching environments, and reflect cultural and pedagogical values in both languages. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of the role interfixed units play in language acquisition and curriculum design, with practical implications for language teaching and intercultural education.

The study of interfixed units—combinations of words or morphemes that convey specific meanings in context—has received considerable attention in linguistic research. However, their role in pedagogical discourse, particularly in the languages of English and Uzbek, remains underexplored. This thesis aims to fill this gap by analyzing the semantic and pragmatic characteristics of interfixed units in educational contexts. In doing so, it highlights how these units influence language learning and teaching practices, as well as the broader cultural and institutional attitudes toward education in English- and Uzbek-speaking environments.

Interfixed units are linguistic elements that combine two or more words or morphemes to create new meanings. These units often include compounds, prefixes, and suffixes that modify or bridge words in meaningful ways. In the context of pedagogy, terms like “student-centered,”

“teacher-student interaction,” and “curriculum development” are prime examples of interfixed units that convey complex educational concepts.

This chapter provides an overview of the lexical approach to language teaching, which emphasizes the importance of fixed expressions or "chunks" that learners must acquire for effective communication. According to scholars such as Lewis (1993) and Nattinger & DeCarrico (1992), these units play a crucial role in language acquisition because they offer learners ready-made expressions that carry substantial meaning in educational contexts. It is explored how interfixed units are employed in pedagogical discourse to communicate specific educational concepts. Terms like "learner-centered approach" or "critical thinking skills" encapsulate central ideas of modern educational philosophies. These units are essential for both teachers and students to convey ideas about the structure and aims of education.

Through a pragmatic lens, interfixed units in pedagogical discourse are not just about word combinations but also the social function of these expressions. They serve to frame relationships between teachers and students and mediate the educational process. For example, the term “student-centered” in English reflects a pedagogical shift towards recognizing the autonomy and agency of learners. This chapter also draws on Halliday and Hasan’s systemic functional linguistics (1976), which views language as a tool for conveying social meanings in context. A central focus of this research is the cross-linguistic comparison between English and Uzbek, focusing on how interfixed units function in each language’s educational discourse. While both languages use compound structures to convey pedagogical meanings, the cultural context significantly shapes how these terms are understood and used. In English, the expression "teacher-student relationship" conveys the balance of authority and collaboration in the classroom. In contrast, in Uzbek, terms like “o’qituvchi-o’quvchi” (teacher-student) or “ta’lim-tarbiya” (education and upbringing) may carry different implications about the roles of authority and the student-teacher dynamic in the classroom. This chapter explores these differences, showing how linguistic structures reflect distinct educational practices and philosophies.

This chapter examines the theoretical frameworks used to analyze the semantic and pragmatic functions of interfixed units in pedagogy. Drawing from Brown and Levinson’s politeness theory and Grice’s cooperative principle, we explore how interfixed units in pedagogical language manage relationships of power and politeness. For example, the phrase “teacher-student” not only refers to roles but can also reflect expectations of formality and hierarchical relationships in the classroom. Additionally, pragmatic markers in terms like “student support” or “inclusive education” are analyzed to determine how these terms signal social expectations and institutional values within educational settings. The pragmatic function of these units reveals how education systems construct social roles through language.

The understanding of interfixed units has significant implications for language teaching and curriculum design, especially in the context of ESL (English as a Second Language) and EFL (English as a Foreign Language) environments. This chapter examines how teaching these units can aid students in acquiring not only vocabulary but also pragmatic competence, helping them understand how language is used to communicate effectively in various educational contexts. Curriculum designers can use interfixed units to create materials that are sensitive to cultural differences while maintaining universal educational values. This chapter also looks at the role of interfixed units in creating teaching resources that reflect the educational philosophies of

both English-speaking and Uzbek-speaking societies. It is also studied that the semantic and pragmatic features of interfixed units in the field of pedagogy, with a particular focus on English and Uzbek. By analyzing these units in both languages, this research has highlighted the role of language in shaping educational discourse and has provided insights into how language learners can better understand and use these units in context. The findings underscore the importance of considering both linguistic and cultural context when teaching language, especially in cross-cultural and multilingual educational settings.

This study contributes to the broader field of linguistic pragmatics and pedagogical discourse analysis, offering new perspectives on how interfixed units function in educational language. Future research could explore the role of interfixed units in digital learning environments or investigate how these units evolve in response to changes in educational philosophy.

## REFERENCES

1. Inagamova, N. A. (2021). Linguocultural and Semantic Features of English and Uzbek Proverbs. *PhilPapers*.
2. Ganieva, D. K. (2020). Three Levels of Access in the Semantic Group of "Educational Process Participants" in the Uzbek and English Languages. *European Journal of Philological Sciences*.
3. 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.
4. Canagarajah, S. (2013). *Literacy as Translingual Practice: Between Communities and Classrooms*. Routledge.
5. Parpibayeva, M. Z. Q. (2023). Educational Discourse in Uzbek and English: A Comparative Analysis. *International Scientific and Current Research Conferences*, 1(01), 74-77.
6. Soqiyeva, S. S. (2021). A Study of the Pragmatic-Semantic Features of Pronominal Reference Units in English and Uzbek Languages\*. *Journal of Comparative Linguistics*.
7. Nizomova, M., & Rahmonova, M. (2023). The concept of "time" in english and uzbek works of art and its linguistic and cultural interpretation. *Oriental Journal of Philology*, 3(05), 15-24.
8. Nizomova, M. B. (2023). Expansion of social functions of pedagogical terms in various spheres of society. *Oriental Journal of Philology*, 3(02), 8-13.
9. Nizomova, M. B. (2020). Classification of pedagogical terms in English and Uzbek languages. *Экономика и социум*, (10 (77)), 178-182.

