



PROFESSIONALLY ORIENTED UZBEK LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION IN AGRARIAN HIGHER EDUCATION: A LINGUODIDACTIC MODEL FOR INTEGRATING TERMINOLOGY, ACADEMIC DISCOURSE, AND NATIONAL CULTURAL VALUES

Boboyev Yusuf Beknazarovich

Teacher, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature

Tashkent State Agrarian University

Abstract

This article examines the theoretical, methodological, and pedagogical foundations of professionally oriented Uzbek language instruction in agrarian higher education and proposes an integrative linguodidactic model designed for the formation of students' communicative, terminological, analytical, and cultural competences in a sector-specific academic environment. The relevance of the topic arises from the growing need to align language education with the communicative realities of specialized professional training, especially in institutions where future agronomists, agroengineers, veterinarians, economists, land managers, food technologists, and environmental specialists must use Uzbek not only as a language of everyday interaction, but as a language of scientific reasoning, professional documentation, field analysis, academic writing, and public communication. The study is grounded in the idea that native-language instruction at university level cannot remain limited to general grammar, literary appreciation, or formal stylistics alone; rather, it must support disciplinary literacy, professional identity formation, ethical communication, terminology management, and the capacity to interpret, produce, and evaluate subject-specific texts. The article synthesizes insights from language-for-specific-purposes research, discourse analysis, higher education pedagogy, terminology studies, and national language policy, while also considering the peculiarities of agrarian discourse, where scientific precision, ecological awareness, regional lexical variation, practical instruction, and socio-cultural embeddedness intersect. Using theoretical analysis, comparative interpretation, content-based pedagogical modeling, and functional discourse examination, the study identifies the core linguistic domains that should structure Uzbek language teaching in agrarian universities: professional terminology, academic genre competence, oral and written field communication, linguistic normativity, text interpretation, speech ethics, interdisciplinary integration,



and culturally grounded meaning-making. Based on these domains, the article develops a staged instructional model in which students move from receptive familiarity with disciplinary vocabulary to productive use of professional discourse in reports, annotations, laboratory descriptions, analytical essays, oral defenses, and community-oriented communication tasks. The results show that the effectiveness of Uzbek language education in agrarian institutions depends on at least five interrelated conditions: the contextualization of linguistic material within real professional situations, the systematic development of terminology through thematic clusters, the integration of literary and cultural texts with sectoral realities, the teaching of genre conventions specific to higher education and agriculture, and the use of assessment criteria that value clarity, logical progression, conceptual accuracy, lexical appropriateness, and social responsibility. The article argues that the native language in agrarian education should be treated not as an auxiliary subject but as a foundational epistemic instrument through which students conceptualize reality, negotiate knowledge, preserve national intellectual heritage, and participate in the modernization of agriculture. In this sense, Uzbek language instruction becomes a strategic site for strengthening scientific literacy, professional communication culture, and the humanistic orientation of agricultural education. The proposed model may be applied in curriculum design, syllabus revision, textbook development, classroom practice, and teacher training, and it also offers a conceptual basis for future empirical research on language education in non-philological higher education programs.

Keywords: Uzbek language instruction; agrarian higher education; professional communication; linguodidactics; terminology; academic discourse; disciplinary literacy; language for specific purposes; national cultural values; higher education pedagogy; scientific communication; genre competence.

Introduction

In contemporary higher education, the status of the native language as a medium of professional knowledge production has acquired renewed significance, particularly in countries where educational modernization, national identity, and scientific development are closely interconnected. Within this context, the teaching of Uzbek language and literature in non-philological universities, especially agrarian



institutions, requires a fundamental rethinking of aims, content, and methods. Traditional approaches that emphasize orthography, isolated stylistic correction, or purely literary-historical transmission remain important but are insufficient for the communicative needs of students who must operate in specialized professional domains where language functions as a tool of analysis, regulation, explanation, persuasion, and documentation. Agrarian higher education presents a particularly rich and complex field for linguodidactic inquiry because it brings together scientific terminology, practical field communication, laboratory description, environmental discourse, rural sociocultural realities, state policy vocabulary, and the ethical dimensions of food, land, water, and ecological stewardship. Future specialists in agronomy, horticulture, veterinary medicine, agricultural engineering, agricultural economics, land cadastre, agroecology, and food technology require linguistic preparation that enables them to read technical manuals, write reports and annotations, explain research results, conduct professional dialogue, interpret legal and normative documents, present scientific arguments, and communicate effectively with both expert and non-expert audiences. Yet in many higher education settings, the native-language course still occupies a marginal place in the institutional imagination, often treated as supplementary rather than formative. This contradiction produces a pedagogical gap: students enter specialized disciplines with weak academic writing habits, fragmented terminology, unstable command of professional styles, and limited awareness of how linguistic choices shape scientific reasoning and social authority. The present article addresses that gap by arguing that professionally oriented Uzbek language instruction in agrarian universities should be organized as an integrated system that links language, disciplinary thinking, and national cultural consciousness. The theoretical basis of this argument emerges from several lines of scholarship. Research in language for specific purposes has shown that professional communities develop distinct lexical, rhetorical, and genre-specific norms, and that successful instruction must account for the communicative practices of particular disciplines rather than rely solely on generalized language models [3], [4], [5]. Discourse theorists have further demonstrated that language does not merely express pre-existing knowledge but actively organizes fields of meaning, identities, and institutional relations [6], [7]. Educational theorists have emphasized that learning is mediated through language-based interaction, conceptual scaffolding, and socially situated meaning-making [8], [9]. In higher education studies, disciplinary literacy



has become a key concept because students must learn not only content but also the communicative forms through which content is produced, validated, and circulated [10], [11]. These insights are directly relevant to agrarian education, where knowledge is embodied in manuals, classifications, field notes, regulations, extension materials, expert consultations, scientific articles, and public recommendations. From a national perspective, the issue gains additional urgency because the strengthening of Uzbek as a full-fledged language of science, administration, and professional life remains inseparable from broader cultural and educational development [1], [2]. For students in agrarian universities, this means that language instruction should not merely correct speech but cultivate the ability to think professionally in Uzbek, build arguments responsibly, interpret local and global knowledge, and connect scientific concepts with the lived realities of Uzbek agriculture and rural life. The present study therefore aims to develop a linguodidactic model for professionally oriented Uzbek language instruction in agrarian higher education by identifying the main communicative demands of agrarian discourse, analyzing the pedagogical deficiencies of conventional practice, and proposing a structured system of content, methods, and assessment criteria suitable for modern university education. The central thesis is that the pedagogical value of the Uzbek language course in agrarian universities increases significantly when it is repositioned as a discipline of professional communication, disciplinary literacy, conceptual precision, and cultural mediation. Such repositioning does not weaken the literary and ethical dimensions of the subject; on the contrary, it deepens them by demonstrating how language, thought, and national identity interact within the practical work of building an intellectually independent and socially responsible agricultural sector. The novelty of the article lies in its attempt to synthesize philological, pedagogical, and profession-oriented approaches into a single instructional model specifically tailored to the conditions of agrarian higher education. Unlike generic university language teaching frameworks, the proposed model centers agrarian terminology, professional genres, research communication, ethical speech behavior, rural sociolinguistic awareness, and the interdependence of scientific precision and cultural intelligibility. This makes the study relevant not only for teachers of Uzbek language and literature, but also for curriculum designers, academic administrators, methodology specialists, and scholars interested in the modernization of humanities teaching within specialized institutions. In methodological terms, the article proceeds from the assumption that the language



classroom in a professional university should become a laboratory of intellectual practice where students learn to name, compare, classify, describe, explain, evaluate, and persuade in ways that are appropriate to their future field. Such a laboratory model requires a move away from fragmented exercises toward communicative sequences anchored in authentic educational tasks: writing abstracts, defining concepts, summarizing field observations, editing research-based prose, presenting disciplinary arguments, comparing terms, and translating professional meaning across audiences. It also requires greater cooperation between language teachers and subject specialists, because terminology and discourse conventions cannot be fully mastered in pedagogical isolation. In the case of agrarian universities, this interdisciplinary cooperation is especially important because agricultural knowledge is simultaneously scientific, technological, ecological, and social, and therefore demands language instruction capable of handling complexity without sacrificing clarity. By situating Uzbek language teaching at the intersection of professional relevance and cultural responsibility, the article contributes to a broader reevaluation of humanities education in specialized universities and argues that language is not a decorative supplement to agrarian expertise, but one of its principal conditions.

Methods

The study employs a qualitative theoretical-methodological design that combines comparative analysis, functional discourse interpretation, content-based pedagogical modeling, and conceptual synthesis. Rather than testing a narrow classroom intervention, the article seeks to construct a coherent instructional framework suitable for professionally oriented Uzbek language teaching in agrarian higher education, and therefore uses methods appropriate to normatively grounded educational design. First, a comparative review of relevant scholarship was conducted in the fields of language for specific purposes, discourse studies, terminology theory, higher education pedagogy, disciplinary literacy, and native-language instruction. The purpose of this review was not to produce a purely descriptive literature summary, but to identify transferable principles that can be adapted to the linguistic and institutional conditions of Uzbek-language education in a non-philological university. Second, a functional analysis of agrarian discourse was carried out by examining typical communicative situations associated with agrarian higher education and professional activity: definition of concepts, field observation, laboratory description, procedural



instruction, oral presentation, scientific annotation, report writing, data commentary, advisory explanation, and ethical public communication. This analytical step treated discourse as a patterned system of communicative actions rather than merely a set of vocabulary items, thereby allowing the study to move beyond the simplistic assumption that professional language teaching is equivalent to terminology memorization. Third, the article uses pedagogical modeling to construct an integrated course architecture based on four interrelated dimensions: lexical-terminological competence, genre-discursive competence, normative-stylistic competence, and cultural-axiological competence. Each of these dimensions was then mapped onto stages of student development, corresponding to the progression from recognition and comprehension to controlled production, independent use, and reflective mastery. Fourth, the study applies the principle of contextual validity, meaning that every proposed teaching element must have a clear relation to the actual communicative needs of agrarian students. This principle functions as a filter against content inflation, abstract formalism, and philological isolation. If a topic, exercise, or assessment form cannot be linked to a real academic or professional communicative function, its priority within the course should be reconsidered. Fifth, the study adopts a linguodidactic perspective in which language is understood simultaneously as a system, a cultural medium, and a professional instrument. On that basis, the course model is designed to preserve the educational value of literary and cultural material while recontextualizing it within communicative and ethical aims relevant to agrarian education. The methodological logic of the study also rests on several assumptions. One assumption is that students in agrarian universities enter higher education with heterogeneous language backgrounds: some possess strong intuitive fluency but weak academic writing skills; others show partial mastery of terminology but low confidence in oral presentation; still others can reproduce definitions without being able to structure an argument or adapt their speech to audience and purpose. A second assumption is that university language courses often overemphasize error correction and underemphasize genre awareness, discourse organization, and epistemic vocabulary. A third assumption is that terminology acquires educational value only when embedded in conceptual relations, textual functions, and communicative tasks. In other words, knowing a term is not equivalent to knowing how to use it in definition, comparison, classification, argumentation, or recommendation. Based on these assumptions, the study formulates criteria for course design: authenticity of



communicative situation, conceptual coherence, cumulative progression, interdisciplinarity, normativity without rigidity, cultural rootedness, and assessability. To operationalize these criteria, the article constructs sample instructional blocks that can be adapted to classroom use. For example, a terminology block begins with concept mapping and lexical differentiation, continues through guided reading of short disciplinary texts, moves into sentence-level application, and culminates in mini-genres such as definitions, short explanations, summaries, and oral clarifications. A genre block begins with recognition of text purpose and structure, proceeds through analysis of model texts, and then requires student production using explicit rubrics. A normative-stylistic block focuses not merely on “correctness” but on appropriateness: choice of lexical register, syntactic economy, cohesion, precision, evidential phrasing, and elimination of ambiguity. A cultural-axiological block connects literary passages, proverbs, essays, and publicistic texts about land, labor, nature, water, and ethical responsibility with contemporary agrarian themes, thereby allowing students to see that professional language is not culturally empty but shaped by historical experience and value systems. Although the study is not based on a statistically measured experiment, its methodological strength lies in its synthetic and design-oriented orientation, which is particularly suitable for educational contexts where the first urgent need is the formulation of a coherent model. In such cases, theoretical modeling is not a substitute for empirical work but its necessary precursor. A poorly conceptualized course cannot later be improved by assessment alone; sound pedagogical architecture must come first. Therefore, the methodological contribution of the article lies in converting scattered pedagogical intuitions into an explicit and transferable framework that can guide syllabus development, classroom practice, and future empirical validation.

Results

The main result of the study is the development of an integrative linguodidactic model for professionally oriented Uzbek language instruction in agrarian higher education, structured around five major components: communicative needs analysis, content selection, staged competence formation, task-system design, and criterion-based assessment. The first result concerns communicative needs analysis. The study shows that agrarian students require not one but several interlocking language repertoires: the repertoire of academic learning, which includes note-taking, summarizing,



defining, comparing, and responding; the repertoire of scientific communication, which includes abstracts, reports, hypotheses, methods descriptions, and interpretation of findings; the repertoire of professional practice, which includes field instructions, observations, oral consultations, and explanatory recommendations; the repertoire of civic and ethical communication, which includes public awareness, ecological advocacy, and responsible use of language in socially sensitive contexts such as food safety, environmental sustainability, and rural development; and the repertoire of national-cultural literacy, which includes knowledge of literary language, rhetorical tradition, value-laden concepts, and culturally significant semantic frames related to land, labor, harvest, water, and stewardship. This finding makes it clear that an effective Uzbek language course for agrarian universities cannot be built on a single model of competence. It must instead cultivate layered proficiency in which scientific precision, communicative flexibility, and cultural depth reinforce one another. The second result concerns content selection. The study identifies eight priority content domains for the curriculum: professional terminology and concept networks; text genres used in agrarian education and practice; oral academic and professional interaction; lexical norm and stylistic appropriateness; sentence and paragraph logic in analytical writing; interpretation of literary and cultural texts connected to nature, labor, and social responsibility; language of policy, regulation, and institutional documentation; and reflective editing skills. These domains should not appear as isolated weekly topics, but as spirally repeated clusters that gain depth over time. For example, terminology should first be introduced through thematic fields such as soil, irrigation, crops, livestock, machinery, ecology, processing, and agro-economics; then revisited through definitional tasks; then used in short analytical writing; and later integrated into oral presentation and research commentary. The third result concerns staged competence formation. The proposed model distinguishes four developmental stages. At the orientation stage, students recognize core vocabulary, identify genre differences, and develop awareness of communicative purpose. At the guided production stage, they practice controlled use of terminology, sentence patterns, and text structures through scaffolded exercises. At the independent application stage, they produce short professional and academic texts with reduced teacher support, adapting language to communicative situation. At the reflective mastery stage, they revise, evaluate, and defend their linguistic choices, demonstrating awareness of norm, audience, argument, and disciplinary expectations.



This staged model helps resolve a common pedagogical problem in university language courses: the premature demand for polished production before the student has developed conceptual and rhetorical control. The fourth result concerns task-system design. The article shows that task effectiveness increases when exercises are organized into meaningful communicative sequences rather than isolated grammar or vocabulary drills. A strong task sequence begins with an authentic problem or text, continues through guided noticing, moves to focused practice, and ends in productive application. For instance, a module on irrigation discourse may begin with a short scientific-popular text on water use, proceed to terminology grouping, then to comparative definitions, then to paragraph writing about efficient irrigation, and finally to an oral mini-presentation in which students explain the concept to a farmer, a peer, and a teacher using different registers. Such sequencing develops not only vocabulary but audience awareness, rhetorical flexibility, and conceptual clarity. Another result is the identification of genre competence as a decisive factor in student success. Many language difficulties attributed to weak grammar are in fact genre difficulties: students do not know how to organize an abstract, formulate a problem statement, describe a process, comment on data, or close a scientific paragraph. Therefore, teaching genre templates, rhetorical moves, and cohesive devices becomes more effective than endless decontextualized correction. In practical terms, the study proposes that the course include work with the following genres: annotation, abstract, explanatory paragraph, procedural instruction, report fragment, concept note, comparative commentary, field observation note, academic presentation outline, and edited summary. Each genre should be taught through model analysis, explicit criteria, and rewriting practice. The results also indicate that the cultural-axiological dimension should not be removed from profession-oriented instruction; rather, it should be pedagogically reframed. Literary texts, essays, aphorisms, and publicistic materials about labor, homeland, nature, knowledge, ethics, and responsibility serve an important function in forming professional speech culture. When such texts are linked to agrarian realities, they help students understand that language is not merely technical but moral and civilizational. A future specialist who can describe a soil profile yet cannot speak responsibly about land degradation, farmer dignity, or ecological obligation remains linguistically incomplete. The model therefore includes interpretive tasks in which students connect artistic language with professional values. Another major result concerns assessment. The study proposes a rubric system based



on six criteria: conceptual accuracy, lexical appropriateness, logical organization, genre conformity, normative correctness, and communicative effectiveness. This multi-criteria approach is superior to error-counting because it recognizes that language competence in higher education includes meaning management, not only formal correctness. A text with minor surface errors but strong conceptual clarity and coherent argument may be pedagogically more valuable than a formally neat but intellectually empty paragraph. Finally, the results highlight the institutional dimension of success. The course becomes significantly more effective when language teachers collaborate with disciplinary departments, use authentic subject-related materials, and align tasks with students' real academic workload. This means that the Uzbek language course should not float above university life as a ceremonial humanities requirement; it should intersect with laboratory practice, seminar discussion, fieldwork reflection, and research culture. Under such conditions, professionally oriented Uzbek instruction can serve as a bridge between general education and specialized training, between language norm and disciplinary voice, and between cultural memory and modern agrarian innovation.

Discussion

The discussion of the results reveals several important implications for the theory and practice of native-language instruction in specialized higher education. First, the proposed model challenges the still widespread assumption that profession-oriented language teaching in the native language is merely a simplified derivative of foreign-language-for-specific-purposes methodology. While there are valuable parallels, the native-language context is more complex because the student's relation to the language is simultaneously cognitive, emotional, cultural, historical, and institutional. A student already "knows" Uzbek in the everyday sense, yet may lack mastery of scientific abstraction, academic register, terminological precision, structured reasoning, and disciplinary voice. This creates a pedagogical paradox: the teacher must develop advanced competence in a language that is already familiar, and must do so without reducing the course either to repetitive normativism or to abstract cultural discourse detached from professional life. The proposed model responds to this paradox by treating language development as a transition from spontaneous fluency to conscious professional literacy. In this sense, the model aligns with sociocultural theories of learning, according to which conceptual development and



disciplined communication emerge through structured mediation rather than through exposure alone [8]. Second, the model highlights the centrality of terminology, but also corrects a common methodological error: the reduction of professional language to terminology lists. Terms are not inert labels. They exist within conceptual systems, rhetorical relations, and disciplinary practices. If students memorize terms without learning how to define, compare, classify, contextualize, and operationalize them in speech and writing, then terminology instruction becomes a decorative exercise. The same principle applies to grammar. In professional higher education, grammar should be taught not as an isolated code but as a resource for precision, hierarchy of information, causality, evidentiality, condition, comparison, and procedural logic. When grammar is refunctionalized in this manner, it ceases to be a burden and becomes a tool. Third, the study invites a reconsideration of literature's place within profession-oriented language teaching. In some modernization discourses, literature is treated as a beautiful but impractical component that must yield space to technical relevance. This view is shortsighted. Literary and publicistic texts enrich professional education by deepening ethical imagination, broadening semantic sensitivity, cultivating rhetorical taste, and connecting students with cultural narratives through which society interprets labor, land, and responsibility. For agrarian students in particular, the motifs of earth, water, seed, season, hardship, patience, and collective life are not external to the profession; they are embedded in its moral vocabulary. The question is therefore not whether literature should remain, but how it should be selected and taught. The article argues for a functional-cultural approach in which literary material supports reflection, interpretation, value articulation, and speech culture, rather than remaining a purely historical object of passive admiration. Fourth, the discussion underscores the importance of genre pedagogy. One of the most persistent weaknesses in university writing instruction is the assumption that students will intuitively learn how to write scientific or professional texts once they know vocabulary and general grammar. In reality, genre knowledge is socially acquired and must be taught explicitly. A student who has never been shown how an annotation condenses purpose, method, and finding cannot be expected to produce one by intuition. A student who has not practiced procedural clarity will struggle to write an instruction text even if lexical knowledge is adequate. Genre teaching also democratizes academic participation because it makes hidden expectations visible. This is especially important in specialized universities where students come from



varied educational backgrounds and may have had unequal access to academic literacy practices before entering higher education. Fifth, the proposed model has implications for curriculum policy. If Uzbek language instruction is to contribute meaningfully to agrarian education, then the course should be repositioned in official curricula not as a residual general subject but as a competence-building discipline with clear outcomes linked to professional communication, academic writing, critical reading, and ethical speech. This does not necessarily require increasing formal contact hours alone; it requires increasing conceptual seriousness, interdisciplinary cooperation, and material relevance. Syllabi should identify target genres, target lexical fields, target communicative situations, and target cultural themes. Assessment should reward intellectual clarity and discourse management, not only formal correction. Textbooks should include authentic materials from agrarian science, policy, and professional communication, as well as carefully chosen literary and publicistic texts that illuminate agrarian values and national identity. Sixth, the study contributes to the broader discussion on the language of science in national higher education. In many post-Soviet and multilingual contexts, the development of national languages as instruments of advanced knowledge remains an unfinished project. The modernization of agriculture, like the modernization of any field, is inseparable from the development of conceptual, terminological, and discursive resources in the language through which students are educated and professionals communicate. Therefore, improving Uzbek language instruction in agrarian universities is not a narrow methodological matter; it is part of a larger intellectual infrastructure project. A language becomes scientifically powerful when it is actively used to formulate hypotheses, argue claims, describe methods, interpret data, and disseminate knowledge. The classroom is one of the places where this power is either developed or neglected. Seventh, the article suggests that pedagogical success in this domain depends heavily on teacher identity and preparation. A teacher of Uzbek language and literature in an agrarian university can no longer operate solely as a guardian of norm or transmitter of canonical texts. That teacher must also function as a mediator between philology and profession, between general culture and disciplinary discourse, between the values of language and the demands of modern communication. This expanded role requires methodological support, access to specialized materials, collaboration with subject departments, and possibly new forms of professional development. In this respect, the study has an institutional message:



reforms in course content will remain superficial if teacher support systems remain unchanged. Finally, the limitations of the present article must be acknowledged. Because the study is theoretical and model-building in nature, it does not yet provide empirical classroom measurement of learning outcomes across multiple cohorts. Its claims are therefore strongest at the level of conceptual validity, curricular logic, and pedagogical plausibility rather than statistical proof. Yet this limitation is also the article's necessity: before large-scale measurement can occur, the field requires a coherent framework capable of guiding practice. Future research may test the model through classroom experiments, discourse-based student performance analysis, rubric validation, and comparative studies across universities. Even so, the present study already establishes a strong foundation by demonstrating that professionally oriented Uzbek language instruction in agrarian higher education should be understood as a strategically significant area where linguistic competence, disciplinary literacy, ethical formation, and national intellectual development converge.

Conclusion

The article has argued that the teaching of Uzbek language and literature in agrarian higher education must be redefined in accordance with the communicative realities, epistemic demands, and cultural responsibilities of modern professional training. The core conclusion is that professionally oriented Uzbek language instruction should not be reduced to grammar revision, literary appreciation in isolation, or mechanical terminology transfer; rather, it should function as an integrated linguodidactic system that develops the student's ability to think, read, write, explain, evaluate, and interact within the discourse world of agriculture. By examining the communicative structure of agrarian education and professional activity, the study identified the need for a multilayered competence model that includes terminology management, genre awareness, normative-stylistic precision, oral and written professional communication, and cultural-axiological depth. On this basis, the article proposed a staged instructional model moving from recognition to guided production, independent application, and reflective mastery. The practical significance of this model lies in its adaptability: it can inform curriculum reform, syllabus design, textbook development, assessment practice, and interdisciplinary cooperation between language teachers and subject specialists. The study also demonstrated that the professionalization of native-language teaching does not require the abandonment



of literary and cultural content; instead, it calls for their pedagogical recontextualization so that they contribute to ethical speech culture, value-based interpretation, and the humanization of technical education. In agrarian universities, where students are prepared to work with land, water, plants, animals, technology, and rural communities, language education must cultivate both precision and responsibility, both scientific clarity and cultural intelligence. Such education strengthens not only student performance but the status of Uzbek as a language of academic and professional modernity. Thus, the native-language course becomes a formative space where national identity and disciplinary competence are not opposed, but mutually reinforcing. The broader educational implication is clear: when Uzbek language instruction is aligned with professional communication needs and institutional realities, it ceases to be a peripheral requirement and becomes a foundational component of higher education quality. Future research should empirically validate the proposed model through classroom-based studies, longitudinal assessment, and comparison across specializations, but the conceptual groundwork is already strong enough to support immediate pedagogical innovation. For teachers working in departments of Uzbek language and literature within specialized universities, this framework offers not only a method but a mission: to prepare students who can carry their field forward through language that is accurate, responsible, culturally rooted, and intellectually alive.

References

1. O‘zbekiston Respublikasining “Davlat tili haqida”gi Qonuni.
2. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining ta’lim, ilm-fan va ma’naviy-ma’rifiy taraqqiyotga oid normativ-huquqiy hujjatlari.
3. Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. London: Longman.
4. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). *Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. London: Routledge.
6. Halliday, M. A. K. (1978). *Language as Social Semiotic: The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold.



7. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
8. Vygotsky, L. S. (1978). *Mind in Society: The Development of Higher Psychological Processes*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
9. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
10. Gee, J. P. (2015). *Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.
11. Shanahan, T., & Shanahan, C. (2008). Teaching disciplinary literacy to adolescents: Rethinking content-area literacy. *Harvard Educational Review*, 78(1), 40–59.
12. Cummins, J. (2000). *Language, Power and Pedagogy: Bilingual Children in the Crossfire*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
13. Nation, I. S. P. (2013). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
14. Flowerdew, J. (2013). *Discourse in English Language Education*. London: Routledge.
15. Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Richards, J. C., & Rodgers, T. S. (2014). *Approaches and Methods in Language Teaching* (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Baxromov, A., and others. Research on Uzbek linguodidactics and higher education methodology.
18. Qo'ng'urov, R., Begmatov, E., and other works on Uzbek literary language, stylistics, and speech culture.
19. Uzbek terminology, lexicography, and functional stylistics studies relevant to higher education practice.
20. Higher education methodology sources on competence-based teaching, academic writing, and communicative assessment.