

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

A COMPARATIVE STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC ANALYSIS OF COMPLEX (SUBORDINATE) SENTENCES IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH: TYPES OF SUBORDINATE CLAUSES, LINKING DEVICES, AND COMPONENT ORDER

Surayyo Mansurova

2nd-Year Master's Student at Nordic International University

Zahriddin Xaitqulov

Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology, Associate Professor

Abstract:

This study presents a comparative structural-semantic analysis of complex sentences with subordination in Uzbek and English, focusing on three interconnected parameters: the typology of subordinate clauses, the linguistic devices that establish clause linkage, and the ordering principles that shape component distribution in discourse. Although both languages employ subordination to encode logical relations such as cause, condition, purpose, time, and concession, they differ substantially in how these relations are grammaticalized. The analysis examines how English predominantly relies on finite subordinate clauses introduced by conjunctions and relative markers, while Uzbek shows a strong preference for non-finite predicative forms, converbs, and nominalized clause-like structures that function as syntactic dependents. Particular attention is given to the mapping between semantic relations and formal exponents, including the functional range of subordinators, correlatives, and morphosyntactic markers of dependency. The study also addresses component order as an interpretive factor, comparing the relatively flexible but information-structure-sensitive placement of subordinate clauses in English with the head-final tendencies and clause-chaining patterns characteristic of Uzbek. By integrating structural description with semantic classification and

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

distributional evidence from contemporary written and academic registers, the research clarifies how comparable meanings can be realized through different grammatical strategies. The findings aim to support contrastive linguistics, translation studies, and advanced grammar pedagogy in EFL and Uzbek philological contexts, offering an empirically grounded account of subordination that prioritizes functional equivalence and intelligibility across typological boundaries.

Keywords: Complex sentence, subordination, subordinate clause types, linking devices, clause order, contrastive syntax, Uzbek syntax, English syntax, structural-semantic analysis, information structure

Introduction

Complex sentences are a central resource of human language for packaging experience, negotiating interpersonal meaning, and constructing coherent discourse. Through subordination, speakers and writers are able to represent relations between events and propositions, including temporality, causation, condition, purpose, concession, comparison, and specification. In philological research, the structural-semantic study of complex sentences provides a link between formal grammar and interpretive meaning, because subordinate constructions simultaneously involve syntactic dependency and semantic integration. For students and researchers working with Uzbek and English, the contrastive description of subordination is especially relevant: the two languages represent different typological profiles and employ distinct grammatical mechanisms for encoding similar semantic relations. English, as an analytic language with relatively limited inflectional morphology, typically expresses subordination through finite clauses introduced by subordinating conjunctions, relative pronouns, and complementizers. Uzbek, as an agglutinative and predominantly head-final language, possesses a rich inventory of non-finite

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

predicative forms and nominalization strategies that often function as equivalents of subordinate clauses in English. These structural differences create both theoretical interest and practical challenges in translation, academic writing, and language pedagogy.

Within English grammar, subordinate clauses are commonly classified into complement clauses, relative clauses, and adverbial clauses. Complement clauses function as arguments of a predicate and are often introduced by markers such as *that*, *whether*, and *if*, or realized as infinitival constructions. Relative clauses modify a nominal head and are introduced by relative pronouns and adverbs such as *who*, *which*, *that*, *where*, and *when*, including zero relativization in certain contexts. Adverbial clauses modify the matrix clause and are introduced by a broad set of subordinators such as *because*, *although*, *when*, *if*, *since*, and *so that*. In Uzbek, a comparable functional space is distributed across finite dependent clauses, participial modifiers, converbal clause chains, and nominalized units that behave like clausal complements. Uzbek subordinate relations are frequently marked not only by conjunction-like elements but also by suffixal morphology, including participles, verbal nouns, and converbial forms that encode temporal, causal, conditional, or purposive relations in a compact way. Consequently, a direct form-to-form mapping between English and Uzbek subordinate structures is rarely straightforward.

The linking devices that establish dependency constitute another key contrastive parameter. In English, subordination is signaled primarily by function words, fixed complementizers, and relative markers; the dependent clause is often formally finite and its boundaries are indicated by subordinators and punctuation conventions in writing. In Uzbek, dependency is frequently encoded by morphology on the verb of the dependent unit, and the clause boundary may be expressed through agglutinative suffixes that simultaneously contribute aspectual, modal, and relational meaning. In addition, correlatives and discourse particles may participate in building semantic cohesion between clauses, shaping

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

how readers recover the intended logical relation. These differences affect not only sentence structure but also the distribution of information and the rhetorical rhythm of academic texts.

Component order, finally, interacts with both grammar and discourse. English allows subordinate clauses in preposed, postposed, and medial positions, with placement often governed by processing considerations, emphasis, and information structure. Uzbek, with strong head-final tendencies, commonly places dependent material before the head or matrix predicate, while clause chaining may lead to sequences where multiple dependent units precede a final finite predicate. This raises methodological questions about what counts as a subordinate clause in contrastive analysis: whether the unit should be defined by finiteness, by dependency marking, or by functional role in clause combining.

The present study addresses these issues by providing a comparative structural-semantic analysis of complex subordinate constructions in Uzbek and English, focusing on subordinate clause types, linking devices, and component order. The purpose is to identify systematic correspondences and divergences, and to explain how similar semantic relations are realized through different grammatical strategies. By situating the analysis within contemporary contrastive syntax and functional semantics, the study aims to contribute to Uzbek-English philology, translation practice, and university-level grammar instruction.

Methods

The study employs a qualitative-quantitative contrastive methodology combining descriptive grammar analysis, structural distributional analysis, and functional-semantic classification. The object of analysis is complex sentences with subordination in contemporary Uzbek and English, restricted to written registers that are typical for a philology university context: academic articles, university textbooks, analytical essays, and formal informational texts. This register choice is motivated by two considerations. First, academic writing maximizes explicit

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

logical relations and thus provides rich data on subordination. Second, it reflects the target competence domain of the intended audience, where syntactic choices are linked to clarity, argumentation, and coherence. The corpus is compiled as a balanced sample of comparable texts in both languages, controlling for genre and communicative purpose to reduce distortions caused by register-specific conventions.

Data collection proceeds in three stages. First, candidate complex sentences are extracted using manual screening supported by pattern-based identification. In English, the screening targets typical subordinators and relative markers, including because, although, if, when, since, while, so that, in order that, that, whether, and relative forms such as who, which, that, where, and when, as well as non-finite complements (to-infinitives and -ing clauses) in argument positions. In Uzbek, the screening targets conjunction-like items and, crucially, verbal morphology associated with dependency, including participial and converbial forms, verbal nouns, and constructions functioning as clausal complements or modifiers. Because Uzbek frequently realizes subordination through non-finite forms rather than overt conjunctions, the sampling criteria are functional: a unit is included if it encodes a proposition that is semantically dependent on a head clause and is syntactically integrated as its modifier or argument.

Second, each extracted sentence is segmented into a matrix clause and its dependent unit(s). Segmentation is guided by three diagnostics: dependency marking (function words in English, morphological markers in Uzbek), syntactic role (argument vs modifier), and semantic relation (e.g., cause, condition, time). Where segmentation is ambiguous, the unit is tested by substitution and extraction diagnostics at the level of phrase-structure approximation: if the dependent unit can be replaced by a proform-like element or nominal equivalent without destroying the grammatical frame, it is treated as a complement-like dependent; if it modifies a nominal head, it is treated as relative/attributive; if it modifies the proposition, it is treated as adverbial. For Uzbek, additional evidence

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

is taken from head-final dependency patterns: dependent material typically precedes the predicate of the matrix unit and is marked by participial or converbial morphology that constrains its integration.

Third, annotation is performed according to a unified comparative scheme with three parameter sets: subordinate clause type, linking device, and component order. Subordinate clause types are coded into complement, relative/attributive, and adverbial categories, with adverbials subclassified by semantic relation: temporal, causal, conditional, concessive, purposive, resultative, comparative, and manner. Linking devices are coded by their formal exponent. In English, this includes subordinating conjunctions, complementizers, relative pronouns/adverbs, and zero marking; in Uzbek, this includes conjunctions, correlatives, particles, and morphological dependency markers on the dependent predicate (participles, converbs, verbal nouns), as well as postpositions or case marking that contribute to the relation. Component order is coded as preposed (dependent before matrix), postposed (dependent after matrix), medial (embedded within the matrix), and chained (multiple dependents preceding a final finite predicate). For each token, the position is recorded together with a brief discourse-function note, such as backgrounding, framing, emphasis, or afterthought.

To ensure reliability, a subset of the data is re-annotated after an interval and compared for category stability. Disagreements are resolved by refining operational definitions, especially in borderline cases where Uzbek nominalized dependents resemble simple noun phrases, or where English non-finite clauses alternate with infinitival complements. Quantitative summaries are then produced to identify distributional tendencies, such as the proportion of adverbial vs complement structures, the frequency of specific linking devices, and the dominant placement patterns in each language. Finally, representative examples are selected for close reading to interpret how formal choices align with semantic relations and discourse organization. This mixed approach supports both

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

generalization and explanatory depth, allowing the study to describe regular correspondences while accounting for typological asymmetries between Uzbek and English subordination systems.

Results

The comparative analysis reveals that Uzbek and English share a broadly similar functional inventory of subordinate relations, yet they differ markedly in the grammatical packaging of those relations. Across the corpus, both languages regularly employ subordination to encode temporal sequencing, causality, condition, purpose, concession, and specification. However, English shows a higher proportional reliance on finite subordinate clauses introduced by explicit subordinators and relative markers, whereas Uzbek more frequently realizes the same semantic relations through non-finite dependent predicates and clause-like nominalizations that are structurally integrated into the matrix clause. As a result, functional equivalence is often achieved through different formal strategies rather than direct structural matching.

In the distribution of subordinate clause types, English demonstrates a clear predominance of finite adverbial clauses in academic register, especially causal, conditional, and concessive clauses introduced by *because*, *since*, *if*, *although*, and *while*. Complement clauses in English are frequent in reporting, evaluation, and epistemic stance constructions, where *that*-clauses and infinitival complements function as objects or extraposed subjects. Relative clauses appear systematically in definitional and classificatory statements, supporting the informational density characteristic of academic prose. Uzbek, by contrast, shows a strong preference for attributive and adverbial dependency realized via participial and converbial forms. Structures functioning as relative clauses are commonly encoded as participial modifiers preceding the nominal head, allowing compact nominal expansion without the need for a relative pronoun. Complement-like relations are frequently expressed through nominalized

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

predicates that behave as clausal arguments, often taking case marking and participating in postpositional government. Finite subordinate clauses exist in Uzbek, but in the examined register they occur less often than non-finite dependent constructions, particularly when the relation can be expressed by a converb or participle.

With regard to linking devices, English is dominated by function-word subordinators and complementizers. Subordinate linkage is overt and segmentable: a dependent clause typically begins with a marker that signals the semantic relation, and clause boundaries are further supported by punctuation. Relative linkage relies on a stable set of pronouns and adverbs, with occasional zero marking in restrictive relatives. Uzbek linkage, in contrast, is predominantly morphological. Dependency is typically encoded on the verb of the dependent unit through suffixation that simultaneously expresses aspectual-temporal meanings and subordination. Converbial forms are especially productive in encoding temporal overlap, sequence, and causal adjacency, producing clause chains that accumulate background conditions before the matrix predicate. Participial forms support attributive relations by turning predicative content into a modifier. Nominalized forms contribute to complement relations, allowing a proposition to be treated as an argument of a higher predicate via case marking and postpositions. Conjunctions and particles are present and play a role in disambiguation, but they do not constitute the sole or primary mechanism of subordination in many tokens.

Component order exhibits a stable cross-linguistic contrast shaped by typology and information structure. In English, subordinate clauses display flexible placement. Postposed adverbial clauses are frequent when the dependent relation is presented as an explanation or justification following the main claim; preposed adverbials are common when the subordinate clause frames the discourse by establishing time, condition, or contrast; medial placement occurs mainly in non-restrictive relatives and parenthetical concessives. This flexibility supports

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

rhetorical maneuvering, allowing writers to foreground the main proposition or to guide the reader by framing before assertion. In Uzbek, preposed placement of dependent material is dominant. Dependent units commonly precede the matrix predicate, consistent with head-final tendencies and the syntactic integration of non-finite forms. Clause chaining is a salient pattern: multiple dependent units, often converbial, may occur in sequence, culminating in a final finite predicate that carries the primary assertion. Postposed dependents are comparatively limited and tend to arise in explanatory afterthought constructions or where discourse management motivates postponement.

Mapping subordinate clause types across languages shows systematic correspondences but also frequent asymmetries. English adverbial clauses of time and cause often correspond to Uzbek converbial constructions; English relative clauses correspond to Uzbek participial modifiers; English that-complements correspond to Uzbek nominalized predicate constructions. Yet the mapping is many-to-one in multiple domains: a single English category such as “adverbial clause of cause” can align with different Uzbek forms depending on nuance, aspect, and textual density, including converbs, postpositional constructions, or finite subordinate clauses with conjunction-like markers. Conversely, Uzbek non-finite dependent forms may correspond to English finite adverbials, reduced clauses, or even prepositional and nominal phrases, depending on how explicitly English encodes the relation.

Overall, the results indicate that the most robust contrastive parameters are the dominance of overt function-word linkage in English versus morphological dependency marking in Uzbek, and the preference for flexible dependent-clause placement in English versus predominantly preposed, chain-friendly organization in Uzbek. These parameters explain recurrent translation shifts and common learner difficulties, particularly the tendency to overuse conjunctions in Uzbek-to-English writing or to underrepresent explicit subordinators in English-to-Uzbek rendering. The observed patterns suggest that effective contrastive

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

instruction should focus on functional equivalence across different formal exponents and on the discourse motivations that govern subordinate clause placement in each language.

Discussion

The findings confirm that a structural-semantic comparison of Uzbek and English subordination must treat “subordinate clause” as a functional domain rather than a single uniform form. While both languages encode comparable relations between propositions, the formal resources they mobilize are distributed differently across grammar. English makes dependency highly visible through a stable inventory of subordinators, complementizers, and relative markers, which facilitates segmentation and explicit signaling of logical relations in academic writing. Uzbek, by contrast, frequently compresses dependency into the morphology of the dependent predicate and into nominalized units that behave syntactically like noun phrases while retaining propositional content. This typological difference explains why formal one-to-one correspondences are limited and why contrastive analysis benefits from a meaning-to-form mapping instead of a form-to-form approach.

The predominance of non-finite dependent predicates in Uzbek has important semantic consequences. Because converbial and participial forms often encode both temporal-aspectual contours and the dependency relation, they can leave certain logical nuances underspecified unless supported by context. English subordinators such as *although*, *because*, and *unless* lexicalize the relation more directly, reducing interpretive load for the reader at the point of processing. Uzbek can achieve comparable explicitness through conjunction-like items, correlatives, or postpositional constructions, but the corpus suggests that academic register often prefers compact morphological packaging for economy and cohesion. This leads to a difference in how argumentation is paced: English commonly alternates a main claim with an overtly introduced justification or

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

limitation, while Uzbek frequently accumulates background conditions through chained dependents before presenting the main assertion.

Component order further supports this discourse contrast. English placement flexibility enables writers to manage information structure by framing, postponement, and parenthetical insertion. Preposed adverbials frame the interpretive domain, postposed adverbials supply justification or elaboration after the central statement, and medial relatives refine reference without interrupting overall clause architecture too heavily. Uzbek's strong tendency toward preposed dependency aligns with head-final organization and makes clause chaining a natural strategy for building an argumentative scaffold. The observed chaining pattern is not merely a syntactic habit but a discourse technique: it creates a progressive narrowing of conditions and premises that culminates in a final finite predicate carrying the rhetorical peak. In translation and learner writing, mismatches arise when this sequencing logic is transferred without adjustment, producing English sentences with excessive preposed background material that can feel heavy or delay the main proposition.

The mapping patterns identified in the results also clarify why some learner errors are persistent. Uzbek-speaking learners of English may overgeneralize conjunction-based linking, adding explicit subordinators where English would prefer reduced clauses, infinitival complements, or nominal structures, or conversely they may underuse overt subordinators because Uzbek can rely on morphological dependency. English-to-Uzbek transfer may lead to an overproduction of finite subordinate clauses mirroring English that-clauses and relative clauses, even when Uzbek would more naturally use participial modifiers or nominalized constructions. These tendencies are not simply mistakes but reflect competing grammatical defaults. Pedagogically, this implies that instruction should foreground alternation sets: for each semantic relation, students benefit from seeing multiple legitimate realizations in both languages and from practicing selection based on genre, density, and rhetorical intent.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

From a theoretical perspective, the findings support a functional-semantic view in which subordination is a gradient domain spanning finite clauses, reduced clauses, clause-like nominalizations, and modifier constructions. Uzbek illustrates how propositional content can be integrated into nominal structure without losing semantic dependency, while English illustrates how dependency can remain clausal but be compacted through non-finite reduction. Treating these as comparable options within a shared functional space allows contrastive analysis to avoid misleading equivalences and to describe systematic correspondences with greater explanatory power.

Conclusion

This study set out to compare the structural and semantic organization of complex (subordinate) sentences in Uzbek and English by focusing on three parameters that are decisive for both description and application: the typology of subordinate relations, the devices that encode dependency, and the preferred ordering of clause components in discourse. The analysis demonstrates that, although the two languages share a broadly comparable functional repertoire for expressing time, cause, condition, purpose, concession, and specification, they diverge substantially in how these meanings are grammaticalized and distributed across syntactic resources.

The strongest generalization concerns the form of linkage. English academic writing relies predominantly on finite subordinate clauses introduced by overt subordinators, complementizers, and relative markers, which makes dependency relations explicit and readily segmentable. Uzbek, in contrast, frequently realizes subordination through morphological dependency marking on non-finite predicates, as well as through nominalized constructions that function as clausal arguments or modifiers. This difference is not a matter of stylistic preference alone but reflects typological properties: English tends to lexicalize clause

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

relations through function words, whereas Uzbek often packages relational meaning into agglutinative morphology and head-final integration.

A second key outcome is the contrast in component order and discourse structuring. English shows flexible placement of subordinate clauses, with preposing, postposing, and medial embedding used strategically to manage information structure and rhetorical pacing. Uzbek displays a strong preference for preposed dependent material and productive clause-chaining patterns, often culminating in a final finite predicate that carries the main assertion. These ordering tendencies shape textual rhythm, reader processing, and the perceived “naturalness” of complex sentence formation in academic prose.

The study also clarifies how functional equivalence between Uzbek and English is typically achieved through non-isomorphic mapping. English finite adverbial clauses often correspond to Uzbek converbial chains; English relative clauses frequently correspond to Uzbek participial modifiers; English complement clauses commonly align with Uzbek nominalized predicate constructions. At the same time, many-to-one and one-to-many correspondences are pervasive, meaning that translation and contrastive instruction should avoid rigid category matching and instead train learners to select structures based on semantic nuance, genre density, and discourse goals.

For philology-oriented university contexts, the implications are practical and immediate. In pedagogy, effective grammar instruction should emphasize alternation sets and the interplay between meaning, form, and placement, rather than teaching subordinate types as isolated templates. In translation and academic writing, attention should be directed to typical restructuring operations: converting Uzbek clause chains into English finite clauses or reduced constructions, and converting English relative and complement clauses into Uzbek participial or nominalized dependencies where appropriate. Such strategies support clarity and stylistic adequacy while preserving logical relations.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

Finally, the findings suggest directions for further research. Expanding the corpus to include spoken academic interaction, media discourse, and student writing would deepen understanding of variation and developmental patterns. A finer-grained analysis of information structure, prosody, and punctuation practices could also refine the account of clause placement and interpretive effects. Overall, the study supports a functional-semantic approach to subordination that treats complex sentence formation as a flexible system of resources, enabling a more accurate and usable contrastive description of Uzbek and English.

REFERENCES

1. Rahmonqulova, Z. (2025). Existentialism and postmodernism: points of tension and intersection in literature. *International journal of political sciences and economics*, 1(1), 21-24.
2. Xushbaroy, B. (2025). Effective strategies for teaching English as a foreign language (EFL). *EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements*, 1(5), 863-867.
3. Jumanazarovna, B. X. (2025). Using innovative technologies in teaching English to medical students. *International Journal of Pedagogics*, 5(03), 18-20.
4. Bekchanova, X. J. (2025). Ingliz tilini tibbiyot talabalariga o'qitishda innovatsion texnologiyalardan foydalanish. *Mugallim*, 2(1), 49-52.
5. Bekchanova, X. J. (2025). Semantic differences between synonyms in English and Uzbek languages: a comparative study. *Tadqiqotlar*, 3(2), 78-82.
6. Bekchanova, X. J. (2025). Comparative analysis of the category of stativity in English and Uzbek languages. *Tadqiqotlar*, 3(2), 83-88.
7. Bekchanova, X. J. (2025). A comparative study of structural and semantic features in English and Uzbek: perspectives from modern comparative linguistics. *Sciental Journal of Education Humanities and Social Sciences*, 3(11), 7-10.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

8. Bekchanova, X. J. (2024). Stativlikni ifodalovchi fe'llar. Ta'lim va rivojlanish tahlili onlayn ilmiy jurnali, 4(1), 387-389.
9. Bekchanova, X. J. (2024). Elements Expressing State in the Uzbek Language. Texas Journal of Philology Culture and History, 3(5), 1-2.
10. Kalandarov, A. R., Bekchanova, X. J. (2022). Ingliz va o'zbek tillarida stativlik kategoriyasining o'rganilishi. Ilm sarchashmalari, 3(3), 44-47.
11. Bekchanova Khushbaroy, J. FOSTERING LEARNER AUTONOMY AND MOTIVATION IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING IN HIGHER EDUCATION.
12. Bekchanova Khushbaroy, J. INTEGRATING CRITICAL THINKING AND ACTIVE LEARNING IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING AT HIGHER EDUCATION.
13. Haytbayeva, S. R. (2024). Kompetensiyaviy yondashuv asosida ta'lim mazmunini takomillashtirish va o'quvchilar kompetenligini rivojlantirishning nazariy asoslari. *MU ALIIM G'YM ZLIKSIKIZ BILIMLЕНДИРИ²*, 109.
14. Raximberganovna, H. S. (2023). Secondary schools to introduce a competency approach to biology education scientific and methodological foundations. *Confrencea*, 6(6), 174-178.
15. Rahimberganovna, H. S., & Alijanovna, S. M. (2025). Tashkilotdagi kommunikatsiya. *IZLANUVCHI*, 1(4), 89-94.
16. Haytbayeva, S. (2025). Ways to adapt assessment mechanisms of the finnish education system to general secondary education in Uzbekistan. *EduVision*, 1(11), 223-232.
17. Haytbayeva, S. (2025). Musiqa va ritmik harakatlar orqali boshlang'ich sinf o'quvchilarida ijodiy fikrlash va ijtimoiy ko'nikmalarini rivojlantirish. *RAQAMLI TRANSFORMATSIYA*, 1(1), 9-13.
18. Haytbayeva, S. (2025). Kompetensiyaviy yondashuv asosida biologiya ta'limi mazmunini takomillashtirish va o'quvchilar kompetenligini rivojlantirish. *Monografiya*, 1(1), 168.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

19. Narzullayeva, Z., Haytbayeva, S. (2025). Biologiya fanini o‘qitishda guruhli va jamoaviy ishlash metodlari. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Innovation in Science and Education*, 1(2), 334-341.
20. Haytbayeva, S. (2025). Steam yondoshuvining tabiiy fanlarni o‘qitishdagi ahamiyat. *CONFERENCE*, 1(1), 38-43.
21. Haytbayeva, S. (2025). STEAM edulab modeli asosida boshlang ‘ich ta’limda integratsiyalashgan to‘garak tashkil etish tajriba. *TAMADDUN NURI*, 11(74), 532-534.
22. Vokhidova, N. K., Khalikova, Z. M., Islamova, F. S., & Abdulkhayeva, M. B. (2024). Organization Of The Educational Process In Primary Education With The Participation Of Artificial Intelligence. *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(4), 1906-1909.
23. Habibullayevna, V. N., & Mirshadmonovna, H. Z. (2019). Intellectual growth and development of the younger generation is a demand of the time. *European science*, (4 (46)), 54-57.
24. Xabibullayevna, V. N., Mirakbarovna, F. D., Mirshadmanovna, X. Z., Shamsuddinovna, I. F., Saydullayevich, N. M. B. R., & Sayfutdinqizi, F. K. (2025). Application of game technologies in education: in the context of Uzbekistan. *Lex Localis: Journal of Local Self-Government*, 23.
25. Mirshadmanovna, X. Z., & Qizi, Q. M. M. (2023). Boshlang ‘ich sinf o ‘quvchilariga predmetlararo integratsiya vositasida metapredmet tushunchalarini o ‘rgatish. *Science and innovation*, 2(Special Issue 14), 658-663.
26. Вохидова, Н. Х., & Халикова, З. М. (2016). Развитие системы образования в Республики Узбекистан. *Europaische Fachhochschule*, (4), 23-24.
27. Вахидова, Н. Х., & Халикова, З. М. (2015). Воображение как фактор творчества личности. *Личностное и профессиональное развитие будущего специалиста*, 17-21.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

28. Вохидова, Н. Х., & Халикова, З. М. (2016). ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ ТОЛЕРАНТНОСТИ У УЧЕНИКОВ НАЧАЛЬНЫХ КЛАССОВ. *Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов*, (6), 70-71.
29. Вахидова, Н. Х., & Халикова, З. М. (2015). ВООБРАЖЕНИЕ КАК ФАКТОР ТВОРЧЕСТВА. *Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов*, (3), 86-88.
30. Kabilova, S. Individual ta'lim trayektoriyasini ishlab chiqishda pedagogik yondashuvlar. *Maktabgacha va maktab ta'limi jurnali*, 676206.
31. Kabilova, S. R. (2025). Sharq mutafakkirlarining ta'lim tarbiyaga oid asarlari ma'naviy va axloqiy qarashlar durdonasi. *Konferensiya*, 1(1), 85-90.
32. НАЙТБАЙЕВА, S. (2024). Biologiya ta'limini kompetensiyaviy yondashuv asosida tashkil etishning didaktik ta'minotini takomillashtirish. «*ACTA NUUZ*», 1(1.3. 1), 233-237.
33. Qodirova, M. (2022). Conceptual metaphor in the literary text. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, 5, 557-560.
34. Qodirova, M. (2024). Motif and its types in literature. *International Journal of World Languages*, 4(1).
35. Komilova, D. S., Ergashev, D. D., & Qodirova, M. D. (2024). *Classification And Analysis Of Speech Genres In Translations. Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30 (4).
36. Zafarovna, Z. Q., & Davronovna, M. Q. (2025). THE RISE OF CYBERLITERATURE: THE INTERNET'S IMPACT ON CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE. *Hamkor konferensiyalar*, 1(14), 1272-1275.
37. Qodirova, M. (2024). GENESIS OF THE ROAD MOTIF: EXPLORING ITS ORIGINS AND EVOLUTION IN LITERATURE. *TAMADDUN NURI JURNALI*, 5(56), 255-258.
38. Norboboeva, S. A. (2025). Bridging languages in medical English education: a practical perspective from the classroom. *E-Conference platform*, 1(20-may), 206-207.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

39. Norboboeva, S. A. (2025). Using task-based learning to teach medical English in international classrooms. *E-Conference platform*, 1(20-may), 208-209.
40. Azamatovna, N. S. (2025). Using authentic materials in ESP classrooms: benefits and limitations. *EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements*, 1(5), 859-862.
41. Azamatovna, N. S. (2025). Tibbiyotda ingliz tilini o'qitishning amaliy strategiyalari.
42. Azamatovna, N. S. (2025). Tibbiyotda inglizcha terminlarni o'rgatishda o'qitish usullari.
43. Azamatovna, N. S. (2024). Developing critical thinking skills through English language learning. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 2(12), 349-350.
44. Azamatovna, N. S. (2024). The role of medical English in modern healthcare. *Web of Medicine: Journal of Medicine, Practice and Nursing*, 2(11), 160-162.
45. Norboboeva, S. (2024). National-cultural semantics of animalistic phraseological units of the Uzbek language. *International journal of science and technology*, 1(13), 100-104.
46. Norboboeva, S. (2024). Figurative usage of animalistic phraseological units in English and Uzbek languages. *Молодой специалист*, 3(2), 6-9.
47. Norboboeva, S. (2026). Ingliz tilini kommunikativ yondashuv asosida o'qitishdagi muammolar. *FILOLOGIYA VA PEDAGOGIKA*, 2(2), 188-189.
48. Norboboeva, S. (2025). Gamification in education: enhancing engagement and learning outcomes. *Educator Insights: A Journal of Teaching Theory and Practice*, 1(12), 111-115.
49. Norboboeva, S. (2025). Using AI to teach medical students: opportunities, evidences and considerations. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 3(12), 40-43.
50. Norboboeva, S. (2025). The role of interactive platforms in learning English for medical students. *Klinik tadqiqotlar va innovatsion tibbiyot*, 1(1), 5-9.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

51. Zafarovna, Z. Q., & Davronovna, M. Q. (2024). COMMON THEMES BETWEEN THE WORKS OF JOHN DONNE AND JOHN MILTON. *Western European Journal of Historical Events and Social Science*, 2(3), 5-7.
52. Davronovna, Q. M. (2022). The role of conceptual metaphor in creating the author's world picture. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 12(3), 37-41.
53. Madinabonu, J. (2026). Pedagogical challenges and limitations of mobile-assisted language learning in higher education. *Eureka Journal of Education & Learning Technologies*, 2(1), 79-84.
54. Jabborova, M. (2025). The use of mobile applications for enhancing vocabulary acquisition and speaking proficiency. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 3(12), 121-125.
55. Madinabonu, J. (2025). A comprehensive exploration of mobile application types in education and their contribution to effective learning. *Образование наука и инновационные идеи в мире*, 82(5), 161-174.
56. Madinabonu, J. (2025). Practical strategies for integrating mobile apps into English language teaching. *Образование наука и инновационные идеи в мире*, 82(5), 175-184.
57. Jabborova, M. (2025). The role of mobile-assisted language learning (mall) in English language teaching: enhancing access, engagement, and outcomes. *E-Conference platform*, 1(20), 113-115.
58. Madinabonu, J. (2025). Enhancing English language learning through mobile technologies: a study of mall. *EduVision: Journal of Innovations in Pedagogy and Educational Advancements*, 1(5), 850-858.
59. Jabborova, M. (2025). Til o'rganishda interfaol metodlarni yo'li. *Mugallim*, 2(1), 218-220.
60. Qizi, J. M. S. (2025). TILNI O 'RGANISHDA MIYANING YOSHGA QARAB FARQLANISHI.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaoa.com/index.php/3>

61. Madinabonu, J. (2024). Pedagogical advancement technologies intercultural competence in the process of teaching a foreign language to learners of primary school. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 2(11), 229-232.
62. Madinabonu, J. (2024). Sociolinguistic factors that impact that students' language learning. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 2(11), 94-96.
63. Jabborova, M. (2024). Organization of extra-class work students of the secondary school on the example of the English language week. *Journal of international scientific research*, 1(1), 5-6.
64. Jabborova, M. (2025). A comparative study of call and mall in enhancing english language learning. *Tadqiqotlar*, 1(3), 198-203.
65. Abdullayeva, R. M., Jabborova, M. (2025). FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN MEDICINE. TEXTBOOK, 1(1), 161.
66. Tashxodjaeva, P. B., Jabborova, M. (2025). FOREIGN LANGUAGE IN PHARMACY. O'QUV QO'LLANMA, 1(1), 175.
67. Шавкатовна, Ж. М. (2026). Аутентичные тексты как носители когнитивно дискурсивных стратегий профессионального общения. *Global Science Review*, 12(02), 45-55.
68. Avezova, A. K., Muzaparov, A. U. (2025). Abdurauf Fitratning "Hind sayyohi" asarida Buxoro jamijatining tanqidi va islohot g'oyalari. Conference of modern science & pedagogy, 1(6), 249-251.
69. Avezova, AK (2025). Tibbiyot yo 'nalishida tahsil olayotgan chet ellik talabalarga o 'zbek tilini o 'rgatish zarurati va o 'qitishning samarali usullari. E-Conference platform, 1(20-may), 43-44.
70. Avezova, AK (2025). Simple medical conversations in uzbek: a guide for beginners in healthcare. E-Conference platform, 1(20-may), 45-47.
71. Avezova, A. K. (2025). Antroponimlarning sintaktik usulda yasalishi. *Filologiya va pedagogika*, 1(1), 87-88.

Eureka Journal of Language, Culture & Social Change (EJLCSC)

ISSN 2760-4926 (Online) Volume 2, Issue 2, February 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://eurekaopenaccess.com/index.php/3>

72. Avezova, A. K. P. Q. (2024). O ‘zbek tili talaffuz qoidalarini xorijlik talabalarga o ‘rgatishda Q, G ‘, X, U va SH tovushlarining ahamiyati. *Academic research in educational sciences*, (1), 407-410.
73. Qizi, A. A. K. P. (2023). O ‘zbek va turk tillarida antroponimlarning motivlanish asoslari (hayvonlar bilan bog ‘liq kishi ismlari misolida). *Science and innovation*, 2(Special Issue 5), 153-156.
74. Avezova, A. K. (2025). Teaching Uzbek as a foreign language to medical students in Uzbekistan. *Volume*, 3, 229-232.
75. Avezova, A. K. (2024). Problems and solutions in teaching Uzbek as a foreign language. *American Journal of Pedagogical and Educational Research*. ISSN, 2832, 9791.
76. Avezova, A. K. (2025). Developing Effective Methods for Teaching Uzbek as a Foreign Language to Medical Students in Uzbekistan. *Journal of intellectual property and human rights*, 4(11), 201-204.
77. Avezova, A. K. (2025). Tibbiyot yo ‘nalishida tahsil olayotgan chet ellik talabalarga o ‘zbek tilida “kasalliklar” mavzusini o ‘qitishning samarali usullari. *Filologiya va pedagogika*, 1(3), 121-123.
78. Avezova, A. K. (2024). Turkologiyada kishi ismlariga oid tadqiqotlar tavsifi. *Qo ‘qon DPI*, 1(4), 16-18.
79. Avezova, A. K. (2024). O ‘zbek va turk tillarida tub va yasama antroponimlar. *Tamaddun nuri*, 3(5), 34-37.
80. Avezova, A. K. (2022). O ‘zbek va turk tilshunosligida antroponimlar haqida nazariy qarashlar. *Ilm sarchashmalari*, 1(2), 81-83.
81. Rahmonqulova, Z. (2025). Developing global cooperation through language learning in military educational institutions. *HARBIY*, 1(1), 166-168.
82. Rahmonqulova, Z. (2024). Alienation and absurdity in Franz Kafkas the metamorphosis: an existentialist study. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, 1(1), 160-163.