

IMPROVING THE METHODOLOGY OF TEACHING FIELD-SPECIFIC VOCABULARY TO ENHANCE COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF FUTURE OFFICERS

Kurbanova Munisa Akbaraliyevna

Senior Researcher, Scientific-Practical Research Center,
University of Public Security, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This study investigates methodological approaches to improving the teaching of field-specific vocabulary in order to enhance the communicative competence of future military officers in English language instruction. In modern military education, effective professional communication is essential for operational coordination, international cooperation, and participation in multinational missions. However, traditional vocabulary instruction often emphasizes memorization rather than functional and communicative use.

The research adopts a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design conducted over a twelve-week English for Specific Purposes (ESP) course at a military higher education institution. Sixty cadets were divided into an experimental group and a control group. The experimental group received instruction based on communicative-task methodology, situational simulations, and discourse-based vocabulary integration, while the control group was taught through traditional translation and definition-based methods. Quantitative measures included vocabulary retention tests, role-play performance scores, and communicative interaction assessments. Qualitative analysis examined discourse fluency, pragmatic appropriateness, and professional terminology usage in simulated operational contexts.

The results indicate that cadets exposed to communicative and context-based vocabulary instruction demonstrated significantly higher levels of lexical retention, interactive fluency, and professional communicative confidence. The study concludes that methodological refinement in teaching field-specific vocabulary—emphasizing contextualization, task-based interaction, and scenario-based communication—can substantially enhance the communicative competence of future officers.

Keywords: field-specific vocabulary; communicative competence; future officers; English for Specific Purposes; military education; task-based learning; professional communication

Annotatsiya: Mazkur tadqiqot bo'lajak ofitserlarning ingliz tili fanida soha terminlarini o'qitish metodikasini takomillashtirish orqali ularning mulohazali va samarali muloqot qobiliyatini rivojlantirish masalasiga bag'ishlangan. Zamonaviy harbiy ta'lim tizimida kasbiy muloqot ko'nikmalari operativ boshqaruv, xalqaro hamkorlik va ko'pmillatli missiyalarda ishtirok etish uchun muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi. An'anaviy lug'at o'qitish metodlari esa ko'pincha so'zlarni yodlashga qaratilib, ularning funksional qo'llanishiga yetarli e'tibor bermaydi.

Tadqiqot 12 haftalik tajriba asosida o'tkazilib, unda 60 nafar kursant ishtirok etdi. Tajriba guruhi kommunikativ-topshiriq asosidagi metodika, situatsion mashqlar va diskursga asoslangan lug'at integratsiyasi asosida ta'lim oldi. Nazorat guruhi esa an'anaviy tarjima va izohli usul asosida o'qitildi. Natijalar tajriba guruhida lug'atni eslab qolish, muloqot jarayonida faol qo'llash va kasbiy nutq ishonchliligi sezilarli darajada oshganini ko'rsatdi.

Kalit so'zlar: soha lug'ati; kommunikativ kompetensiya; bo'lajak ofitserlar; ESP; harbiy ta'lim; topshiriq asosida o'qitish; kasbiy muloqot

1. Introduction

Communicative competence is a core component of professional readiness in military education. Future officers must be capable of using English effectively in operational briefings, joint exercises, peacekeeping missions, and international cooperation contexts. In such settings, the ability to employ field-specific vocabulary accurately and appropriately determines not only linguistic performance but also professional credibility.

However, vocabulary instruction in many military educational institutions remains focused on translation, memorization of terminology, and isolated lexical drills. While these approaches may support short-term retention, they often fail to develop communicative flexibility or pragmatic competence. As a result, cadets may recognize professional terms but struggle to use them effectively in real-time communication.

English for Specific Purposes (ESP) offers a framework for integrating professional vocabulary with communicative tasks. Within military education, ESP instruction must move beyond lexical accumulation toward contextualized, discourse-oriented vocabulary usage. This study aims to examine how methodological improvements in teaching field-specific vocabulary can enhance the communicative competence of future officers.

Literature Review

The concept of communicative competence, introduced by Hymes (1972) and later developed by Canale and Swain (1980), emphasizes not only grammatical accuracy but also sociolinguistic, discourse, and strategic competence. In ESP contexts, communicative competence includes the ability to use professional terminology appropriately within specific occupational domains.

Research in military ESP highlights that professional vocabulary should be taught through contextualized and scenario-based methods rather than isolated lexical lists (Basturkmen, 2010). Task-based learning theory (Ellis, 2003) suggests that meaningful interaction enhances vocabulary acquisition and long-term retention. Through role-plays, simulations, and problem-solving tasks, learners internalize terminology more effectively than through memorization alone.

Studies on lexical acquisition (Nation, 2001) indicate that repeated contextual exposure and productive use significantly increase retention. Furthermore, discourse-based approaches argue that vocabulary is best acquired within authentic communicative contexts where learners negotiate meaning (Hyland, 2006). In military training environments, simulations of operational briefings and command interactions can provide realistic contexts for lexical integration.

Despite these theoretical insights, research specifically addressing methodological refinement in teaching field-specific vocabulary to future officers remains limited. Many programs still rely on traditional translation-based instruction. There is a need for empirical evidence demonstrating the effectiveness of communicative-task-based vocabulary teaching in military English contexts.

Research Objectives

- a) To examine the effectiveness of communicative-task-based vocabulary instruction in enhancing communicative competence of future officers.
- b) To compare traditional translation-based vocabulary teaching with contextualized, discourse-based methodology.
- c) To identify methodological strategies that improve lexical retention and professional interaction skills.

Research Questions

- a) How does communicative-task-based vocabulary instruction influence the communicative competence of future officers?
- b) To what extent does contextualized vocabulary teaching improve professional interaction and lexical retention compared to traditional methods?

Methodology

This study adopted a quasi-experimental mixed-methods design conducted over twelve weeks in a military higher education institution. Sixty second-year cadets participated in the research. They were randomly assigned to an experimental group (n = 30) and a control group (n = 30).

The experimental group received vocabulary instruction through:

- Scenario-based simulations (e.g., operational briefings, checkpoint communication, mission planning discussions);
- Role-play tasks requiring real-time use of military terminology;
- Problem-solving discussions integrating professional lexical items;
- Discourse-level vocabulary integration in oral and written tasks.

The control group was instructed through traditional methods, including:

- Translation of military terms;
 - Memorization of definitions;
 - Written vocabulary exercises and gap-filling tasks.
- Data collection included:
- Pre- and post-tests measuring vocabulary retention;
 - Communicative performance assessments during role-plays;
 - Oral interaction scoring using a standardized communicative competence rubric;
 - Qualitative analysis of recorded simulation dialogues.

Quantitative data were analyzed using independent-sample t-tests to determine statistical significance between groups. Qualitative analysis examined fluency, pragmatic appropriateness, and accuracy of terminology usage.

3. Results

3.1 Quantitative Findings

The comparative analysis of profiling-related English-origin terminology used in military-public service contexts reveals measurable differences between **standardized terminological application** and **non-standard / inconsistent usage**. The dataset includes four primary indicators: Terminological Consistency Index (TCI), Conceptual Precision Rate (CPR), Frequency of Borrowed English Terms (per 1000 words), and Operational Clarity Score (OCS) (see Table 1).

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics of Terminological Measures

Measure	Standardized Usage (Mean)	Non-Standard Usage (Mean)	Std. Deviation
Terminological Consistency Index	0.84	0.63	0.09
Conceptual Precision Rate	0.79	0.58	0.11
Borrowed English Terms /1000	42.3	27.6	7.2
Operational Clarity Score	4.31	3.48	0.52

Terminological Consistency Index (TCI)

Standardized texts demonstrate a higher consistency index (0.84) compared to non-standard texts (0.63), with a standard deviation of 0.09. This indicates that professional documents applying systematized terminology maintain more stable lexical repetition and conceptual alignment. Higher consistency supports clearer institutional communication, aligning with principles of terminological standardization discussed by Cabré [1] and ISO frameworks [5]. The difference of 0.21 suggests that structured terminology significantly reduces ambiguity in profiling discourse.

Conceptual Precision Rate (CPR)

The conceptual precision rate reached 0.79 in standardized documents, compared to 0.58 in non-standard usage (SD = 0.11). This measure reflects the degree to which terms such as *profiling*, *risk assessment*, and *behavioral detection* are used according to clearly defined operational criteria. The 36% increase in conceptual precision indicates that terminological regulation enhances analytical accuracy, which is essential in preventive security contexts [3].

Borrowed English Terminology Frequency

Standardized documents show a higher frequency of English-origin security terms (42.3 per 1000 words) compared to 27.6 in non-standard texts ($SD = 7.2$). This suggests deliberate integration of internationally recognized terminology into military discourse. As noted by Hyland [4], globalized professional communication increasingly relies on English-based discourse structures, particularly in institutional domains.

Operational Clarity Score (OCS)

Operational clarity, measured on a 5-point scale, was significantly higher in standardized texts (4.31) than in non-standard texts (3.48), with $SD = 0.52$. This improvement reflects clearer procedural definitions and more transparent classification of risk indicators. The findings correspond with research emphasizing that conceptual clarity directly affects applied security practices [3].

Taken together, the four measures indicate that standardized integration of English-origin profiling terminology positively influences professional communication in military-public contexts:

Conceptual stability improves (higher TCI and CPR).

Operational transparency increases (higher OCS).

International discourse alignment strengthens (greater use of standardized English-origin terms).

The relatively low standard deviations suggest consistent improvement across documents rather than isolated cases.

3.2 Inferential Statistics

Table 2. Independent-Samples t-Test Results

Measure	t-value	p-value	Effect Size (d)
Terminological Consistency	4.67	<0.001	0.85
Conceptual Precision	3.92	<0.001	0.72
Borrowed Terminology Frequency	5.18	<0.001	0.94
Operational Clarity	3.41	0.001	0.63

The results indicate statistically significant differences across all indicators. The largest effect size is observed in borrowed terminology frequency ($d = 0.94$), suggesting that institutional standardization strongly influences lexical selection. Terminological consistency also shows a large effect, confirming the structural impact of regulated terminology frameworks.

Interpretation:

All measured variables demonstrate statistically significant improvements in standardized texts, with medium-to-large effect sizes favoring terminologically regulated profiling discourse.

3.3 Diagrammatic Representation**Figure 1. Mean Terminological Measures Across Groups (Bar Chart Description)**

The diagram illustrates consistently higher terminological and operational metrics in standardized texts. The most pronounced difference appears in terminology frequency and conceptual precision, visually reinforcing the statistical findings.

3.4 Qualitative Discourse Analysis

Qualitative analysis revealed that standardized profiling-related texts demonstrate:

- ✓ Clear definitional statements of key terms
- ✓ Stable repetition of core concepts
- ✓ Explicit categorization of behavioral indicators
- ✓ Structured procedural sequencing

In contrast, non-standard texts show:

- ✓ Variable translation of English-origin terms
- ✓ Occasional semantic shifts
- ✓ Conceptual overlap between related categories
- ✓ Reduced procedural transparency

These findings suggest that standardized terminology enhances analytical coherence, while inconsistent usage introduces interpretative flexibility but also potential ambiguity.

4. Discussion

The results indicate that structured integration of English-origin profiling terminology significantly influences discourse organization and operational clarity in military-public communication. Higher terminological consistency and conceptual precision confirm that standardized frameworks support analytical rigor, aligning with terminological theory [1] and international discourse practices [4].

However, qualitative findings reveal that excessive reliance on borrowed terminology without conceptual adaptation may create superficial standardization. Terminology must be integrated not only lexically but conceptually within national institutional frameworks. This supports Schmidt's noticing hypothesis [8], suggesting that professional awareness and training are necessary for meaningful internalization of specialized terminology.

Thus, terminological regulation improves clarity and coherence but requires contextual calibration to avoid mechanical borrowing.

5. Conclusion

This study examined the structural and conceptual characteristics of English-origin profiling terminology in military-public discourse. Quantitative findings demonstrate that standardized usage significantly enhances terminological consistency, conceptual precision, and operational clarity. Qualitative analysis confirms that regulated terminology reduces ambiguity and supports institutional communication.

The study concludes that English-origin profiling terminology should be implemented through systematic conceptual adaptation and professional training rather than unregulated borrowing. Terminological standardization functions as a strategic tool for ensuring analytical clarity, operational effectiveness, and alignment with international security discourse frameworks.

References

1. Akbaraliyevna, K. M. (2025). THE LINGUODIDACTIC FEATURES OF TEACHING MILITARY TERMINOLOGY. *SHOKH LIBRARY*, 1(10).
2. Akbaraliyevna, K. M. (2025). THE PECULIARITIES OF TEACHING MILITARY TERMINOLOGY. *PROSPECTS OF TEACHING ENGLISH FOR PROFESSIONAL PURPOSES IN NON-PHILOLOGICAL HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS: PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS*, 486-493.
3. Arntz, R., Picht, H., & Mayer, F. (2014). *Introduction to Terminology Work and Terminography*. John Benjamins.
4. Bigo, D. (2002). Security and immigration: Toward a critique of the governmentality of unease. *Alternatives*, 27(Special Issue), 63–92.
5. Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, Methods and Applications*. John Benjamins.
6. Crossley, S. A., & McNamara, D. S. (2016). Say more and be more coherent: How text elaboration and cohesion can increase writing quality. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 32, 14–29.
7. Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
8. Felbab-Brown, V. (2017). *The Limits of Punishment: Assessing the Use of Targeted Security Measures*. Brookings Institution Press.
9. Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. Pantheon Books.
10. Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. University of Michigan Press.
11. International Organization for Standardization (ISO). (2017). *ISO 704: Terminology Work — Principles and Methods*. ISO.
12. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2006). The emergence of complexity, fluency, and accuracy in second language development. *Applied Linguistics*, 27(4), 590–619.
13. Lyon, D. (2007). *Surveillance Studies: An Overview*. Polity Press.
14. McNamara, D. S., Graesser, A. C., McCarthy, P. M., & Cai, Z. (2014). *Automated Evaluation of Text and Discourse with Coh-Metrix*. Cambridge University Press.
15. Meyer, I., & Mackintosh, K. (2000). When terms move into our everyday lives: An overview of de-terminologization. *Terminology*, 6(1), 111–138.
16. Ranalli, J. (2021). Automated feedback in second language writing: A review of the field. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(5–6), 1–25.
17. Salter, M. B. (2008). When the exception becomes the rule: Borders, sovereignty, and security. *Citizenship Studies*, 12(4), 365–380.
18. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 11(2), 129–158.
19. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

20. Ware, P. (2018). Feedback and learner autonomy in computer-mediated writing contexts. *Language Learning & Technology*, 22(1), 1–15.
21. Wierzbicka, A. (1996). *Semantics: Primes and Universals*. Oxford University Press.
22. Zedner, L. (2009). *Security*. Routledge.