

**KOREAN AND UZBEK AS AGGLUTINATIVE LANGUAGES: A CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR EFFECTIVE TEACHING METHODOLOGY****Xolmatova Maxliyoxon Bahromjon kizi**Senior Student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University  
Toshkent, UzbekistanE-mail: [xolmatovamahliyoxon12@gmail.com](mailto:xolmatovamahliyoxon12@gmail.com)  
+998903959435**Bekmurodova Maftuna Jumanazar kizi**Teacher at the Department of English Teaching Methodology №2,  
Uzbekistan State World Languages Universitye-mail: [maftunabekmurodova52@gmail.com](mailto:maftunabekmurodova52@gmail.com)  
+998971672101

**Abstract:** This study investigates the structural similarities and differences between Korean and Uzbek as agglutinative languages and examines their pedagogical implications for effective language instruction. Both languages demonstrate agglutinative morphology characterized by the linear addition of suffixes, yet they differ significantly in phonology, pragmatics, and sociolinguistic features. A mixed-method research design was employed, involving 80 Uzbek learners of Korean divided into experimental and control groups over a 16-week period. The experimental group was taught using a combined Communicative Language Teaching (CLT) and contrastive analysis approach, while the control group followed traditional grammar-based instruction.

Quantitative data were collected through pre- and post-tests, while qualitative data were obtained via classroom observations and learner feedback. The results indicate statistically significant improvement in communicative competence, grammatical accuracy, and learner motivation in the experimental group ( $p < 0.05$ ). The study highlights the importance of leveraging positive language transfer while addressing negative transfer through targeted pedagogical strategies. The findings contribute to applied linguistics and offer practical recommendations for Korean language teaching in Uzbek contexts.

**Keywords:** agglutinative languages, Korean, Uzbek, contrastive analysis, CLT, second language acquisition

**Аннотация (Russian):** В данной статье проводится сопоставительный анализ корейского и узбекского языков как агглютинативных языков и рассматриваются его методические последствия для эффективного обучения. Оба языка характеризуются агглютинативной морфологией, порядком слов SOV и структурной прозрачностью, что способствует положительному переносу при изучении второго языка. Однако различия в фонологии, системе вежливости и прагматике создают определённые трудности для узбекских изучающих корейский язык.

В исследовании использован смешанный метод, включающий экспериментальную и контрольную группы (80 студентов) в течение 16 недель. Экспериментальная группа обучалась с использованием коммуникативного подхода и сопоставительного анализа, тогда как контрольная группа — традиционным методом.

Результаты показали статистически значимое улучшение навыков говорения, аудирования и грамматики у экспериментальной группы ( $p < 0.05$ ). Сделан вывод о высокой эффективности интеграции коммуникативного и сопоставительного подходов.

**Ключевые слова:** агглютинативные языки, корейский язык, узбекский язык, сопоставительный анализ, методика обучения

**Annotatsiya (O‘zbek tilida):** Mazkur maqolada koreys va o‘zbek tillari agglutinativ tillar sifatida qiyosiy tahlil qilinib, ularning til o‘qitish metodikasiga ta’siri o‘rganiladi. Har ikkala til suffixlarga asoslangan morfologiya, SOV gap tuzilishi va struktur shaffoflik bilan ajralib turadi, bu esa til o‘rganishda ijobiy transforni yuzaga keltiradi. Shu bilan birga, fonologiya, hurmat kategoriyalari va pragmatik jihatlardagi farqlar o‘zbek o‘rganuvchilar uchun qiyinchilik tug‘diradi.

Tadqiqotda 80 nafar talaba ishtirok etib, 16 hafta davomida eksperimental va nazorat guruhlarida asosida o‘rganildi. Eksperimental guruhda kommunikativ yondashuv va qiyosiy tahlil birgalikda qo‘llanildi.

Natijalar eksperimental guruhda nutq, tinglab tushunish va grammatika bo‘yicha sezilarli o‘rishni ko‘rsatdi ( $p < 0.05$ ). Tadqiqot natijalari samarali o‘qitish uchun integrativ metod zarurligini tasdiqlaydi.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** agglutinativ tillar, koreys tili, o‘zbek tili, qiyosiy tahlil, kommunikativ metod

## Introduction

Agglutinative languages represent a typological category in which words are formed through the sequential addition of affixes, each carrying a distinct grammatical function. Uzbek and Korean, despite belonging to different linguistic families, share this structural characteristic. Uzbek is a Turkic language, while Korean is often classified as a language isolate with typological similarities to Altaic languages.

In recent years, the demand for Korean language learning in Uzbekistan has increased significantly due to economic cooperation, migration, and cultural exchange. However, teaching methodologies have not fully adapted to the specific linguistic background of Uzbek learners.

This study addresses the gap by analyzing:

- structural similarities and differences between the two languages
- their impact on language acquisition
- effective teaching methodologies

## Research Questions:

1. What are the key structural similarities and differences between Korean and Uzbek?
2. How do these affect language learning?
3. Which teaching methodology yields better results?

## Agglutinative Language Theory

Agglutination refers to the process where morphemes are added linearly without significant internal change.

Example:

Language Example	Structure
Uzbek kitoblarimizdan	root + plural + possessive + case
Korean 먹었습니다	root + tense + politeness

These languages exhibit:

- morphological transparency
- predictable grammar
- suffix dominance

### Uzbek Language Features

- SOV word order
- vowel harmony (partial)
- rich case system
- suffix-based derivation

### Korean Language Features

- strict SOV structure
- honorific system
- speech levels
- complex verb endings

### Contrastive Studies

Previous research shows:

- strong structural overlap
- significant pragmatic divergence

### Research Gap

There is limited research combining:

- contrastive linguistics
- experimental pedagogy
- Uzbek-specific context

### Methodology

### Research Design

Mixed-method:

- quantitative (tests)
- qualitative (observations)

### Participants

Group	Students	Method
Experimental	40	CLT + contrastive
Control	40	traditional

Level: A2–B1

### Instruments

- Grammar test (50 items)
- Speaking test (interview-based)
- Listening test
- Questionnaire (Likert scale)

### Procedure

Duration: 16 weeks

Experimental group:

- role plays
- contrastive explanations
- communicative tasks

Control group:

- translation
- grammar drills

### Data Analysis

- SPSS t-test
- descriptive statistics

### Results

#### Pre-test Results

Skill	Experimental	Control
Grammar	52.3	51.8
Speaking	48.5	47.9
Listening	50.2	49.7

→ No significant difference

#### 4.2 Post-test Results

Skill	Experimental	Control
Grammar	78.6	65.2
Speaking	82.1	60.4
Listening	79.5	66.8

#### 4.3 Improvement (%)

Skill	Experimental	Control
Grammar	+26.3	+13.4
Speaking	+33.6	+12.5
Listening	+29.3	+17.1

#### 4.4 Statistical Significance

t-test results:

Skill	p-value
Grammar	0.003
Speaking	0.001
Listening	0.005

→ Significant ( $p < 0.05$ )

#### Learning Progress Comparison Between Experimental and Control Groups

Test Stage	Group	Grammar Score	Speaking Score	Listening Score	Average Score
Pre-test	Experimental	52.3	48.5	50.2	50.3
Pre-test	Control	51.8	47.9	49.7	49.8
Post-test	Experimental	78.6	82.1	79.5	80.1
Post-test	Control	65.2	60.4	66.8	64.1

Interpretation:

- Experimental group shows steeper growth curve
- Speaking skill shows highest improvement

#### Learner Feedback (Questionnaire)

Statement	Agreement (%)
-----------	---------------

---

<b>Statement</b>	<b>Agreement (%)</b>
CLT is engaging	92%
Contrastive method helpful	88%
Confidence increased	90%

### **Discussion**

#### **Positive Transfer**

Similarities helped learners:

- understand suffixation faster
- grasp sentence structure easily

#### **Negative Transfer**

Challenges:

- Korean honorific system
- pronunciation differences
- politeness levels

#### **Pedagogical Model Effective Model:**

CLT + Contrastive Analysis

Steps:

1. Explain similarity
2. Highlight difference
3. Practice in communication

#### **Teaching Implications**

- use bilingual explanations
- focus on pragmatics
- include real-life tasks

#### **Conclusion**

This study confirms that:

- Uzbek and Korean share strong typological similarities
- differences affect higher-level communication
- integrated teaching approach is most effective

#### **Recommendations**

- develop localized textbooks
- train teachers in CLT
- include contrastive grammar

---

**References**

1. Brown, H. D. (2007). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. Pearson.
2. Ellis, R. (2003). *Task-based language learning and teaching*. Oxford University Press.
3. Richards, J. C. (2006). *Communicative language teaching today*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Savignon, S. J. (2002). *Interpreting communicative language teaching*. Yale University Press.
5. Littlewood, W. (1981). *Communicative language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
6. Sohn, H. M. (1999). *The Korean language*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Comrie, B. (1989). *Language universals and linguistic typology*. University of Chicago Press.
8. Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Bybee, J. (2010). *Language, usage and cognition*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Haspelmath, M. (2010). Comparative concepts and descriptive categories. *Language*, 86(3), 663–687.
11. Johanson, L. (1998). The structure of Turkic. In *The Turkic languages*. Routledge.
12. Kornfilt, J. (1997). *Turkish*. Routledge.
13. Lee, I., & Ramsey, S. (2000). *The Korean language*. SUNY Press.
14. Song, J. J. (2005). *The Korean language: Structure, use and context*. Routledge.
15. Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (2008). *Second language acquisition*. Routledge.
16. Odlin, T. (1989). *Language transfer*. Cambridge University Press.
17. Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures*. University of Michigan Press.
18. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-based language teaching*. Cambridge University Press.
19. Larsen-Freeman, D. (2000). *Techniques and principles in language teaching*. Oxford.
20. Canale, M., & Swain, M. (1980). Theoretical bases of communicative approaches. *Applied Linguistics*, 1(1), 1–47.
21. Bachman, L. (1990). *Fundamental considerations in language testing*. Oxford University Press.
22. Celce-Murcia, M. (2001). *Teaching English as a second language*. Heinle.