Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

PROFESSION-ORIENTED RUSSIAN LANGUAGE EDUCATION FOR AGRARIAN UNIVERSITIES IN UZBEKISTAN: AN ACTION-ORIENTED, CORPUS-INFORMED, AND AI-RESPONSIBLE MODEL

Kasimova Mukhabbatkhon Bazarovna
Lecturer, Department of Uzbek Language and Literature
Tashkent State Agrarian University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article develops a doctoral-level conceptual and methodological framework for profession-oriented Russian language education in agrarian higher education, with particular relevance to Uzbekistan and to the institutional environment of Tashkent State Agrarian University. The problem addressed is not merely linguistic but systemic: in a university ecosystem increasingly shaped by the digital transformation of education, the technologization of agriculture, multilingual communication, academic mobility, and new expectations of graduate employability, a traditional language course organized around isolated grammar themes and decontextualized vocabulary no longer meets the communicative needs of future agronomists, agricultural engineers, plant-protection specialists, veterinarians, agrobusiness managers, and researchers. The study therefore asks how Russian language instruction for agrarian students can be redesigned so that it functions as an instrument of professional action, disciplinary mediation, scientific literacy, and digital participation rather than as a peripheral general-education subject. Methodologically, the article is a framework study based on integrative literature review, policy-document analysis, comparative pedagogical synthesis, and curriculum-design modeling. Its source base includes the CEFR Companion Volume, UNESCO guidance on multilingual education and digital learning, UNESCO's AI Competency Framework for Teachers, DigComp 2.2, FAO materials on digital agriculture, and a selected body of scholarship on CLIL, corpus-based instruction, discipline-

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

specific vocabulary, project-based learning, and profession-oriented language teaching in agrarian universities. The principal result is a six-component instructional model that combines action-oriented learning, multilingual mediation, corpus-informed lexical design, staged content integration, digital and AI-responsible pedagogy, and performance-based assessment. The article argues that the most productive model for agrarian universities in Uzbekistan is a blended, multilingual, professionally anchored approach in which Russian serves simultaneously as a language of access to scientific information, a tool of communication in agricultural practice, a medium of academic and interprofessional mediation, and a support mechanism for the modernization of agrarian education. The study concludes that the reform of Russian language teaching in agrarian universities should be based on authentic professional tasks, carefully structured lexical cores, ethical technology use, and a measurable competency architecture aligned with national educational modernization and international language-education frameworks.

Keywords: Russian for Specific Purposes; agrarian higher education; Uzbekistan; action-oriented approach; multilingual education; corpus-informed pedagogy; CLIL; digital competence; artificial intelligence in education; CEFR

Introduction

The contemporary discussion of language education in higher school has moved decisively beyond the old question of whether language instruction should prioritize grammar, vocabulary, translation, or communication, because universities are now confronted by a more complex and more consequential issue: what kind of language user must a graduate become in order to function productively in a professional field that is itself changing under the influence of digitalization, interdisciplinarity, automation, ecological pressure, and international knowledge exchange. In agrarian higher education this question is especially acute. Agriculture is no longer reducible to manual practice, local terminology, or narrowly technical routines; it is increasingly a data-rich and communication-intensive domain involving precision technologies, remote sensing, biological risk management, environmental compliance, digital

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

documentation, scientific reporting, market analysis, and interaction with diverse stakeholders ranging from farmers and extension officers to laboratory personnel, software providers, and researchers. In such a context, a student's language preparation cannot be treated as an ornamental supplement to "real" professional subjects. Rather, language becomes one of the infrastructures of professional action. For universities in Uzbekistan, and particularly for institutions working in agricultural sciences, this shift coincides with broader transformations in national educational and technological policy. The state's "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" agenda has explicitly linked modernization with the diffusion of digital technologies across social and economic sectors, while official higher-education discourse emphasizes innovation, competitiveness, and integration into wider scientific and educational processes. Tashkent State Agrarian University, which publicly describes itself as a university with a 95-year history, advanced science, and innovation-oriented development in support of the country's agricultural potential, provides a concrete institutional example of this transition, because the university's own self-presentation signals that agrarian education is expected to participate in national modernization rather than remain confined to inherited instructional routines. At the same time, international organizations have formulated the educational principles needed to understand this transformation in conceptual terms. UNESCO argues that digital technology has become a social necessity for the realization of education as a right and that the disruption of recent years has shown the need to ally technologies and human resources in building inclusive, open, and resilient learning systems; in more recent digital-education guidance, UNESCO further stresses that digital and AI competencies have become essential for learners and educators, but that human agency, ethics, and critical judgment must remain central. Equally important is UNESCO's 2025 guidance on multilingual education, which treats multilingualism not as a classroom inconvenience but as a fundamental human characteristic and as an essential educational approach. That proposition is immediately relevant for Uzbekistan, where students in higher education commonly navigate Uzbek, Russian, and English in asymmetrical yet pedagogically meaningful ways. A language course that ignores this multilingual ecology will either create artificial barriers between what students know and what they are expected to learn, or it

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

will reduce professional language to memorized equivalences devoid of communicative power. The CEFR Companion Volume offers a particularly valuable theoretical response to this situation because it redefines the learner as a social agent, places action at the center of language use, and expands the role of mediation, online interaction, plurilingual competence, and collaborative meaning-making. This reconceptualization is not a matter of fashionable terminology. It changes the very unit of curriculum design. If a student is a social agent, then the aim of language teaching is not simply mastery of linguistic forms but the capacity to perform purposeful acts in real or realistically simulated contexts. For agrarian students, these acts include reading field instructions, interpreting fertilizer recommendations, describing crop symptoms, discussing irrigation regimes, reporting laboratory observations, summarizing scientific texts, comparing equipment specifications, preparing short presentations, clarifying safety procedures, and translating specialized information into accessible language for non-specialist audiences. In other words, the agrarian student does not merely learn a language about agriculture; the student learns to do agriculture-related reasoning, explanation, coordination, and problem-solving through language. This perspective also exposes the limitations of the traditional post-Soviet model of language instruction still visible in many non-linguistic universities, where the course often remains divided into discrete grammar topics, abstract lexical lists, and translation exercises detached from the logic of professional communication. Such courses may produce students who can identify case endings, reproduce isolated terms, or translate single sentences, yet still cannot conduct a short professional dialogue, summarize a technical text orally, or formulate a precise explanation of a process. In employability terms, that gap matters. The World Bank's analysis of skills in Uzbekistan showed that labor-market outcomes are influenced not only by formal qualifications but by broader skill configurations, and even when the report was not narrowly about language education, its diagnosis remains important for universities: professional success depends on a combination of cognitive, non-cognitive, and demonstrable applied skills, not on credential possession alone. Language competence, particularly when it supports access to knowledge, documentation, teamwork, and digital communication, must therefore be understood as part of the

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

employability architecture rather than as a decorative cultural add-on. Recent scholarship on profession-oriented and integrated language teaching in agrarian universities supports this conclusion. Baydikova's work on agricultural-engineering students, for example, identifies a set of pedagogical conditions that make profession-oriented foreign-language teaching effective in an agrarian context, including the selection of subject content through interdisciplinary links, the use of problem speech tasks reflecting future professional activity, attention to proficiency thresholds, profile grouping, and teacher competence across language, methodology, and specialty areas. Tokmakova's model for students in the technology of agricultural production and processing similarly demonstrates that integrated content-language instruction can be organized as a coherent methodological system rather than as occasional thematic borrowing from disciplinary courses. These studies are significant not because they can be mechanically transferred into every national context, but because they show that agrarian language teaching becomes genuinely professional only when its content, tasks, and outcomes are aligned with disciplinary action rather than left at the level of generalized academic language. Research on CLIL and related integrated approaches also points in the same direction. Although results vary across contexts, work on university students indicates that content and language integrated learning can contribute not only to language development but to transversal skills such as communication, collaboration, and critical thinking, provided that design conditions are met. At the same time, more recent studies warn against simplistic implementation, especially in online modes, where motivation, interaction, and teacher workload may become problematic. This double lesson is crucial: integration is pedagogically promising, but it requires careful staging, adequate support, and realistic adaptation to learners' proficiency levels. Another essential strand of evidence comes from corpus linguistics and discipline-specific vocabulary research. Martínez, Beck, and Panza demonstrated in their study of agriculture research articles that reliance on general academic vocabulary is insufficient for specialized discourse, because the agricultural domain mobilizes a more restricted and more specific lexical profile than generalized academic lists can capture. Kamrotov, Talalakina, and Stukal later showed in a Russian-language for specific purposes context that a corpus-based

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

word list can substantially improve lexical coverage of specialized texts. Meanwhile, current agenda-setting work in corpus linguistics argues that language pedagogy increasingly benefits from corpus-informed design, data-driven learning, and attention to multilingual and AI-enriched environments. For Russian language teaching in agrarian universities, the implication is straightforward but powerful: lexical content should not be chosen merely because it appears in an old textbook or because it "sounds professional"; it should be selected from authentic or near-authentic disciplinary communication and organized around frequency, conceptual centrality, collocational behavior, and communicative usefulness. A final transformation affecting the Russian-language classroom is the arrival of generative AI and broader digital tools. Recent work in agrarian university settings suggests that AI-based technological solutions, when used as guided supplements to traditional teaching, may improve student performance across vocabulary, grammar, reading, dialogue, and writing. Yet this possibility also creates pedagogical risk. Without clear principles, students may use AI to bypass cognitive effort, submit unexamined output, or internalize inaccurate terminology and unstable register patterns. UNESCO's AI Competency Framework for Teachers is therefore particularly relevant, because it insists that AI use in education must be grounded in human rights, ethics, professional judgment, pedagogical intentionality, and the preservation of human agency. In the language classroom, that means AI should not be treated as an automatic substitute for analysis or authorship; it should be incorporated as an object of critical engagement, revision, comparison, and reflective evaluation. Taken together, these policy frameworks and research findings make one conclusion unavoidable: the teaching of Russian in agrarian higher education requires a deep methodological redesign. The central problem is not that students need "more vocabulary" or "better grammar practice" in the abstract. The problem is that the structure of the course often fails to reflect the communicative, disciplinary, multilingual, and digital realities of contemporary agrarian education. This article responds to that problem by developing a profession-oriented, action-based, corpus-informed, and AI-responsible model for Russian language education in agrarian universities, with Uzbekistan as the primary contextual frame. The study asks four interrelated questions: what professional

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

communicative outcomes should define Russian language learning for agrarian students; how should content and tasks be structured to support those outcomes; how can multilingual and digital realities be productively integrated without weakening linguistic rigor; and what assessment architecture can capture genuine professional language competence. The answer proposed here is not a one-size-fits-all prescription but a theoretically grounded and practically adaptable model whose basic pedagogical unit is the professional communicative task rather than the isolated linguistic topic. By moving from language as subject matter to language as instrument of professional action, the model aims to make Russian language instruction both academically rigorous and institutionally relevant for agrarian higher education in Uzbekistan and comparable multilingual contexts.

Materials and Methods

The present study is designed as a conceptual and methodological article rather than as an empirical intervention report, because its primary purpose is to formulate, justify, and structurally articulate a model for profession-oriented Russian language instruction in agrarian universities before that model is subjected to pilot implementation and statistical testing. This choice is methodological rather than merely pragmatic. In many higher-education settings, curricular reform fails not because institutions lack enthusiasm for innovation, but because innovation is introduced without a sufficiently coherent design logic. For that reason, the study adopts a framework-building methodology based on integrative review, document analysis, comparative synthesis, and design-oriented educational reasoning. The source corpus was selected through four linked criteria: normative relevance, disciplinary relevance, pedagogical relevance, and transferability to the agrarian-university context of Uzbekistan. Normative relevance required the inclusion of international and national documents capable of informing the conceptual architecture of language education, digital education, multilingual policy, and teacher competence. These materials included the CEFR Companion Volume, UNESCO guidance on digital learning and the transformation of education, UNESCO's global guidance on multilingual education, UNESCO's AI Competency Framework for Teachers, DigComp 2.2, the FAO e-agriculture strategy guide, and FAO materials on digital

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

technologies in agriculture and rural areas. National relevance was addressed through official materials connected to the digitalization agenda in Uzbekistan and the institutional profile of Tashkent State Agrarian University. Disciplinary relevance required studies that, directly or indirectly, could clarify the communicative demands of agrarian education, the logic of language for specific purposes, or the design of learning tasks connected with agricultural content. Pedagogical relevance required sources dealing with profession-oriented language teaching, CLIL or integrated content-language learning, corpus-based instruction, project-based learning, digital competence, AI-supported pedagogy, or discipline-specific lexical design. Transferability was evaluated not by superficial similarity of national setting, but by the presence of mechanisms likely to remain meaningful across contexts: action orientation, professional task authenticity, lexical specificity, staged scaffolding, mediation, and performance-based assessment. The resulting source base combined international frameworks, official institutional materials, review studies, and research articles, with particular attention to publications that explicitly addressed agrarian or non-linguistic university environments. Once the source base was assembled, the analysis proceeded in three stages. The first stage was diagnostic extraction. Here the study identified recurrent problems in existing approaches to language education for non-linguistic students, especially those that become more visible in agrarian universities: decontextualized grammar teaching; inadequate connection between language syllabus and professional subjects; lack of systematic lexical selection; overreliance on translation as a proxy for competence; underuse or misuse of multilingual resources; weak integration of digital work; and assessment models that privilege recognition over purposeful production. The second stage was principle abstraction. Instead of reproducing each author's recommendations individually, the study distilled from the literature a set of design principles that repeatedly appeared across frameworks and research traditions. These principles were action orientation, authenticity of professional task, integration of disciplinary content, staged scaffolding, lexical and discourse specificity, multilingual mediation, teacher-guided digitalization, ethical AI use, and assessment through observable communicative performance. The third stage was model construction. In this stage, the extracted principles

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

were reorganized into a coherent pedagogical architecture specifying target competencies, curricular sequencing, lexical organization, task design, technology integration, and assessment procedures. Throughout this process, contradictory findings were not ignored but treated as constraints that sharpen the design. For example, studies on CLIL show clear advantages in motivation and transversal skill development, but also indicate that implementation becomes fragile when student proficiency is too low or when online delivery dominates without adequate interactional support. Accordingly, the proposed model does not recommend immediate full-scale immersion in disciplinary content; it recommends staged integration with pre-professional bridging. Likewise, research on corpus-based instruction highlights both its pedagogical benefits and its cognitive demands. Therefore, the model includes corpus-informed design at the curriculum-development level and simplified corpus-aware tasks at the classroom level, rather than requiring every student to become an expert corpus user from the outset. The methodological stance of the study is thus neither prescriptive dogmatism nor descriptive accumulation. It is design rationality: the search for the most coherent arrangement of pedagogical means in relation to clearly defined educational ends. To increase the robustness of this design logic, the study used analytic triangulation across six categories. The first category, competence definition, asked what kind of Russian language user agrarian higher education should aim to develop. The second, content organization, asked how professional subject matter should be selected and sequenced. The third, lexical architecture, asked how specialized vocabulary and phraseology should be chosen, clustered, and recycled. The fourth, mediation and multilingualism, asked how students can move information across languages, registers, and communicative formats without reducing the course to translation drills. The fifth, digital and AI integration, asked what forms of technological use are pedagogically valuable and ethically defensible. The sixth, assessment, asked how to evaluate professional language ability in ways that are observable, valid, and adaptable to university constraints. For each category, evidence from policy documents and scholarship was compared not only for convergence but also for blind spots. For example, broad digital-education frameworks often articulate valuable principles but remain general about discipline-specific language

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

learning, while profession-oriented language studies sometimes describe useful tasks yet under-theorize ethics or multilingualism. The model developed here attempts to compensate for such gaps by cross-feeding the categories rather than treating them as separate domains. An important feature of the methodology is its deliberate refusal to simulate empirical data. In contemporary academic writing, there is a persistent temptation to embellish conceptual articles with weak surveys, schematic percentages, or invented classroom measurements that create the appearance of research without generating credible knowledge. The present study avoids that practice. Its validity rests instead on the transparency of source selection, the coherence of its analytical categories, the defensibility of its design decisions, and the extent to which the resulting model resolves practical contradictions more effectively than traditional language-course structures. Such a stance is entirely compatible with design-based educational research, particularly in contexts where institutional adaptation must precede controlled experimentation. At the same time, the article is not indifferent to later empirical verification. On the contrary, the model is constructed in a way that makes future validation possible. Each major component is expressed in operationalizable terms: competencies can be translated into descriptors; lexical cores can be tested against corpora and teaching materials; stages can be mapped onto semester structures; tasks can be piloted and rated; AI use can be documented and evaluated; and assessment rubrics can be calibrated against CEFR-informed performance criteria. Thus, while the present article is non-experimental, it is not non-empirical in spirit; it is pre-empirical in the constructive sense that it seeks to create a research-worthy design before measuring outcomes. The proposed model should therefore be read as a scholarly framework for action, a conceptual instrument capable of guiding curriculum reform, teacher training, materials development, and future intervention research in Russian language education for agrarian students.

Results

The synthesis produced a profession-oriented model of Russian language instruction for agrarian universities that is organized around six mutually reinforcing components: target professional communicative competence,

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

curricular staging, lexical-discursive architecture, multilingual mediation, digital and AI-responsible pedagogy, and performance-based assessment. The first component redefines the target outcome of the course. Instead of describing the desired graduate as a student who possesses a set of grammatical rules or can translate short professional texts with dictionary support, the model defines the graduate as a multilingual agrarian social agent able to use Russian to perform academic and professional actions. These actions include accessing scientific and technical information, interpreting and explaining professional content, interacting in routine and problem-based communicative situations, producing short but functional written documents, and mediating information between audiences, languages, and semiotic formats. This definition is deliberately broader than "professional vocabulary knowledge" because agricultural communication in real life is not reducible to terminology alone. It is built from actions such as describing symptoms of plant disease, explaining a treatment sequence, discussing irrigation regimes, reporting machine malfunction, interpreting a weather-related risk, commenting on tabular or graphical data, preparing a brief field note, participating in a meeting, or orally reformulating a specialist source for a less specialized listener. On this basis the model specifies six competence dimensions: linguistic competence, professional-discursive competence, mediation competence, digital competence, collaborative-interactional competence, and ethical-AI competence. Linguistic competence includes lexico-grammatical control, intelligibility, and flexibility of basic productive and receptive resources. Professional-discursive competence concerns the genres, rhetorical patterns, and communicative frames typical of agrarian education and agricultural work. Mediation competence includes the capacity to transmit information, summarize, paraphrase, explain, simplify, compare, and translate meaning functionally rather than mechanically. Digital competence includes searching, evaluating, organizing, communicating, and producing information in digital environments relevant to academic and professional tasks. Collaborative-interactional competence includes the ability to negotiate meaning, distribute roles, ask clarifying questions, manage task interaction, and participate respectfully and effectively in team-based work. Ethical-AI competence includes transparent and critical use of AI tools, including verification of terminology,

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

correction of generated output, recognition of limitations, and responsible documentation of assistance. The second component is curricular staging. Because agrarian students enter university with uneven exposure to Russian and with different degrees of confidence in academic communication, the model rejects both a single-track uniform syllabus and sudden immersion into complex professional content. Instead, it proposes a four-stage progression. Stage one, Orientation and Foundation, is aimed at stabilizing the learner's basic communicative repertoire and creating the first bridge between general academic language and professional relevance. At this stage students work with high-frequency academic and agrarian vocabulary, routine classroom and laboratory instructions, basic descriptive patterns, simple cause-and-effect structures, and bilingual support mechanisms. They learn to label tools, processes, organisms, locations, and quantities; to formulate short observations; and to recognize the logic of agrarian texts without being overwhelmed by disciplinary density. Stage two, Guided Professionalization, introduces profile-linked thematic modules and controlled task clusters. Here students engage with simplified or adapted professional texts, visual data, diagrams, and scenario prompts. They practice describing procedures, interpreting short data sets, comparing alternatives, reporting observations, and participating in guided pair or group interactions. Stage three, Integrated Professional Communication, moves learners toward semi-authentic and authentic materials. Texts become less didactically sanitized, vocabulary becomes more collocationally organized, and tasks demand not only comprehension but transformation of information: summarizing an agronomy article, converting a chart into oral explanation, preparing a short troubleshooting note for machinery, or participating in a simulated consultation on crop management or veterinary procedure. Stage four, Capstone Application, requires students to complete multi-step performance products: mini-project reports, poster sessions, bilingual terminology files, mediated summaries of scientific literature, video explanations of field procedures, professional correspondence, or short analytical presentations based on agricultural case material. These stages are not rigidly tied to years of study; they are intended as a flexible sequencing logic adaptable to student intake, program length, and institutional resources. The third component is lexical-discursive architecture. The analysis of research on

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

specialized vocabulary and corpora made it clear that a professional Russian course cannot rely on randomly accumulated terminology or on textbook inheritance alone. The model therefore organizes lexical content into six thematic macro-domains: agrobiology and crop production; soil, water, irrigation, and climate; agricultural engineering and machinery; plant protection, biosafety, and veterinary basics; agribusiness, management, and documentation; and academic-scientific communication. Each macro-domain is structured through three layers. The first layer is core lexical units: terms and high-value semi-technical items necessary for basic access to the domain. The second layer is collocational patterns: recurrent combinations that actually carry disciplinary meaning, such as expressions for assessing soil moisture, identifying disease symptoms, calibrating equipment, regulating irrigation, reducing yield loss, conducting preventive treatment, recording laboratory results, or describing seasonal variability. The third layer is discourse frames: sentence and paragraph patterns for defining, classifying, describing sequence, expressing cause and consequence, comparing alternatives, formulating recommendations, reporting results, indicating uncertainty, and communicating safety-related instructions. This tripartite lexical architecture is crucial because professional incompetence in language often arises not from ignorance of isolated terms, but from inability to mobilize those terms in predictable disciplinary patterns. The course therefore includes systematic recycling of terminology across modalities: recognition, controlled use, explanation, comparison, oral transfer, written production, and mediated reformulation. The fourth component is multilingual mediation. In many university settings, translation is either overused as the dominant method or rejected as an outdated relic. The proposed model adopts neither extreme. Instead, it treats multilingual mediation as a structured pedagogical mechanism aligned with the CEFR. Students may compare Russian and Uzbek terms, identify semantic mismatches, explain Russian concepts through Uzbek or English scaffolds, convert simplified explanations into more specialized forms, or produce bilingual artifacts such as glossaries and annotated diagrams. However, the goal is not to trap them in perpetual dependence on another language. The goal is to use multilingual resources strategically in order to increase precision, deepen conceptual understanding, and accelerate the transition to more

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

autonomous Russian performance. Different modes of mediation are specified. Textual mediation includes summarizing, paraphrasing, and extracting essential information from readings. Conceptual mediation includes explaining disciplinary content to peers with weaker background knowledge. Interlingual mediation includes functional translation of instructions, definitions, cautions, and data commentary. Intersemiotic mediation includes transforming tables, graphs, photographs, or process schemes into spoken or written explanation. These forms are especially relevant in agrarian education because students constantly encounter hybrid information formats rather than pure prose alone. The fifth component is digital and AI-responsible pedagogy. The model does not append technology to the course as an afterthought; it integrates digital work where it enhances authenticity, accessibility, and disciplinary relevance. Students work with digital text banks, short video clips of procedures, online glossaries, interactive diagrams, simple corpora or corpus-derived materials, shared documents for collaborative editing, and presentation software for short professional outputs. At the same time, digital use is evaluated according to purpose. If a tool merely decorates old exercises, it is pedagogically redundant. If it enables access to authentic materials, multimodal mediation, collaborative writing, vocabulary consolidation, or critical comparison of formulations, it becomes educationally meaningful. AI use is allowed only in explicitly defined roles: generating alternative phrasings for comparison, proposing draft glossaries, producing rough summaries for critique, creating practice dialogues from teacher-defined prompts, or supporting pronunciation and vocabulary revision. Students are required to label AI-supported work, identify inaccuracies, and demonstrate the revisions they introduced. In this way AI becomes not a ghost author but a problematic interlocutor whose output must be evaluated. This changes the pedagogical emphasis from passive reception to critical linguistic judgment. The sixth component is assessment architecture. The model replaces the narrow dominance of translation tests and discrete-item grammar checks with a layered system consisting of diagnostic profiling, formative observation, module-end performance tasks, and cumulative portfolio assessment. Diagnostic profiling identifies the learner's initial command of Russian in relation to the six competence dimensions. Formative assessment tracks progress in lexical

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

activation, interactional behavior, mediation strategies, and task completion. Module-end tasks are designed as authentic or near-authentic performances: reading a brief agrarian text and explaining it orally; interpreting a chart of irrigation data; drafting a safety instruction; taking part in a short role-play about equipment use; preparing a bilingual terminology map; or summarizing an article relevant to the student's specialty. Portfolio assessment collects evidence across time, allowing the teacher to judge development rather than isolated performance. Assessment criteria are expressed through rubrics that combine CEFR-informed descriptors with profession-specific indicators: accuracy of content transfer, adequacy of terminology, clarity of explanation, audience awareness, task completion, quality of collaboration, digital responsibility, and transparency of AI use. In practical curricular terms, the result of combining these six components is a different kind of Russian course. The lesson is no longer built around the question "Which grammar theme shall we cover today?" but around the question "What professional communicative action will students learn to perform today, and what language resources do they need in order to perform it well?" Once that question becomes primary, the structure of materials, classroom interaction, homework, technology use, and assessment all change accordingly. The language course becomes less like a museum of grammatical exhibits and more like a workshop of professional communication where agrarian students read, analyze, explain, compare, negotiate, and produce meaning through Russian in increasingly realistic academic and field-related contexts.

A further outcome of the synthesis is the specification of a model lesson architecture that can translate the general framework into teachable and repeatable classroom practice. Each instructional module is designed around a professional scenario rather than around a textbook chapter title. A scenario might involve diagnosing crop stress, explaining a machinery maintenance procedure, discussing irrigation scheduling after a change in weather conditions, recording laboratory observations, or preparing a short recommendation for a farm manager. The module begins with a trigger resource, which may be a short text, photo sequence, instrument display, chart, map, video excerpt, or excerpt from a technical note. Students first complete a guided noticing phase in which they identify key terms, relations, and task purpose. This is followed by a

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

comprehension-to-analysis phase where they group vocabulary into conceptual sets, recognize collocations, extract essential data, and clarify meanings through multilingual support if necessary. The next phase is mediation: students convert the input into another form by explaining a chart orally, summarizing a text for a peer, converting a photo sequence into procedural narration, or translating specialist content into accessible instructional language. Only after this stage do they move into interaction and production, where they negotiate a decision, formulate a recommendation, role-play a consultation, or produce a concise written product such as a field note, safety instruction, report fragment, or presentation slide. The module closes with reflection and lexical consolidation, during which students evaluate the adequacy of their language choices, correct terminology, compare alternate formulations, and archive useful patterns in a personal or group glossary. This cyclical design is pedagogically important because it prevents a common weakness of profession-oriented language courses: the tendency to confront students with difficult professional content but stop at comprehension. The model insists that comprehension is a starting point, not an endpoint; professional language competence emerges when information is transformed, discussed, and used to achieve a practical goal. A second practical specification concerns semester planning. In the recommended version of the course, each semester should include two or three anchor modules linked to the student's disciplinary profile, with shorter supporting units focused on cross-cutting communicative functions such as describing processes, comparing alternatives, interpreting data, making recommendations, reporting problems, and presenting results. This makes the course cumulatively coherent. Students do not simply encounter disconnected topics such as "agriculture," "my specialty," or "environmental protection"; they repeatedly practice a stable set of high-value communicative actions in changing agrarian contexts. A third specification concerns teacher and learner roles. The teacher is not a sole knowledge transmitter but a designer of communicative environments, a curator of lexical and discourse resources, a coach for mediation strategies, and a guardian of disciplinary precision. The learner is not a passive recipient of terminology but an increasingly autonomous participant who must notice patterns, justify choices, and take responsibility for the adequacy of information transfer. This shift in roles

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

is essential if the classroom is to resemble professional communication rather than recitation. A fourth specification concerns materials development. The model recommends the creation of departmental or institutional resource banks containing short authentic texts, teacher-adapted extracts, image sets, data displays, sample role cards, bilingual glossary seeds, and AI-criticality exercises. Such banks reduce teacher overload over time and ensure that profession-oriented design does not depend exclusively on the heroic effort of individual instructors. Finally, the assessment architecture can itself be staged developmentally. In early modules, rubrics focus on comprehensibility, essential terminology, and successful transfer of basic information. In later modules, they expand to include audience adaptation, collocational naturalness, evidence handling, discourse organization, quality of interaction, and reflective control over digital or AI-supported work. This developmental staging ensures that assessment remains demanding without becoming punitive at the initial levels of professionalization. An additional result of the framework-building process is the formulation of an implementation roadmap suitable for gradual adoption in agrarian universities that may not yet possess extensive specialized language materials or strong traditions of interdepartmental collaboration. The roadmap consists of four levels of institutional maturity. At level one, departments revise existing syllabi by replacing a portion of generic topics with professionally anchored modules and by introducing basic mediation tasks, bilingual glossaries, and performance rubrics. This level requires minimal structural change and is therefore realistic even in resource-constrained contexts. At level two, teachers begin systematic lexical planning through the creation of thematic banks of terms, collocations, and discourse frames drawn from agrarian texts and classroom experience. Short authentic resources are added to lessons, and students produce simple portfolio artifacts such as summaries, annotated diagrams, and brief oral explanations. At level three, collaboration with specialty departments becomes more visible: subject teachers recommend key genres, validate terminology priorities, and occasionally participate in module review or co-assessment. Digital resources are curated more deliberately, and AI-critical tasks are introduced under teacher guidance. At level four, the university develops a recognizable institutional model of profession-oriented language education supported by shared materials, internal

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

training workshops, and periodic review of outcomes. Such staged implementation is pedagogically important because it protects reform from two common failures: stagnation disguised as caution and chaotic innovation disguised as progress. Universities do not need to wait for perfect conditions before improving Russian language instruction, but neither should they declare full transformation after cosmetic revision of lesson titles. The roadmap also clarifies that evaluation should be proportionate to implementation level. Early success may mean stronger thematic relevance and better student engagement; later success may mean improved mediation performance, more accurate professional writing, more effective digital collaboration, and more reflective use of AI. In this way the model remains flexible without becoming vague.

Discussion

The proposed model has several theoretical and practical implications because it resolves, or at least productively reframes, a series of contradictions that continue to weaken professional language education in agrarian universities. The first contradiction is between declarative linguistic knowledge and operational communicative competence. Many university language courses still assume that once students have accumulated sufficient grammar and vocabulary, professional communication will emerge naturally as a by-product. In practice, however, the transfer is often weak. Students may correctly manipulate isolated forms yet fail to perform even moderately complex communicative actions such as clarifying a procedure, summarizing a technical paragraph, explaining a diagram, reformulating information for a different audience, or participating in a problem-solving dialogue. The action-oriented logic of the CEFR makes visible why this happens: language ability is not only a stock of forms but an organized capacity to mobilize forms under conditions of purpose, audience, context, and task constraint. For agrarian students, those constraints are especially concrete. They must communicate under the pressure of safety, time, specificity, and practical consequence. If one cannot clearly distinguish between preventive and curative treatment, explain the order of a field procedure, identify a parameter in a machine specification, or summarize a research finding relevant to crop productivity, then “knowing the language” remains educationally hollow. The

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

present model therefore relocates grammar inside professional action. Grammar is still necessary, but its pedagogical status changes from content center to enabling resource. The second contradiction is between the monolingual ideal of many language methods and the multilingual reality of higher education in Uzbekistan. UNESCO's multilingual education guidance makes it increasingly difficult to defend pedagogies that behave as if students think, read, and build concepts in one language only. In practice, agrarian students often move among Uzbek, Russian, and English, sometimes within a single learning task: a textbook definition may be encountered in Russian, a lecture clarification in Uzbek, and a technical manual or software interface in English. Suppressing this reality in the name of purity may create a neat classroom ideology, but it does not create better professionals. Yet the opposite extreme is equally problematic. If every communicative difficulty is immediately resolved through translation, students never build autonomous Russian performance. The proposed framework treats multilingualism as a regulated pedagogical resource. Students may compare lexical and conceptual structures across languages, diagnose false equivalences, and use interlingual scaffolds to establish precision, but these moves are embedded in a progression toward independent Russian action. In this sense multilingual mediation is not a methodological concession; it is a disciplined strategy for moving from distributed linguistic resources toward more specialized and self-sustaining competence. The third contradiction is between digital enthusiasm and pedagogical seriousness. Current educational discourse is saturated with the language of innovation, platforms, AI, smart classrooms, and transformation. Yet many institutions still reproduce old pedagogies through new devices: PDF worksheets replace paper worksheets, slide decks replace chalkboards, and chatbot outputs replace dictionary lookups, while the logic of teaching remains unchanged. UNESCO's digital-learning guidance and DigComp 2.2 are useful precisely because they resist this superficiality. They define digital competence in terms of information and data literacy, communication and collaboration, content creation, safety, and problem solving. When applied to the Russian-language classroom in agrarian education, this means that technology should not be judged by novelty but by its contribution to meaningful disciplinary communication. A corpus-derived vocabulary exercise

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

that helps students notice recurrent agrarian collocations is pedagogically richer than a flashy but trivial quiz. A collaborative digital annotation of a short technical text may develop mediation, terminology, and interaction more effectively than a polished but passive presentation. A teacher-guided comparison between a human-written explanation and an AI-generated explanation may deepen students' understanding of register, accuracy, and disciplinary precision more than either text alone. The real task, then, is not "using technology" but subordinating technology to communicative and epistemic goals. This also explains why ethical-AI competence is a distinct dimension in the model. The entry of generative AI into higher education has destabilized inherited assumptions about authorship, practice, and evaluation. In language education the threat is obvious: students may outsource drafting, rely on hallucinated terminology, confuse fluency with correctness, or lose the habit of struggling productively with formulation. Yet the opportunity is equally real if AI is pedagogically domesticated rather than worshipped. When students learn to test AI-generated summaries against source texts, compare alternate lexical choices, identify terminological inaccuracies, revise structure, and justify corrections, they engage in metalinguistic reasoning of high educational value. UNESCO's AI framework for teachers strongly supports this direction by placing human agency, ethics, and pedagogical judgment at the center of AI integration. In effect, the model argues that AI should make students more linguistically responsible, not less. The fourth contradiction is between general academic language and discipline-specific discourse. A long-standing tendency in university language teaching has been to treat disciplinary adaptation as a late-stage decoration: first teach general language, then add some special vocabulary. Research in specialized vocabulary challenges this assumption. Agriculture, like other professional fields, has a distinct lexical ecology shaped by domain concepts, processes, relations, and reporting practices. Martínez, Beck, and Panza showed that general academic vocabulary covers only part of the communicative terrain in agricultural research, while corpus-based work in Russian LSP demonstrates that specialized word lists and phraseological patterns can significantly improve access to texts. This is why the model places lexical-discursive architecture at its core. The goal is not to create a frightening wall of terminology, but to identify

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

the lexical-semantic backbone of agrarian communication and then organize it around meaningful recurrent tasks. Such design also improves equity. Students from stronger linguistic backgrounds often infer collocations and discourse frames more easily, while weaker students remain trapped at the level of isolated word recognition. Corpus-informed materials make the hidden structure of professional discourse more teachable. They reveal that language learning in the agrarian sphere involves learning how experts habitually classify, compare, warn, infer, recommend, and report. The fifth contradiction is between integrated content-language learning as an attractive ideal and the institutional realities that often undermine it. CLIL and related approaches are attractive because they promise efficiency, relevance, and deeper motivation: students learn language through meaningful disciplinary content and learn content through language-rich interaction. But implementation can become fragile when language teachers lack access to subject expertise, when subject teachers are uninterested in collaboration, when students' proficiency is too low, or when administrative expectations assume instant results. Studies in agrarian contexts suggest that integrated learning works best under identifiable conditions: content must be selected carefully; tasks must mirror future professional activity; grouping and scaffolding must respect learner differences; and teacher competence must be broad enough to manage the borderland between language and specialty. The model therefore resists the romance of total integration. It proposes staged and selective integration. In early stages, content is simplified and professionally framed rather than fully subject-driven. In intermediate stages, semi-authentic materials allow students to build confidence without drowning in disciplinary density. Only at later stages do authentic materials and more demanding task chains become central. This sequencing is not pedagogical cowardice; it is a recognition that meaningful integration requires readiness. The sixth contradiction is between formal assessment culture and the development of authentic competence. Many higher-education systems continue to reward what is easy to grade rather than what matters most. Translation of disconnected sentences, recognition of terms, and multiple-choice grammar tests are administratively convenient, but they are poor proxies for the communicative performances required in agricultural study and work. A student may obtain

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

acceptable marks while remaining unable to mediate information, collaborate effectively, or produce a coherent short professional text. Portfolio and performance-based assessment are therefore not luxuries imported from educational fashion. They are instruments for increasing validity. In the proposed model, assessment aligns with communicative action: students must show that they can interpret, summarize, explain, compare, advise, warn, document, and present. Importantly, such assessment also reveals learning trajectories. A student who begins by relying heavily on bilingual scaffolds and fragmented oral production may, over time, move toward more fluent and more independent Russian performance. This developmental dimension is invisible in one-time testing but visible in longitudinal task evidence. The model also carries strong implications for teacher identity. The teacher of Russian in an agrarian university can no longer be defined only as a language specialist who brings a generic course to a non-linguistic faculty. The role becomes hybrid. Without turning the teacher into a full agronomist or engineer, the profession-oriented course requires selective disciplinary literacy: familiarity with the central concepts, genres, communicative situations, and documentation practices of the students' field. It also requires digital competence, assessment literacy, and, increasingly, the ability to manage AI critically. This is demanding, but it should not be exaggerated into impossibility. Much of the required expertise can be developed through collaborative routines: shared terminology banks, co-planning of thematic modules, consultation with specialty teachers, use of authentic but manageable materials, and departmental repositories of tasks and rubrics. In institutional terms, this suggests that reform of language teaching in agrarian universities is not only a matter of syllabus revision; it is also a matter of professional development and interdepartmental culture. The model further implies a change in the status of textbooks and teaching materials. Traditional profession-oriented textbooks often become outdated because agriculture changes faster than textbooks do: new digital tools enter the field, regulatory language shifts, climate-related issues intensify, and scientific priorities evolve. For that reason, the model privileges a flexible material ecology rather than a single authoritative book. Core materials may still be textbook-based, but they should be supplemented with short current texts, visual resources, institutional

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

documents, video fragments, data displays, and corpus-informed lexical materials. Such diversity is especially important for maintaining relevance without overburdening students. Authenticity, however, should not be fetishized. Not every authentic text is pedagogically useful. Some are too dense, too bureaucratic, too repetitive, or too specialized for a given stage. The point is controlled authenticity: selecting materials that preserve the communicative logic of real professional discourse while remaining tractable for learning. Another important implication concerns the relationship between Russian language education and scientific literacy. In many post-Soviet and Central Asian academic contexts, Russian still serves as a significant channel for access to research, specialized monographs, conference materials, technical standards, and professional exchange. Even where English gains importance as the language of international publication, Russian remains educationally valuable as a language of regional scholarship, technical communication, and interinstitutional cooperation. For agrarian students, this means that Russian teaching should include not only everyday professional communication but also entry into academic discourse: reading abstracts, identifying research problems, summarizing methods, interpreting results, and writing concise research-related texts. The model therefore includes academic-scientific communication as one of its lexical macro-domains and treats the classroom as a preparatory site for future thesis writing, conference participation, and work with scientific sources. This feature is especially relevant for institutions seeking to cultivate research-oriented graduates rather than narrow technical executors. The model also contributes to the debate on equity in higher education. Students do not enter agrarian university with the same linguistic capital. Some come from schools with stronger Russian exposure; others have more limited access and may initially experience professional language as a barrier to disciplinary success. A rigid monolingual and grammar-dense course often amplifies such inequality. By contrast, staged scaffolding, multilingual mediation, corpus-informed lexical sequencing, and performance-based assessment create more entry points for students with diverse starting profiles. Equity here does not mean lowering expectations. It means designing pathways by which students can genuinely reach demanding outcomes. Yet the model also has limitations that must be acknowledged. First, because the

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

present article is conceptual, it does not provide causal evidence that the model improves outcomes in a specific population. Such evidence requires future pilot studies, quasi-experimental comparisons, and longitudinal portfolio analyses. Second, the model assumes a minimum level of institutional support, including time for teacher preparation, access to digital materials, and at least modest willingness to cooperate across departments. In under-resourced settings, implementation may need to begin with small-scale modules rather than wholesale course redesign. Third, the model is developed for agrarian higher education broadly conceived, which means that its thematic and lexical dimensions still require local adaptation: crop science, irrigation, veterinary education, agroeconomics, food technology, and agricultural engineering have overlapping but not identical discourse needs. Fourth, ethical-AI pedagogy remains a moving target because the technological environment evolves rapidly. What counts as appropriate AI use today may need revision tomorrow. These limitations, however, do not weaken the central claim. They simply indicate that serious curriculum design must be adaptive rather than doctrinaire. From a research perspective, the model generates a substantial agenda for future inquiry. One line of work should focus on needs analysis in Uzbek agrarian universities: which genres, documents, and communicative situations do students encounter most frequently, and where do breakdowns in Russian-mediated communication occur? A second line should build small disciplinary corpora for agronomy, irrigation, veterinary basics, agricultural engineering, and agroeconomics in order to refine lexical cores and collocational priorities. A third line should test staged modules experimentally, comparing traditional grammar-translation sequences with action-oriented professional tasks. A fourth line should develop and validate rubrics for agrarian mediation tasks informed by the CEFR but localized to university practice. A fifth line should study teacher professional development, especially how language teachers acquire selective disciplinary literacy and how specialty teachers perceive collaboration with language departments. A sixth line should examine AI critically: under what conditions does guided AI use improve reflective language learning, and when does it weaken autonomy or accuracy? These future directions underscore a final point. Reforming Russian language teaching for agrarian students is not about chasing methodological trends. It is

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

about aligning educational means with the communicative reality of a transforming professional domain. Agriculture today demands specialists who can understand, interpret, collaborate, and communicate across disciplinary and technological boundaries. A language course that remains trapped in isolated forms and outdated routines fails both the student and the institution. By contrast, a profession-oriented, action-based, multilingual, corpus-informed, and ethically digital model gives Russian language education a clear academic identity and a practical purpose. It ceases to be the obligatory side corridor of the curriculum and becomes part of the main road on which professional formation actually moves. In that sense, the future of Russian in agrarian higher education will depend less on rhetorical declarations about its importance and more on whether universities redesign the course so that students experience the language as a working instrument of modern agricultural knowledge, responsibility, and action. Beyond curriculum design, the model has implications for educational governance and for the broader place of language within agrarian modernization. If universities continue to treat profession-oriented language teaching as a low-status support subject, reforms will remain cosmetic because the timetable, workload allocation, teacher training structures, and material support necessary for serious innovation will never be secured. The framework developed here implies that language policy at the institutional level should become more strategic. Departments responsible for Russian and other languages should participate in discussions of graduate profiles, digital competence, and educational quality assurance. Language outcomes should be mapped explicitly onto program outcomes in agronomy, agroengineering, veterinary science, irrigation, and agroeconomics. Such mapping has two advantages. First, it makes visible the contribution of language learning to disciplinary success, thereby strengthening the legitimacy of curricular investment. Second, it enables a more rational division of labor between language teachers and subject teachers: the former focus on communicative and mediational design, while the latter help identify authentic situations, key genres, and terminology priorities. Another implication concerns students' motivational economy. One reason language courses underperform in non-linguistic universities is that students often perceive them as disconnected from the "real" center of their studies. Profession-oriented

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

design can change this perception only if relevance is not asserted rhetorically but experienced repeatedly in task performance. When students see that Russian helps them understand a machinery manual, comment on field data, summarize a scientific abstract, or present a practical recommendation, motivation becomes function-based rather than grade-based. This is especially important in agrarian education, where many students value utility and professional applicability highly. The model also has significance for regional and international cooperation. In Central Asia and the wider post-Soviet academic space, Russian continues to function in many channels of scientific exchange, technical documentation, and interinstitutional communication. Strengthening professional Russian competence therefore supports not only local classroom success but participation in conferences, internships, joint projects, and access to regional knowledge networks. At the same time, because the framework is explicitly multilingual, it does not position Russian against English or against Uzbek; instead, it helps universities build complementary linguistic repertoires. This plural orientation is strategically wiser than competitive language ideologies, particularly in fields such as agriculture where information circulates across several linguistic domains. A final implication is methodological culture. The proposed model encourages universities to evaluate innovation not by slogans or isolated digital purchases but by asking whether students can demonstrably perform more complex, more accurate, and more professionally relevant communicative actions over time. That criterion may sound simple, but it is methodologically revolutionary in environments accustomed to equating reform with paperwork. In this sense the model functions not only as a syllabus proposal but as a diagnostic mirror for institutional seriousness.

The framework also yielded a profile-sensitive mapping of likely communicative priorities by specialty, which can help universities localize the common model without fragmenting it into unrelated subcourses. Agronomy students require especially strong abilities in describing phenological stages, symptoms, treatment sequences, environmental conditions, and yield factors. Irrigation and water-management students need language for parameters, measurements, hydraulic processes, equipment operation, safety, and data commentary. Agricultural engineering students need procedural language, troubleshooting discourse,

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

specification reading, and comparison of technical options. Veterinary and animal-science students need descriptive precision for diagnosis, care routines, preventive measures, and record keeping. Agroeconomics and management students need discourse for planning, reporting, negotiation, documentation, and presentation of analytical conclusions. The model does not propose separate full syllabi for each specialty at the initial stage; instead, it recommends a shared communicative core with profile-specific modules layered onto it. This preserves coherence while increasing relevance. The existence of such a mapping is significant because it prevents profession-oriented teaching from collapsing into vague generality. It gives teachers a rational basis for deciding which lexical sets, genres, and scenarios deserve priority in a given faculty or semester.

Conclusion

This study has argued that profession-oriented Russian language education in agrarian universities must be rethought as a structured system of professional communicative development rather than maintained as a residual general-language subject with occasional thematic references to agriculture. The analysis of international frameworks, agrarian-language pedagogy, corpus-based scholarship, multilingual education guidance, and digital-education policy supports a clear conclusion: the most productive model for agrarian higher education in Uzbekistan is a staged, action-oriented, multilingual, corpus-informed, and AI-responsible approach in which Russian serves as a language of access to knowledge, mediation of meaning, academic participation, and practical professional interaction. The theoretical contribution of the article lies in the integration of several strands that are too often treated separately: CEFR-based action orientation and mediation; UNESCO's human-centered digital and multilingual principles; specialized lexical architecture grounded in corpus logic; agrarian relevance through selective content integration; and assessment based on demonstrable performance rather than on isolated linguistic recognition. The practical contribution lies in the six-component model itself, which specifies target competencies, curricular stages, lexical-discursive design, multilingual mediation, digital and AI use, and assessment procedures that can be adapted to the needs of agronomy, agricultural engineering, veterinary, irrigation, and related

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

profiles. Several general conclusions follow from this model. First, the basic unit of course design should be the professional communicative task, not the grammar topic. When instruction begins from what students must actually do with language, grammatical and lexical content become easier to prioritize, sequence, and assess. Second, professional vocabulary teaching must move beyond static term lists toward collocational and discourse-based organization, because real agrarian communication depends on patterned expression rather than on isolated lexical recall. Third, multilingualism should be managed as an educational resource rather than denied or romanticized. Uzbek, Russian, and English can interact productively in the classroom if that interaction is pedagogically regulated and directed toward stronger Russian-mediated performance. Fourth, digital tools and AI should be integrated only insofar as they deepen access, analysis, collaboration, and reflection; technological novelty without communicative purpose adds little to professional formation. Fifth, assessment must reward what matters: explanation, mediation, interpretation, documentation, collaboration, and purposeful production in realistic academic and professional contexts. Sixth, teacher development is indispensable. No sustainable reform can occur unless language teachers gain selective disciplinary literacy, stronger digital competence, and principled strategies for managing AI-supported learning. For institutions such as Tashkent State Agrarian University, these conclusions have strategic significance. A university that presents itself as innovation-oriented and committed to strengthening national agricultural potential requires a language curriculum capable of supporting scientific literacy, professional communication, and interdisciplinary cooperation. In that setting, Russian should not be taught merely as a legacy language of reading or as a conventional requirement; it should be taught as one of the working instruments through which agrarian students learn to enter the knowledge systems, communication practices, and problem-solving cultures of their profession. The article does not claim that the proposed model is complete or final. Its components must be tested empirically, localized to particular specialties, and refined through classroom evidence. Nevertheless, its overall direction is clear and, in the present educational moment, difficult to avoid. If agrarian higher education is becoming more digital, more multilingual, more interdisciplinary, and more accountable to

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

real professional outcomes, then Russian language teaching must evolve accordingly. The decisive methodological shift is from language as material to be covered toward language as action to be performed. Once that shift is accepted, curriculum, materials, teacher roles, assessment, and technology use can be reorganized on a more coherent basis. The future value of Russian in agrarian universities will therefore depend not on nostalgia, not on administrative obligation, and not on the symbolic prestige of the language alone, but on whether universities succeed in making it experientially useful, intellectually rigorous, and professionally indispensable for the students they educate.

References

1. Adipat, S. (2021). Developing technological pedagogical content knowledge (TPACK) through technology-enhanced content and language-integrated learning (T-CLIL) instruction. Education and Information Technologies, 26(5), 6461–6477.
2. Baydikova, T. V. (2020). Pedagogical conditions for professional foreign language teaching to students of "Agricultural Engineering" programme based on the model of content and language integrated learning. Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities, 25(185), 94–106. https://doi.org/10.20310/1810-0201-2020-25-185-94-106
3. Baydikova, T. V., & Solomatina, A. G. (2025). Teaching agricultural university students a professional foreign language using technological solutions based on artificial intelligence. Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities, 30(3).
4. Council of Europe. (2020). Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment—Companion Volume. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.
5. Curry, N., & McEnery, T. (2025). Corpus linguistics for language teaching and learning: A research agenda. Language Teaching, 58(2), 232–251. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0261444824000430
6. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2016). E-agriculture strategy guide. Rome: FAO.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

7. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2019). Digital technologies in agriculture and rural areas: Status report. Rome: FAO.
8. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, & International Telecommunication Union. (2021). Digital excellence in agriculture in Europe and Central Asia. Rome: FAO and ITU.
9. Government of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2026). Digital technologies and the "Digital Uzbekistan – 2030" strategy. Tashkent: Government portal of Uzbekistan.
10. Jiang, P., Akhter, S., Azizi, Z., Gheisari, A., & Kumar, T. (2022). Exploring the role of content and language integrated learning approach in developing transversal skills in university students with respect to the mediating role of emotional intelligence. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 988494. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.988494
11. Kamrotov, M., Talalakina, E., & Stukal, D. (2022). Technical vocabulary in languages for special purposes: The corpus-based Russian economics word list. Lingua, 273, 103326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2022.103326
12. Kapranchikova, K. V., Zavgorodnyaya, E. L., & Saenko, E. S. (2021). Interdepartmental interaction in an agrarian university as a basis for the development of a professional foreign language course based on the model of content and language integrated learning. Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities, 26(190).
13. Li, D., Noordin, N., Ismail, L., & Cao, D. (2025). A systematic review of corpus-based instruction in EFL classroom. Heliyon, 11(2), e42016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2025.e42016
14. Martínez, I. A., Beck, S. C., & Panza, C. B. (2009). Academic vocabulary in agriculture research articles: A corpus-based study. English for Specific Purposes, 28(3), 183–198. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2009.04.003
15. Makarowa, E. L. (2022). Approaches to teaching agricultural university students a foreign language for professional communication. Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities.
16. Tashkent State Agrarian University. (2025). Official university website. Tashkent: TSAU.

Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy
ISSN (E): 3067-7874
Volume 2, Issue 3, March, 2026
Website: usajournals.org

17. Tokmakova, Y. V. (2020). Methodic model of teaching professional foreign language communication students of "Technology of production and processing of agricultural products" programme based on the model of content and language integrated learning. Tambov University Review. Series: Humanities, 25(186), 53–63.
18. UNESCO. (2024). Digital learning and transformation of education: What you need to know. Paris: UNESCO.
19. UNESCO. (2025). Languages matter: Global guidance on multilingual education. Paris: UNESCO.
20. UNESCO. (2024). AI competency framework for teachers. Paris: UNESCO.
21. Vuorikari, R., Kluzer, S., & Punie, Y. (2022). DigComp 2.2: The Digital Competence Framework for Citizens. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
22. World Bank. (2014). The skills road: Skills for employability in Uzbekistan. Washington, DC: World Bank.