UDK: 378.016:811.111

VOCABULARY IN ENGLISH FOR INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC RELATIONS AND ITS TREATMENT IN SECOND-YEAR ESP COURSES

Djuraev Abdulkhay Shukhratdjanovich
Teacher of English, University of World Economy and Diplomacy
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
adjurayev@uwed.uz, +998 94 695 60 65
ORCID: 0009-0004-9942-3253

Annotation. *The aim of the article is to establish how the specialist lexis of international economic relations is actually structured, and what follows from that structure for the design of second-year ESP courses at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy. The study is analytical and descriptive. It combines a review of research on specialised vocabulary and on ESP course design with document analysis of the working syllabus of the second-year ESP course, the materials used on it, and publicly available professional texts of the field such as trade policy reviews and country reports. Lexical items were classified not by semantic field but by what prevents a learner from acquiring them through glossing and repetition. The analysis identifies three layers: a thin layer of genuine technical terms, a thick layer of general and academic words carrying field-specific senses, and a large body of fixed collocations. The second and third layers, not the first, account for most of the observed difficulty. It is concluded that vocabulary work in such courses should move away from glossaries towards sense disambiguation, the learning of chunks and planned recycling, and that it should be assessed through production rather than recognition.*

Keywords: *English for specific purposes; international economic relations; specialised vocabulary; collocation; technical terms; needs analysis; second-year students; ESP course design; higher education in Uzbekistan; assessment of vocabulary.*

XALQARO IQTISODIY MUNOSABATLAR SOHASIDAGI INGLIZ TILI LEKSIKASI VA UNI IKKINCHI BOSQICH ESP KURSLARIDA O‘QITISH

Annotatsiya. *Maqolaning maqsadi — xalqaro iqtisodiy munosabatlar sohasidagi ingliz tili leksikasining haqiqiy tuzilishini aniqlash va bu tuzilishdan Jahon iqtisodiyoti va diplomatiya universitetining ikkinchi bosqich ESP kurslarini loyihalash uchun qanday xulosalar kelib chiqishini ko‘rsatish. Tadqiqot tahliliy va tavsifiy xarakterga ega. Unda sohaviy leksika hamda*

maxsus maqsadlar uchun ingliz tili kurslarini loyihalashga oid ilmiy adabiyot tahlili ikkinchi bosqich ESP kursining ishchi dasturi, undagi materiallar va soha bo'yicha ochiq manbalardagi kasbiy matnlar — savdo siyosati sharhlari va mamlakat hisobotlari — hujjatli tahlili bilan birlashtirilgan. Leksik birliklar odatdagidek ma'noviy guruhlar bo'yicha emas, balki ularni tarjima va takrorlash orqali o'zlashtirishga nima to'sqinlik qilishi bo'yicha tasniflangan. Tahlil natijasida uch qatlam ajratildi: haqiqiy atamalarning nisbatan yupqa qatlami, sohaga xos ma'no kasb etgan umumiy va akademik so'zlarning qalin qatlami hamda turg'un birikmalarning katta hajmi. Qiyinchilikning asosiy qismini birinchi emas, ikkinchi va uchinchi qatlamlar tashkil etadi. Xulosa shuki, bunday kurslarda leksika ustida ishlash lug'at ro'yxatlaridan ma'noni farqlash, birikmalarni yaxlit o'zlashtirish va rejali takrorlash tomon siljishi, baholash esa tanib olish emas, nutq mahsuli orqali amalga oshirilishi lozim.

Kalit so'zlar: *maxsus maqsadlar uchun ingliz tili; xalqaro iqtisodiy munosabatlar; sohaviy leksika; turg'un birikma; atamalar; ehtiyojlar tahlili; ikkinchi bosqich talabalari; ESP kursini loyihalash; O'zbekiston oliy ta'limi; leksikani baholash.*

ЛЕКСИКА АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА В СФЕРЕ МЕЖДУНАРОДНЫХ ЭКОНОМИЧЕСКИХ ОТНОШЕНИЙ И ЕЁ ПРЕПОДАВАНИЕ НА КУРСАХ ESP ВТОРОГО КУРСА

Аннотация. *Цель статьи — установить, как в действительности устроена специальная лексика сферы международных экономических отношений и какие выводы из этого устройства следуют для проектирования курсов ESP второго года обучения в Университете мировой экономики и дипломатии. Исследование носит аналитический и описательный характер. В нём обзор работ по специальной лексике и по проектированию курсов английского языка для специальных целей соединён с документальным анализом рабочей программы курса ESP второго курса, используемых на нём материалов и общедоступных профессиональных текстов отрасли — обзоров торговой политики и страновых докладов. Лексические единицы классифицированы не по семантическим полям, как это принято, а по тому, что мешает учащемуся усвоить их путём перевода и повторения. Анализ выявил три слоя: тонкий слой собственно терминов, широкий слой общих и академических слов, приобретающих отраслевое значение, и обширный корпус устойчивых сочетаний. Основная трудность приходится не на первый, а на второй и третий слои. Сделан вывод, что работа над лексикой в таких курсах должна сместиться от словарных списков к различению значений, усвоению сочетаний целиком и планомерному повторению, а оцениваться она должна через порождение речи, а не через узнавание.*

Ключевые слова: *английский язык для специальных целей; международные экономические отношения; специальная лексика; устойчивое сочетание; термины; анализ потребностей; студенты второго курса; проектирование курса ESP; высшее образование Узбекистана; оценивание лексики.*

INTRODUCTION

A second-year student at the University of World Economy and Diplomacy has passed the unit vocabulary test with a good mark. She matched twenty terms to their definitions and translated fifteen more without error. Two weeks later she is asked to read three paragraphs of a trade policy review and write a short note on what they say. She produces sentences such as "the government made new tariffs" and "our country has a big exposure in the European market", and when asked what the text means by "the terms of trade deteriorated" she answers that the conditions of the agreement became worse. None of these is a spelling mistake or a gap in grammar, and none of them would have been caught by the test she passed.

This pattern is familiar to anyone who teaches English to students of international economic relations, and it points to a mismatch between what such courses test and what they are supposed to develop. The working assumption behind most specialist vocabulary teaching is that the lexis of a professional field is a list of terms: identify the two hundred most important ones, present them with definitions and translations, test recognition, and the student is equipped. The assumption is attractive because it is easy to operationalise. A list can be printed, a test can be marked objectively, and progress can be reported in numbers.

The difficulty is that the assumption does not describe the lexis accurately. The words that cause trouble in the example above are not rare technical terms. "Make" and "impose" are both high-frequency verbs; "exposure" and "terms" are ordinary words that every intermediate learner already knows. What the student lacks is not items but information about items she already possesses: which verb goes with which noun, and which of several familiar senses is in play in a professional text. Neither kind of knowledge is reached by a glossary, and neither is measured by a matching test.

Research on vocabulary has long distinguished between knowing the form of a word and knowing its behaviour, placing collocation, register and range of meaning in the second category [19; 21]. Work in English for specific purposes has likewise insisted that course content follow from an analysis of what learners will actually do with the language rather than from a progression through a subject field [13; 10; 1]. Within the Uzbek context these principles have been applied to professionally oriented teaching in

economics [17] and to the relationship between professional English and the demands of the national economy [16]. What has not been described for international economic relations specifically is the internal structure of its lexis — where, within the vocabulary of this field, the learning difficulty actually sits.

Three questions organise the present article. First, how is the lexis of international economic relations structured, and which parts of it resist ordinary classroom treatment? Second, what does that structure imply for the design of a second-year ESP course taught under the conditions that exist in Uzbek universities, namely two to four contact hours a week and groups of mixed proficiency? Third, how can the result be assessed within the reporting requirements that institutions already impose?

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

Three bodies of work inform the analysis. The first concerns the nature of specialised vocabulary. Chung and Nation proposed a four-step scale of technicalness, running from words with no particular relationship to a field through to items whose meaning is unintelligible outside it, and found that the proportion of genuinely technical items in specialised texts is considerably smaller than teachers assume [3]. Nation's broader framework divides the vocabulary of any text into high-frequency words, academic words, technical words and low-frequency words, and shows that these four groups require different instructional treatment [19]. The academic layer has been described in detail and made teachable through the Academic Word List and its successors [5; 11], while research on lexical thresholds indicates how much of a text a reader must already know before unassisted comprehension becomes realistic [18]. Schmitt's review of instructed vocabulary learning establishes that the knowledge of collocation and of sense range, unlike the knowledge of form and basic meaning, rarely develops from exposure alone and requires deliberate attention [21].

The second body of work concerns course design. The founding principle of English for specific purposes is that content follows from needs analysis rather than from the structure of a subject [13], a position developed by Dudley-Evans and St John into a distinction between carrier content and real content [10] and by Basturkmen into a practical procedure for building courses [1]. Genre analysis supplies the complementary insight that professional texts have recurring structures which experienced members of a field produce automatically [22], and this has been applied recently to the specific case of graduates of international economic relations programmes, whose professional writing was found to consist largely of a small number of recurring genres [2]. Research on authentic materials indicates that real texts repay the effort only when the task exploits what makes them authentic [12].

The third body of work is local. Jalolov's treatment of methodology situates assessment and instruction within one system, so that a change in what is taught entails a change in what is tested [15]. Normatova examines productive skills in non-philological universities, where contact hours are few and groups uneven [20], and Ismoilov made the descriptive apparatus of the Common European Framework available to readers in this country [14; 4]. Studies of learner profiles in Business English here describe the sociolinguistic starting points that students bring to such courses [9], while needs analysis conducted for particular professional groups shows how far their requirements diverge from general course content [7]. Work on task-based arrangements adapted to Uzbek institutional conditions indicates what forms of classroom organisation are realistic, including with students of economics [6; 8].

The present study is analytical and descriptive. It reports no new learner data and makes no claim to have measured the effect of the proposals it advances. Three sets of material were examined. The first is the working syllabus of the second-year ESP course for students of international economic relations at the author's institution, together with the reading materials and vocabulary lists used on it. The second is a set of publicly available professional texts of the field: trade policy reviews, country economic reports, and the English-language annual reports of companies operating in the region. The third is the research literature described above.

The classification presented in the results was derived by a single procedure. Each lexical item encountered in the professional texts was examined not for its subject matter, which is the usual basis for grouping vocabulary, but for the question of what would prevent a second-year student from acquiring it through the ordinary route of definition, translation and repetition. Items for which that route is adequate were set aside. The remainder fell into recognisable groups, and those groups form the three layers described below. The procedure is open to the objection that it depends on the analyst's judgement of difficulty, and that objection is accepted; the classification is offered as a working instrument rather than as an empirical finding.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The three layers of lexis in international economic relations

The first result of the analysis is that the vocabulary of this field is not one body of material but three, and that the three differ in the kind of difficulty they present rather than in their subject matter. Table 1 sets them out.

Table 1

Three layers of lexis in texts on international economic relations

Layer	Representative items	What makes it difficult, and for whom
0. Genuine technical terms	*most-favoured-nation treatment, tariff rate quota, balance of payments, letter of credit, Incoterms, countervailing duty*	Small in number. The difficulty is conceptual rather than linguistic, and it disappears once the concept is explained, often in the first language. A glossary works here.
1. General and academic words in field-specific senses	*exposure, margin, position, instrument, facility, liquidity, terms, claim, security, sanction, performance*	The student already knows a frequent everyday sense, and that sense blocks the professional one. The failure is silent: nothing in the sentence looks unfamiliar, so no dictionary is consulted.
2. Fixed and semi-fixed collocations	*impose / lift tariffs, run a trade deficit, service a debt, tighten monetary policy, diversify exports, ease restrictions, a basket of currencies*	Every component word is already known and the combination is still not predictable. Produced from first principles, the result is grammatical and professionally wrong.

The relative sizes of the three layers are the opposite of what course materials imply. Unit glossaries in the materials examined consist overwhelmingly of layer one, which is the layer a motivated student can handle alone with a bilingual dictionary and ten minutes. Layers two and three, which account for most of the comprehension failures observed in class and nearly all of the production errors, appear in those glossaries only by accident, when an item happens to be new in form as well as in use.

Layer two deserves particular comment because its difficulty is invisible. A student who reads that a bank has reduced its exposure to a market, and who understands exposure in its everyday sense, produces a reading that is coherent, confident and wrong. Nothing prompts her to check. The same applies to security in the sense of a traded financial instrument, to performance in the sense of the fulfilment of a contractual obligation, and to sanction, which in professional use can mean either a

penalty or an authorisation depending on the context. These are not rare words, and that is precisely the problem: they pass the filter that a learner applies when deciding what to look up.

Layer three fails in the opposite direction, at the moment of production rather than reception. Students read collocations without difficulty, because the meaning of the whole is recoverable from the parts. They cannot produce them, because the parts do not predict the whole. A government does not make a tariff, it imposes one; a country does not do a trade deficit, it runs one; a debt is not paid in the general sense but serviced. These combinations have to be learned as units, in the way that individual words are learned, and the research on instructed vocabulary learning is clear that they do not emerge from exposure at the volume available in a two-hour-a-week course [21; 19].

What the second-year course shows

The second-year ESP course examined here is taught to students who have completed a general English programme in their first year and who sit in groups spanning roughly B1 to B2. Contact time is limited and the groups are mixed, which are the conditions documented for non-philological programmes generally in this country [20; 8]. The course materials combine a published coursebook of business English with texts selected by the teacher from professional sources.

Three observations follow from examining the course documents against the classification above. The first concerns the balance of attention. Vocabulary work in the syllabus is organised around unit word lists, and the assessed vocabulary component is a recognition test. Layer one is therefore taught and tested; layers two and three are neither. The second observation concerns the materials. Texts drawn from professional sources contain all three layers in their natural proportions, which means that the teacher who selects such a text is already supplying the right input — but the accompanying tasks, taken from the coursebook model, address only the first layer. The third concerns the students themselves. Their recorded performance on vocabulary tests is good and stable, which is the strongest practical obstacle to changing the approach: a measure that produces satisfactory numbers is rarely questioned, even when everyone involved knows that the numbers do not predict performance on a real task.

This last point connects to a wider problem of alignment. Where assessment addresses one layer and the professional requirement rests on the others, students allocate effort rationally and the gap persists. Jalolov's insistence that assessment is a component of instruction rather than an addition to it describes exactly the issue [15], and the local evidence on criterion-referenced judgement indicates that changing the measure

requires prior agreement between the teachers who will apply it rather than a change in regulations [20].

Implications for the design of the course

Four principles follow from the analysis, and Table 2 sets out the treatment each layer requires.

Table 2

Classroom treatment appropriate to each layer

Layer	Treatment	Time it deserves in class
0. Technical terms	Glossed once, in a list, with the concept explained in the first language where that is faster. Left to the student thereafter.	Minimal. Five minutes of pre-teaching before a text, not a lesson stage of its own.
1. Words in field-specific senses	Contrastive presentation: the everyday sense and the professional sense side by side, in two sentences, with a task that forces the student to choose between them.	Substantial. This is where the comprehension failures are, and the work cannot be delegated to a dictionary.
2. Collocations	Learned as whole chunks, in the way vocabulary is learned, and recycled across the semester with the content changed and the support withdrawn.	Substantial, and distributed. Three short encounters across a semester outperform one long treatment.

The first principle is that teaching time should be reallocated rather than increased. The course does not need more hours; it needs the hours currently spent presenting layer one to be spent on layers two and three. This is a change a teacher can make within an existing syllabus and without institutional approval.

The second principle concerns the contrastive treatment of layer two. The procedure is simple and takes about four minutes per item set. Students meet the word in two short sentences, one everyday and one professional — "the exposure of the film

was wrong" against "the bank reduced its exposure to the Turkish market" — and are asked to say what changed. They are then given four further sentences and must identify which sense is in play. The exercise is quick, it can be prepared once and reused for several years, and it addresses a failure that no amount of reading will correct by itself, because reading is where the failure occurs undetected.

The third principle concerns the learning of chunks. Collocations should be presented as units, practised as units and tested as units. A productive gap-fill in which the noun is supplied and the verb is missing — "the government _____ new tariffs on imported steel" — is more informative than any matching exercise, because it requires retrieval rather than recognition. The research position here is unambiguous: this kind of knowledge develops under deliberate attention and not otherwise at the exposure levels available in a university course [21].

The fourth principle is recycling. A lexical item met once is lost. The course should be designed so that each set of items is met three times across the semester, in different texts and with decreasing support, which costs nothing in additional hours and requires only that the syllabus be planned with repetition in mind rather than as a sequence of unrelated topics. This is the same principle that governs the design of task sequences more generally, and it has been described for local institutional conditions elsewhere [8; 6].

Materials present no obstacle. Trade policy reviews, country economic reports and the annual reports of regional companies are published in English without restriction and are revised each year, so the same task design can be reused with current figures and current text. These are the genres that graduates will actually read, which is the condition under which authentic input repays the effort of using it [12; 2].

Assessment

A recognition test measures layer one and reports a number that satisfies institutional requirements while predicting very little. The alternative does not require any change to those requirements. A short productive task — a note of 150 to 200 words summarising three paragraphs of a professional text — can be marked against criteria drawn from the task itself: whether each claim is supported by the source, whether the verbs chosen are the ones the field uses, and whether words from layer two are used in their professional rather than their everyday sense. The resulting mark converts to the recorded scale in the ordinary way.

Two conditions make such a measure workable. The criteria must be few enough for a teacher to hold in mind during marking, and they must be interpreted consistently by everyone applying them, which requires an hour of comparison against sample scripts

before the semester begins rather than a discussion after it. Both conditions are organisational rather than methodological, and both are within the reach of a department that decides to meet them.

Limitations

Two limitations qualify the account above. The classification in Table 1 rests on the author's judgement of what obstructs learning, informed by the research literature and by observation of one course, and it has not been validated against learner data. A study capable of testing it is modest in scale: a receptive and a productive measure administered to two comparable second-year groups, taught the same texts and differing only in whether layers two and three are addressed explicitly, with the productive task marked blind. Second, the professional texts examined were drawn from trade and macroeconomic reporting, and the lexis of adjacent areas within the same faculty — investment arbitration, for instance, or customs procedure — may be distributed differently across the three layers. Needs analysis conducted for the particular group remains the only reliable way of establishing which items matter for which students [7; 1].

CONCLUSION

The vocabulary of international economic relations is taught in most courses as though it consisted of technical terms, and it does not. Technical terms form the smallest of the three layers identified here and present the least difficulty, because their obstacle is conceptual and dissolves once the concept has been explained. The two layers that actually determine whether a student can read a professional text and write about it are made up of words the student already knows: ordinary and academic words carrying senses specific to the field, and fixed combinations whose meaning is not recoverable from their parts.

The practical consequences for a second-year ESP course are modest in cost and substantial in effect. Time spent presenting glossaries should be moved to contrastive work on sense and to the learning of collocations as whole units. The syllabus should be planned so that each lexical set is met three times across the semester rather than once. Materials can be taken from the professional sources that are published free each year, which also ensures that students meet the genres they will later have to handle. Assessment should include a short productive task marked against criteria drawn from the task, because a recognition test will continue to report success in precisely the area where success matters least.

None of this requires additional contact hours, a new textbook or a change in institutional regulations. What it requires is a decision about where the difficulty in

specialist vocabulary actually lies, and the agreement of the teachers in a department to act on that decision together. Whether the reallocation produces measurable gains for students of international economic relations in this country remains an empirical question, and the study that would answer it can be carried out within a single semester by the department that stands to benefit from the answer.

REFERENCES

1. Basturkmen H. Developing Courses in English for Specific Purposes. – Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2010. – 156 p.

2. Bekmirzayev B., Djuraev A. From General Proficiency to Professional Genre Competence in English for International Economic Relations // International Sciences, Education and New Learning Technologies. – 2026. – Vol. 3, No. 14. – P. 11–18.

3. Chung T.M., Nation P. Technical Vocabulary in Specialised Texts // Reading in a Foreign Language. – 2003. – Vol. 15, No. 2. – P. 103–116.

4. Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment – Companion Volume. – Strasbourg: Council of Europe Publishing, 2020.

5. Coxhead A. A New Academic Word List // TESOL Quarterly. – 2000. – Vol. 34, No. 2. – P. 213–238.

6. Djuraev A., Djurayeva N. Barqaror sifat uchun vazifaga asoslangan til o'qitish: xorijiy yondashuvlar va O'zbekiston oliy ta'limida moslashuv // «Raqamli transformatsiya davrida pedagogik ta'limni rivojlantirish istiqbollari». – 2025. (Task-based language teaching for sustainable quality: foreign approaches and adaptation in Uzbek higher education)

7. Djurayeva N., Djuraev A. Conducting a Needs Analysis in Business English for Marketing Professionals. – Preprints, 2024.

8. Djurayeva N., Djuraev A. Developing Linguistic Competence of Economics Students through Task-Based Language Teaching in Uzbek Higher Education // Russian-Uzbekistan Conference. – 2025. – P. 560–566.

9. Djurayeva N., Djuraev A. Revealing the Sociolinguistic Environment: Investigation of the Profiles of Business English Learners // Proceedings of the 2nd Pamir Transboundary Conference for Sustainable Societies. – 2023. – P. 642–651.

10. Dudley-Evans T., St John M.J. Developments in English for Specific Purposes: A Multi-Disciplinary Approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998. – 301 p.

11. Gardner D., Davies M. A New Academic Vocabulary List // Applied Linguistics. – 2014. – Vol. 35, No. 3. – P. 305–327.

12. Gilmore A. Authentic Materials and Authenticity in Foreign Language Learning // Language Teaching. – 2007. – Vol. 40, No. 2. – P. 97–118.

13. Hutchinson T., Waters A. English for Specific Purposes: A Learning-Centred Approach. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 183 p.

14. Ismoilov Y. "A Common European Framework of Reference for Languages: Learning, Teaching, Assessment" — what is CEFR? // Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan. – 2015. – No. 5.

15. Jalolov J.J. English Language Teaching Methodology (Theory and Practice). – Tashkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2015. – 336 p.

16. Khudoykulova S., Tokhirov M. The Impact of Business English on Uzbekistan's Economy: WTO Accession and Strategy-2030 // International Conference on Business & Management. – 2026. – Vol. 2, No. 5. – P. 104–109.

17. Kushieva N., Komilova D. Professionally Oriented English Language Teaching in Economics // Perspectives of Philology and Practical Possibilities of Teaching Foreign Languages. – Gulistan: Gulistan State University, 2024. – P. 364–366.

18. Laufer B., Ravenhorst-Kalovski G.C. Lexical Threshold Revisited: Lexical Text Coverage, Learners' Vocabulary Size and Reading Comprehension // Reading in a Foreign Language. – 2010. – Vol. 22, No. 1. – P. 15–30.

19. Nation I.S.P. Learning Vocabulary in Another Language. – 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. – 624 p.

20. Normatova N. Developing Foreign Language Speaking Skills of the Students of Non-Philological Universities // Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan. – 2020. – Vol. 4, No. 33.

21. Schmitt N. Instructed Second Language Vocabulary Learning // Language Teaching Research. – 2008. – Vol. 12, No. 3. – P. 329–363.

22. Swales J.M. Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. – 260 p.