DIFFERENCES BETWEEN TEACHING ENGLISH AND UZBEK GRAMMAR USING GAMIFICATION: AN ANTHROPOCENTRIC PERSPECTIVE

Bobur Suyunov,
Head of Department, Lecturer, Narpay foreign languages faculty, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
Independent researcher, Uzbekistan National Pedagogical University Tashkent, Uzbekistan
E-mail: bobur.suyunov.95@gmail.com

Doston Pirnazarov,
Lecturer, Narpay foreign languages faculty, Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages, Samarkand, Uzbekistan
E-mail: dostonpirnazarov124@gmail.com

DOI: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18779516

Abstract. *Gamification has emerged as an effective pedagogical tool in language education, yet its application differs significantly between teaching grammar in a foreign language (English) and a mother tongue (Uzbek). This literature review explores these differences, focusing on motivational factors, structural challenges, and anthropocentric linguistic paradigms. In English as a foreign language (EFL) contexts, gamification primarily addresses extrinsic motivation, anxiety reduction, and typological gaps, while in mother tongue Uzbek instruction, it enhances intrinsic engagement and cultural embedding. Drawing on Uzbek educational studies and broader EFL research, findings highlight how anthropocentric views-emphasizing human cognition and experience-inform tailored gamified strategies. Implications advocate for context-specific approaches to optimize grammar acquisition.*

Keywords: *gamification, grammar teaching, English as foreign language, Uzbek mother tongue, anthropocentric paradigm, motivation.*

Introduction. Grammar instruction forms the backbone of language proficiency, but approaches vary markedly depending on whether the language is taught as a foreign language or mother tongue. English grammar teaching in Uzbekistan often grapples with abstract rules, cultural distance, and learner anxiety, necessitating innovative methods like gamification to boost motivation (Qobilova et al., 2023; Dehghanzadeh et al., 2021). In contrast, Uzbek grammar, as the native language, benefits from intuitive understanding rooted in daily use, where games reinforce rather than introduce structures (Qobilova & Suyunov, 2022). Gamification incorporates game elements-points, badges, competitions-to engage learners, transforming rote learning into interactive experiences. In EFL settings, it counters demotivation from typological differences, such as English post-modificational structures versus Uzbek agglutination (Suyunov, 2024c; Purgina et al., 2020).

Anthropocentric paradigms frame these differences as reflections of human-centered cognitive and cultural priorities (Suyunov, 2024a; Suyunov, 2024b), suggesting gamification should align with learners' experiential worlds. This review synthesizes specified Uzbek studies on gamification in primary and higher education with comparative insights from EFL literature, examining motivational, structural, and paradigmatic differences in gamified grammar teaching for English (foreign) and Uzbek (mother tongue).

This study utilizes a qualitative literature review methodology, employing interpretive thematic analysis to compare gamification applications in grammar teaching across foreign (English) and mother tongue (Uzbek) contexts. Sources were selected for relevance to gamification in language education, grammatical differences between English and Uzbek, and anthropocentric linguistic analyses. Inclusion criteria encompassed:

- Peer-reviewed works on gamification or game activities in teaching grammar, particularly in EFL versus mother tongue settings.
- Studies addressing motivational and structural challenges in English/Uzbek grammar instruction.
- Publications applying anthropocentric paradigms to grammatical structures or pedagogy.

Core sources include the designated works by Qobilova Nodira Sanaqulovna and Suyunov Bobur Shokir o‘g‘li, offering direct insights into Uzbek gamification practices. These were augmented by reliable supplementary publications from academic databases and journals (e.g., Frontiers in Psychology, Computers & Education, Journal of Educational Computing Research, Philology Matters). Analysis proceeded through thematic categorization: motivational differences, structural adaptations in games, and anthropocentric integrations. Synthesis focused on interpretive comparisons, drawing implications without primary data collection.

Motivational Differences in Gamification:

Gamification markedly enhances motivation in EFL grammar teaching by reducing anxiety and fostering engagement in abstract, rule-based learning. In foreign language contexts like English in Uzbekistan, games address extrinsic barriers such as fear of errors and cultural unfamiliarity, promoting persistence through rewards and competition (Qobilova et al., 2023; Dehghanzadeh et al., 2021; Hong et al., 2020). For mother tongue Uzbek grammar in primary classes, games build on intrinsic motivation, leveraging familiar structures to reinforce intuitive knowledge via playful activities (Qobilova & Suyunov, 2022). Literature indicates gamification

in native instruction emphasizes enjoyment and cultural relevance over anxiety alleviation (Hashim et al., 2019).

Structural and Application Differences:

English grammar gamification often targets typological challenges, such as post-modificational structures requiring explicit practice through puzzles or digital sorting games (Suyunov, 2024c; Purgina et al., 2020). In EFL, contextual gaming reduces errors by simulating real-use scenarios (Lin et al., 2020). Uzbek grammar, with agglutinative morphology, benefits from games focusing on suffixation and relational markers, analyzed anthropocentrically as cognitive prioritizations of agency (Suyunov, 2024a). Primary-level activities integrate games for holistic reinforcement without heavy explicit rule explanation.

Anthropocentric Integrations:

Anthropocentric paradigms highlight human-centered differences: English games embed structures in experiential contexts to bridge cognitive gaps, while Uzbek games amplify relational and cultural encodings inherent to native speakers (Suyunov, 2024b). Both foster communicative competence, but EFL applications prioritize functional recreation over native intuitive mastery (Zarzycka-Piskorz, 2016).

The findings reveal fundamental differences: gamification in teaching English grammar (foreign) primarily combats demotivation and structural alienation, shifting focus to explicit, anxiety-reducing practice aligned with anthropocentric cognitive mappings (Suyunov, 2024a; 2024b; Dehghanzadeh et al., 2021). In Uzbek mother tongue instruction, it enhances existing intrinsic motivation and cultural embedding, using games for reinforcement rather than introduction (Qobilova & Suyunov, 2022; Hashim et al., 2019). These disparities stem from typological distance-English post-modification versus Uzbek agglutination—necessitating adaptive strategies (Suyunov, 2024c; Purgina et al., 2020). In Uzbekistan's bilingual context, gamification bridges theory-practice gaps more acutely for EFL (Qobilova et al., 2023). Limitations include reliance on secondary sources and limited direct comparisons; future empirical studies could test tailored gamified interventions. Hybrid approaches, informed by anthropocentrism, promise optimized grammar teaching across contexts.

Conclusion. This review underscores that gamification's efficacy in grammar instruction varies profoundly between foreign (English) and mother tongue (Uzbek) languages. In EFL settings, it serves as a vital motivational and structural bridge, mitigating anxiety and typological challenges through explicit, engaging practice

(Dehghanzadeh et al., 2021; Hong et al., 2020). For native Uzbek grammar, gamification amplifies intrinsic intuition and cultural depth, reinforcing human-centered relational structures in playful ways (Qobilova & Suyunov, 2022). Anchored in anthropocentric paradigms, these differences reflect diverse cognitive and experiential priorities (Suyunov, 2024a; 2024b). In Uzbekistan, integrating context-specific gamification-from primary games for Uzbek to higher-education elements for English (Qobilova et al., 2023)-can foster holistic proficiency. Ultimately, tailored gamified strategies not only enhance engagement and retention but also promote humanistic, effective language education, preparing learners for communicative competence in multilingual worlds. Future research should empirically validate these adaptations to refine pedagogical practices.

References:

1. **1.**Dehghanzadeh, H., Fardanesh, H., Hatami, J., Talaee, E., & Noroozi, O. (2021). Using gamification to support learning English as a second language: A systematic review. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 34(7), 934-957.
2. Hashim, H., Rafiq, K. R. M., & Yunus, M. M. (2019). Improving ESL learners' grammar with gamified-learning. *Arab World English Journal*, 5, 41-50.
3. Hong, J.-C., Hwang, M.-Y., Liu, Y.-H., & Tai, K.-H. (2020). Effects of gamifying questions on English grammar learning mediated by epistemic curiosity and language anxiety. *Computer Assisted Language Learning*, 35(7), 1458-1482.
4. Lin, C.-J., Hwang, G.-J., Fu, Q.-K., & Cao, Y.-H. (2020). Facilitating EFL students' English grammar learning performance and behaviors: A contextual gaming approach. *Computers & Education*, 152, 103876.
5. Purgina, M., Mozgovoy, M., & Blake, J. (2020). WordBricks: Mobile technology and visual grammar formalism for gamification of natural language grammar acquisition. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 58(1), 126-159.
6. Qobilova, N. S., & Suyunov, B. S. (2022). Methods of Using Game Activity in Teaching a Foreign Language in Uzbek Primary Classes. *Theoretical & Applied Science*, 108(4). DOI: 10.15863/TAS.2022.04.108.19
7. Qobilova, N. S., Suyunov, J. S., & Suyunov, B. S. (2023). Gamification as a Method of Increasing Motivation of Students of Higher Educational Institutions in Teaching a Foreign Language on the Example of English. *Science and Innovation International Scientific Journal*, 2(2).
8. Suyunov, B. S. (2024a). Analyzing Uzbek Grammatical Structures Through the Lens of Anthropocentric Paradigms. *Philology Matters*, 48(1).
9. Suyunov, B. S. (2024b). The Role of the Directions of the Paradigm of the Anthropocentrism in Modern Linguistics. *Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics*, 2(2).
10. Suyunov, B. S. (2024c). The Concepts of Modifier and Post-Modificational Structure in English. *International Journal of Education, Social Science & Humanities*, 12(6).
11. Zarzycka-Piskorz, E. (2016). Kahoot it or not? Can games be motivating in learning grammar? *Teaching English with Technology*, 16(3), 17-36.