SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL OF

2026 / No. 1(2)

Contemporary Pedagogical and Philological Research

THE EFFECT OF MOTHER TONGUE INTERFERENCE ON ENGLISH GRAMMAR ACQUISITION AMONG UZBEK-SPEAKING LEARNERS

Damirova Kamola Mirshod qizi

Student at Narpay foreign languages faculty

SamSIFL, Samarkand

Abstract. This article examines how Uzbek as a first language (L1) may influence the acquisition of English grammar among Uzbek-speaking learners of English as a foreign language (EFL). It focuses on five high-value areas for classroom diagnosis: article use, tense and aspect, English subject–verb–object (SVO) order, auxiliary verbs in questions and negatives, and countability and number marking. Rather than treating every error as a direct result of the mother tongue, the article proposes a layered account in which cross-linguistic influence interacts with developmental learning, limited exposure, task demands, and individual strategies. Its principal contribution is a proposed diagnostic-and-teaching framework called the Interference Fingerprint and Repair Loop (IFRL). The framework links each recurring error to (1) the intended meaning, (2) the Uzbek structure that may have shaped the learner's choice, (3) the English grammatical cue that was missed, and (4) a targeted repair task followed by delayed retrieval. A small-scale empirical design is outlined using a pre-test, learner explanations, error coding, focused instruction, a post-test, and a delayed test. No experimental results are fabricated; the article distinguishes theoretical proposals from findings that would need verification. The paper argues that contrastive analysis is most useful when it helps learners notice meaning contrasts rather than merely memorize rules. It offers sample tasks, an error-coding scheme, research questions, ethical considerations, and recommendations for teacher education. The proposed model may be adapted for university students and upper-secondary learners in Uzbekistan, subject to piloting and validation.

Key words: Mother-tongue interference, Uzbek-speaking learners, English grammar, cross-linguistic influence, error analysis, articles, tense and aspect, word order, formative assessment, EFL methodology.

Аннотация. В статье рассматривается возможное влияние узбекского языка как первого языка на усвоение английской грамматики узбекоязычными учащимися. Особое внимание уделяется употреблению артиклей, временам и аспекту, порядку слов, вспомогательным глаголам, а также исчисляемости существительных. Предлагается диагностико-методическая модель «Interference Fingerprint and Repair Loop» («Диагностический отпечаток интерференции и цикл коррекции»), связывающая тип ошибки, предполагаемое влияние родного языка, пропущенный грамматический сигнал английского языка и целевое упражнение. Статья представляет теоретически обоснованную концепцию и проект эмпирического исследования; результаты эксперимента не выдумываются и должны быть подтверждены реальными данными.

INTRODUCTION

Learning a foreign language is not a process of replacing one linguistic system with another overnight. Learners interpret new forms through knowledge, habits, expectations, and communicative strategies already available to them. For Uzbek-speaking learners of English, the Uzbek grammatical system can sometimes provide helpful support and sometimes encourage choices that do not fit English conventions. This influence is commonly discussed under the terms language transfer or cross-linguistic influence (Odlin, 1989). The relationship is not mechanical. A learner who omits an English article may be influenced by the fact that Uzbek does not use an article system equivalent to English a/an/the; however, the same omission may also reflect limited attention, uncertainty about countability, or a developmental stage. Similarly, an unusual English word order may reflect transfer from Uzbek's typical subject–object–verb pattern, but it can also result from a learner's attempt to emphasize

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

information. A rigorous study must therefore investigate patterns and explanations, rather than label every non-standard sentence as interference. The topic matters in Uzbekistan because English is learned in a multilingual environment and is frequently used in education, examinations, employment, and international communication. Teachers need practical ways to identify which errors are persistent, which are context-dependent, and which respond to targeted practice. Broad advice such as “think in English” is difficult to measure. A more useful approach is to identify the precise grammatical decision a learner must make, examine the meaning they intend, and create tasks that make the relevant contrast visible. This article advances a specific proposal: instead of correcting errors only as isolated wrong forms, teachers can build an individual “interference fingerprint”—a small, evidence-based profile of recurring choices—and use it to plan a repair loop of noticing, comparison, controlled practice, meaningful production, and delayed retrieval. This is a proposed framework, not an already validated intervention. Its value should be judged through transparent classroom research.

AIM, OBJECTIVES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The aim is to explain the ways Uzbek grammatical patterns may influence English grammar acquisition and to propose a practical, testable method for diagnosing and reducing persistent errors among Uzbek-speaking learners. The study seeks to describe relevant differences between Uzbek and English without assuming that language differences automatically cause errors. It also aims to organize recurring grammatical difficulties into observable categories and distinguish possible cross-linguistic influence from developmental and instructional explanations. Another objective is to design the Interference Fingerprint and Repair Loop (IFRL) as a classroom diagnostic and teaching procedure. The study also intends to provide sample exercises and an empirical research plan suitable for a university-level student project.

Finally, it aims to identify the limitations, ethical safeguards, and criteria for evaluating the proposed model.

Research Questions

The study addresses the following research questions:

Which grammatical error types occur most frequently in a defined group of Uzbek-speaking English learners?

Under what linguistic and task conditions do article, tense/aspect, word-order, and auxiliary errors become more likely?

Can learner explanations and contrastive prompts help distinguish possible L1 influence from other causes?

Does a focused repair cycle lead to improvement on new items and on a delayed test, compared with ordinary practice?

Which features of the proposed model are practical for teachers and acceptable to learners?

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Contrastive Analysis and Language Transfer

Lado’s contrastive approach proposed that similarities and differences between languages can help predict areas of difficulty (Lado, 1957). This perspective remains useful when it guides teachers toward plausible contrasts, but prediction should not be treated as certainty. Learners do not simply reproduce their first language; they develop an evolving interlanguage with its own patterns. Odlin (1989) defines transfer broadly as the influence of prior linguistic knowledge on later language learning. Such influence may be positive when a familiar pattern helps, or negative when it leads to a form that is unsuitable in the target language. For Uzbek-speaking learners, a contrastive perspective can highlight the different ways Uzbek and English express grammatical relations. Uzbek commonly uses agglutinative suffixes and has a basic SOV order, while English relies more heavily on word order and auxiliary constructions and

typically follows SVO order in declarative clauses. Yet both languages allow discourse-driven variation, and the actual pattern depends on context. Therefore, a sound analysis should compare particular constructions, not reduce either language to a single rule. Corder (1967) argued that learner errors are informative evidence of the language-learning process rather than merely signs of failure. Error analysis asks what learners produce, how often a form appears, whether the error is systematic, and what explanations are plausible. Selinker's (1972) concept of interlanguage likewise emphasizes that learner language is a developing system. These perspectives support the present article's central principle: correction should begin with observation and classification, not with assumptions about the cause. A useful distinction is between an error and a performance mistake. An error is a recurring pattern that suggests incomplete knowledge; a mistake may be an occasional slip made by a learner who can usually produce the correct form. This distinction is not always easy to establish from a single sentence. Repeated tasks, learner self-correction, and short explanations can provide stronger evidence.

Second-language learning depends on meaningful exposure, opportunities to use language, feedback, and attention to form. Schmidt's noticing hypothesis (1990) emphasizes the role of conscious attention in learning features of input. Long (1991) discusses focus on form within communicative instruction, while Ellis (2006) reviews ways of integrating attention to grammar with meaning-focused activity. These perspectives suggest that contrastive teaching is likely to be most useful when learners encounter a meaningful choice, notice a form, and then use it to communicate—not when they only copy a table. The British Council's grammar learning resources illustrate a practical sequence of explanation, examples, and checking exercises for topics such as articles and tense forms. Such materials can supplement classroom instruction, but a local diagnostic tool should still be designed around the needs and actual performance of the learners being studied.

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

Not every error has one cause. Article omission, for example, may be connected with L1 transfer, but it can also reflect the complexity of English article semantics, the difference between count and non-count nouns, or the pressure of speaking quickly. Verb-tense errors can arise because learners map time onto verb forms differently, because the context does not make the time reference clear, or because auxiliary forms are not yet automatized. A credible study should therefore use cautious language such as “consistent with possible transfer” rather than claiming direct causation from a single example. This caution is especially important for a scholarship-level article. A claim of novelty should not mean that no one has ever studied Uzbek–English interference. Existing studies have already discussed article omission, word order, tense, and contrastive instruction. The more defensible contribution here is a clearly specified diagnostic procedure that connects error evidence to learner reasoning and delayed follow-up, then tests whether this procedure is useful.

RELEVANT CONTRASTS BETWEEN UZBEK AND ENGLISH

Articles and Definiteness

English uses a/an with singular count nouns in many first-mention or non-specific contexts, the with identifiable or contextually specific referents, and a zero article in several plural and mass-noun contexts. Uzbek does not have a directly equivalent obligatory article system. Definiteness and specificity may be conveyed through context, word order, demonstratives, possessive constructions, or other resources. This means that English learners must learn not only a form but also the information that the form signals. Compare: “I bought a book” (a book is introduced) and “The book was expensive” (the reader can identify which book). A learner may write “I bought book” or overuse the, but the surface form alone does not show whether the learner misunderstands countability, first mention, or shared knowledge. A diagnostic task should vary the context while keeping the noun constant.

Word Order

A typical English declarative clause follows Subject–Verb–Object: “The student reads the article.” Uzbek commonly uses Subject–Object–Verb order: “Talaba maqolani o‘qiydi.” Directly transferring the Uzbek sequence into an English declarative sentence may produce “The student the article reads.” Nevertheless, learners can know the basic English pattern and still rearrange information for emphasis or imitate a structure heard in a subordinate clause. Researchers should test several sentence types and not assume that every non-SVO sequence is caused by L1.

Tense, Aspect and Time Reference

English expresses time and aspect through combinations of verb forms, auxiliaries, and context: “I study,” “I am studying,” “I have studied,” and “I studied” do not simply represent different dates. Uzbek expresses time and aspect through its own verb morphology, auxiliaries, lexical choices, and context. There is no one-to-one mapping between the systems. A learner may use the present simple where English requires the present continuous, or omit an auxiliary, because they are still learning how English packages ongoing action, completion, habit, and time reference. For example, “I am study now” contains a problem with the progressive construction, while “Yesterday I go to class” contains a mismatch between past-time context and verb form. These examples should be coded separately: the first concerns auxiliary plus -ing morphology; the second concerns tense marking. Combining them into a single “tense error” category would make the diagnosis less precise.

Auxiliary Verbs and Questions

English questions often require auxiliary support and subject–auxiliary inversion: “Do you like tea?” and “Is she working?” Uzbek forms questions differently, including through question particles. Consequently, learners may produce “You like tea?” in contexts where a standard information question is expected, or may omit do-support: “Where you live?” The form “You like tea?” can be grammatical as an echo question

or conversational confirmation, so the intended communicative function must be established before coding it as an error.

Countability, Plural Marking and Agreement

English count nouns generally require a determiner in the singular and often take plural -s, whereas Uzbek marks plural through -lar/-lar variants and uses its own patterns for quantity and definiteness. Learners may omit a determiner in “She is teacher,” write “many information,” or overgeneralize plural marking. Such forms may reflect different category boundaries across languages, incomplete learning of English noun classes, or a lack of familiarity with particular lexical items. A useful test should include familiar and unfamiliar nouns so that grammar knowledge is not confused with vocabulary knowledge.

THE PROPOSED INNOVATION: INTERFERENCE FINGERPRINT AND REPAIR LOOP (IFRL)

Core Idea

The article proposes the Interference Fingerprint and Repair Loop (IFRL), a diagnostic-and-teaching model that treats a learner’s recurring grammar choices as a pattern to investigate. “Fingerprint” does not mean a permanent label or a judgment about ability. It is a temporary profile of observed responses in a specific set of tasks. “Repair loop” means that teaching follows the evidence and checks whether learning lasts beyond immediate practice. The model has five stages: elicit, classify, explain, repair, and retrieve. The model’s potential originality lies in combining error frequency with intended meaning, a possible L1 mapping, a specific English cue, and delayed retrieval. Its originality must still be assessed against the full literature and its usefulness tested empirically; it should not be described as proven or globally unprecedented.

Five Stages of the IFRL Model

Elicit: Collect short writing, picture-description, question-formation, and contextual choice responses. Use several examples per grammar target.

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

Classify: Code the error by form and function—for example, article omission before a singular count noun, not simply "article problem."

Explain: Invite the learner to explain the intended meaning or choose between two paraphrases. Record the explanation without assuming it proves causation.

Repair: Design a brief activity that makes the relevant English cue visible and compares it with Uzbek only where the comparison clarifies the choice.

Retrieve: Revisit the same grammatical decision with new vocabulary and contexts after a delay, then check whether the improvement transfers.

A Practical Diagnostic Record

For each learner, the teacher can record the target structure, number of opportunities, correct responses, error subtype, context, self-correction, learner explanation, intervention used, immediate result, and delayed result. The denominator matters. Five errors in six opportunities do not mean the same thing as five errors in thirty opportunities. Reports should provide both counts and rates, and should avoid comparing learners unless tasks and conditions are sufficiently similar.

Field	Illustrative entry
Target	English articles in singular count-noun phrases
Observed pattern	Article omitted in 4 of 8 relevant contexts
Possible explanation	Article category not activated; countability uncertainty; possible L1 influence
Evidence to seek	Does the learner distinguish first mention from identifiable reference? Can they self-correct?
Repair task	Choose a/an/the/zero article in short illustrated contexts and explain what the listener can identify
Delayed check	New nouns and contexts one or two weeks later

SAMPLE ERROR-CODING FRAMEWORK

A coding scheme improves consistency and makes the proposed research replicable. The following categories are starting points; a pilot study may require additional categories. Each response should be coded by the smallest meaningful error unit, while preserving the full sentence and context.

Code	Category	Example	Possible interpretation
ART-OM	Article omission	“She is teacher.”	Article system, countability, or transfer hypothesis
ART-SUB	Article substitution	“The dog” for first-mention non-specific “a dog”	Reference tracking or overgeneralization
WO-SOV	Non-target declarative order	“She the text reads.”	Possible SOV transfer; test other contexts
AUX-OM	Auxiliary omission	“Where you live?”	Do-support not established or conversational function
TNS-CX	Tense-context mismatch	“Yesterday I go.”	Past marking, time cue, or lexical retrieval
ASP-FM	Aspect-form mismatch	“I am study now.”	Progressive construction not fully acquired
NUM-CT	Countability/number	“many information”	Noun class or lexical pattern

For reliability, two trained raters should independently code a portion of the responses, discuss disagreements, revise category definitions, and report an agreement statistic where appropriate. A codebook should include inclusion rules, exclusion rules, and examples of borderline cases. If the project is small, a transparent account of disagreements may be more informative than presenting a misleadingly precise percentage.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY: A STUDY THAT CAN BE CONDUCTED

Research Design

A feasible design is a small mixed-method classroom study with a diagnostic pre-test, brief learner explanations, a focused teaching period, an immediate post-test, and a delayed test. If access and permissions allow, learners may be assigned to an IFRL group and a comparison group receiving the same grammar content through ordinary practice. If random assignment is not feasible, the article should describe the design as quasi-experimental and acknowledge group differences.

Participants and Setting

The target population could be Uzbek-speaking university students studying English as a foreign language at approximately A2–B2 level. The researcher should

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

report the actual institution, number of participants, age range, proficiency evidence, languages used at home, prior English study, and selection method only after the study is approved and conducted. A pilot with a small group can check whether the instructions and test items are understandable. The article must not invent a sample size or claim that data were collected if they were not.

Research Instruments

The study may use a contextual grammar task containing short items that test articles, tense/aspect, word order, auxiliary use, and countability in meaningful contexts. Written production can involve a short paragraph or picture-based description that encourages spontaneous grammar use. A question-formation task can require learners to form information questions and yes/no questions from prompts. Think-aloud or retrospective explanations can be collected from a small subset of learners to understand how they selected particular grammatical forms. Brief prompts should be used to avoid overburdening participants. A delayed test should contain parallel items using new vocabulary and scenarios and should be administered after a pre-specified interval. A teacher log should record lesson duration, attendance, task completion, and any deviations from the planned instruction.

Research Procedure

The research should begin with institutional approval and informed consent. Participants should be informed that participation is voluntary and does not affect their course grades. The instruments should then be piloted and revised if any instructions or test items are unclear. The pre-test should be administered under consistent conditions. Responses should be coded using the predefined scheme, and the most frequent error patterns should be identified. A short instructional sequence should then be delivered, focusing on the selected patterns through comparison, noticing, controlled practice, and communicative use. After instruction, learners should complete a post-test containing parallel but not identical items. A delayed test should subsequently be administered to

examine retention and transfer. Finally, quantitative changes should be analyzed alongside learner explanations and teacher observations.

Data Analysis Plan

For each error category, the error rate should be calculated as the number of target errors divided by the number of relevant opportunities, multiplied by 100. The denominator and missing responses should also be reported. Pre-test and post-test performance should be compared within each group and between groups using methods appropriate to sample size and data distribution. For a small student project, descriptive statistics and confidence intervals may be more appropriate than complex inferential claims. If statistical tests are used, they should be specified in advance, and effect sizes should be reported where possible. Qualitative explanations can be grouped by themes while retaining contradictory cases. A decline in errors after instruction would be encouraging but would not, by itself, prove that the mother tongue caused the original errors or that IFRL alone produced the improvement. Alternative explanations include repeated-test effects, teacher attention, general English exposure, and differences in motivation. A comparison group, delayed testing, and transparent reporting help address these issues.

PROPOSED CLASSROOM INTERVENTION

Module A: Articles as Information Management

The goal is to help learners connect article choice with what the listener can identify. The lesson begins with three pictures and a short story. For example, the first mention can be expressed as “A girl entered a room.” A later reference can be expressed as “The girl sat near a window.” Learners then compare “Water is essential” with “The water in this bottle is cold.” Learners choose an article and answer the following questions: What does the listener know? Is the noun singular and countable? Is the reference identifiable? This approach moves beyond memorizing “a means one” and “the means specific.” For the repair task, pairs of learners receive picture cards with a

hidden object. One learner describes the scene, while the other selects the matching picture. The speaker must decide whether to introduce an object or refer back to it. The listener's choice provides a communicative reason to notice the article.

Module B: Tense and Aspect Through Timelines and Situations

The goal is to distinguish habitual actions, actions in progress, completed past events, and experiences relevant to the present. Short situations are used instead of isolated translations: "She usually walks to university"; "She is walking there now"; "She walked there yesterday"; and "She has already arrived." Learners place each sentence on a timeline, identify the time expression, and explain what the speaker wants to communicate. For the repair task, learners receive event cards and create a short news report, diary entry, and live commentary. The same event is expressed through different discourse purposes. The teacher records whether learners select the target form in a new context rather than simply repeat a memorized sentence.

Module C: Word Order as a Meaning-Building Frame

The goal is to establish English clause structure while allowing learners to compare it with Uzbek. Word cards labelled subject, verb, object, and time/place phrase are used. Learners arrange the sentence "The researcher / analysed / the responses / yesterday." They then move the time phrase and discuss which arrangements remain grammatical. Negative sentences, questions, and subordinate clauses are also included so that the lesson does not create the false rule that every English sentence must follow one fixed sequence. For the repair task, students reconstruct short scrambled messages and then write their own. Each item is followed by a meaning check: who did what, to whom, and when? This connects word order to interpretation.

Module D: Auxiliary Verbs in Questions and Negatives

The goal is to make the role of do, be, and have visible. Learners compare "You study English," "Do you study English?" and "You do not study English." They underline the finite verb or auxiliary and identify what changes in a question or

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

negative. The sentences “Is she ready?” and “Does she work here?” are also compared to avoid overgeneralizing do-support. For the repair task, an interview grid requires students to ask genuine questions about routines, current activities, and experiences. The partner answers naturally, and the interviewer follows up. Feedback focuses on one or two target forms at a time.

Module E: Countability and Noun Phrases

The goal is to connect noun meaning with grammatical choices. Learners sort nouns into count and non-count uses, while recognizing that some nouns vary according to meaning. For example, “a coffee” can mean a serving, while “coffee” can refer to the substance. Students practise expressions such as “a piece of advice,” “some information,” “many books,” and “much time.” They then edit a short message and explain their noun phrase choices.

SAMPLE IFRL TASKS

Context Changes the Article

In the first context, learners see a cat for the first time and complete the sentence: “There is ___ cat under the table.” In the second context, their partner already knows which cat is being discussed, so they complete: “___ cat is sleeping.” The expected answers are “a” and “the.” As a follow-up, learners explain what information changed between the two sentences.

Meaning Before Tense

Learners choose the best sentence for each situation. For a routine, the correct sentence is “I walk to class every day.” For an action happening now, it is “I am walking to class now.” For a completed event yesterday, it is “I walked to class yesterday.” Learners underline the contextual clue and explain why the other forms change the meaning.

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

Rebuild the Clause

Learners arrange the words “the students / discussed / the article / after class” to form the sentence “The students discussed the article after class.”

They then make a question: “What did the students discuss after class?” The teacher discusses why did appears and why discussed changes to discuss after did.

Repair Without Shame

A fictional learner sentence is presented: “She go to university every day.” Students identify the intended meaning, find the verb phrase, and suggest a correction. They then compare “She goes every day” with “She is going now.”

The classroom message should be that an error is evidence for the next learning step, not evidence of low intelligence.

Delayed Transfer

One or two weeks after the lesson, learners complete new items with different vocabulary:

“The engineer ___ a report every Friday.”

“Look! The children ___ in the garden.”

“I saw ___ interesting film yesterday. ___ film was about space.”

New nouns and situations test whether learners have learned the grammatical decision rather than memorized the original item.

DISCUSSION

The proposed model treats the first language as a resource for analysis rather than an enemy to be eliminated. A contrastive comparison can help learners notice that languages package meaning differently. However, the teacher should avoid implying that Uzbek is deficient because it does not use English articles or because its typical word order differs. Each language has systematic ways of expressing meaning; the task is to learn how English distributes grammatical information.

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

The model also moves the focus from “correct or incorrect” toward “what choice did the learner make, in which context, and why?” This is particularly important for articles and questions, where the same surface form can be acceptable in one discourse context and unsuitable in another. By adding learner explanations, teachers can test hypotheses rather than simply attach labels. The delayed-retrieval stage is central. Immediate success can result from short-term memory or repeated examples. A learner who can select the in a practiced sentence may still omit an article in a spontaneous paragraph. New contexts help determine whether the learner can transfer the decision. In a future study, the delayed test should be planned before instruction and should use comparable difficulty without copying the exact pre-test items. Finally, a learner’s profile should not become a permanent identity. The “fingerprint” is tied to a particular task set and time point; it can change as learning develops. Teachers should share results constructively, protect student privacy, and use the information to adjust teaching rather than rank students.

LIMITATIONS

The IFRL model is proposed and has not been validated by the present article through a completed experiment. Observed error frequencies depend on learner level, task design, topic familiarity, and opportunities to use each structure. Attributing a pattern to Uzbek influence requires more evidence than a simple comparison between Uzbek and English. Small convenience samples may not represent all Uzbek-speaking learners, including learners with different home languages or extensive exposure to English. Teacher-researchers may unintentionally influence coding or outcomes; independent coding and transparent procedures can reduce this risk. Short interventions may improve test performance without producing lasting change in spontaneous communication.

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

ETHICAL AND ACADEMIC CONSIDERATIONS

Any empirical study involving learners should follow the institution's ethical requirements. Participants should receive a clear explanation of the purpose, activities, risks, and use of data. Participation should be voluntary; where participants are minors, the required guardian permission and learner assent must be obtained. Names should be replaced with codes, files should be stored securely, and individual results should not be shared with classmates. The researcher should not imply that participation will guarantee a higher grade or scholarship. Academic integrity is equally important. This article does not present invented participant data or fabricated statistical findings. If the author later conducts the proposed study, the methodology, dates, sample, instruments, and results should be reported accurately. Sources should be checked against the original publications, and the final manuscript should follow the target journal's citation and formatting rules.

CONCLUSION

Mother-tongue influence can be an important factor in English grammar acquisition among Uzbek-speaking learners, especially where the two languages encode reference, time, clause structure, and noun categories differently. Yet language transfer should be treated as a hypothesis to investigate, not a universal explanation for every learner error. Error analysis and interlanguage research encourage teachers to interpret learner production as evidence about the learning process. The main contribution of this article is the proposed Interference Fingerprint and Repair Loop: a structured sequence of eliciting responses, classifying error subtypes, examining intended meaning, designing focused repair tasks, and checking delayed transfer. The framework aims to make contrastive teaching more specific, measurable, and respectful of learners. It combines grammar explanation with meaningful tasks and encourages teachers to document both progress and persistent difficulty. The next step is empirical validation. A pilot study should establish whether the coding scheme is reliable,

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

whether learners understand the tasks, and whether the repair loop improves accuracy on new contexts after a delay. Only real data can establish which error categories are most frequent in a particular learner group and whether the proposed method outperforms an appropriate comparison. With these safeguards, the framework offers a feasible direction for research in English language teaching in Uzbekistan.

PRACTICAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Teachers should start with a diagnostic task and identify the learner's most frequent error types using rates rather than impressions alone. Uzbek and English should be compared only when the comparison clarifies a real grammatical decision. Articles should be taught through reference and shared knowledge, while tense and aspect should be taught through situations and discourse purpose. Auxiliary omission, tense mismatch, and progressive-form errors should be treated as separate categories instead of combining them into a single group. Spontaneous writing or speaking should be included alongside controlled grammar tests. New items should be used in delayed tests to measure transfer beyond memorized examples. Two raters should be trained to apply the coding scheme and report disagreements honestly. Finally, findings should be described as applying to the studied group unless the sample supports wider generalization.

References

1. British Council. (n.d.). A1–A2 grammar: Articles, tense and other grammar topics. LearnEnglish. https://learnenglish.britishcouncil.org/free-resources/grammar/a1-a2

2. Corder, S. P. (1967). The significance of learners' errors. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 5(4), 161–170.

3. Ellis, R. (1994). The Study of Second Language Acquisition. Oxford University Press.

4. Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. TESOL Quarterly, 40(1), 83–107.

5. Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers. University of Michigan Press.

6. Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. B. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins.

7. Odlin, T. (1989). Language Transfer: Cross-Linguistic Influence in Language Learning. Cambridge University Press.

8. Schmidt, R. (1990). The role of consciousness in second language learning. Applied Linguistics, 11(2), 129–158.

9. Selinker, L. (1972). Interlanguage. International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 10(3), 209–231.

10. Swan, M., & Smith, B. (Eds.). (2001). Learner English: A Teacher's Guide to Interference and Other Problems (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.

11. Amirqulova, D. B. (2026). 10–11-sinf o'quvchilarida ingliz tili grammatik interferensiyasini aniqlash va bartaraf etishning diagnostik-metodik asoslari. Zamonaviy fan: innovatsion yondashuvlar va yosh tadqiqotchilarning dolzarb izlanishlari, 665–669. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22006191

12. Ergasheva, F. (2025). Linguistic interference in English teaching to Uzbek-speaking learners and strategies for its elimination. International Journal of Scientific Researchers, 15(1). https://worldlyjournals.com/index.php/IJSR/article/view/22045

13. Masrurova, K., & Ergashev, R. (n.d.). Impact of Uzbek language structure on English grammar acquisition. Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal. https://www.giirj.com/index.php/giirj/article/view/6423

14. Turayeva, M., & Xayrullayeva, D. (2024). The influence of Uzbek language structure on the acquisition of English grammar. Journal of Science-Innovative

Research in Uzbekistan, 2(6), 20–29. https://www.universalpublishings.com/index.php/jsiru/article/view/6144

15. The influence of Uzbek language structures on English grammar acquisition among EFL learners. (2026). Zenodo record 19036545. https://zenodo.org/records/19036545

APPENDIX A. MINI DIAGNOSTIC TEST

Instructions: Complete each item without a dictionary. The items are illustrative and should be piloted before formal research.

– I saw ___ bird in the garden. ___ bird was blue. (a / the)

– She usually ___ (take) the bus to university.

– Listen! Someone ___ (knock) at the door.

– Yesterday we ___ (visit) the library.

– Make a question: You speak English. → _____?

– Arrange: the students / finished / the task / quickly.

– Choose: much information / many information.

– Correct the sentence if needed: “He is engineer.”

– Write one sentence about a routine and one about something happening now.

– Explain in one or two sentences why you selected an article in the first item.

APPENDIX B. SUGGESTED ANSWER KEY

– a; The

– takes

– is knocking

– visited

– Do you speak English?

– The students finished the task quickly.

– much information

– He is an engineer.

– Answers vary; assess form in relation to intended meaning.

– Responses vary; code the explanation thematically rather than marking it only right or wrong.

APPENDIX C. PROPOSED DATA TABLE TEMPLATE

Participant code	Category	Pre-test errors / opportunities	Post-test errors / opportunities	Delayed-test errors / opportunities
P01	ART-OM	—	—	—
P01	AUX-OM	—	—	—
P02	TNS-CX	—	—	—

This template is intentionally blank. Enter only observed data and preserve an anonymized participant code. Report how the opportunities were counted and how missing responses were handled.