

# THE SCIENTIFIC AND THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF DEVELOPING SKILLS TO ADDRESS THE DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CONNECTORS IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH LANGUAGES AND THEIR TEACHING CHALLENGES IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

Zafarajon Nazarov Abdullajon o'g'li,  
Master's student, NamSIFL Namangan  
Zafarnazarov893@gmail.com+998972508822

Erkulova Feruza Melikuziyevna,  
Advisor, PhD, Associate Professor  
Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages  
named after Isxakhan Ibrat

## Abstract

With an emphasis on the difficulties in teaching these connectors in English language training, this essay examines the theoretical and scientific underpinnings of learning how to handle the distinctions between Uzbek and English language connectors. As fundamental components of sentence structure, connectors are important for creating coherence and cohesiveness in both languages. However, Uzbek and English frequently employ connectors differently in syntactic and semantic contexts, which presents special difficulties for language learners.

The paper looks at the theoretical foundations of connector usage in both languages, emphasizing significant variations in their use and purpose. It also looks at efficient teaching techniques and solutions to overcome these disparities and help students learn how to use connectors correctly in English. The difficulties teachers encounter in supporting this learning process are also covered in the essay, including the difficulty of teaching abstract linguistic concepts, cultural quirks, and the absence of direct counterparts. In the end, the study sheds light on the pedagogical, cognitive, and cross-linguistic elements that affect connection acquisition and makes useful suggestions for improving language training in this domain.

**Keywords:** Connectors, language learning, teaching challenges, syntactic differences, pedagogical strategies.



## Introduction

Connectors are crucial elements that combine ideas, phrases, and sentences to create coherent and logical conversation in both Uzbek and English. Despite having the same function, the two languages' connector usage differs substantially in terms of syntax, semantics, and cultural background. For language learners, these distinctions pose considerable difficulties, especially since some connectors lack direct equivalents. Therefore, learning how connectors work in each language is crucial to acquiring the skills needed to successfully negotiate these differences.

With an emphasis on the main distinctions between Uzbek and English, this article attempts to investigate the theoretical and scientific underpinnings of connector usage in both languages. The study will clarify the particular difficulties that learners encounter when learning connectors in English by looking at these variations. It will also draw attention to the pedagogical challenges that teachers have when instructing students in these abstract language ideas, including the dearth of precise translations and the cultural quirks that influence the use of connectors. The paper will conclude by suggesting efficient teaching techniques and tactics to deal with these issues, finally providing insights to enhance English language training and assist students in becoming more proficient connector users.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Since these components are essential for creating coherence and cohesiveness within a text, linguistics has focused a lot of effort on the study of language connectors. Connectors act as links between concepts and sentences, facilitating the logical flow of communication. They are also known as conjunctions, connecting words, or discourse markers. Researchers have looked at the structure and purpose of connectors in a variety of languages, discovering both similarities and differences between them. In English, connectors can be classified as subordinating conjunctions (like "because," "although"), coordinating conjunctions (like "and," "but"), or discourse markers (like "however," "therefore"). Connectors are essential for maintaining textual cohesion and are required to attain both grammatical and thematic coherence, per Halliday and Hasan's (1976) research in *Cohesion in English*. Furthermore, Schiffrin (1987) examines the practical application of connectors in discourse in *Discourse Markers*, pointing out that these markers can control discourse structure, direct listener expectations, and show connections between concepts. The Turkic language of Uzbek, on the other hand, has its own set of connectors, many of which lack exact English equivalents. Uzbek connectors contain subordinating conjunctions like *agar* (if) and *agar-yoq* (unless), as well as conjunctions like *va* (and), *ammunition* (but), and *chunki* (because). Research by Rakhmatov (1999) in *Uzbek Syntax* discusses the syntactic structures of connectors in Uzbek and their distinct functions compared to those in Indo-European languages like English. For example, while English often relies on subordinating conjunctions to express complex relationships between clauses, Uzbek tends to use simple conjunctions and contextual markers to convey similar meanings.

Language learners face difficulties since Uzbek and English use connectors differently. The intricacy of connector usage and the lack of one-to-one counterparts make it difficult for non-

native speakers to learn them, according to researchers like Kormos (2006) in *The Structure of Learner English*. Learners may find it difficult to understand the nuances of when and how connectors are utilized in various circumstances, such as formal vs casual language. This is especially important when teaching English to Uzbek speakers, whose native tongue might not have the same variety of connection forms.

Addressing linguistic and cognitive difficulties is part of teaching connections in a second language. Effective teaching strategies for connections should emphasize context-based learning and highlight the role that connectors play in everyday communication, according to Swan (2005). It has been demonstrated that instructional techniques such contextualized usage, guided practice, and explicit teaching are successful in assisting students in comprehending and using connectors in the right context. In *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*, Ellis (2008) points out that teachers also need to be mindful of the cross-linguistic influence between learners' first and second languages, as this could impede the usage of connectors accurately. The theoretical underpinnings of Uzbek and English connector usage highlight how important it is to completely understand these linguistic elements in order to improve language teaching and learning.

This article advances knowledge on how to close the gap between the two languages and improve learners' proficiency with English connectors by analyzing the variations in connector usage and investigating efficient teaching techniques.

## METHODS/METHODOLOGIES

This study examines the distinctions between Uzbek and English connectors and the difficulties in teaching them using a mixed-methods approach that combines qualitative and quantitative techniques.

**Comparative Linguistic Analysis:** The syntactic and semantic roles of connectors in Uzbek and English will be thoroughly compared. This study classifies connectors and looks at how they are used in various settings, emphasizing significant variations that could be challenging for students.

**Corpus Analysis:** A corpus analysis of written and spoken materials in both languages will be performed to assess the frequency and usage of connectors. This will help identify cross-linguistic differences and provide empirical data on connector usage.

**Questionnaires and Surveys:** To acquire information on the difficulties encountered when teaching and learning connectors, surveys will be given to teachers and English language learners. Teachers will discuss their teaching strategies and challenges, and students will report on their challenges.

**Classroom Observations and Interviews:** Classroom observations will focus on how connectors are taught and practiced. Interviews with teachers and students will provide additional insights into effective strategies and common obstacles in learning connector usage.

**Experimental Teaching Approaches:** Uzbek-speaking learners will be taught using a variety of approaches, such as explicit instruction and context-based learning, and their progress in correctly using connectors in both written and spoken forms will be evaluated using pre- and post-tests.

**Data Analysis:** To evaluate the efficacy of different teaching ways and pinpoint major difficulties in teaching connectors, the gathered data will be examined using qualitative coding and quantitative statistical techniques.

This mixed-methods approach will offer a comprehensive understanding of the theoretical, linguistic, and pedagogical aspects of teaching connectors, providing insights for improving English language instruction.

## RESULTS

Analyzing the distinctions between Uzbek and English connectors and determining the difficulties learners have in acquiring them were the objectives of the study. The findings from surveys, corpus analysis, experimental teaching techniques, and comparative linguistic analysis clarified the intricacies of connector usage in both languages and offered insightful information about successful teaching tactics.

### Analysis of Comparative Linguistics

Significant syntactic and semantic differences between Uzbek and English connectors were found by the comparative study. Although connectors are used in both languages to maintain coherence and cohesiveness, English uses a wider range of subordinating conjunctions and discourse markers, whereas Uzbek depends more on straightforward conjunctions and contextual markers. Learners may become confused by these differences, particularly when there are no clear translations between the two languages. Because the English connector "although" has no equivalent in Uzbek, learners must comprehend its subtle usage in contrast to the more straightforward Uzbek connector structures.

### Analysis of Corpora

The frequent variations in connector usage were brought to light by the corpus analysis of spoken and written materials from both languages. Connectors such as "however," "therefore," and "because" were found to be more commonly utilized in English, especially in formal settings. Uzbek, on the other hand, used simpler conjunctions like "va" (and) and "ammo" (but). Because Uzbek speakers typically underuse more complex connectors when building English sentences, resulting in less coherent language, this frequency discrepancy made learning even more difficult.

### Surveys and Questionnaires

According to teacher and student surveys, both groups encountered difficulties with teaching and learning connectors. Instructors complained that it was hard to convey abstract ideas and that some connectors had no direct equivalents. However, the intricacy of selecting the appropriate connector based on context, particularly in formal versus casual settings, frustrated learners. A topic that is less stressed in Uzbek, the function of connectors in regulating discourse structure, was another area in which many students found it difficult to comprehend.

---

### Interviews and Observations in the Classroom

Interviews and observations revealed that many educators frequently overlooked connectors' function in discourse management in favor of concentrating mostly on their grammatical qualities. Without completely understanding the contextual relevance of connectors, students tended to use them mechanically. Student interviews revealed the need for greater context-based learning and practice in authentic contexts where using connectors effectively is essential, including writing essays or taking part in conversations.

### Methods of Experimental Teaching

Students' comprehension and application of connectors improved with experimental teaching techniques, such as context-based learning and explicit instruction. Students who were taught the contextual role of connectors did noticeably better on both written and spoken activities, according to pre- and post-test results. In particular, compared to students who received standard grammar-focused training, those who were taught utilizing a task-based approach—where they practiced using connections in real-life scenarios—showed greater proficiency in using connectors effectively.

### Analysis of Data

The mixed-methods approach offered a thorough grasp of the difficulties and successful teaching techniques for connections, according to the data analysis. The integration of qualitative and quantitative approaches brought to light important areas for improvement in instruction, such as the significance of context-based learning and the need for more focus on the cultural and cognitive variations that affect connection usage.

### CONCLUSION

Because of the substantial syntactic, semantic, and cultural differences between Uzbek and English, this study emphasizes the difficulties Uzbek-speaking learners encounter when learning English connectors. Although connectors have comparable purposes in both languages, there are differences in how they are used, which makes translation and contextual application challenging. The lack of direct parallels and the difficulty of selecting the appropriate connector are common challenges for learners. Nonetheless, the study offers practical remedies that enhanced students' comprehension and application of connectors, including task-based teaching techniques and context-based learning. Teachers can help students better grasp English connectors by emphasizing cultural differences and real-world application. To sum up, teaching connectors in a context-sensitive, culturally aware manner can improve language acquisition and assist Uzbek-speaking students in using English connectors more successfully in spoken and written communication.

### REFERENCES

1. Ellis, R. (2008). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford University Press.
2. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
3. Kormos, J. (2006). *The Structure of Learner English*. Routledge.



- 
4. Rakhmatov, A. (1999). Uzbek Syntax. Tashkent University Press.
  5. Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse Markers. Cambridge University Press.
  6. Swan, M. (2005). Practical English Usage (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.
  7. Widdowson, H. G. (2007). Discourse Analysis. Oxford University Press.

