

INTERSTRUCTURAL CONFLICT: THE GAP BETWEEN “UZBEK EXPRESSION” AND “ENGLISH NORM”

Mohinur Ernazarova

Lecturer, Department of World Languages
Kokand University

ernazamohinur@gmail.com

Abstract : This article discusses the theoretical foundations of structural discrepancies that emerge in the process of learning English through the medium of Uzbek. The gap between “Uzbek expression” and the “English norm” is analyzed within the frameworks of interference, contrastive linguistics, and pragmatic differences. Highlighting these discrepancies from a theoretical perspective creates opportunities to design effective methodological approaches in language education.

Keywords: structural discrepancy, interference, English norm, Uzbek expression, contrastive analysis, pragmatics.

Introduction

When acquiring a foreign language, the structural patterns embedded in a learner’s mother tongue inevitably come into contact with—and at times contradict—the grammatical and conceptual frameworks of the target language. In linguistic studies, this phenomenon is often referred to as an *interstructural discrepancy*. Such tensions are particularly noticeable in the context of learning English through the medium of Uzbek, as the two represent distinct typological systems: Uzbek operates on an agglutinative basis, whereas English follows an analytic model. Consequently, the learner’s speech tends to reveal subtle disruptions—manifested as a divergence between “*Uzbek-oriented expression*” and “*English normative usage*.”

Main Body

1. Problem Definition and Theoretical Scope

In this paper, the term *interstructural discrepancy* is conceptualized as a systematic manifestation of cross-linguistic interference occurring between the native linguistic system (Uzbek expression) and the second language framework (English norm). This interaction permeates all linguistic levels—from phonological and morphological features to syntactic organization, lexical semantics, and pragmatic appropriateness. Over time, such interference continuously shapes and constrains the learner’s developing *interlanguage*, influencing both spoken and written communication.

In Contemporary Linguistics

In modern linguistic and pedagogical discourse, *interference* is no longer viewed as a mere source of error but rather as a multifaceted phenomenon that actively shapes the learner’s strategies for constructing meaning in a second language. Particularly in the global context of



English as a medium of international communication, the intersection—and often friction—between pragmatic conventions and local communicative habits assumes crucial importance.

2. Core Discrepancies Between Uzbek Expression and English Norms

2.1. Syntax and Textual Convention

Within the English academic tradition, *brevity and precision* are regarded as fundamental stylistic principles; writers are expected to avoid unnecessary repetition and circumlocution. When this stylistic discipline interacts with the Uzbek tendency toward *explicative elaboration* and *redundancy*, it often results in what might be termed “untranslated verbosity.”

This disjunction is further amplified by differences in sentence architecture and the placement of functional elements. English syntax adheres strictly to an SVO pattern and generally minimizes abstract or implicit subjects, whereas Uzbek allows greater flexibility in word order and relies on suffixation to express grammatical relationships. Consequently, Uzbek learners of English frequently transfer native syntactic logic into L2 production, creating subtle yet persistent deviations from target-language norms.

2.2. Lexical-Semantic and Culture-Specific Units

Culture-bound expressions, such as national metaphors or conventional speech etiquette, often require pragmatic equivalents when rendered in English; literal translation can result in semantic incongruities and stylistic exaggeration. Uzbek politeness is frequently conveyed through indirect phrasing, explanatory preambles, and forms of address, whereas English norms prioritize clarity, conciseness, and function-oriented expressions tailored to the communicative context.

2.3. Pragmatics and Speech Acts

Research indicates that the degree of directness or indirectness in speech acts—such as *requests* or *expressions of disagreement*—and the selection of modifiers are strongly conditioned by L1 cultural norms. This often leads to the misapplication of English politeness conventions in EFL contexts, as learners transfer native pragmatic strategies into their L2 production.

Intercultural Pragmatics and Pedagogical Implications

Studies in intercultural pragmatics demonstrate that interlocutors rely on pre-existing norms while collaboratively constructing new, shared conventions in communication. Consequently, in language teaching, it is insufficient to focus solely on grammar; learners must also receive explicit guidance on context-sensitive communicative strategies.

3. Empirical Evidence: The Uzbek Context

Recent research on EFL writing and pronunciation in Uzbekistan has revealed clear traces of interference. In written production, this manifests as recurring grammatical and structural errors identifiable through corpus analysis, while in pronunciation, inconsistencies arise in the perception and articulation of fricatives.



Analyses of local publications further emphasize the impact of cross-linguistic influence and highlight recurring error patterns. These findings suggest a need to re-evaluate EFL teaching strategies, underscoring the didactic significance of addressing interference systematically in both writing and speaking instruction.

4. Theoretical Foundations and Methodological Implications

4.1. Contemporary Approaches to Contrastive and Error Analysis

Modern interpretations of contrastive analysis and error analysis extend beyond the mere identification of linguistic deviations. They aim to uncover systematic patterns in learner language that reflect interlanguage development and cross-linguistic transfer, providing a framework for informed pedagogical interventions.

4.1. Contemporary Approaches to Contrastive Analysis (continued)

The contrastive approach has been revitalized in current research, emphasizing the fine-grained mapping of L1–L2 differences, viewing interlanguage as a dynamic system, and advocating for the design of instructional materials that reflect these insights.

4.2. Integrating Intercultural Pragmatics and Writing Standards

Language curricula should incorporate pragmatic competence alongside grammatical proficiency, gradually teaching learners strategies related to register, request formulation, and politeness conventions. In writing instruction, conciseness and clarity can be reinforced through explicit rubrics and targeted reduction exercises, ensuring learners internalize these norms effectively.

4.3. Localized Materials and Context-Sensitive Equivalents

In Uzbek–English instructional texts, culture-specific expressions should be rendered using pragmatic equivalents that approximate intended meaning, while in diplomatic or formal registers, conventional formulas for speech acts (e.g., hedging, stance markers) should be explicitly indicated. Such structured guidance reduces the risk of interference and supports accurate, context-appropriate L2 production.

Conclusion

Interstructural conflicts between Uzbek and English are not merely linguistic discrepancies; they constitute significant factors shaping the learner’s and translator’s overall communicative competence. When the explicative, redundant, and indirect patterns of Uzbek expression are compared with the concise, rigidly structured, and direct norms of English, the inevitability of interference becomes evident. This phenomenon extends across all linguistic levels—from phonetics and syntax to lexical semantics and pragmatics.

Contemporary studies (James, 2018; Ishihara & Tarone, 2021; Dastjerdi, 2022) demonstrate that such divergences should not be evaluated solely as “errors.” Rather, they represent a process of co-constructing norms, reflecting natural stages of interlanguage development and intercultural communication. Accordingly, integrating contrastive analysis, error analysis, and intercultural



pragmatics into language instruction is essential, enabling learners to develop grammatical, lexical, and pragmatic competencies in a holistic, context-sensitive manner.

Thus, the theoretical analysis of the discontinuity between “*Uzbek expression*” and “*English norms*” demonstrates that this phenomenon should not be regarded as a mere linguistic error. Rather, it serves as a signal for the need to update pedagogical approaches. Preparing learners involves not only mastering the formal rules of English but also familiarizing them with its pragmatic and stylistic conventions, which is essential for effective participation in global communication.

References:

1. Dastjerdi, H. V. (2022). Cross-linguistic influence in EFL writing: Interference or resource? *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 9(2), 45–63.
2. Ishihara, N., & Tarone, E. (2021). *Pragmatics and language learning: Cross-cultural perspectives*. Routledge.
3. James, C. (2018). *Errors in language learning and use: Exploring error analysis* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
4. Kecskes, I. (2019). *Intercultural pragmatics*. Oxford University Press.
5. Khaydarova, C. J. (2022). Modern teaching methods. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(6), 1609–1613. <https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/AMG46>
6. Li, S., & Hiver, P. (2021). Cross-linguistic influence and second language writing: A dynamic systems perspective. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 53, 100852. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2021.100852>
7. Marhaboxon, M. (2025). Intercultural communication and linguo-cultural specificity in film texts: Uzbek and Western cinematography. *Advances in Science and Education*, 1(5), 16–18. <https://doi.org/10.70728/edu.v01.i05.006>
8. Nguyen, T. M. H., & Boers, F. (2019). Addressing redundancy in L2 academic writing: From awareness raising to practice. *System*, 81, 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.system.2018.12.001>
9. Sharifian, F. (2019). *Cultural linguistics and intercultural communication*. Springer.
10. Thomas, M., & Reinders, H. (Eds.). (2022). *Language teaching with corpora: Research and practice*. Bloomsbury.
11. Uchibori, A., & Saito, K. (2020). Second language pragmatics development in EFL contexts: Explicit vs. implicit instruction. *Applied Pragmatics*, 2(2), 171–200.
12. Wei, L., & Cook, V. (2020). *The Cambridge handbook of linguistic multi-competence*. Cambridge University Press.

