

*Mahmudov Biloldin, MA student
School of Humanities and Fine Arts
Kapranov Yan, Dr. Habil., Prof.
VIZJA University, Warsaw, Poland*

TEACHING BRITISH ENGLISH GRAMMATICAL CONSTRUCTIONS FOR TRANSLATION INTO UZBEK: A SURVEY-BASED STUDY AT ANDIJAN STATE INSTITUTE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGES

Teaching English grammar to students of English Philology should not be limited to the memorisation of rules or the mechanical completion of exercises. In translation-oriented education, grammar functions as a tool for interpreting and transferring meaning. A translator works not only with words, but also with tense relations, aspectuality, modality, voice, definiteness, word order, syntactic hierarchy, and logical relations between clauses. Therefore, grammatical competence is a central component of translation competence.

The present paper examines the teaching of British English grammatical constructions for translation into Uzbek. The term “British English grammatical constructions” is used here in the sense of the English academic norm adopted in philological and educational practice. The study does not compare British and American English. Its focus is on those grammatical constructions of English that are particularly relevant to translation into Uzbek: tense and aspect, passive voice, modal verbs, articles, prepositions, complex sentences, and clause relations.

The theoretical basis of the study comprises translation competence theory, functional grammar, contrastive grammar, and task-based grammar teaching. The PACTE model stresses that translation competence is not the same as bilingual competence; it includes strategic, linguistic, instrumental, and cognitive components [11]. The EMT Competence Framework also emphasises that professional translator training requires mastery of the grammatical, lexical, and idiomatic structures of working languages [6]. In this sense, grammar is not an auxiliary subject. It is part of professional translation thinking.

The relevance of the English–Uzbek direction is connected with the typological distance between the two languages. English is largely analytic and uses auxiliary verbs, articles, prepositions, modal verbs, function words, and relatively fixed word order to express grammatical meaning. Uzbek is a Turkic agglutinative language in which many grammatical meanings are expressed through suffixes, case forms, postpositions, and other syntactic mechanisms. As a result, English grammatical constructions rarely have direct formal equivalents in Uzbek. Translation requires functional transformation rather than mechanical transfer.

The study was conducted at Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages and involved 100 undergraduate students of English Philology. The research design was survey-based and exploratory, combining quantitative and qualitative components. The online questionnaire included background questions, grammar-based reformulation tasks, Likert-scale statements about grammar teaching methods, an English-to-Uzbek translation task, and open-ended questions. The purpose was not to experimentally prove the effectiveness of one method, but to identify students’ perceptions, difficulties, and pedagogical needs.

The participant profile showed that students had varied academic and language-learning experiences. The sample included first-, second-, third-, and fourth-year BA students. A total of 71% of respondents reported having experience with translation or interpreting courses. However, only 35% stated that they often or very often perform translation-related tasks. This reveals an important methodological gap: translation may be present in the curriculum, but grammar and translation practice are not always integrated systematically.

Students' self-assessment of English grammar knowledge also showed a mixed picture. While 54% of students assessed their grammar knowledge as good or very good, 46% evaluated it as average, weak, or very weak. This is important because translation-oriented grammar instruction requires not only passive grammatical knowledge, but the ability to apply grammar in translation tasks. A student may know a grammar rule, but still fail to render its meaning naturally in Uzbek.

The survey results show that students support a mixed approach to grammar teaching. The highest level of positive response concerned interactive grammar activities, which 66% of students associated with increased motivation. Technology-assisted grammar practice was positively evaluated by 64% of students. Comparison of sentence structures received 63% positive agreement, and grammar instruction connected with practical translation-related tasks received 60%. These findings suggest that students value grammar teaching when it is practical, comparative, interactive, and connected with translation.

At the same time, students did not reject explicit explanations of grammar. A majority of respondents still considered rule explanation useful. This means that modern grammar teaching should not simply abandon traditional grammar instruction. The stronger conclusion is that traditional grammar teaching must be reorganised. Rules should be explained clearly and immediately connected to context, contrastive analysis, translation tasks, and reflection.

The grammar-based reformulation tasks revealed difficulties in the productive use of grammatical constructions. The tasks focused on Past Perfect, passive voice, modal verbs, and complex sentence structure. The strongest result was observed in the Past Perfect task, where 29 responses contained the expected construction. Passive voice and modal constructions were also challenging, while the complex sentence task produced the weakest result, with only 16 responses containing a clearly expressed target complex structure. This indicates that students struggle most when grammar requires syntactic organisation and logical connection between clauses.

The open-ended responses confirmed this tendency. The two most frequently reported difficulties were tense or tense-aspect constructions (46 mentions) and complex sentence structure, sentence organisation, or word order (45 mentions). Passive voice, modal verbs, articles, and prepositions were mentioned less frequently, but they remain translation-relevant because they encode meanings that often require transformation in Uzbek. These findings show that students' difficulties are not random. They cluster around constructions that are typologically and functionally important in English–Uzbek translation.

The English-to-Uzbek translation task provided further diagnostic evidence. The task contained grammatically significant elements: a contrastive connector, gerundial constructions, the passive voice, conditional structures, modal verbs, and abstract grammatical meaning. A total of 74 responses could be interpreted as Uzbek translations, while 26 responses were incomplete, written in another language, or consisted of comments. This result itself is

important: even when students are asked to translate into Uzbek, not all are ready to perform a coherent translation task in the target language.

The analysis of the Uzbek translations showed that many students could convey the text's general meaning. However, grammatically dense fragments created difficulties. For example, a sentence such as "If grammatical structures are used incorrectly, misunderstandings may occur" requires the student to process conditionality, the passive voice, and modality simultaneously. In Uzbek, such a construction must usually be rendered through functional restructuring rather than a word-for-word transfer. This confirms that grammar teaching for translation should focus on meaning-bearing constructions rather than isolated forms.

One of the central findings of the study is the gap between declarative grammatical knowledge and its application in translation. More than half of the students admitted that they find it difficult to apply grammar rules when reformulating or translating sentences. This supports the argument that grammar teaching should be connected with translation competence. Knowing the form of the Past Perfect, the passive voice, or a modal verb is insufficient if the student cannot explain what this form means in a specific context and how to express that meaning in Uzbek.

The study therefore proposes a translation-oriented grammar teaching model: **Form** → **Meaning** → **Contrast** → **Translation** → **Reflection**. The first stage is the identification of grammatical form. The second stage is the interpretation of meaning in context. The third stage is contrastive comparison between English and Uzbek. The fourth stage is translation practice. The fifth stage is reflection, where students justify their translation choices, compare alternatives, and receive feedback. This model directly responds to the weaknesses identified in the survey.

For example, when teaching the passive voice, the teacher should not stop at the formula "be + past participle". Students should analyse why the passive is used: to foreground the object, hide the agent, create academic neutrality, or focus on the result. Then they should compare possible Uzbek renderings: passive, active, impersonal, or restructured sentence. Finally, they should translate and justify their choice. This sequence turns grammar into translation reasoning.

Similarly, when teaching modal verbs, students should distinguish possibility, probability, obligation, permission, recommendation, and inference. A modal verb should not be translated mechanically. The student must interpret the type and strength of modality before choosing an Uzbek equivalent. This is especially important because one English modal verb may require different Uzbek renderings depending on context.

The same applies to articles and definiteness. Since Uzbek does not have an article system equivalent to English a/an and the, students should not look for direct equivalents. They should identify whether the article expresses new information, known reference, specificity, generalisation, or uniqueness. Then they should decide whether this meaning must be made explicit in Uzbek or can remain implicit in the context.

The pedagogical implications are clear. English grammar courses for Uzbek-speaking students of English Philology should include grammar reformulation tasks, English–Uzbek contrastive analysis, short translation tasks, translation commentary, error analysis, and feedback focused on meaning. Students should work not only with textbook sentences, but also with semi-authentic academic, professional, and communicative texts. This would help them see grammar as a tool for translation rather than merely an examination topic.

The study has limitations. It was conducted at one institution and used a convenience sample of 100 students. The research was survey-based and did not include classroom observation, interviews with teachers, or a pedagogical experiment. Part of the data is self-reported, and the translation task included only one coherent English text. Therefore, the results should be interpreted as diagnostic rather than universal. Still, the findings provide a useful basis for improving grammar instruction in translation-oriented English Philology programmes.

In conclusion, teaching British English grammatical constructions for translation into Uzbek requires methodological rethinking. Grammar should not be treated as a closed system of rules. It should be taught as a functional, contrastive, and translation-relevant tool. The survey data show that students need explicit explanation, but they also need practical translation tasks, structural comparison, interaction, technology-supported practice, and reflective feedback. The proposed model **Form** → **Meaning** → **Contrast** → **Translation** → **Reflection** offers a practical way to connect grammatical knowledge with translation competence.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation* (3rd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315619187>
2. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
3. Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2018). *Research Methods in Education* (8th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
4. Dörnyei, Z. (2007). *Research Methods in Applied Linguistics: Quantitative, Qualitative, and Mixed Methodologies*. Oxford University Press.
5. Ellis, R. (2006). Current issues in the teaching of grammar: An SLA perspective. *TESOL Quarterly*, 40(1), 83–107. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40264512>
6. European Commission, Directorate-General for Translation. (2022). *European Master's in Translation: Competence Framework 2022*. Publications Office of the European Union. <https://doi.org/10.2782/858200>
7. Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203783771>
8. Long, M. H. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 39–52). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/sibil.2.07lon>
9. Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S. S. (2011). *Teaching Grammar in Second Language Classrooms: Integrating Form-Focused Instruction in Communicative Context*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203850961>
10. Nunan, D. (2004). *Task-Based Language Teaching*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667336>
11. PACTE Group. (2003). Building a translation competence model. In F. Alves (Ed.), *Triangulating Translation: Perspectives in Process-Oriented Research* (pp. 43–66). John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.45.06pac>