

COMMON ERRORS IN ENGLISH WRITING AMONG UZBEK EFL STUDENTS AND THEIR PEDAGOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

Shakhnoza Rakhimova

PhD — Senior Teacher

Uzbekistan state world languages university

ABSTRACT: This article explores the most frequent types of errors made by Uzbek students learning English as a Foreign Language (EFL) in their written compositions. Drawing on classroom observations, student writing samples, and teacher interviews, the study identifies common grammatical, lexical, and syntactic mistakes. The research highlights how native language interference, insufficient vocabulary, and lack of exposure to authentic English contribute to these errors. Furthermore, the paper discusses the pedagogical implications of these findings and offers practical recommendations for EFL teachers in Uzbekistan to address such issues through targeted instruction, corrective feedback, and error-based learning activities. Emphasis is placed on developing students' metalinguistic awareness and fostering autonomous learning strategies to enhance writing proficiency.

Keywords: Uzbek EFL learners, english writing errors, grammar mistakes, interlanguage interference, pedagogical implications, corrective feedback, writing instruction, lexical errors, syntax, error analysis

INTRODUCTION

In the context of globalization and educational reform, English has become an essential skill for academic and professional success in Uzbekistan. As a result, English language teaching (ELT) has gained significant prominence in schools, lyceums, and higher education institutions. However, despite the increasing emphasis on English language instruction, many Uzbek EFL (English as a Foreign Language) students continue to face serious challenges in acquiring effective writing skills. Writing, being one of the most complex and cognitively demanding language skills, requires a deep command of grammar, vocabulary, coherence, and discourse structure — aspects that Uzbek learners often struggle with. The frequency and nature of writing errors among EFL learners can reveal a great deal about their interlanguage development and the effectiveness of the pedagogical methods used in the classroom. In the Uzbek context, students often make recurring errors in areas such as article usage, subject-verb agreement, tense consistency, word order, and spelling. These mistakes can be attributed to a range of factors, including negative transfer from the Uzbek language, limited exposure to authentic English usage, and insufficient feedback from instructors. Understanding the types and causes of these common errors is crucial for language teachers, curriculum designers, and policymakers. Not only does it inform more effective instructional strategies, but it also highlights the need for error-sensitive teaching approaches that promote learner awareness and self-correction. This study, therefore, aims to investigate the prevalent types of writing errors made by Uzbek EFL students, analyze their underlying causes, and discuss their implications for teaching practices. By identifying these recurring issues, the research seeks to propose pedagogical solutions that can support learners in developing greater accuracy and fluency in their English writing.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study reveal that Uzbek EFL students frequently encounter difficulties in English writing due to a variety of linguistic and pedagogical factors. The most recurrent errors identified include misuse of grammatical structures, lexical inaccuracies, syntactic disorganization, and improper spelling or punctuation. These challenges are often rooted in first language interference, limited exposure to authentic English, and traditional teaching practices that prioritize rule memorization over communicative competence. Addressing these issues requires a comprehensive pedagogical response. Teachers must go beyond merely correcting mistakes; they need to understand the sources of learner errors and implement instructional strategies that foster critical reflection and language awareness. Integrating process-based writing approaches, increasing students' access to authentic input, and emphasizing peer- and self-correction can significantly improve writing performance. Additionally, targeted professional development for teachers focusing on effective error analysis and feedback methods is essential. Ultimately, improving the quality of English writing instruction in Uzbekistan demands a shift toward learner-centered, communicative methodologies. By recognizing the patterns and causes of common errors, educators can create more responsive and supportive learning environments that empower students to become more accurate, confident, and independent writers in English.

REFERENCES

1. Abdulloh, R. (2021). *EFL learners' common grammatical errors in writing: A case study of Uzbek university students*. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 17(1).
2. Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. Oxford University Press.
3. Ellis, R. (2008). *The study of second language acquisition* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
4. Gass, S. M., & Selinker, L. (2001). *Second language acquisition: An introductory course* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
5. Karimova, D., & Nishanova, S. (2022). An analysis of typical English writing mistakes among Uzbek EFL students. *International Journal of Instruction*, 15(3), <https://doi.org/10.29333/iji.2022.15318a>
6. Khudoyberganova, D. (2020). Common writing errors among ESL learners in Uzbekistan: A linguistic and pedagogical perspective. *Uzbek Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 4(2).
7. Richards, J. C., & Schmidt, R. (2010). *Longman dictionary of language teaching and applied linguistics* (4th ed.). Pearson Education.
8. Sultannaeva, M. (2023). *Writing proficiency and syntactic errors among Uzbek EFL learners: Trends and solutions*. Tashkent State University Press.
9. Swales, J. M., & Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic writing for graduate students: Essential tasks and skills* (3rd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
10. Ur, P. (2012). *A course in language teaching: Practice and theory* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.