



---

## SHORTAGE OF TYPOLOGICALLY INFORMED TEACHING MATERIALS AND REFERENCE GRAMMARS

Shiraliyeva Mexribon Rustamovna  
SamSIFL Faculty of Evening Education  
Foreign Language and Literature (English)  
5th Year Student of Group 2122  
TEL: +998915367610

---

### Abstract

The present article examines the typology of the verb as a central part of speech in English and Uzbek from both theoretical and applied perspectives. By drawing on cross-linguistic typology, reference grammars, and applied linguistics literature, it explores how verbal categories such as tense, aspect, mood, and voice are realized differently in the analytic structure of English and the agglutinative morphology of Uzbek. The study further considers pedagogical implications, highlighting the need for typologically informed teaching materials to address learner difficulties arising from structural contrasts.

**Keywords:** Order, Pedagogy, Reference Grammars, Tense–Aspect, Morphology, Language Teaching, Material Designing.

### Introduction

The verb is one of the most complex and semantically rich parts of speech in any language. Its typological properties influence not only grammatical structure but also language acquisition and pedagogy. English and Uzbek, typologically distinct languages, exemplify this complexity. English, an analytic SVO language, primarily relies on auxiliary verbs, word order, and periphrastic constructions to express tense, aspect, and mood. Uzbek, in contrast, is an agglutinative SOV language, employing rich suffixal morphology to encode these categories. This article investigates the typology of verbs in these languages,



---

emphasizing both linguistic structure and practical implications for language teaching. The object of this study is the verb as a part of speech, analyzed through cross-linguistic comparison, reference grammars, and applied linguistic perspectives. The study also identifies gaps in locally adapted teaching materials, which is crucial for developing effective grammar instruction for Uzbek learners of English.

In English, tense–aspect distinctions are largely analytic, while Uzbek uses agglutinative suffixes, resulting in a typologically significant contrast. Understanding these contrasts is essential for designing effective language instruction that reduces transfer errors and facilitates learner comprehension. Giacalone Ramat provides a foundational perspective on how typological distance affects language acquisition. The author emphasizes that verbal categories cannot be understood in isolation; they are conditioned by both the source and target languages.

Functional typology seeks to identify constraints on variation across a wide range of linguistic phenomena. While early typological research in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries focused primarily on classifying languages according to structural types, contemporary studies have shifted toward identifying cross-linguistic generalizations, or language universals, based on systematic surveys of multiple languages.[1; 2] These universals can be categorized as either substantive or formal. Substantive universals may be absolute (for instance, the fact that all languages possess consonants, vowels, nouns, and verbs) or implicational, where the presence of one grammatical feature predicts the presence of another.

It is important to note that typological universals are often tendencies rather than exceptions-free rules. Unlike formal generative approaches, which often posit innate, deductively derived universals, typological universals are inductively derived from empirical language data. Resources such as the World Atlas of Language Structures (WALS) provide comprehensive surveys of phonological and grammatical features across the world's languages, supporting typologically informed research and analysis.

Joseph H. Greenberg shows that verb placement correlates with other grammatical structures, such as object and modifier ordering. English verbs occupy a medial position (SVO), influencing auxiliary constructions, while



---

Uzbek verbs occur clause-finally (SOV), shaping morphological strategies for tense and aspect. [2; 80] These universals explain why English–Uzbek learners often struggle with tense–aspect correspondence and verb agreement.

In languages with dominant SOV order, the only alternative word order is typically OSV, and all adverbial modifiers—indicating time, manner, place, frequency, or degree—precede the verb. This rigid pattern ensures that the verb remains clause-final, with modifiers accumulating before it, following the structure: Subject + Object + Adverbs + Verb. Unlike SVO or VSO languages, SOV languages show highly predictable adverb placement, which influences sentence parsing, syntactic processing, and language acquisition. For learners of SOV languages such as Uzbek, Japanese, or Korean, this can cause transfer difficulties when learning verb-medial languages like English, where adverbs often follow or surround the verb.

Reference grammars serve as essential tools for cross-linguistic comparison. Nikolaeva's work on Reference Grammars emphasizes their role in documenting language-specific patterns, including verbal morphology and syntax. For Uzbek, reference grammars reveal the agglutinative encoding of tense, aspect, mood, and agreement, while English grammars highlight analytic constructions and auxiliary systems.[4; 2041] Rasulova specifically addresses the verb, offering concrete comparisons between English and Uzbek verbal forms.[5; 75] The manual also points to gaps in locally available, typologically informed teaching resources, which can impede effective grammar instruction.

Applied linguistics provides methodological guidance for addressing these typological contrasts in teaching. Lado underscores the importance of comparing linguistic structures to anticipate learning difficulties.[3; 72] He highlights predictable errors arising from structural differences, particularly in tense, aspect, and mood. The compilation of issues arising from comparing a foreign language with a learner's native tongue represents a crucial resource for teaching, assessment, research, and comprehension. However, this compilation should initially be regarded as a set of potential or hypothetical issues until it is confirmed through observation of actual student language use. Such validation may reveal that certain problems were underestimated or misunderstood and could be more significant than initially thought. It is important to remember, of course, that



---

individual learners will experience varying degrees of difficulty with each issue due to personal and dialectal differences. Despite these variations, the identified problems tend to remain relatively consistent and predictable within specific language backgrounds.

The typological differences between English and Uzbek verbs are evident in several domains. For example, progressive and perfect constructions rely on auxiliary sequences, while negation and question formation involve auxiliary placement. Uzbek verbs, by contrast, are agglutinative: a single verbal stem may carry multiple suffixes simultaneously to encode tense, aspect, mood, person, and number.

This contrast has direct pedagogical implications. Learners must acquire not only the morphological forms but also the syntactic strategies that encode verbal meaning in each language. Typological awareness helps teachers anticipate common errors, such as overgeneralization of English auxiliary patterns or misapplication of Uzbek suffix sequences.

Typologically informed teaching materials are critical for effective instruction. Rasulova highlights the scarcity of locally adapted materials for Uzbek learners of English, emphasizing the need for comparative charts, contextualized examples, and explicit explanations of structural contrasts. Tomlinson (2011) provides a methodological framework for material development, advocating for task-based, learner-centered resources that reflect authentic language use. Incorporating cross-linguistic contrasts into teaching materials not only clarifies grammatical differences but also supports deeper cognitive processing of verb forms. Language learning materials can be broadly defined as any resources that facilitate the acquisition of a language. According to Tomlinson, materials encompass linguistic, visual, auditory, or kinaesthetic elements and may be presented in various formats, including print, live performance, display, or digital media such as cassette, CD-ROM, DVD, or the internet.[6; 13] These materials serve multiple pedagogical functions: they can be instructional, providing learners with information about the language; experiential, offering opportunities to engage with language in use; elicitive, prompting learners to produce language; or exploratory, enabling learners to discover linguistic patterns independently.



While most language learning materials are print-based, contemporary approaches recognize the value of diverse media. Although instructional materials remain predominant due to their role in providing structured input and practice, there is increasing emphasis on experiential and elicitive materials, as discussed in

For example, teaching English tense-aspect combinations to Uzbek learners benefits from explicit comparison with Uzbek verbal suffixes. Visual aids showing how English auxiliary constructions map onto Uzbek suffix sequences can reduce transfer errors and enhance comprehension. Similarly, exercises that manipulate word order and auxiliary placement in English can prepare learners for syntactic patterns that are absent in their native language.

Giacalone Ramat and Lado emphasize that typological distance significantly affects SLA. The more structural divergence between the learner's first language and the target language, the greater the potential for error. English–Uzbek verb contrasts exemplify this: analytic versus agglutinative encoding of tense, aspect, mood, and voice creates predictable learning challenges. Teachers and material developers must therefore integrate typological insights into lesson planning, error analysis, and instructional design.

The typology of the verb in English and Uzbek illustrates the importance of cross-linguistic comparison for both linguistic theory and pedagogy. English verbs, with their analytic constructions, contrast sharply with the agglutinative, suffix-based system of Uzbek verbs. These structural differences shape acquisition patterns, influence learner errors, and determine the design of effective teaching materials.

The literature surveyed provides a comprehensive framework for understanding and addressing these contrasts. A central finding is that locally adapted, typologically informed teaching materials are critical for overcoming learning difficulties and improving grammatical competence. Future research and material development should continue to integrate linguistic theory with classroom practice, ensuring that learners acquire both accurate forms and functional understanding of the verb in English and Uzbek.



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,  
Education, and Pedagogy***

**ISSN (E):** 3067-7874

**Volume** 01, **Issue** 09, December, 2025

**Website:** [usajournals.org](http://usajournals.org)

***This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution  
4.0 International License.***

---

**References**

1. Giacalone Ramat, Anna, editor. *Typology and Second Language Acquisition*. John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 2003 — p.2.
2. Greenberg, Joseph H. Some Universals of Grammar with Particular Reference to the Order of Meaningful Elements. In *Universals of Language*, edited by Joseph H. Greenberg. MIT Press, Cambridge, 1966 (orig. 1963) — pp. 73–113.
3. Lado, Robert. *Linguistics Across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. University of Michigan Press, Ann Arbor, 1957 — pp. 162.
4. Nikolaeva, Irina. Reference Grammars. *Handbücher zur Sprach- und Kommunikationswissenschaft (HSK)*, vol. 42/3, 2015 — pp. 2036–2063.
5. Rasulova, M. *Comparative Typology of English and Native Languages (Manual)*. Renessans-edu, 2024 — p. 263.
6. Tomlinson, Brian. *Developing Materials for Language Teaching*. 2nd ed., Bloomsbury Academic, 2011 — p. 320.