

## DIFFERENCES OF LEARNING ENGLISH ON MIDDLE- AGED MONOLINGUAL LEARNERS.

**Qurbanova Hilola Maqsadbekovna**

Assistant teacher of Asia International University

**Annotation:** The article describes an English teacher's first-course class at Agrarian University, Yunusabad, consisting of 20 monolingual Uzbek students aged 16-22. Due to English not being a compulsory subject, their proficiency levels vary significantly: 6 are intermediate, 10 pre-intermediate, and 4 elementary. Intermediate students, many with B2 certificates and prior educational center experience, show strong grammar and academic writing skills, though they occasionally struggle with direct translation from Uzbek. Pre-intermediate learners, who often studied online, have a good academic vocabulary base but make errors with articles and relative clauses. Elementary students are new to the language but display high motivation and strong vocabulary memory, despite initial difficulties distinguishing tenses. This diverse group presents unique teaching challenges and opportunities, with many students aspiring to achieve IELTS or TOEFL certifications for further studies.

### 1.TARGET LEARNERS

Since working at Agrarian university situated in Yunusabad region as an English teacher, 1st course monolingual students were given (L1 is Uzbek) whose ages are from 16 (Aziz, Gulbakhor, Shoirra, Diyor, Mehro'za, Gulsanam, Aziza) and 18 years old (Shakhzoda, Jaloliddin, Jakhongir, Asilbek, Sirojiddin) to 22 years old (Zebo, Mohinur, Maftuna, Bilol, Mironshox, Laziz, Jamol, Asad). As English is not their compulsory subject at this university, their levels are totally different from each other. There are 9 female (Gulbakhor, Shoirra, Mehro'za, Gulsanam, Aziza, Shakhzoda, Zebo, Mohinur, Maftuna) and 11 male (Aziz, Diyor, Jaloliddin, Jakhongir, Asilbek, Sirojiddin, Bilol, Mironshox, Laziz, Jamol, Asad) students, overall 20 students in my group, 6 of them are intermediate level (Zebo, Asilbek, Sirojiddin, Mironshox, Jakhongir, Aziza) 10 students are pre-intermediate level (Jaloliddin, Bilol, Aziz, Asad, Laziz, Shakhzoda, Diyor, Mehro'za, Gulsanam, Maftuna) and the other 4 ones ( Shoirra, Gulbakhor, Mohinur, Jamol) are elementary level. Some of my strong intermediate students (Sirojiddin, Asilbek, Aziza, Zebo) have got B2 CEFR certificate and the rest are spending their whole potential and effort to take IELTS certificate for master's degree even few students want to take TOEFL to study abroad. Students had dissimilar learning processes. They started to learn English (grammar) differently before entering to this university. Most of the students (Zebo, Asilbek, Sirojiddin, Mironshox, Jakhongir, Aziza) whose levels are intermediate used to go to the educational centers, as a result, it helped them to decrease numbers of grammatical mistakes such as the usage of relative clauses and articles as well as improving self-esteem at the same time by communicating and receiving feedback from teachers face to face. They are able to write academic writings and barely make grammatical mistakes. In terms of *strong points*, they can comprehend and use confidently all Perfect tenses either writing or speaking which do not exist in their L1. They sometimes *struggle with* translating sentences into English, because they usually translate sentences into English as they think and speak in Uzbek. Because of the weak point, they cannot impress to the reader or listener and cannot make logical meaningful contexts or speeches. When it comes to pre- intermediate students, (Jaloliddin, Bilol, Aziz, Asad, Laziz, Shakhzoda, Diyor, Mehro'za, Gulsanam, Maftuna) they attended to online classes and mostly learned individually. Therefore, although their level is pre- intermediate,

sometimes some grammatical mistakes namely, where to put articles and sometimes confusing with relative clauses are observed on their essays. However, their vocabulary base is quite perfect to express their ideas either speaking or writing especially they are good at using academic vocabularies on their essays.

Elementary students (Shoira, Gulbakhor, Mohinur, Jamol) just started to learn the language after entering to this university. They know the rules of the grammar which they have learned nevertheless, they make mistakes orally because of lack of experience. In other words, they mostly mix Perfect tenses to Past tenses and need more practice and learning process. When it comes to their achievements, they are energetic and have strong effort, therefore they are learning the language as fast as possible. In addition, all have strong memory of learning vocabularies. It brings them huge development on the language while expressing ideas. Vocabularies are the fundament of the building when the grammar is the brick of the structure. Attending to learning environment and student affect is not a matter of social work, but a pathway to support achievement (Tomlinson, 2003).

**Motivation and Investment** may seem similar pattern but their purposes are totally different. Motivation is encouragement to do something while investment is acting such as spending and giving up something (laziness, social media, entertainment) in the learning process. More preciously, motivation is given separately because students' aims and desires differ from each other, I believe all levels' of my students intermediate, pre-intermediate and elementary (Sirojiddin, Asilbek, Aziza, Zebo), (Jaloliddin, Bilol, Aziz, Asad, Laziz, Shakhzoda, Diyor, Mehro'za, Gulsanam, Maftuna), (Shoira, Gulbakhor, Mohinur, Jamol) motivation is learning a language to achieve high goals and broadening their knowledge by studying abroad with the help of English while the investment is their time and effort on the process as well as financial outcome at the same time. Students may be highly motivated but have less investment in the language practices such as sexist, racist and identity. Motivation itself is not enough for a learner to learn a language because motivation is mental support while investment is practical support. As an investment, I always advise different videos, podcasts and tedtalks which made by native people to my students according to their levels as well as their interests in order not to make the lesson boring. Topics and themes may be chosen by students themselves and the freedom gives a comfortable environment to my students in a class. All level students have grammatical issues on the language therefore, as an English teacher they should be supported to make their English as better as possible.

## 2. GRAMMAR BOOKS AND SELECTED TOPIC

Topic is **Passive Voice**

**First chosen book** is *Structure and meaning in English: A guide for teachers*. Routledge by Kennedy, G. (2014)

**Second book** entitled *Mastering English: An advanced grammar for non-native and native Speakers* by De Gruyter Mouton Bache, C. & Davidsen-Nielsen, N. (1997). According to Subban (2006) learners are individuals and have individual approaches to and levels of learning, teachers need to consider their differences when planning and implementing instruction.

## 3. GRAMMAR EXPLORATION

The main reason I chose passive voice is to help my students overcome the difficulties and hesitations on this topic. The main reason most of my students struggle is that grammar is not available in my students' L1.

There are several **differences** which Carl Bache and Graeme Kennedy proved on their books. Bache pointed out that "passive" and "active" sentences are the result of semantic function, and active participant is **Doer**, passive participant is **Done-To** while Kennedy emphasized Voice

which is considered grammatical term focuses on the *Subject* or *Object* in a sentence. He calculated that 90 percent of transitive verbs highlights the subject as active voice and the rest 10 percent focuses on the subject considered passive voice. Moreover, Bache wrote that it is possible to make passive voice from active voice with the help of some transitive verbs such as be associated with, be based on, be sold. Besides, he divided sentences into groups such as sentences *describing stative situations*, which describes situations namely not only Doer and Done-To but also *Specified* and *Specifier*. Next group of sentences are stranded prepositions which includes prepositional predicators at the end of a sentence before time predicators for example, *The room has not been cleaned in for ages*. According to Kennedy, learners are taught the passive voice as a difference or transformation of the active voice verb forms and add *by* + agent (person). However, sometimes there is no need to add *by* in some passive voice sentences because Subject namely Doer is not focused in the sentences like *Sugar is added to the soup*. Kennedy explained some easier ways to approach passives through the SVC construction, here S-Subject, V-Tobe, Auxiliary verbs, C- Past participle of the Verb or the formation of the verbs which *ed* is added.

In terms of *similarities*, both scholars supported the idea that Specifier usually comes in the sentences with the help of *by* in order to highlight and show the Subject (Doer) of a sentence when it is needed. Scientists showed the difficulties which most students struggle with namely, English is the use of decreased relative clauses which follow learners to interpret the passive non-finite *ed* participle as it is the finite past tense in active voice. For example, *Students punished in the class should be given some time to correct to their mistakes*. Learners may comprehend that punished is an active finite verb instead of a reduced relative clause in the passive voice (Students who are punished . . .). According to Kennedy belief, constructing sentences with SVC ensures that you never make mistakes or make incorrect sentences. These books not only taught me to better understand the passive voice, but also how and in what ways to help students construct correct sentences. Personally, while Kennedy taught me strategies and ways, Bache was able to improve my knowledge on this topic.

## References

1. Kennedy, G. (2014). *Structure and meaning in English: A guide for teachers*. Routledge. <https://bridges.searchmobi.us:443/record=b3083644~S9Links to an external site.>
2. Bache, C. & Davidsen-Nielsen, N. (1997). *Mastering English: An advanced grammar for non-native and native Speakers*. De Gruyter Mouton. <https://bridges.searchmobi.us:443/record=b2570038~S9Links to an external site.>
3. Ellis R. (2009). The methodology of task-based teaching. *Asian Journal of English Language teaching*, 11(5), (79–100).
4. Tomlinson C. (2003). Fulfilling the promise of the differentiated classroom: Tools and strategies for responsive teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. (92–98).
5. Subban, P. (2006). A research basis supporting differentiated instruction. Retrieved from <http://www.aare.edu.au/06pap/sub06080.pdf>.