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**Abstract****.** Analyzing the morphological and lexical characteristics of the primary means of expressing questions in both English and Uzbek languages is a complex method of language acquisition. The principles of showcasing the distinctive and unique elements in literary works in relation to the intellectual aesthetic qualities of contemporary linguistic levels represent one of the pressing issues in comparative linguistics. The focus of this investigation is on pedagogical strategies for interrogative sentences to improve the comprehension of foreign language learners within the realm of linguistics. The focus of these strategies is on Uzbek language learners and educators in the EFL context, aiming to enhance their language abilities. In this investigation, we have pinpointed the contrasts and similarities of interrogative words between English and Uzbek, appreciating their individual and diverse features. Scrutinizing syntactic expressions and cultural peculiarities, this research suggests hands-on pedagogical methodologies for language training. By formulating practical solutions to the challenges surrounding the acquisition of interrogative sentence structures, this research aims to enhance the linguistic experience of Uzbek learners in English language teaching and learning, facilitating a more effective utilization of authentic materials and promoting fruitful engagement in the language.

**INTRODUCTION**

The study of questions plays a critical role in developing modern theories about how languages are structured. The question is a moment that tests a new direction of search; it gives a new meaning to what we know or to what was going on in or minds, with respect to a particular theory, to a given field of knowledge, and to a certain way to validate knowledge [3]. Jesperson explained the act of questioning expressed through interrogative sentences and has different meanings depending on the meaning of its expression [21]. The terms question and interrogative have been used interchangeably [15]. While questions are one of the main means of organizing speech communication between people or exchanging ideas (obtaining and giving information), and are one of the main factors chosen by people for communication, interrogatives have been a topic of interest in language learning and teaching.

Clearly, the terms “question” and “interrogative” themselves have been debated for a long time regarding the fact that both of them are equally used in syntax but there was a tendency several years ago to treat “interrogative” as a syntactic term and “question” as a semantic and pragmatic term [21]. At the pragmatic level, questions, defined as requests for information, are prototypical cases of interrogative sentences [13]. Fareh and Bin Moussa (2022) explored the various discourse or pragmatic functions of interrogative sentences in English tailored to teach students in EFL classes. They argue the relationship between interrogative sentences as grammatical units and interrogative sentences as pragmatic units. They looked into how the immediate context and the discourse world in which an utterance is employed influence the speech acts of interrogative sentences in discourse. This means that both linguistic and non-linguistic circumstances are necessary for an accurate understanding of statements in natural discourse. Therefore, teaching grammar to foreign language learners needs to be expanded to incorporate discourse-based grammar rather than remaining sentence-based [46].

Reviewing the scientific experiments conducted by several scientists, we can say that interrogatives are a widely studied topic.

Pasaribu et al. (2022) explored the pragmatic principles of English teachers in Islamic elementary schools, highlighting the importance of pragmatic politeness in language instruction. Liu (2014) conducted an empirical study on the attrition sequence of English interrogative structures in the Chinese context, focusing on Chinese adult EFL learners. Umami (2016) performed a contrastive analysis of interrogative sentences in English and Indonesian to identify the similarities and differences between the two languages. Solihati et. al. (2019) developed a teaching tool called Magic Round to enhance students' motivation to learn interrogative sentences. Suleymanov (2020) discussed the role of interrogative sentences in teaching foreign languages, emphasizing the importance of theory and experience in language learning. In addition, Shutova et al. (2020) focused on teaching Russian interrogative intonation to foreign students, highlighting the importance of intonation in language instruction. Husnan (2021) discussed interrogative sentences in Sasak, emphasizing the need for materials to support local language teaching. Finally, Yibing et al. (2024) researched innovative teaching strategies for Arabic interrogative sentences to enhance language learners' proficiency and comprehension in this linguistic domain.

Language learning entails acquiring grammatical rules and understanding various linguistic structures, including phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, and pragmatics [10]. It is essential to comprehend grammatical principles when learning a language, because failing to do so can lead to serious problems, especially between contrast language speakers. Not surprisingly, reference grammars almost never fail to dedicate a section to the form (structure) and sometimes also the functions (specific contextualized uses) of interrogative constructions [43]. In this case of interrogative constructions in Uzbek presents multiple challenges, in which different interrogative words can have unique implications, while similar meanings are expressed differently in written and spoken forms, creating a synonymic character in written form. By contrast, more English interrogative words have multiple implications, and they acquire a consistent system in their written form. This case sometimes obtains the problem to Uzbek learners when learning English. Below, we divide the problems into parts A B C and tried to develop solutions to these problems together.

**PROBLEM STATEMENT**

As contrasting languages English and Uzbek are in different group Uzbek learners often encounter challenges to comprehend context when translating into a foreign language [8], as well as due to their morphological differences.

Linguistic expressions of interrogative sentences arising in the process of exchanging ideas in Uzbek and English are similar in exchanging speech for the purpose of factual reference and certain communicative forms. Interrogative words in Uzbek can be used in different word forms to address the listener without changing the meaning of the sentences, whereas it is the mistake in the English language and can cause challenges in concise translation. Where words express constituent questions [44] in English it is reflected direct meaning in situation cases in Uzbek. To provide solutions to these challenges concisely, this study aims to emphasize language acquisition processes via pedagogical and educational practices.

Cultural and social factors play important roles in the process of learning a foreign language [4] and sometimes, Uzbek EFL learners may feel unsuccessful in asking questions rooted in cultural diversity between the two languages.

Language and culture are inextricably linked, and during the process of translation, it is imperative to traverse numerous strata of culture to facilitate successful communication. When learners and teachers are exposed to a new language, they are introduced to conversational contexts or reading contexts in which native speakers in different groups and statuses in a particular society take different roles [ 40].

Illustrations of this intricate relationship can be found in literary works, idiomatic phrases, and even in the realm of product marketing. However, interrogative expression, which requires repeated meaning through one letter or sound instead of the core component of the interrogative and moves to the clarifying plan in the sentence, is unique because of the cultural context of the Uzbek language. Understanding these nuances is crucial for learners, as they categorize questions about someone or something and stimulate critical thinking in literary texts [10]. Tanyeri (2021) investigates the challenges and strategies in translating cultural nuances. Emphasizing translation requires a deep comprehension of cultures, histories, and contexts to facilitate effective cross-cultural communication, acting as a vital bridge between diverse communities.

C) The main problem in learning English is that there is no environment that makes them familiar with the original language [2]. More students do not feel the necessity of English and cannot communicate with others due to lack of communication in English and face with difficulties when to ask or answer the question. This is one of challenge that Uzbek students encounter in the in the process of learning English.

Many educational establishments have admitted that English is a foreign language in Uzbekistan. However, few scientific studies have been conducted to improve Uzbek learners’ language acquisition in dialogic aspects, specifically on the theme of how to teach and how to learn interrogations that are more effective in building communication in English. We believe that it is vital for teachers to enhance interrogative strategies [24] while teaching English with innovative teaching approaches. Learners can effectively address and overcome these challenges through methods such as comparative analysis [38], error analysis [7], performance analysis [22], and discourse analysis [23].

In order to solve the mentioned problems abovethe study aimed to achieve the following objectives.

1) To analyze the distinctions and commonalities, functions, and complexity related to interrogative sentences in English and Uzbek, focusing on explaining grammatical structures and cultural nuances.

2) Implementation of methodological strategies that create a communicative learning environment for students, highlighting active engagement with English interrogative sentence structures.

**METHOD AND METHODOLOGY**

Data collection. The data for this work originated from the following sources:

1) Literature: a review of academic journals, books, and research articles on the theme of interrogative sentences in English and Uzbek, their formations, functions, and teaching strategies.

2) Linguistic analyses: Working on linguistic areas, analyses investigating the grammatical and lexical characteristics of English and Uzbek interrogative sentences as well as comparisons with both languages, supported by the use of two tables that present the findings and facilitate a comprehensive understanding of the similarities and differences [10] between English and Uzbek interrogatives.

3) Suggested pedagogical approaches: Pedagogical science, as one of the forms of social consciousness, continues to grow, change, and improve. Teaching is the main activity of pedagogy. The organization of interaction between the teacher and the student, methods for increasing the effectiveness of classes, approaches to the pedagogical process are selected based on the conditions and requirements of each period, and new modern approaches are discovered. In modern pedagogy, the organization of education based on personality-oriented, competency-based, archeological, and heuristic technologies is recommended as one of the effective forms of practical activity. Study of scientific research articles and pedagogical guidelines suggesting innovative teaching strategies for EFL teachers to teach English interrogative sentences to Uzbek learners.

 Data analysis:The collected data were qualitatively analyzed in comparison with the following steps.

1) Literature review: Collecting information from scientific and literary scholarly sources to identify key items related to English and Uzbek interrogative sentences.

2) Comparative analysis: Comparing the word formations, pragmatic implicatures, and structures of English and Uzbek interrogative words in Tables 1 and 2 presents their differences and commonalities.

3) Pedagogical analysis: Assessing the effectiveness of communicative language teaching strategies in teaching interrogative sentences in Uzbek classes.

Pedagogical methodology is the study of principles, methods, forms, procedures of cognition, and the organization of pedagogical activity. These concepts are combined on two criteria. This encompasses a complex of tools for understanding pedagogical reality and technologies for realizing pedagogical reality. In our work, pedagogical analysis acquires the content of communicative language teaching, and on this basis, it can be proven that the phenomenon of interrogativity is one of the active communicative strategies in teaching English to Uzbek learners.

**RESEARCH RESULTS**

The reason for the development of any field in society is realized by finding answers to questions that arise as a result of people's interests in this field. Therefore, interrogative sentences are one of the main language units chosen by people belonging to different languages for the development of communication, that is, for the exchange of ideas between people (obtaining and transmitting information). In the comparative study of languages, each nation creates its own language system that transmits communication, which should define the world of people’s linguistic culture and be able to fully perceive the differences and similarities between languages.

Matluba Ortikova (2022) conducted comparative analysis, drawing between English and Uzbek interrogative units. She reveals isomorphic and allomorphic feature distinctions in both languages; for example, there are prepositions that can be used with *wh-s* that do not exist in Uzbek and postpositions that are observed in Uzbek, whereas there are no such types in English.

  Some examples are provided for clarity.

1. What are you looking for?

Nimani izlayapsiz?

What looking you?

1. What is it made of?

U nimadan tayyorlanadi?

It what made?

The Uzbek word type applies suffixes *-dan, -da* as inflectional suffixes and linking words like -*uchun, -sababli* referred to as word-final suffixes, while interrogative pronouns [27] are in English applied by linking words like -*about*, -*from*.

1. Where are you from?

Siz qayerdansiz?

You where from?

1. What about your action?

Sizning harakatingiz nima uchun

Your action what about?

As shown above, the morphological characteristics of wh-words in English and Uzbek vary from each other [27], and these morphological comparisons prove to grasp the learners navigating the differences and similarities of interrogative sentences in native and target languages. Comprehending these differences is fundamental for learners in preventing the application of English-formed structures to Uzbek interrogatives.

In the study by Sh. Ismailova, one of the most fundamental rules of linguodidactics, is the development of language competence associated with the need to use methods based on the idea of forming different approaches to enhance teaching interrogatives in EFL classes. She refers the for quick and easy learning of interrogatives and forming a reflex to structural composition it is advisable to use many "authentic" materials which include videos, voice recordings, and songs. Using this approach, teachers could recognize interesting and enjoyable dialogic environments for young people and, most importantly, guarantee effective lesson processes [34].

From a syntactic perspective, these can be viewed as replacements for interrogated noun phrases, determiners, adverbs, verbs, or phrases that convey time, place, manner, etc. While content interrogatives exist universally, there is significant diversity among languages regarding the specific content of individual interrogatives and the semantic differences that distinguish them. When second-language learners find connections between the vocabulary and grammar of their first and second languages, they can better understand the differences and similarities between the two [10]. Fareh and Bin Moussa (2022) recommend that EFL learners develop pragmalinguistic competence. They need to be more aware of the relationship between syntactic forms of sentences and their pragmatic functions in authentic discourse [46]. A comparison of grammatical structures in English and Uzbek interrogative sentences reveals the diversity and complexity of language systems. This distinction helps learners understand how language operates across different linguistic contexts, emphasizing variations in syntax and word order that impact meaning and communication. Recognizing these differences promotes cultural and linguistic awareness, which is vital to effective language learning and cross-cultural communication.

**Table 1.** Morphological differences of interrogatives in English and in Uzbek

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **English** | **Uzbek** | **English** | **Uzbek** |
| 1.what | nima (-ni, -ning, -da, -dan, -ga) | 5.when | qachon (-ga, -da, -dan) |
| 2.who | kim (-ni, -ning, -da, -dan, -ga) | 6. which | qaysi (-ni, -ning, -da, -dan, -ga) |
| 3.why | nima sabab (-ga, -da,  -nimadan, -nima uchun | 7. how | qanday |
| 4.where | qayer (-ni, -ning, -da, -dan, -ga) | 8. how many/much | qancha (-ga, -da, -dan, -ni) |

It can be observed from **Table 1** that when interrogatives are translated into English, certain interrogatives have consistent meanings; however, interrogatives in Uzbek can be used in a wide range of cases. One of the commonalities of interrogative words in English and Uzbek appears to contradict the contention that they are indefinite. Briefly, questions are in the sentences beginning with wh-words like in English *when, where, why, how many, how, which,* and *kim, nima, qachon, qayer, qaysi,qanday* in Uzbekare also called content questions that demand some substance or content in the response. From the morphological type, these words are called interrogative pronouns in both English and Uzbek [27]. In both languages, interrogative pronouns exist among pronoun groups to form special questions. In English, interrogative pronouns have two types of case categories, whereas in Uzbek, there are six categories of cases.

**In English**

*Nominal case:* What is your favorite dish?

*Genitive Case:* Which book is this?

*Accusative case:* Who do you call your boss?

**In Uzbek**

*Nominative case:* Kim? (Who) Sizning otangiz kim? / Who is your father?

*Genitive case:* Kimning. (whose): Kim**ning** otasi doctor? Whose is the father a doctor?

*Accusative case:* Kim**ni**? (whom) – Kim**ni** axmoq deb atayapsan? / Whom do you call ignorant?

*Dative case:* Kim**ga**? (to whom) Buni kim**ga** yubording. Whom did you send?

*Locative case:* kim**da**? (Who) Kim**da** ruchka bor? Who has got a pen?

*Ablative case:* Kim**dan**? (From whom) Buni kim**dan** olding? Whom did you get from?

As the Uzbek language is in a group of agglutinative, there are more words, including interrogative pronouns derived through the affixes. There is a similar type of variation among languages regarding the number of rows that occur among the paradigms of preforms [27].

As noted above, in English, only the interrogative component varies morphologically in three ways: who, whom, and whose. These grammatical features in unrelated languages are characterized by the fact that the Uzbek language is an agglutinative language and the English language is a fusion language. The main commonality in both languages is that interrogative sentences are so different from others in form, meaning, and textual neighbors that they permit a variety of specialized descriptions designed to account for them [16].

**Table 2.** Semantic formations of interrogatives in English and in Uzbek

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **English** | **Uzbek** |
| what | nima, nimasi, qanday, qanaqa, qancha, qaysi, qachon, nega, necha, qayerda, qani, ne, na |
| why | nima uchun, nega, nimaga, nechun, ne sabab, namuncha |
| when | qachon, qay vaqt, qaysi payt |
| which | qaysi, qay biri, qaysinisi, qaysilari |
| where | qayer, qay tomon, qayoq, qayon, qaylar, qani |

From linguistics, we know that different languages have different ways of forming wh-questions. There are other intriguing wh-properties that demonstrate variations in world languages, even if the primary divergence is between wh-movement and wh-in situ. Here are the general facts in English and Uzbek due to their semantic meaning: **Table 2** shows the differences of interrogatives in English and Uzbek due to their semantic meaning.

**Table 3.** Cases of reduplication of interrogative pronouns in English and in Uzbek

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **English** | **Uzbek** | **Example** |
| what | nima  nima-nima | - Nima sotib olding?  - Nima-nima sotib olding?  - Nimalar sotib olding?  -What did you buy?  -What-what did you buy?  - What-plr are did you buy? |
| who | kim  kim-kim | - Kim majlisga keldi?  -Majlisga kim-kim keldi?  - Kimlar keldi majlisga?  -Who came to the meeting?  -Who-who came to the meeting?  -Who-plr are came to the meeting? |
| where | qayer  qayer-qayer | -Qayerga bordingiz?  -Qayer-qayerga bordingiz?  -Qayerlarga bordingiz?  -Where did you go?  -Where -where did you go?  -Where-plr did you go? |

Semantically, interrogative (which question) words have a wide range of variants in Uzbek because they express formal, literary, and dialectic speech. Almost all interrogative wh-question have different form of the words: For example, there are six variants of the interrogative pronoun denoting reason in the Uzbek language: *nima uchun, nega, ne sababdan, nimaga, namuncha, nechuk*. In English, the wh-question is expressed as *why*.  In English, interrogative pronouns denote consistency and do not acquire the properties of variation. According to the morphological characteristics, the interrogative pronouns in Uzbek are different. The difference in underscoring the interrogative words (wh- questions) in English is expressed in interrogative sentences by keeping it stable word formation, while in Uzbek, interrogative pronouns are expressed in different word formations. Thus, interrogative words in Uzbek are well-developed in their morphological units. In both diverse languages, wh-words via interrogative sentences express different meanings, emotions, and the speaker's different attitudes towards reality, and the interrogative tone takes the main place.

**Table 3** presents the process of reduplication to express not only a question but also the meanings of plurality and indignity. It is notable that certain unique features exist in some languages that are not found in others. Uzbek also possesses unique features that set it apart. One example is the reduplication of Wh-words. In this case, question words such as *who, what*, and *where* are understood as non-interrogative terms through reduplication. Reduplicated wh-words in Uzbek *what – what* denotes sort of the things, *who-who* denotes group of the people, and *where-where* denotes type of the place, whereas that kind of word units are not acceptable to the morphology of English.

Another distinctive feature revealed in the study is that in Uzbek, pronouns such as Kim? (who?), Nima? (what?), and Qayer? (where?) exhibits multiple forms, a feature that is absent in English. Unlike English wh-words, Uzbek wh-words can incorporate the plural suffix "lar" and can exist in both singular and plural forms. When wh-words are pluralized in Uzbek, they can lead to ambiguity. Conversely, in English, there is no morphological distinction between singular and plural wh-words, whereas in Table 3, the pair form of Wh-words can also donate the meaning of plurality in Uzbek. The plural form of the affix-lar (plural suffix “s”) can also be applied to specific wh-words that possess noun characteristics, providing both lexical meaning and plurality. In contrast, English wh-words do not use the plural suffix. To convey this meaning, verbs or auxiliary verbs are typically used in plural forms, as illustrated in the examples. These translations show syntactical differences and provide insight into the unique characteristics of English and Uzbek.

It can be seen from the table that grammatical and lexical expressions of the same concept can differ in different languages. If a certain concept is expressed in Uzbek with one word, it can sometimes be stylistically expressed in English using a word, phrase, or even a completely different sentence. The belonging of languages to different families and language groups creates grammatical problems in translations.

To form questions with interrogative words, learners should take into account that Uzbek words do not align directly with English interrogative components. Challenges may arise from unfamiliarity with the meanings of interrogative words in the second language or cultural nuances embedded in the local language [10]. In many situations, errors in translating interrogative sentences can be found when Uzbek learners attempt to translate their first language into a foreign language using Uzbek grammar, while not being aware of the grammar of English. When learners rehearse literal word-to-word translation from native to foreign language, it can result in awkward and nonsensical sentences in English.

**DISCUSSION**

Strategy is defined as teachers' efforts in the learning process to achieve the goals of learning. In language teaching, this strategy is one of the ways that teachers use teaching materials. There are many kinds of teacher strategies in their teaching, depending on what information or skills the teacher is trying to convey [12].

The grammar-based approach is an important part of language learning, because it helps students understand language rules and allows them to create correct and meaningful sentences.  In the 21st century, Krashen's distinction between language acquisition and language learning has been contested, formal grammar teaching has made a comeback, and the question is no longer *whether* to teach grammar but *how* to teach it [5].  Although many teachers do not agree to teach grammar while teaching foreign languages, there is agreement that teaching grammar is effective in EFL learners’ classes. In learning grammar, students are usually taught phrases, clauses, sentences, and question sentences [29]. Grammar deals with a sentence that we combine in a proper way and a proper meaning in order to be a good sentence with meaning and usage [29]. Therefore, a grammar-based approach is important for learners to make proper questions and differentiate the morphology of English and Uzbek languages, including the construction of interrogative and relative sentences in both languages. In this way, [20] suggested a Grammar-Translation Method that focuses on developing students' appreciation of the target language's literature and teaching the language. Students are presented with target-language reading passages and answer questions that follow [20].

It would be easy for learners to construct interrogative sentences in social and cultural contexts. Teachers’ awareness of minority groups’ different cultures and their openness and tolerance can also be listed as the professional development requirements of today’s language teachers [14]. This could include identifying best practices for integrating students’ cultural experiences into the curriculum, developing teaching strategies that recognize and value diversity, and fostering both intercultural and culturally responsive learning environments [1]. When teaching a foreign language, it is good to know the language and culture to better understand the true/intended meaning of the speakers involved in a conversation [41].

Some advice given by other researchers found in Simpson’s article like “receiving shy students in regular office hours” suggested by Tang and Absalom; “Providing supportive environment for risk-taking, hypothesis testing and providing feedback phrases as encouragement rather than criticism” advised by Mark; “Writing instruction on the board, asking students the questions directly not waiting for volunteers, incorporating the Western culture into their lessons to teach language but also to raise the students’ awareness of Western educational and societal ideals in a non-confrontational way” advised by Wong [41]. It has long been said that when teaching a foreign language, its culture is automatically integrated into its introduction. “Language and culture have a complex, homologous relationship. Language is intertwined with culture [41]. If the two cultures are not integrated well, it can cause communication to break down, and frustrate both parties during classroom time [41]. Since, communicative approaches like “Role play” is one of the crucial points in classroom activity.

 Role-play is where students are encouraged to use language both imaginatively and creatively.  Drama is similarly useful for directly involving students in cross-cultural misunderstanding.  In this technique, selected members act out a misinterpretation of something that happens in the target culture in a series of short scenes and is clarified in the final scene via the authentic materials.

Authentic materials are materials that differ from typical materials used in classes. They are more stimulating, engaging, and have different learning styles for learners aimed at developing all language skills and critical thinking abilities will be used. They are images, written or spoken language related for pedagogical purposes. Authentic materials are newspapers, magazines, periodicals, brochures, films, televisions sometimes may differ from educational materials and others. If we use authentic materials in classes we introduce our readers to the real language.

Authentic materials can help students to develop cross-cultural insights. Specifically, inquiry-based authentic materials not only provide an expanded knowledge of the target culture but also increase student motivation and attempt by making learning fun and engaging, while encouraging students to use the situational language with interrogative content that will help them cultivate pragmatics.

One of the suggested techniques is to enhance the teaching English interrogative sentences, which is considered a key strategy for promoting students’ critical thinking. Conversely, a major problem teachers usually face in the Uzbek EFL classroom is that students seem to be passive in interactive activities and once teachers ask a question, only one or two students raise their hands. By incorporating Socrates’ method into the classroom, students are encouraged to effectively develop their critical thinking skills in both languages.

Teaching interrogatives in Uzbek classes, Socrates’ method of questioning is an indelibly powerful teaching approach to challenge learners’ assumptions, exposing them to contradictions that finally lead to new knowledge and wisdom. Based on the Socratic model, this questioning technique helps students not only put wh-questions appropriately but also think critically by focusing explicitly on the process of thinking. Cox and Griffith (2007), the UK based educational trainers, also argue that integrating Socratic questioning techniques in the classroom is essential to developing active and independent learners [45].

Careful and structured questioning in the classroom can accomplish several educational objectives: promoting active and learner-focused education, assisting students in building their understanding, fostering the development of problem-solving abilities in students, and enhancing the durability of knowledge retention over time.

**CONCLUSION**

From the observed analysis above, the morphological and syntactic-semantic differences between the languages considered are significantly greater than similarities. Although the grammatical categories of Uzbek are very close to those of English wh-words, there are certain notable cases that we have learned in this thesis. In Uzbek EFL classes, interrogative sentence teaching involves recognizing the critical role of grammar in language learning. When not comprehended, grammar can hinder the learners’ progress. Language learning fosters cross-cultural connections as a communication medium. Teachers play a crucial role by employing grammatical knowledge to guide students in sentence analysis and comprehension.

The effective teaching of English interrogative sentences requires educators to adopt methodological strategies tailored to address grammar-related challenges. Incorporating cultural awareness into teaching methodologies empowers students to play an active role in their learning processes, fostering confidence and proficiency in forming interrogative sentences. Creating a communicative environment enables students to engage in language, thereby promoting fluency and comprehension. Teaching English interrogative sentences involves paying attention to linguistic aspects, such as syntactic structures and cultural nuances.

Integrating these factors into pedagogical strategies is crucial for effective and engaging in learning language. The goal is to equip learners with not only linguistic skills, but also the cultural competence needed for effective communication. As educators refine their approach, they aim to provide learners with tools for successful language acquisition and cultural understanding. Considering all the above findings, it can be understood that comparative analysis plays an important role in language learning, as different languages have their own unicals and universals, such as English and Uzbek.

In this article, the issue of mastering interrogatives based on a linguistic and communicative approach for those studying English as a foreign language was deeply analyzed. The following main scientific results were obtained during the research:

It has been proven that interrogativity is not only a set of grammatical categories, but also an important speech phenomenon that forms the pragmatic basis of communication. It has been established that its various forms should be considered as a separate competency in language learning.

The theoretical aspects of the effectiveness of the communicative approach in language teaching were discussed. Especially when teaching English language learning activities through comparing sentence structures in English and Uzbek, real-life situations, and interactive exercises, students' speech activity increases, they strive to express independent thoughts, and significantly increase their English literacy.
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