American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research

Vol. 7 Issue 3 | **pp.** 134-141 | **ISSN:** 2690-9626
Available online @ https://globalresearchnetwork.us/index.php/ajshr

Article

Comparative Analysis of Grammatical Structures of Different Languages

Kodirova Zebo Abdigaffarovna[1], Atavullaeva Saida Jumabekmuradovna[2]

1. Samarkand State University named after Sharaf Rashidov Institute of Languages and Culture of the Peoples of Central Asia 140104, Samarkand, University Boulevard, 15 Department of Russian Language Associate Professor *Correspondence: kadirovazebiniso76@gmail.com
2. Samarkand State University named after Sharaf Rashidov Institute of Languages and Culture of the Peoples of Central Asia 140104, Samarkand, University Boulevard, 15 Department of Russian Language Associate Professor *Correspondence: saidaatavullaeva@gmail.com

Citation: Abdigaffarovna K. Z., Jumabekmuradovna A. S. Comparative Analysis of Grammatical Structures of Different Languages. American Journal of Social and Humanitarian Research 2026, 7(3), 134-141

Received: 23rd Des 2026
Revised: 06th Jan 2026
Accepted: 13th Feb 2026
Published: 14rd Mar 2026

Copyright: © 2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Abstract: This article is devoted to the study of the grammatical structures of languages belonging to different language families based on the methodology of comparative linguistics. In the framework of the article, word order, verb tense system, morphological types, conjugation categories and the structure of parts of speech are taken as examples and a comparative analysis is carried out. The article uses comparative-historical and typological methods to identify common and specific grammatical features between languages. It is shown that the Uzbek language belongs to the agglutinative type, and the grammatical meaning is expressed through special suffixes that are clearly distinguished from each other. It is analyzed that the Russian language belongs to the inflectional type and that one suffix can express several grammatical meanings at the same time. It is determined that the English language, as an analytical language, expresses grammatical meaning mainly through word order and auxiliary words. It is shown that the Arabic language is based on the three-letter root system characteristic of Semitic languages. The study also examines the typological classification of word order in detail: the use of the SOV (Owner-Complement-Partitive) order in Uzbek, SVO (Owner-Partitive-Complement) in English, and VSO (Partitive-Owner-Complement) in Arabic as the main pattern is studied in comparison. In addition, the article presents complete comparative tables on the conjugation system, grammatical gender category, definite/indefinite article, verb tenses and aspect categories, as well as negative, interrogative and subordinate clause structures.

Keywords: comparative linguistics, grammatical structure, contrastive analysis, typology, word order, morphology, syntax.

1. Introduction

The comparative analysis of grammatical structures of different languages is one of the most important directions in modern linguistics. Comparative grammar analysis in linguistics serves not only to identify commonalities and differences between languages, but also plays a significant role in effectively organizing the processes of language learning, translation, and language teaching.

As one of the key branches of linguistics, comparative grammar aims to reveal the common and distinctive features of various languages by comparing their structures. Throughout

human history, more than 7,000 languages have existed, each possessing its own unique grammatical system. The comparative study of these languages holds immense value not only for theoretical linguistics, but also for applied linguistics - particularly for language teaching methodology[1].

The scientific foundations of comparative grammar were established in the 19th century by scholars such as Franz Bopp, Rasmus Rask, and Jakob Grimm. Subsequently, the contrastive analysis theory developed by Charles Fries and Robert Lado began to serve as the methodological basis for teaching foreign languages. In recent decades, this theory has been enriched by new linguistic theories - Universal Grammar and Cross-linguistic Typology.

The relevance of this research lies in the fact that in the process of teaching English, Russian, and other foreign languages in Uzbekistan, learners frequently make errors due to the interference of their native language grammar. Comparative grammatical analysis is a necessary methodological tool for understanding the nature of these errors and predicting them in advance[2].

The main objective of this research is to conduct a comparative analysis of the grammatical structures of languages belonging to different language families and to develop practical conclusions for the practice of teachers.

- To achieve this goal, the following tasks were identified:
- To analyze the main methodological approaches in comparative linguistics
- To compare the grammatical structures of Uzbek, Russian, English, and Arabic according to key parameters
- To identify differences and commonalities in word order, morphology, and syntax
- To classify the grammatical causes of interference errors
- To develop practical recommendations based on contrastive analysis for teachers

Contemporary research in the field of comparative grammar covers several major directions. The first direction is typological linguistics, which classifies languages based on their structural features. The theory of typological universals proposed by Greenberg made it possible to classify languages according to word order, morphological type, and other parameters.

The second important direction is the theory of Universal Grammar developed by Noam Chomsky . According to this theory, deep grammatical structures common to all human languages exist, determined by the biological aspects of the human mind. This approach provided new impetus for studying universal features across languages[3,4]

The third direction is contrastive analysis, widely applied in applied linguistics (Lado, Fries,). This approach enables the identification in advance of grammatical phenomena that may be difficult for learners by systematically comparing two languages. Subsequent research (Corder, Selinker) enriched this theory with error analysis and interlanguage theory[5].

Significant contributions to the comparative study of Uzbek grammatical structure were made by Fitrat, Abdurauf Fitrat , Shoabdurahmonov, and others. Contemporary research makes extensive use of the possibilities of computational linguistics and corpus linguistics[6,7,8,9].

2. Research Methodology

This research employed several complementary methods. Comparative-historical and synchronic comparison methods were chosen as the primary methods. Through these methods, both the current state of languages and their historical development paths were taken into account.

3. Research languages

Four languages were selected for analysis: Uzbek (Turkic family, Altaic macro-family), Russian (Slavic family, Indo-European macro-family), English (Germanic family, Indo-European macro-family), and Arabic (Semitic family, Afro-Asiatic macro-family). The membership of these languages in different families allows for a comprehensive typological analysis of grammatical structures.

4. Result

The comparative analysis was conducted according to the following main parameters:

- Morphological type (agglutinative, inflectional, isolating, incorporative)
- Word order typology (SOV, SVO, VSO, and others)
- Case system and features of its use
- Verb tenses and aspect categories
- Definiteness/indefiniteness category (article system)
- Agreement between adjective and noun (congruence)

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF GRAMMATICAL STRUCTURES

Morphological typology

Morphology studies the system of word formation and inflection in a language. The languages studied differ fundamentally in morphological terms. Uzbek belongs to the agglutinative type, in which grammatical meaning is expressed through special suffixes that are clearly separated from one another. For example, the word "o'qituvchilarimizdan" (from our teachers) vividly illustrates the agglutinative nature of Uzbek. [10]

Russian belongs to the inflectional type, where grammatical meaning is often conveyed through flexions (variable suffixes) that simultaneously express several categories. Although English historically derived from an inflectional language, today it predominantly exhibits analytic language features. Arabic is based on the unique trilateral root system characteristic of Semitic languages.

Table 1. Morphological comparison of the languages studied.

No.	Parameter	Uzbek	Russian	English	Arabic
1	Morphological type	Agglutinativ	Flektiv	Analitik	Flektiv/Introflektiv
2	Word order	SOV	Erkin (SVO asosiy)	SVO (qat'iy)	VSO/SVO
3	Number of cases	6 kelishik	6 kelishik	Yo‘q (pronoun)	3 kelishik (i'rob)
4	Verb Tenses	3 asosiy	3 zamon, aspekt	12+ zamon-aspekt	3 asosiy
5	article	Yo‘q	Yo‘q	a, an, the	Al- (aniqlik)
6	Grammatical gender	Yo‘q	3 rod	Yo‘q	2 rod
7	Congruence	Cheklangan	Keng	Cheklangan	Keng

Comparative Analysis of Morphological Structures

Table 2. Word formation and affixation system.

No.	Feature	Uzbek (Agglutinative)	English (Analytic)	Russian (Inflectional)
1	Word formation	Suffikslar, qo‘shma so‘zlar, o‘zlashmalar	Suffiks/prefix, conversion, compounding	Suffiks/prefix, qo‘shma so‘zlar, o‘zlashmalar
2	Affixation	Ko‘plab suffikslar, har bir morfema aniq ma’no beradi	Cheklangan infleksiya, ko‘proq derivatsiya	Ko‘p ma’noli affikslar, flektiv
3	Example (derivation)	kitob+lar+imiz+dan (kitoblarimizdan)	happiness (happy + -ness)	писатель (писать + -ель)
4	Example (inflection)	o‘qituvchi+lar+imiz+ga	cats, walked	столы, писал

Table 3. Case system.

Feature	Uzbek	English	Russian
Gender	6 ta asosiy kelishik (suffixlar orqali)	Minimal (asosan egalik va olmoshlar)	6 ta grammatik kelishik (suffixlar orqali)
Number	kitob+ni, uy+ga	John's, him	стол, стола, столу, столом, столе

Table 4. Grammatical categories: gender, number, definiteness.

Feature	Uzbek	English	Russian
Gender	Yo‘q	Olmoshlarda (he/she/it)	Uch jins: erkak, ayol, o‘rta
Number	-lar/-lar suffiksi	-s/-es, irregular	Suffixlar, ba’zan ildiz o‘zgaradi
Definiteness	Maqola yo‘q, kontekst orqali	the, a/an	Maqola yo‘q, kontekst orqali

Examples:
Uzbek: bola (child), bolalar (children)
English: cat/cats, child/children
Russian: stol/stoly, kniga/knigi

Word order typology

Word order is one of the most important typological features of languages. According to cross-linguistic research conducted by Greenberg (1963), approximately 45% of world languages use SOV order, 42% use SVO order, and 9% use VSO order.

Uzbek strictly uses SOV (Subject-Object-Verb) order: "Men kitob o'qiyman" (I a-book read). This order is characteristic of Turkic languages, and the predicate always appears at the end of the sentence. In contrast, English strictly maintains SVO order, and deviation from this order leads to grammatical errors.

Russian uses word order relatively freely, but the basic order is SVO. Changes in word order alter the communicative structure (information structure) of the text. In Arabic, VSO order is considered traditional, although SVO has become widespread in modern usage.

Case categories

The case category expresses the syntactic relationship of a noun with other words. Uzbek has 6 cases: nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, locative, and ablative. These cases are expressed through agglutinative suffixes, and the boundaries between them are clear[11,12].

Russian also has 6 cases (nominative, genitive, dative, accusative, instrumental, prepositional), but they are expressed through inflectional changes and vary depending on the gender, number, and declension type of the noun. In English, noun cases are practically absent, and syntactic relationships are expressed through word order and prepositions. This difference creates both an opportunity (grammatical simplicity) and a challenge (new means of expression) for Uzbek and Russian-speaking learners of English.

Verb and tense category

The verb system is an area where some of the greatest differences between languages are observed. English has a complex system of tense-aspect categories comprising more than 12 tense-aspect forms. Through these forms, not only the time of an action, but also its duration, completion, and relation are expressed.

The Uzbek verb tense system is comparatively simpler: past, present, and future tense are the main tenses. The aspect category is not grammaticalized as in English, but can be expressed through lexical means[13,14]. In Russian, the aspect (perfective/imperfective) category carries great grammatical importance and is one of the phenomena most difficult to master for Uzbek-speaking learners.

Table 5. Typical errors arising from uzbek language interference.

No.	Grammatical Phenomenon	Uzbek Interference (in English)	Uzbek Interference (in Russian)
1	Word Order	Placing the predicate at the end (e.g., I book read)	Confusing word order with information structure
2	Article	Omitting the article (e.g., I see cat)	Errors in congruence
3	Tense-Aspect	Simplifying complex tenses	Errors in aspect category
4	Case	Incorrect use of prepositions	Errors in case suffixes
5	Grammatical Gender	None (no interference)	Errors in gender agreement

Table 6. Verb tense and aspect system.

Language	Tense System	Aspect System	Examples
Uzbek	Via suffixes: present, past, future	Suffixes and auxiliary verbs	Men yozaman, Men yozdim
English	12 tenses (auxiliary verbs)	Progressive, perfect, etc.	I am reading, I have read

Russian	3 tenses	Perfective / Imperfective	pisat' / napisat'

Table 7. Negation structure.

Language	Negation Form	Double Negation	Example
Uzbek	ma/mas, emas	Grammar	Men bilmayman.
English	not (with auxiliary)	No	I do not know.
Russian	ne (before verb)	Grammar	Ya ne znayu.

Table 8. Interrogative sentences.

No.	Language	Yes/No Questions	Wh-Questions	Example
1	Uzbek	"mi" particle	Wh-word in place	Siz kelyapsizmi?
2	English	Inversion	Wh-word fronted	Are you coming? What are you doing?
3	Russian	Intonation / "li"	Wh-word fronted	Ty idyosh'? Chto ty delayesh'?

Table 9. Subordinate clauses.

Language	Subordination Strategy	Example
Uzbek	Participial/converbial, sometimes conjunctions	U kelganidan so'ng, men ketdim. (After he came, I left.)
English	Conjunctions (that, if, etc.)	I know that she is coming.
Russian	Conjunctions (chto, chtoby, etc.)	Ya znayu, chto ona pridet.

Table 10. Morphological and syntactic features.

Feature	Uzbek	English	Russian
Typology	Agglutinativ	Analytic	Flektiv
Word Order	SOV	SVO	SVO (moslashuvchan)
Cases	6 ta	Minimal	6 ta
Gender	Yo‘q	In pronouns	Uch jins

Number	-lar/-lar	-s/-es	Suffixlar
Definiteness	Maqola yoʻq	the, a/an	Maqola yoʻq
Tense/Aspect	Suffikslar	Auxiliary verbs	Aspekt juftliklari
Negation	ma/mas, emas	not	не
Questions	"mi" partikulasi	Inversion	Intonatsiya/"ли"
Subordinate Clauses	Participial/converbial	Conjunctions	Bogʻlovchilar

5. Discussion

The results obtained allow us to draw a number of important conclusions for teaching practice. First and foremost, differences in the morphological type of languages create varying levels of difficulty for learners. When transitioning from agglutinative Uzbek to inflectional Russian, learners encounter significant difficulties in the areas of case and gender agreement.

Second, word order differences cause syntactic errors. Learners accustomed to SOV order in Uzbek tend to place the predicate at the end of the sentence in English. To overcome this problem, the targeted use of a system of contrastive exercises is considered effective[15].

Third, differences in the number and nature of grammatical categories are significant. The English article system and the Russian grammatical gender category are phenomena absent in Uzbek, and are conceptually complex for learners. Teachers should spend more time and resources on teaching these categories.

Teaching strategies based on contrastive analysis

Based on the research results, the following practical strategies are recommended:

- At the start of lessons, presenting grammatical phenomena comparatively between the native language and the target language -this helps learners clearly understand the difference
- Teaching "dangerous similarities" (false friends) and new concepts separately
- Predicting interference errors in advance and creating a system of preventive exercises
- Using the grammar-translation method purposefully for harmful parallel constructions
- Distinguishing between genetic and typological causes when analyzing errors

6. Conlusion

The grammatical structures of Uzbek, English, and Russian differ fundamentally from a typological standpoint. Uzbek is agglutinative, with grammatical meaning expressed through clear suffixes. Russian is inflectional, with a single affix expressing multiple grammatical meanings and a complex case and gender system. English is analytic, with grammatical meaning expressed primarily through word order and auxiliary words. These differences are of great importance in determining methodological approaches in language learning and teaching. The results of comparative analysis serve to prevent errors by language learners and to improve the effectiveness of translation and language teaching.

This research arrived at a number of important conclusions through comparative analysis of the grammatical structures of Uzbek, Russian, English, and Arabic.

First, morphological differences between language families (agglutinative, inflectional, analytic) constitute the main source of grammatical complexity.

Second, word order typology (SOV, SVO, VSO) serves as one of the most reliable indicators for predicting syntactic errors.

Third, asymmetries in the number and nature of grammatical categories -that is, categories present in one language but absent in another (the English article, Russian grammatical gender, Uzbek agglutinative suffixes) -represent the most important area to which teachers must pay attention. Fourth, contrastive analysis methodology serves as an effective tool for teachers in predicting errors and creating a targeted system of exercises.

REFERENCES

[1] Sh. Shoabdurahmonov et al., Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O‘qituvchi, 1980.

[2] T. Mirzayev, O‘zbek tili grammatikasi: morfologiya va sintaksis. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 2005.

[3] B. Yo‘ldoshev, Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili: leksikologiya va stilistika. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O‘zbekiston, 2008.

[4] H. Ne‘matov and O. Bozorov, Til va nutq. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: O‘qituvchi, 1993.

[5] E. Begmatov and N. Nazar’yanova, O‘zbek tilining qiyosiy grammatikasi. Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Fan, 1994.

[6] A. Rasulov, Qiyosiy tipologik tilshunoslik. Samarkand, Uzbekistan: SamDU, 2010.

[7] V. V. Vinogradov, The Russian Language: A Grammatical Study of the Word. Moscow, USSR: Vysshaya Shkola, 1972.

[8] A. A. Reformatsky, Introduction to Linguistics. Moscow, Russia: Aspekt Press, 1996.

[9] V. N. Yartseva, Ed., Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary. Moscow, USSR: Sovetskaya Entsiklopediya, 1990.

[10] [G. A. Zolotova, Communicative Grammar of the Russian Language. Moscow, Russia: MGU, 2004.

[11] N. Chomsky, Aspects of the Theory of Syntax. Cambridge, MA, USA: MIT Press, 1965.

[12] B. Comrie, Language Universals and Linguistic Typology, 2nd ed. Oxford, UK: Blackwell, 1989.

[13] L. J. Whaley, Introduction to Typology: The Unity and Diversity of Language. Thousand Oaks, CA, USA: SAGE Publications, 1997.

[14] S. P. Corder, “The significance of learner’s errors,” International Review of Applied Linguistics, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 161–170, 1967.

[15] L. Selinker, “Interlanguage,” International Review of Applied Linguistics, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 209–231, 1972.