

UO'K: 811.111:808.5+811.512.133:808.5

SOCIOPRAGMATIC FEATURES OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Raxmonova Dilnavoz Shavqiddinovna,

Renaissance University of Education

Senior Lecturer of the Department of Foreign Philology

Email: rakhmonova1989@gmail.com

Annotation. Language functions not only as a means of communication but also as a tool for expressing social relations and speaker intentions. This study investigates the sociopragmatic features of academic discourse, focusing on the interaction between linguistic choices and social factors. The research provides a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek academic discourse, identifying both universal principles and culture-specific characteristics. Using theoretical and discourse analysis, including examples from literary texts, the study demonstrates how social context, politeness strategies, and communicative norms influence academic communication. The findings reveal that while both languages share core features such as objectivity, logical coherence, and terminological precision, their realization differs due to sociocultural and communicative traditions.

Keywords: sociopragmatics, academic discourse, English language, Uzbek language, communication, pragmatics, discourse analysis.

Annotatsiya. Til insoniyat jamiyatining ajralmas qismi bo'lib, nafaqat muloqot vositasi, balki ijtimoiy munosabatlarni ifodalash quroli ham hisoblanadi. Ushbu tadqiqot akademik nutqning sotsiopragmatik xususiyatlarini o'rganishga bag'ishlangan bo'lib, unda til birliklari va ijtimoiy omillar o'rtasidagi o'zaro bog'liqlik tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda ingliz va o'zbek akademik nutqi qiyosiy jihatdan o'rganilib, ularning umumiy hamda milliy o'ziga xos xususiyatlari aniqlanadi. Nazariy va diskursiv tahlil asosida, jumladan, badiiy matnlar misolida, ijtimoiy muhit, nutqiy strategiyalar va kommunikativ me'yorlarning akademik nutqqa ta'siri yoritiladi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, har ikki tilda obyektivlik, mantiqiylik va terminologik aniqlik umumiy xususiyat bo'lsa-da, ularning ifodalanishi sotsiokulturologik omillar bilan belgilanadi.

Kalit so'zlar: sotsiopragmatika, akademik nutq, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, muloqot, pragmatika, diskurs tahlili.

Аннотация. Язык является неотъемлемой частью человеческого общества и выступает не только средством коммуникации, но и инструментом выражения социальных отношений и намерений говорящего. В данном исследовании рассматриваются социопрагматические особенности академического дискурса с акцентом на взаимодействие языковых средств и социальных факторов. Проводится сравнительный анализ английского и узбекского академического дискурса с выявлением как универсальных, так и национально-специфических характеристик. На основе теоретического и дискурсивного анализа, включая примеры из художественных текстов, показано влияние социального контекста, коммуникативных стратегий и норм на формирование академической речи. Результаты исследования свидетельствуют о том, что, несмотря на общие принципы объективности, логичности и терминологической точности, способы их реализации обусловлены социокультурными особенностями.

Ключевые слова: социопрагматика, академический дискурс, английский язык, узбекский язык, коммуникация, прагматика, дискурсивный анализ.

Introduction. Language is an integral component of human society, serving not only as a medium of communication but also as a mechanism for expressing social relationships [4]. In communication, linguistic units convey not only semantic meaning

but also the speaker's intention, social identity, and attitude toward the interlocutor [11]. From this perspective, sociopragmatics has emerged as a significant branch of linguistics.

Sociopragmatics examines how speech is shaped under the influence of social factors such as age, gender, profession, social status, and cultural norms [7]. The same idea may be expressed differently depending on context for example, in informal versus formal interaction [3]. Therefore, speech is context-dependent.

This field lies at the intersection of pragmatics and sociolinguistics. Pragmatics studies language use in context [10], while sociolinguistics explores the relationship between language and society [5]. Sociopragmatics focuses on how speech adapts to social contexts. In this regard, speech acts such as requests, commands, and advice play a central role, as each utterance performs a communicative function [8].

Academic discourse, as a product of scientific thinking, is characterized by logical structure, argumentation, and clarity [6]. It prioritizes precision and objectivity, while emotional expression is minimized.

Methods. This study adopts a qualitative and comparative methodology. It is based on theoretical analysis and discourse analysis of English and Uzbek academic texts. Additionally, examples from *Jane Eyre* [12] are analyzed to explore sociopragmatic features in literary discourse.

The research focuses on key categories such as formality, objectivity, politeness strategies, and social distance. Comparative analysis is used to identify similarities and differences between English and Uzbek academic discourse [9].

Results.

Core Features of Academic Discourse

The analysis shows that academic discourse in both languages demonstrates:

1. Formality, characterized by the absence of subjective evaluation [6];
2. Logical coherence, where ideas are connected through cause-and-effect relations [9];
3. Terminological precision, ensuring clarity and consistency [4];
4. Objectivity, focusing on facts rather than personal opinions [11].

Sociopragmatic Differences

Despite these similarities, differences emerge: English academic discourse tends to use impersonal constructions and passive voice to ensure objectivity [6]. Statements are often direct and explicit.

In contrast, Uzbek academic discourse reflects national communicative traditions, incorporating politeness and respect markers. Hedging strategies also differ: English uses forms such as "it appears" or "it is considered" [7], while Uzbek employs equivalents like "mumkin" or "deb hisoblanadi."

Literary Discourse Analysis

The analysis of *Jane Eyre* [12] reveals that:

- First-person narration enhances subjectivity but maintains logical organization;

- Internal monologues demonstrate reflective and analytical thinking;
- Emotional expression is controlled and balanced with rational evaluation.

These features reflect a sociopragmatic tendency in English discourse toward individual expression combined with communicative restraint [3].

Discussion. The findings demonstrate that academic discourse is not merely a neutral vehicle of knowledge transmission, but a complex communicative system shaped by the interaction of linguistic structures and sociocultural norms. Although universal principles such as objectivity, coherence, and logical argumentation are common to both English and Uzbek academic traditions, their realization is mediated by language-specific and culture-bound conventions.

In English academic discourse, objectivity is predominantly achieved through formal grammatical and stylistic mechanisms. These include the frequent use of passive constructions, nominalization, hedging devices (e.g., *may*, *might*, *suggests*), and impersonal expressions that minimize the author's presence and foreground the research itself. Such strategies contribute to the construction of an epistemically distanced and institutionally standardized voice, which is considered a hallmark of international scientific communication.

In contrast, Uzbek academic discourse, while maintaining logical rigor and clarity, tends to integrate sociocultural values such as respect, modesty, and interpersonal sensitivity. This is reflected in the use of politeness markers, honorific forms, and more explicit authorial positioning, which do not necessarily undermine objectivity but rather recontextualize it within a culturally embedded communicative framework. The presence of such elements indicates that academic writing in Uzbek operates not only within a cognitive-scientific paradigm but also within an ethical-pragmatic one.

Sociopragmatic factors—including social distance, communicative intention, status relations, and cultural expectations—play a decisive role in shaping discourse patterns in both languages. For instance, indirectness and mitigation strategies are more systematically employed in Uzbek discourse to preserve social harmony and avoid face-threatening acts, whereas English discourse tends to prioritize clarity and argumentative precision, sometimes at the expense of interpersonal nuance.

Moreover, the analysis confirms that literary texts constitute a rich empirical basis for sociopragmatic investigation. They provide insight into authentic language use, revealing how pragmatic norms are enacted in context-dependent communication. Through literary discourse, it becomes possible to observe the interplay between linguistic choice, cultural meaning, and communicative intent in a more nuanced and dynamic manner.

Conclusion. In conclusion, academic discourse represents a highly structured and norm-governed form of communication grounded in scientific reasoning and epistemological principles. Despite sharing core universal features such as coherence,

precision, and argumentativity, English and Uzbek academic discourses diverge significantly in their sociopragmatic realization.

English academic discourse is characterized by a strong orientation toward impersonality, structural objectivity, and standardized rhetorical conventions, aligning with global academic norms. Uzbek academic discourse, on the other hand, preserves culturally significant elements such as politeness, respect, and relational sensitivity, reflecting the broader sociocultural context in which it operates.

These distinctions underscore the critical role of sociopragmatic factors in shaping not only the form but also the function of academic communication. Consequently, effective participation in international academic environments requires not only linguistic competence but also sociopragmatic awareness. Understanding these differences contributes to more accurate cross-cultural interpretation, more effective academic writing, and the development of inclusive models of scholarly communication.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. 1962. *How to do things with words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., and Kasper, G. 1989. *Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and apologies*. Ablex Publishing.
3. Brown, P., and Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press. pp.70-75.
4. Cutting, J. 2002. *Pragmatics and discourse: A resource book for students*. Routledge, pp. 1–25.
5. Holmes, J. 2013. *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (4th ed.). Routledge, pp. 9–35.
6. Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum, pp. 45–70.
7. Leech, G. 1983. *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman, pp. 10–20.
8. Searle, J. R. 1979. *Expression and meaning: Studies in the theory of speech acts*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Swales, J. M. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press, pp. 58–85.
10. Thomas, J. 1995. *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman, pp. 1–30.
11. Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press, pp. 3–20.
12. Brontë, C. 1847. *Jane Eyre*. Smith, Elder and Co.
13. Qodiriy, A. (1929). *Mehrobdan chayon*. Toshkent: O‘zbekiston davlat nashriyoti.