

EXTRALINGUISTIC FACTORS IN CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNICATION: PRAGMATIC AND LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS

Ergasheva Xayriniso Abdurasul qizi,

*Trainee Teacher at Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
Samarkand, Uzbekistan*

E-mail: xayrinisoergasheva4@gmail.com

Annotation. *This article examines extralinguistic factors within cross-cultural communication. Special attention is given to gestures, silence, politeness, and facial expressions. The study analyzes their pragmatic and linguocultural meanings. Different cultures interpret nonverbal communication differently. Misunderstandings often appear during intercultural interaction. The article discusses communicative behavior in various social situations. Real communicative examples are analyzed pragmatically. The research highlights cultural influence on interpersonal communication. The findings reveal the importance of extralinguistic factors in effective interaction.*

Keywords: *cross-cultural communication, pragmatics, linguoculturology, discourse, nonverbal communication, politeness, communicative behavior.*

Annotatsiya. *Mazkur maqolada madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiyadagi ekstralingvistik omillar tahlil qilinadi. Asosiy e'tibor imo-ishora, sukut va mimik vositalarga qaratiladi. Tadqiqot ularning pragmatik va lingvokulturologik ma'nosini yoritadi. Turli madaniyatlarda noverbal vositalar turlicha talqin qilinadi. Shu sababli kommunikativ tushunmovchiliklar yuzaga keladi. Maqolada real kommunikativ vaziyatlar pragmatik jihatdan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot madaniyatning muloqotga ta'sirini ko'rsatadi. Natijalar samarali kommunikatsiyada ekstralingvistik omillar muhimligini tasdiqlaydi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiya, pragmatika, lingvokulturologiya, diskurs, noverbal kommunikatsiya, kommunikativ xulq, pragmatik ma'no.*

Аннотация. *В статье рассматриваются экстралингвистические факторы межкультурной коммуникации. Особое внимание уделяется жестам, молчанию и мимике. Исследование анализирует их прагматические и лингвокультурологические значения. Разные культуры по-разному интерпретируют невербальное общение. Это нередко вызывает коммуникативные недоразумения. В статье прагматически анализируются реальные коммуникативные ситуации. Исследование показывает влияние культуры на межличностное общение. Полученные результаты подтверждают значимость экстралингвистических факторов в эффективной коммуникации.*

Ключевые слова: *межкультурная коммуникация, прагматика, лингвокультурология, дискурс, невербальная коммуникация, коммуникативное поведение.*

Introduction. Modern linguistics pays considerable attention to cross-cultural communication studies. Globalization increases intercultural interaction within education, business, and digital communication daily. Successful communication now requires both linguistic and extralinguistic competence. Language alone cannot ensure effective communicative understanding between representatives of different cultures. Nonverbal behavior significantly influences communicative interpretation and social interaction. Extralinguistic factors include gestures, facial expressions, silence, eye contact, intonation, and interpersonal distance. These elements often express pragmatic meanings more effectively than verbal language. Different cultures interpret communicative behavior differently according to national traditions and cultural values. Consequently, intercultural misunderstandings frequently appear during communication processes. For example,

silence may symbolize politeness within Eastern cultures. However, Western communicative culture may perceive silence negatively. M.A.K.Halliday explains that language functions through social and communicative interaction. The scholar emphasizes that communicative meaning depends on social context and interpersonal relations. Halliday also states that communication involves both verbal and nonverbal semiotic systems simultaneously [1, 56]. Therefore, extralinguistic behavior remains an essential component of communication. O.Safarov explains that pragmatics studies language within real communicative situations. The researcher highlights that pragmatic meaning appears through context, communicative intention, and social environment. According to Safarov, nonverbal behavior strongly affects interpersonal understanding and communicative effectiveness [4, 72]. Consequently, extralinguistic factors possess important pragmatic functions during intercultural communication. Modern communication studies increasingly analyze cultural influence on communicative behavior. Gestures, smiling, and eye contact carry different meanings across cultures. Certain communicative norms acceptable within one culture may seem inappropriate within another environment. This situation demonstrates the importance of linguocultural competence during intercultural interaction.

The purpose of this article involves analyzing extralinguistic factors pragmatically and linguoculturally. The research also examines their influence on successful cross-cultural communication.

Methodology. The present research applies descriptive, pragmatic, and linguocultural analysis methods. The study examines extralinguistic factors within authentic communicative situations. Special attention is given to gestures, silence, facial expressions, and eye contact. These factors influence communicative interpretation during intercultural interaction significantly.

Extralinguistic behavior often carries meanings stronger than verbal language itself. Different cultures interpret identical communicative behavior differently. Consequently, misunderstanding frequently appears during intercultural communication. For example, direct eye contact demonstrates confidence within many Western cultures. Business communication often encourages continuous eye contact during conversation. However, prolonged eye contact may appear disrespectful within certain Eastern cultures. Uzbek communicative culture usually values modest and respectful behavior during formal interaction. Therefore, excessive eye contact sometimes creates communicative discomfort. S.G.Ter-Minasova explains that communication reflects national mentality and cultural worldview simultaneously [8, 118]. The scholar emphasizes that communicative behavior develops according to cultural traditions and social norms. Certain nonverbal actions acceptable within one society may possess negative meanings elsewhere. Therefore, intercultural communication requires cultural and pragmatic awareness together. Silence also performs important pragmatic functions during

communication processes. In Uzbek communicative culture, silence frequently expresses politeness, respect, or careful thinking. For example, younger speakers often remain silent while elders speak. This silence demonstrates respect rather than communicative weakness. However, certain Western communicative environments may interpret silence negatively. Business conversations within Western cultures usually expect immediate verbal response. Consequently, silence may appear uncertain or unprepared communicatively. This situation demonstrates how cultural background shapes pragmatic interpretation.

Another important extralinguistic factor involves gestures and facial expressions. Smiling carries different communicative meanings across cultures. American communication culture commonly encourages smiling during interaction. Smiling often reflects friendliness and openness socially. Uzbek communicative culture also values smiling positively. Nevertheless, excessive smiling during serious conversations may seem unnatural within Uzbek society. Thus, identical facial expressions may create different pragmatic interpretations culturally.

N.M.Suleymanova and S.S.Soleyeva explain that communicative meaning develops through contextual and conceptual interpretation [6, 25]. The researchers emphasize that discourse meaning depends on cultural background and communicative environment. Their study demonstrates the relationship between pragmatic interpretation and intercultural understanding. This approach proves the importance of contextual competence during communication processes.

In my opinion, intercultural misunderstanding develops not because of language only. Communicators often misinterpret cultural behavior and pragmatic intention unconsciously. Many people understand words correctly but misunderstand gestures, silence, or emotional reactions. Therefore, successful intercultural communication requires cultural sensitivity and pragmatic awareness together. Modern communication increasingly depends on understanding nonverbal behavior correctly.

The research additionally analyzes interpersonal distance during communication. Different cultures maintain different physical distances while speaking. Uzbek communicative culture generally prefers closer interpersonal interaction among relatives and friends. Western communicative environments often preserve greater personal distance. Violation of communicative distance sometimes creates pragmatic misunderstanding. Consequently, successful communication requires understanding cultural norms beyond linguistic competence. O.Safarov explains that pragmatic meaning appears through contextual interaction and communicative intention [4, 81]. The researcher highlights that verbal and nonverbal elements function together during discourse formation. Safarov also notes that communicative effectiveness depends on correct interpretation of pragmatic signals. This approach demonstrates the importance of extralinguistic factors within real communication processes.

Result and discussion. The findings reveal that extralinguistic factors strongly influence intercultural understanding. Gestures, silence, smiling, and eye contact shape communicative effectiveness considerably. The research demonstrates that pragmatic misunderstanding frequently develops because communicators interpret behavior differently. Therefore, intercultural communication requires both linguistic and linguocultural competence simultaneously.



1-Picture.

The flowchart demonstrates the role of extralinguistic factors in cross-cultural communication. It shows how nonverbal elements, such as eye contact, silence, smiling, and personal distance, influence communicative interpretation within different cultural environments. These factors shape pragmatic meaning and affect communicative understanding between interlocutors (1-picture).

Conclusion. In conclusion, extralinguistic factors play an essential role in cross-cultural communication. Gestures, silence, facial expressions, eye contact, and personal distance strongly influence communicative interpretation. Different cultures perceive these elements differently according to national traditions and social norms. Consequently, misunderstanding frequently appears during intercultural interaction.

The research demonstrates that pragmatic meaning develops through contextual and cultural interpretation. Successful communication requires both linguistic and extralinguistic competence simultaneously. The study also proves that communicative effectiveness depends on linguocultural awareness and pragmatic understanding.

The scientific novelty of this research involves pragmatic and linguocultural analysis of extralinguistic factors within authentic communicative situations. Real intercultural examples were analyzed contextually and pragmatically. The findings reveal the relationship between communicative behavior and cultural worldview.

The practical significance of the research lies in intercultural communication studies, pragmatics, and discourse analysis. The results may help improve communicative competence during intercultural interaction. The study may also contribute to future research related to pragmatology and linguoculturology.

Used literature:

1. Halliday M.A.K. Language as Social Semiotic. – London: Edward Arnold, 1978. – 256 p.
2. Mahmudov N., Nurmonov A. Tilshunoslik nazariyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2010. – 320 b.
3. Mamatov A. Lingvokulturologiya asoslari. – Toshkent: Fan, 2019. – 240 b.
4. Safarov O. Pragmatologiya. – Toshkent: Mumtoz soʻz, 2008. – 286 b.
5. Saidov X. Madaniyatlararo kommunikatsiya asoslari. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2021. – 224 b.
6. Suleymanova N.M., Soleyeva S.S. Intertextuality and conceptual integration: mechanisms of creating cross-textual meanings // International Conference on Science, Education & Law. – New York, 2025. – B. 24–28.
7. Soleyeva S.S. The conceptual formation of meaning in literary texts: cognitive and pragmatological approach // Yangi Oʻzbekiston, yangi tadqiqotlar jurnali. – 2025. – Volume 3, Issue 5. – B. 433–438.
8. Ter-Minasova S.G. Language and Intercultural Communication. – Moscow: Slovo, 2000. – 624 p.

