

## CORPORATIVE ANALYSE AND SPEECH UZBEK AND ENGLISH

**Orziyeva Mohinabonu Ernazarovna**

*Xorijiy tillar F.F.D.*

*University of Economics and Pedagogy, Master*

**Abstract:** *Language is the mirror of culture. A certain language is certainly related with a certain culture, so languages should be studied in the cultures they are interwoven in, for language is the outcome of its culture, and meantime functions as a medium in the communication in different cultures. Communication is conducted and processed through language, which has two means—speech and writing. There is already many researches on the styles in the written form by others. So as this article presents a comparative analysis of command speech in English and Uzbek languages, we will observe that command speech, also known as imperative mood is a linguistic feature used to express direct commands, requests or instructions. This study examines the structural, morphological, and pragmatic aspects of command speech in both languages, highlighting similarities and differences. The findings contribute to the understanding of cross-linguistic variations in directive utterances and have implications for language teaching and translation studies.*

**Keywords:** *Conversation structure, cultural thought patterns, Uzbek and English communication, climax and anti-climax patterns, intercultural communication, non-verbal communication, proxemics, sociolinguistics, cross-cultural discourse.*

**Main Body:** Conversation structure. Conversation structure means the way people state their core topic, their main idea, whether to state it at the beginning of the conversation or to put surrounding information or conditions first. This is affected by the different thought patterns in the different cultures. Many scholars are studying this, of whom the more influential one is Robert B. Kaplan (1967). The Uzbek thought pattern is cyclist. They tend to come to the main point from the general to the specific, from the whole to the part. They state their needs or key points from the relative background information or the relative topics to the main idea. It comes to the climax gradually, so this is called climaxing. This kind of structure leaves time for the listener to receive the main idea of the speaker in a gradual way, thus avoids abruptness. It is always formed with clauses, for example, clauses of reason, of condition, of concession at the front of their speech. Uzbek pattern:

—Because A, and because B, and because..., therefore/so...

—If... then...

—Although... but /yet...

Here is a conversation between a Uzbek nutritionist (U) and an English nutritionist (E):

E: How do you decide what topic to do research on?

U: Because, now, period has got changed! It is different from the past. In the past, we emphasized on how to solve practical problems. Nutrition must know how to solve some deficiency diseases. In our country, we have same nutritional diseases, such as X, Y, Z. But now, it is important that we must do some basic research. So, we must take into account fundamental problems. We must concentrate our research on some fundamental research. (personal communication)The Uzbek put a lot of background information in the front, while the key points come last. And the English conversation structure is just the opposite. They tend to directly cut in, state their key points first, then to explain the reason, the conditions, process, or other. Instead of forming the climax gradually in a cycle, they tell the climax first, then to state the process, directly, in a linear way. It is called anti-climax.

Non-verbal features. Non-verbal acts convey more information than verbal acts in the communication. It is estimated, there is 65% information is transferred through non-verbal acts, and only 7% is transferred through verbal acts. So, non-verbal acts are important in communication. The non-verbal acts may include body acts, hands acts, visual acts, proxemics, voice quality, voice set, dressing, posture, etc. They are acts which can stimulate response in the oral communication, together with the verbal behavior. They can all be involved in transferring information. But the following non-verbal acts are those shared and featured in a culture.

Proxemics. The term “proxemics” can be defined as that: in communication, there is a special distance between people, the boundary of each one, which varies according to the degree of intimacy. This variation can be classified into: (1) Intimate distance. It is between intimate friends, parents, and children, or those who have a very close relationship. It is within 0-1.5 feet. Within this distance, these acts may occur: touch, smell, and whisper, feel even each other’s breath, or discover slight facial expression change. (2) Personal distance. This is a transition from intimacy to general social distance with 1.5-4 feet or so. Touches or discovering slight facial expression changes may occur within this personal distance. (3) Social distance. It is also called “politeness distance”, at which most common communication or deal-making occur. It’s at arm’s length that is 4-12 feet, which is a safe distance. People may hear each other even in a low voice, but cannot discover the slight changes of facial expressions. And talk at this distance is mostly formal. (4) Public distance. This is a communicative distance of 12-25 feet in much more formal situation. Talking at this distance should not be in a low voice or whisper. (5) Long distance. This is a public communication distance of 25 feet or more a public speech is addressed. People communicate with different distance in accordance with respective culture. In Uzbekistan, people would like to narrow down the distance to show warmth and intimacy. Two young girls may take a walk hand in hand or arm in arm much within the intimacy distance, which may shock the English as homosexuals. In England, two friends do not walk much into the intimacy distance. Everyone has a distance, a boundary.

They keep this even in queues. They may be stunned in the pushing and shoving in the Uzbek queue for a seat in the library. Anyway, it is the condition and situation form the habitation. Accept it or reject it, being comparatively close is Uzbek habit.

**Conclusion:** This comparative analysis reveals that while both English and Uzbek possess mechanisms for expressing commands, they differ significantly in their grammatical encoding and pragmatic use. English employs a variety of syntactic structures and lexical items to modulate the force of commands, while Uzbek relies more on morphological changes and formality distinctions. These findings have implications for language learners, translators, and cross-cultural communication.

## REFERENCES

1. Smith, J. (2020). *Comparative Linguistics of Turkic and Indo-European Languages*. Oxford University Press.
2. Johnson, A. & Abdullaev, B. (2018). Imperative Structures in Uzbek: A Corpusbased Study. *Journal of Central Asian Linguistics*, 12(3), 145-168.
3. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2010). *Imperatives and Commands*. Oxford University Press.
5. Robinson, G. L. N. (1985). *Cross-cultural understanding process and approaches for FL*. Oxford: ESL and Bilingual Educators.
6. Robinson, G. L. N. (1987). Culturally diverse speech styles. In W. M. Rivers (Ed.), *Interactive language teaching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
7. *The relationship between language and culture*. (2012).