



UDK:811.512

*Nasibillo NOSIROV,*  
ADCHTI tayanch doktoranti  
E-mail: [nosirovnasibillo22@gmail.com](mailto:nosirovnasibillo22@gmail.com)

ADCHTI dotsenti, PhD S.Abdugaxxorov tqarizi asosida

## DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS OF POLITENESS STRATEGIES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK PROFESSIONAL COMMUNICATION

Annotation

This article provides analysis of politeness strategies in English and Uzbek professional communication. The research relies on Brown and Levinson's Face Theory, Foucault's Discourse Theory, Van Dijk's Contextual Models, and Arutyunova's pragmatic framework. Findings indicate that negative politeness strategies dominate in English professional discourse, while positive politeness strategies prevail in Uzbek communication. The study also highlights the role of linguocultural factors in shaping strategic choices.

**Key words:** Politeness, discourse, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, professional communication, English, Uzbek.

## ДИСКУРСИВНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ СТРАТЕГИЙ ВЕЖЛИВОСТИ В АНГЛИЙСКОЙ И УЗБЕКСКОЙ ПРОФЕССИОНАЛЬНОЙ КОММУНИКАЦИИ

Аннотация

В статье представлен анализ стратегий вежливости в профессиональной коммуникации на английском и узбекском языках. Исследование основано на теориях лица Брауна и Левинсона, дискурсивной теории Фуко, когнитивно-контекстуальной модели ван Дейка и прагматической концепции Арутюновой. Результаты показывают, что в английском профессиональном дискурсе преобладают стратегии негативной вежливости, тогда как в узбекской коммуникации — позитивной. Работа подчеркивает влияние лингвокультурных факторов на выбор стратегий.

**Ключевые слова:** Вежливость, дискурс, прагматика, социолингвистика, профессиональная коммуникация, английский язык, узбекский язык.

## INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK PROFESSIONAL MULOQOTIDA XUSHMUOMALILIK STRATEGIYALARINING DISKURSIV TAHLILI

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek professional muloqotidagi xushmuomalilik strategiyalarining lingvopragmatik, sotsiolingvistik va diskursiv xususiyatlari tahlil qilindi. Tadqiqot Brown va Levinsonning yuz nazariyasi, T.A. van Deykning kontekstual modellar nazariyasi, M. Fuko diskurs nazariyasi va Arutyunova pragmatik yondashuviga tayangan holda amalga oshirildi. Natijalar shuni ko'rsatdiki, ingliz professional muloqotida salbiy xushmuomalilik strategiyalari ustun bo'lsa, o'zbek diskursida ijobiy xushmuomalilik strategiyalari yetakchi hisoblanadi. Maqola lingvokulturologik omillarning strategiya tanlashdagi rolini ham yoritadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Xushmuomalilik, diskurs, pragmatika, sotsiolingvistik, professional muloqot, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili.

**Introduction.** Professional communication represents one of the most regulated and socially conditioned forms of discourse. In English and Uzbek languages, politeness strategies function not only as linguistic tools but also as cultural mechanisms that ensure interpersonal balance, institutional hierarchy, and communicative success. According to Brown and Levinson's Face Theory, individuals use linguistic strategies to protect their positive and negative face wants. This understanding becomes central in analyzing cross-cultural professional communication. In Uzbek linguistic culture, collectivistic values manifest in the dominance of positive politeness strategies, whereas English professional settings prioritize negative politeness as an indicator of respect for personal autonomy. This study aims to systematically examine the pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse-level mechanisms that shape polite behavior in both linguistic communities. Professional communication represents one of the most regulated and socially conditioned forms of discourse.

**Literature review.** In English and Uzbek languages, politeness strategies function not only as linguistic tools but also as cultural mechanisms that ensure interpersonal balance,

institutional hierarchy, and communicative success. According to Brown and Levinson's Face Theory, individuals use linguistic strategies to protect their positive and negative face wants. This understanding becomes central in analyzing cross-cultural professional communication. In Uzbek linguistic culture, collectivistic values manifest in the dominance of positive politeness strategies, whereas English professional settings prioritize negative politeness as an indicator of respect for personal autonomy. This study aims to systematically examine the pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse-level mechanisms that shape polite behavior in both linguistic communities. Professional communication represents one of the most regulated and socially conditioned forms of discourse. In English and Uzbek languages, politeness strategies function not only as linguistic tools but also as cultural mechanisms that ensure interpersonal balance, institutional hierarchy, and communicative success. According to Brown and Levinson's Face Theory, individuals use linguistic strategies to protect their positive and negative face wants. This understanding becomes central in analyzing cross-cultural professional communication. In Uzbek linguistic culture, collectivistic values manifest in the

dominance of positive politeness strategies, whereas English professional settings prioritize negative politeness as an indicator of respect for personal autonomy. This study aims to systematically examine the pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse-level mechanisms that shape polite behavior in both linguistic communities. Professional communication represents one of the most regulated and socially conditioned forms of discourse. In English and Uzbek languages, politeness strategies function not only as linguistic tools but also as cultural mechanisms that ensure interpersonal balance, institutional hierarchy, and communicative success. According to Brown and Levinson's Face Theory, individuals use linguistic strategies to protect their positive and negative face wants. This understanding becomes central in analyzing cross-cultural professional communication. In Uzbek linguistic culture, collectivistic values manifest in the dominance of positive politeness strategies, whereas English professional settings prioritize negative politeness as an indicator of respect for personal autonomy. This study aims to systematically examine the pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse-level mechanisms that shape polite behavior in both linguistic communities. Professional communication represents one of the most regulated and socially conditioned forms of discourse. In English and Uzbek languages, politeness strategies function not only as linguistic tools but also as cultural mechanisms that ensure interpersonal balance, institutional hierarchy, and communicative success. According to Brown and Levinson's Face Theory, individuals use linguistic strategies to protect their positive and negative face wants. This understanding becomes central in analyzing cross-cultural professional communication. In Uzbek linguistic culture, collectivistic values manifest in the dominance of positive politeness strategies, whereas English professional settings prioritize negative politeness as an indicator of respect for personal autonomy. This study aims to systematically examine the pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and discourse-level mechanisms that shape polite behavior in both linguistic communities.

**Research Methodology.** The study employs discourse analysis, comparative pragmatics, and sociolinguistic observation. Primary theoretical models include Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, Foucault's discourse-power framework, Van Dijk's contextual models, and Arutyunova's pragmatic categorization of discourse. Professional communication samples were taken from business correspondence, legal documents, academic e-mails, and institutional dialogues in both English and Uzbek. The methodology also incorporates qualitative analysis of lexical, grammatical, and functional markers of politeness, with particular attention to hedging, honorifics, address forms, mitigation devices, and discursive coherence strategies. The study employs discourse analysis, comparative pragmatics, and sociolinguistic observation. Primary theoretical models include Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, Foucault's discourse-power framework, Van Dijk's contextual models, and Arutyunova's pragmatic categorization of discourse. Professional communication samples were taken from business correspondence, legal documents, academic e-mails, and institutional dialogues in both English and Uzbek. The methodology also incorporates qualitative analysis of lexical, grammatical, and functional markers of politeness, with particular attention to hedging, honorifics, address forms, mitigation devices, and discursive coherence strategies. The study employs discourse analysis, comparative pragmatics, and sociolinguistic observation. Primary theoretical models include Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, Foucault's discourse-power framework, Van Dijk's contextual models, and Arutyunova's pragmatic categorization of discourse.

Professional communication samples were taken from business correspondence, legal documents, academic e-mails, and institutional dialogues in both English and Uzbek. The methodology also incorporates qualitative analysis of lexical, grammatical, and functional markers of politeness, with particular attention to hedging, honorifics, address forms, mitigation devices, and discursive coherence strategies. The study employs discourse analysis, comparative pragmatics, and sociolinguistic observation. Primary theoretical models include Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, Foucault's discourse-power framework, Van Dijk's contextual models, and Arutyunova's pragmatic categorization of discourse. Professional communication samples were taken from business correspondence, legal documents, academic e-mails, and institutional dialogues in both English and Uzbek. The methodology also incorporates qualitative analysis of lexical, grammatical, and functional markers of politeness, with particular attention to hedging, honorifics, address forms, mitigation devices, and discursive coherence strategies. The study employs discourse analysis, comparative pragmatics, and sociolinguistic observation. Primary theoretical models include Brown and Levinson's politeness theory, Foucault's discourse-power framework, Van Dijk's contextual models, and Arutyunova's pragmatic categorization of discourse. Professional communication samples were taken from business correspondence, legal documents, academic e-mails, and institutional dialogues in both English and Uzbek. The methodology also incorporates qualitative analysis of lexical, grammatical, and functional markers of politeness, with particular attention to hedging, honorifics, address forms, mitigation devices, and discursive coherence strategies.

**Analysis and Results.** The findings indicate that English professional discourse relies heavily on hedging devices such as 'could you', 'would it be possible', 'I was wondering if', which help mitigate imposition and protect the negative face of the interlocutor. In contrast, Uzbek professional interaction is characterized by honorific suffixes ('-ingiz', '-lar'), politeness markers ('marhamat', 'iltimos', 'rahmat'), and status-raising address forms such as 'hurmatli janoblari' and 'aziz hamkor'. These linguistic choices reflect deeper cultural models: individualism in English communication and collectivism in Uzbek communication. Additionally, English discourse displays a preference for passive constructions, distancing modality, and indirectness, while Uzbek discourse favors direct requests softened by positive evaluative expressions. In sector-specific contexts such as diplomacy, law, and business, these trends become even more pronounced. The findings indicate that English professional discourse relies heavily on hedging devices such as 'could you', 'would it be possible', 'I was wondering if', which help mitigate imposition and protect the negative face of the interlocutor. In contrast, Uzbek professional interaction is characterized by honorific suffixes ('-ingiz', '-lar'), politeness markers ('marhamat', 'iltimos', 'rahmat'), and status-raising address forms such as 'hurmatli janoblari' and 'aziz hamkor'. These linguistic choices reflect deeper cultural models: individualism in English communication and collectivism in Uzbek communication. Additionally, English discourse displays a preference for passive constructions, distancing modality, and indirectness, while Uzbek discourse favors direct requests softened by positive evaluative expressions. In sector-specific contexts such as diplomacy, law, and business, these trends become even more pronounced. The findings indicate that English professional discourse relies heavily on hedging devices such as 'could you', 'would it be possible', 'I was wondering if', which help mitigate imposition and protect the negative face of the interlocutor. In contrast, Uzbek

professional interaction is characterized by honorific suffixes ('-ingiz', '-lar'), politeness markers ('marhamat', 'iltimos', 'rahmat'), and status-raising address forms such as 'hurmatli janoblari' and 'aziz hamkor'. These linguistic choices reflect deeper cultural models: individualism in English communication and collectivism in Uzbek communication. Additionally, English discourse displays a preference for passive constructions, distancing modality, and indirectness, while Uzbek discourse favors direct requests softened by positive evaluative expressions. In sector-specific contexts such as diplomacy, law, and business, these trends become even more pronounced. The findings indicate that English professional discourse relies heavily on hedging devices such as 'could you', 'would it be possible', 'I was wondering if', which help mitigate imposition and protect the negative face of the interlocutor. In contrast, Uzbek professional interaction is characterized by honorific suffixes ('-ingiz', '-lar'), politeness markers ('marhamat', 'iltimos', 'rahmat'), and status-raising address forms such as 'hurmatli janoblari' and 'aziz hamkor'. These linguistic choices reflect deeper cultural models: individualism in English communication and collectivism in Uzbek communication. Additionally, English discourse displays a preference for passive constructions, distancing modality, and indirectness, while Uzbek discourse favors direct requests softened by positive evaluative expressions. In sector-specific contexts such as diplomacy, law, and business, these trends become even more pronounced. The findings indicate that English professional discourse relies heavily on hedging devices such as 'could you', 'would it be possible', 'I was wondering if', which help mitigate imposition and protect the negative face of the interlocutor. In contrast, Uzbek professional interaction is characterized by honorific suffixes ('-ingiz', '-lar'), politeness markers ('marhamat', 'iltimos', 'rahmat'), and status-raising address forms such as 'hurmatli janoblari' and 'aziz hamkor'. These linguistic choices reflect deeper cultural models: individualism in English communication and collectivism in Uzbek communication. Additionally, English discourse displays a preference for passive constructions, distancing modality, and indirectness, while Uzbek discourse favors direct requests softened by positive evaluative expressions. In sector-specific contexts such as diplomacy, law, and business, these trends become even more pronounced.

The results confirm that politeness is a culturally embedded phenomenon rather than solely a linguistic category. In English professional communication, politeness strategies function as mechanisms of protecting personal space and maintaining institutional neutrality. This aligns with Foucault's notion of discourse as a regulator of power relations. Uzbek professional discourse, however, frames politeness as a means of reinforcing social cohesion, maintaining harmony, and demonstrating respect. The presence of honorifics, collective

identity markers, and emotional-ethical expressions supports Arutyunova's claim that pragmatics reflects societal values. The contrast between hedging in English and positive reinforcement in Uzbek also supports Van Dijk's theory that context models shape linguistic choices. Thus, politeness strategies cannot be analyzed separately from cultural, historical, and institutional backgrounds. The results confirm that politeness is a culturally embedded phenomenon rather than solely a linguistic category. In English professional communication, politeness strategies function as mechanisms of protecting personal space and maintaining institutional neutrality. This aligns with Foucault's notion of discourse as a regulator of power relations. Uzbek professional discourse, however, frames politeness as a means of reinforcing social cohesion, maintaining harmony, and demonstrating respect. The presence of honorifics, collective identity markers, and emotional-ethical expressions supports Arutyunova's claim that pragmatics reflects societal values. The contrast between hedging in English and positive reinforcement in Uzbek also supports Van Dijk's theory that context models shape linguistic choices. Thus, politeness strategies cannot be analyzed separately from cultural, historical, and institutional backgrounds. The results confirm that politeness is a culturally embedded phenomenon rather than solely a linguistic category. In English professional communication, politeness strategies function as mechanisms of protecting personal space and maintaining institutional neutrality. This aligns with Foucault's notion of discourse as a regulator of power relations. Uzbek professional discourse, however, frames politeness as a means of reinforcing social cohesion, maintaining harmony, and demonstrating respect. The presence of honorifics, collective identity markers, and emotional-ethical expressions supports Arutyunova's claim that pragmatics reflects societal values. The contrast between hedging in English and positive reinforcement in Uzbek also supports Van Dijk's theory that context models shape linguistic choices. Thus, politeness strategies cannot be analyzed separately from cultural, historical, and institutional backgrounds. The results confirm that politeness is a culturally embedded phenomenon rather than solely a linguistic category. In English professional communication, politeness strategies function as mechanisms of protecting personal space and maintaining institutional neutrality. This aligns with Foucault's notion of discourse as a regulator of power relations. Uzbek professional discourse, however, frames politeness as a means of reinforcing social cohesion, maintaining harmony, and demonstrating respect. The presence of honorifics, collective identity markers, and emotional-ethical expressions supports Arutyunova's claim that pragmatics reflects societal values. The contrast between hedging in English and positive reinforcement in Uzbek also supports Van Dijk's theory that context models shape linguistic choices. Thus, politeness strategies cannot be analyzed separately from cultural, historical, and institutional backgrounds.

**Conclusion** . This study demonstrates that English and Uzbek professional communication differ significantly in their preferred politeness strategies. English relies on negative politeness rooted in personal autonomy, while Uzbek discourse favors positive politeness driven by collectivistic values and social respect. Understanding these differences is essential for effective intercultural communication, translation studies, and diplomatic or business interaction. The study contributes to ongoing research in cross-cultural pragmatics by offering a deep discursive examination of politeness strategies and showing how linguistic, cultural, and social systems interact within professional settings.

## REFERENCES

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.
2. Арутюнова, Н. Д. Дискурс. Москва: Наука, 1990.
3. van Dijk, T. A. Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
4. Карасик, В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2002.
5. Нурмонов, А. Нутқ маданияти ва услубият. Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 1995.
6. Morris, C. Foundations of the Theory of Signs. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1938.
7. Мадвалиев, А. Ўзбек тилида нутқ маданияти. Тошкент: Фан, 1981.
8. Фуко, М. Археология знания. Москва: Прогресс, 1994; van Dijk, T.A. Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008; Арутюнова, Н.Д. Дискурс. // Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. Москва: Советская энциклопедия, 1990.
9. Земская, Е. А. Русская разговорная речь: Лингвистический анализ и проблемы обучения. Москва: Наука, 1981.
10. Мирзаев, М. Ҳозирги ўзбек адабий тили. Тошкент: Ўқитувчи, 2008.
11. Қўнгулов, Р. Ўзбек нутқ маданияти асослари. Тошкент: Фан, 2010.
12. Hyland, K. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. London: Continuum, 2005.
13. Сулейманова, Э.Д. Язык и культура: взаимосвязь и взаимодействие. Москва: Флинта, 2015