Comparative Pragmatic Analysis of Speech Acts in English and Uzbek Family Discourse

Nabiyeva Laylokhon Valisher kizi

PhD student, Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Abstract: This study investigates the pragmatic features of speech acts in English and Uzbek family discourse through a comparative lens. The research examines how key speech act categories—including requests, directives, suggestions, prohibitions, gratitude, and expressions of empathy—are realized within the micro-context of family communication in both linguistic communities. Attention is given to the influence of cultural norms, social hierarchy, kinship relations, and age-based expectations on the formulation and interpretation of speech acts. The analysis, based on naturally occurring discourse samples, reveals that English family interactions tend to prioritize individual autonomy, direct yet polite modal constructions, and symmetrical communication patterns. In contrast, Uzbek family discourse reflects collectivist values, hierarchical role distribution, higher reliance on indirectness, and culturally embedded honor–respect markers. The findings contribute to cross-cultural pragmatics, discourse studies, and the development of culturally informed language-teaching approaches

Key words: Pragmatics; speech acts; family discourse; cross-cultural communication; English; Uzbek; indirectness; politeness strategies; illocutionary force; discourse analysis.

Introduction

Family discourse represents one of the most fundamental contexts in which social identities, interpersonal relationships, and cultural norms are enacted through language. As the primary site of early socialization, the family shapes individuals' communicative behavior and provides a rich environment for observing how speech acts function in everyday interaction. Comparative studies of family discourse across cultures have gained scholarly attention because speech act realization is deeply embedded in cultural expectations, politeness conventions, and social role structures. English and Uzbek, belonging to distinct linguistic and cultural traditions, provide a particularly compelling contrast for pragmatic analysis. In English-speaking contexts, communication tends to emphasize individual autonomy, personal boundaries, and symmetrical interactional patterns, even within family settings. Such tendencies are reflected in the frequent use of mitigated requests, attention to personal preference, and modal constructions that soften illocutionary force. Conversely, Uzbek family discourse is rooted in collectivist values, hierarchical role relations, and strong expectations regarding age, seniority, and respect. These cultural orientations influence the degree of directness, choice of address forms, and preference for implicit or indirect strategies when performing everyday speech acts. Despite increasing interest in cross-cultural pragmatics, systematic comparisons of English and Uzbek family discourse remain limited. Existing studies often focus on isolated speech act types or formal communication settings, leaving a gap in understanding how pragmatic norms unfold in intimate, multi-generational interactions. Addressing this gap, the present study examines how core speech acts—such as requests, directives, suggestions, prohibitions, gratitude, and supportive expressions—are realized in both languages and how contextual variables shape their pragmatic distribution. By analyzing naturally occurring discourse data from both linguistic communities, the study seeks to uncover culturally specific communicative tendencies as well as potential universals in family interaction. The findings aim to deepen our understanding of cross-cultural pragmatics, contribute to theoretical discussions on speech act realization, and inform the development of culturally responsive teaching practices for learners of English and Uzbek as foreign languages.

Methods

This study adopts an integrated comparative pragmatics and micro-ethnographic discourse analysis approach to examine how English and Uzbek families perform and interpret speech acts within everyday interaction. The method combines structural coding of speech act forms with interpretive analysis of socio-cultural meanings, allowing both linguistic patterns and underlying cultural logics to be captured simultaneously. To ensure ecological validity, the corpus was constructed exclusively from naturally occurring interactions recorded in authentic domestic environments rather than elicited or role-played dialogues. The English corpus comprised 18 hours of audio material collected from families in the United Kingdom and the United States. The Uzbek corpus included 17 hours of family conversations recorded in Tashkent, Samarqand, and several rural districts, providing variation in dialectal and socio-cultural background. The dataset includes interactions across different activity contexts such as shared meals, household chores, routine decision-making, and emotional support episodes. A total of 68 participants were included (32 English-speaking, 36 Uzbek-speaking), representing three generational layers—children, parents, and grandparents. The sampling strategy ensured diversity in kinship relations (e.g., mother–daughter, father–son, siblings, elder–younger). Participants' age ranged from 9 to 74. Field researchers lived with or regularly visited participant families over a four-week period to reduce observer's paradox and allow natural communicative behavior to emerge. Audio recordings were supplemented with brief ethnographic field notes capturing contextual cues such as body language, tone, activity type, and power asymmetry. All interactions were transcribed using a modified Jeffersonian transcription system to accurately represent pauses, intonation, overlaps, and emphatic stress—features critical to pragmatic interpretation. Using Searle's and Austin's theoretical frameworks as guiding models, each utterance was coded for speech act type (directive, expressive, commissive, representative) and for specific subtypes relevant to family discourse: requests, suggestions, orders, reprimands, advice and warnings, gratitude, praise, empathy, consolation, permissions and prohibitions.

Results

A clear divergence emerged in how English- and Uzbek-speaking families formulate requests, commands, and prohibitions. English family discourse was dominated by mitigated forms such as could you, would you mind, and can we maybe…, even in parent–child interactions. The preference for indirectness functioned as a means of preserving personal autonomy and minimizing imposition. Uzbek family discourse, in contrast, displayed a higher frequency of explicit imperatives and hierarchy-based directives, especially from elders to younger members. Honorific forms and culturally embedded expressions of respect accompanied many directives, illustrating how authority is socially legitimized through linguistic markers. Overall, directive acts in English tended toward softened negotiation, while in Uzbek they reflected structured hierarchy and obligation. In English interactions, expressions of gratitude (thank you so much, I appreciate it) appeared even for minor acts, indicating a cultural preference for constant reinforcement of positive affect. Uzbek family discourse showed fewer explicit gratitude expressions; instead, emotional warmth was communicated through relational closeness, supportive tone, or indirect praise. Appreciation was often implied rather than stated overtly. Empathy and consolation in English tended to be verbally explicit (e.g., I know that was hard for you), while in Uzbek, non-verbal cues, softening of tone, and culturally patterned supportive phrases carried much of the emotional load. English speakers showed dominant use of negative politeness (minimizing pressure, acknowledging personal boundaries). Indirect modal constructions and hedges ("maybe," "a bit," "sort of") frequently lowered illocutionary force. Uzbek speakers relied heavily on positive politeness strategies—emphasizing solidarity, fostering connectedness, and expressing mutual dependence. At the same time, younger speakers used negative politeness toward elders, often refraining from direct refusals and opting for culturally recognizable indirect strategies. These patterns reflect broader cultural orientations: individualism in English interactions and collectivism coupled with respect hierarchy in Uzbek discourse. Generational differences were more pronounced in Uzbek than in English families. In

English discourse, intergenerational interactions were comparatively symmetrical, with children frequently negotiating, asking for explanations, or providing opinions on decisions. In Uzbek families, speech act realization strongly reflected age-based hierarchy. Elders initiated most directives, controlled turn-taking, and framed evaluations; younger members responded with softened compliance or indirect disagreement. Sibling interactions also differed: English siblings tended to use collaborative problem-solving language, while Uzbek siblings displayed clearer role differentiation based on age. When conflicts arose, the two linguistic communities used different strategies. English speakers employed verbal explanation, calm negotiation, and explicit articulation of feelings as primary tools of de-escalation. Uzbek speakers relied more on tone modulation, implicit warnings, and socially understood indirect cues to signal disagreement or dissatisfaction. In many cases, conflict resolution was achieved through a shift in activity or silent alignment rather than extended verbal negotiation.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the pragmatic realization of speech acts within family discourse is deeply intertwined with broader cultural, social, and relational structures in both English-and Uzbek-speaking communities. The comparative analysis highlights not only linguistic contrasts but also distinct cultural orientations toward authority, autonomy, politeness, and emotional expression. The observed differences in directive forms reflect fundamental cultural frameworks. English families' preference for mitigated requests aligns with cultural norms of individual autonomy, low power distance, and the expectation that even children possess a degree of personal agency. This linguistic tendency echoes Brown and Levinson's notion of negative politeness, where minimizing imposition is culturally valued. In contrast, Uzbek family directives mirror collectivist social organization and high power distance, in which hierarchy and age serve as natural bases for authority. The frequent use of explicit directives and respect-marking expressions indicates that directness is not perceived as face-threatening, but rather as a culturally sanctioned expression of responsibility and care. These patterns reaffirm Hofstede's classification of Central Asian cultures as collectivist and community-driven. The cross-linguistic discrepancy in gratitude, praise, and empathy reveals divergent emotional expectations. English discourse reflects a cultural preference for verbal affirmation and emotional transparency, where positive affect is often articulated explicitly. This aligns with research showing that Western cultures tend to value clear emotional communication as a means of strengthening relationships. Uzbek expressive acts, however, rely more heavily on contextual warmth, tone, and implicit appreciation, consistent with cultural norms that view excessive verbal admiration as unnecessary or even inappropriate. In this sense, emotional support is negotiated indirectly, embedded within relational roles rather than explicit linguistic markers. These findings support the argument that collectivist cultures often encode emotion in relational behaviors rather than in direct verbalization. The study reveals that politeness is not a universal construct but is culturally reframed in each linguistic community. English speakers' use of hedges and modal verbs reflects a politeness strategy built around respect for personal boundaries. Conversely, Uzbek speakers rely on strategies that reinforce group solidarity, respect for elders, and maintenance of social harmony. Indirect refusals and softened disagreements in Uzbek discourse demonstrate how politeness is embedded in hierarchical sensitivity rather than autonomy protection. These distinctions affirm that politeness cannot be interpreted through a single cultural lens—a point of relevance for language teaching, translation studies, and intercultural communication training. The stark contrast in intergenerational communication suggests different socialization philosophies. English interactions encouraging children's negotiation, questioning, and self-expression align with social norms emphasizing independence and confidence-building. In this environment, speech acts function as a mechanism for fostering critical thinking and self-advocacy. Uzbek families, however, socialize children into respect-based communicative roles, where compliance, attentive listening, and indirect disagreement form the backbone of appropriate behavior. Speech acts therefore carry socializing weight, reinforcing cultural values of humility, modesty, and deference. This highlights the role of

language in transmitting cultural expectations and shaping interpersonal behavior from an early age. Differences in conflict management strategies reveal distinct cultural beliefs about emotional equilibrium. English families' reliance on explicit negotiation and verbal explanation reflects a cultural view that problems are best addressed through open dialogue and transparency. Uzbek families prioritize relational harmony, often managing conflict through subtle cues and non-verbal adjustments rather than confrontation. This style reflects a cultural expectation that emotions should be regulated discreetly, especially by younger family members. These differing strategies demonstrate how speech acts are embedded in culturally specific models of emotional control and interpersonal harmony.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrated that speech acts within English and Uzbek family discourse are shaped by distinct cultural norms that influence patterns of politeness, hierarchical relations, emotional expression, and indirectness. English interactions reflect an emphasis on autonomy, egalitarianism, and explicit articulation of feelings, aligning with low-context, individualistic communicative traditions. Uzbek family discourse, however, is characterized by collectivist values, respect-based hierarchy, implicit emotional signaling, and relational harmony, making indirectness and deference central pragmatic features. Despite these cross-cultural contrasts, the study identified several universal tendencies across both languages, including parental dominance in directive acts, consistent use of supportive speech in emotionally charged contexts, and shared pragmatic strategies fostering cohesion. These findings confirm that while cultural values shape how speech acts are realized, the purpose of family communication—to nurture relationships, establish norms, and ensure cooperation—remains fundamentally constant. The results have implications for cross-cultural pragmatics, language teaching, and intercultural competence development. A deeper understanding of how culturally grounded speech act strategies operate can help learners, educators, and translators avoid misinterpretation, enhance communicative effectiveness, and navigate multicultural interactions more successfully. Future research may expand the corpus size, include urban–rural variations, and explore digital family communication to further enrich comparative pragmatic insights.

REFERENCES:

1. Searle, J. R. (1969). Speech Acts. London: Routledge.

2. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

3. Hofstede, G. (2001). Culture's Consequences. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

4. Blum-Kulka, S. (1990). Understanding Requests. Oxford: Blackwell.

5. Tannen, D. (2005). Conversational Style. New York: Oxford University Press USA.

6. Kasper, G. & Kellerman, E. (1997). Communication Strategies. London: Longman.

7. Spencer-Oatey, H. (2008). Culturally Speaking. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

8. Duranti, A. (1997). Linguistic Anthropology. Berlin: De Gruyter.

9. Coulmas, F. (2005). Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

10. Thomas, J. (1995). Meaning in Interaction. London: Routledge Academic.