A Comparative Analysis of Educational Discourse in Uzbek and English Languages

Shahnoza Bobojonova orcid: 0009-0000-3204-345X
e-mail: shahnozabobojonova@utas.uz

Tashkent University of Applied Sciences, Gavhar Str. 1, Tashkent 100149, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article defines the rapid evolution of educational discourse in the context of in Uzbek and English Languages**.** Traditional face-to-face teaching methods are scrutinized, revealing their limitations in addressing the diverse needs of today's multilingual and multicultural student populations. The study emphasizes the importance of understanding the linguistic and cultural features of oral educational discourse to overcome communication barriers. Through a comparative analysis of Uzbek and English educational discourses, the article identifies four main communication styles—closed, aggressive, manipulative, and open—and examines their manifestations in different cultural contexts. The research highlights the critical role of teachers as communicators and the impact of social and cultural norms on educational interactions. The findings underscore the necessity of adapting educational practices to accommodate diverse cultural backgrounds, enhancing the effectiveness of teaching and learning in a globalized educational sphere.

Key words: Educational discourse, oral communication, multilingual education, multicultural education, didactic communication, social communication, communication styles, Uzbek discourse, English discourse, cultural barriers

1 Introduction

The rapid improvement and change of educational forms and tools, the “attack” of digital technologies on the educational process expanded the research scope of the educational discourse. Face-to-face teaching processes, which were once considered the main and traditional form of education, have not satisfied the needs of learners and providers. On the one hand, this can be explained by the fact that today’s modern world education fills its audience with multilingual and multi-cultural education participants, that is, international students are also attracted to a certain educational field, on the other hand, the development of web technologies is remote forms of education cause discourse participants who are owners of another culture to interact for educational purposes. This requires the study of linguistic and cultural features of oral educational discourse in order to overcome cultural barriers in communication. Communication is a linguistic thinking activity in a complex form. As a result of this activity, speech structures are formed, and the "traces" of linguistic thought activity are stored in the structure of these structures. But it is not easy to find these "traces" and separate them into parts, because in the composition of the text, all the elements of our thoughts become tools for realizing the speech pattern born in the human mind. In addition, it should not be forgotten that linguistic units are also involved in the formation of the communication text [1].

Simultaneously with the philological researches, general pedagogical and psychological researches were also carried out, which determine the role and function of the teacher in the educational environment, and the teacher and the student are at the center of the participants of the educational discourse, and the teacher is a coach, communicator, supervisor, teacher. It shows that there are a number of tasks such as creating the environment and conditions of education, forming and developing the student's behavior, and ensuring their safety. Each task, based on its characteristics, causes the occurrence of specific forms of social communication in the speech process.

2 Methods

It is known that the educational environment serves for the learner to develop knowledge, skills and abilities in various fields of science and science, and in this process, a unique communication personality is created between the teacher and the teacher. comes out and has different social status[2]. The role of the teacher comes out mainly through the process of didactic communication. In the process of such a discourse, the following tasks are performed between the teacher and the student:



1. The role of the teacher emerges through the process of didactic communication.

In the process of didactic communication, the mental communicative activity of the teacher determines that he has his own style of speech in relation to each of the above-mentioned social problems. In the discourse situation, the individual characteristics of the speech participant are added to the speech style and cause the educational discourse to differ from each other under the influence of the following factors[3].



2. Factors causing differentiation of educational discourse

Although educational discourse cannot be put into the same patterns as other areas of communication, the factors and causes of communication describe four main styles of educational communication. We would like to describe them below:

As factors and causes of communication:

1. Closed communication style. In this case, the participants of educational communication avoid face-to-face communication. Common signs of this style include extreme kindness in communication, avoiding the issue, delaying the decision-making process, or waiting for others to make a decision in the situation. In the process of observing the Uzbek and English educational discourse, we can observe that in the Uzbek oral educational discourse, the communicative signs listed above are relatively more observed. The fact that the rules and principles of the written order are relatively dominant in the English educational

discourse, and the fact that there is little habit of "circumventing" the issue according to the rules of speech etiquette shows that the general communication style is not typical for the English educational style.

2. Aggressive communication style. In this style of communication, there is a strict commanding tone and cases of dominating the reader or listener. In the Uzbek educational discourse, the habits listed above are observed in the example of an angry, stubborn or very demanding teacher. In the English style based on the principled approach, speech expressions with an aggressive attitude are relatively less observed.

3. Manipulative style. As the main sign of this style, it is observed that the participants of the dialogue wait for a convenient time and use discursive tools specific to the speech to increase the effectiveness of the speech. In the Uzbek language, phraseological units such as "read into the sentence", "he speaks the cock of the sentence" and "gapi sharp" are used in relation to the owners of this style.

4. **Opened style**. In this case, there are signs such as expressing one's opinion openly and sincerely, not trying to influence others, and expressing the opinions of others.

All the characteristics described above differ in English and Uzbek educational discourse according to their social and mental characteristics, but also according to the implementation of the discourse in oral and written form. It is known that oral discourse has different characteristics from written discourse. These differences are more apparent in the following aspects:

-written discourse has a grammatically more complex structural structure than oral discourse, and the possibilities of expression are also wider. In oral discourse, sentences consist of short and simple sentences. Long and rambling sentences are often observed in written discourse. According to M. A. Halliday, it is wrong to say that the sentences in oral discourse are grammatically simple, because they also have their own grammatical complexity, and sentences in oral discourse can last longer than in writing[4].

Oral discourse is much freer in terms of using vocabulary than written discourse. In written discourse, lexical units (noun, verb, adjective, adverb, conjunction, auxiliary, etc.) are very dense and orderly. In oral discourse, this density is not noticeable. In oral educational discourse, it is also related to content knowledge. lexical units may participate, but they are not organized and densely arranged in the written discourse. In addition, in the oral educational discourse, which is not subject to specific formal patterns, the dense arrangement of terms and denominational units is not observed. The written discourse is rich in descriptive terms In oral discourse, the speaker's discourse in lecture classes may deviate from the general oral discourse characteristics in some cases.

3 Result

In oral discourse, not only language units, but also body language participate in conveying the general content of the speech, and this plays an important role in the understanding of the expression. In the written language, non-verbal elements specific to body language do not participate, requiring a more open and complete expression of thought in the educational discourse. This difference is not a fixed feature of spoken and written speech, but changes according to the context. The discursive purpose of the speaker in expressing the speech also determines how open and detailed the expression is. The occurrence of oral speech according to the requirements of a certain topic or situation increases the possibility of understanding the intended idea, and the referent understands what is being said in the course of the discourse.

Oral speech is not organized in advance and syntactic-structural patterns of sentences are not created. This can lead to the use of some sentences through repeated expressions, the repetition and explanation of thoughts, and at the same time, the topic can change between thoughts. In contrast to written discourse, in oral discourse, the division of opinion by the interlocutor is often observed. Although many stops, pauses, and repetitions are observed in the realization of oral discourse, for those who accept the discourse as corpus material, both types of discourse are common, and in the process of creating and improving the corpus, they are not significantly different from each other.

In contrast to the written discourse, the oral educational discourse, which requires a real speech situation and a reason for its realization, requires the communication participants to overcome the obstacles caused by the linguistic and cultural barriers of the language.

If we analyze the social characteristics, signs and elements of the educational discourse, this type of discourse process cannot be far from the rules of culture and social communication of the dialogue participants. It is known that intercultural communication is based on the ability of representatives of two cultures to understand each other. According to O. A. Leontovich, there are several linguistic factors that determine the national and cultural specificity of intercultural communication. For example: Reflecting the cultural traditions of the people: permissions, prohibitions, stereotypical actions and features of communicative universal etiquette[5]. We can see such communication criteria in the Uzbek educational discourse. For example, in the Uzbek language, the pronouns you and you are used to refer to the second person. According to cultural norms, the pronoun you is used to express the content of respect towards the teacher, and it is not considered a cultural norm to censure the teacher. But in English, the pronouns you and

you are represented by the same lexeme, and in the process of English oral educational discourse, there is almost no need for a meaningful distinction between the lexemes you and you. But in Russian and Turkish languages, lexical-semantic laws work differently between *you* and *you* in polite form in Uzbek. That is, in the process of communication in these languages, the personal pronoun you is also used in relation to persons who are close to him. In English, the forms of addressing each other between the teacher and the student are completely different from those of the Uzbek language. In the Uzbek language, the use of address words such as *ustoz, muallim (slang mallim), domla* for the teacher is considered a norm in the educational discourse. In some places, in the situation of oral discourse, this speech norm is violated, and there are cases of addressing the teacher by first name (surname) or using the words *brother* and *sister* together with the name. In such speech situations, the lexeme is characterized according to the age and gender of the communicants.

4 Discussion

In the oral educational discourse of the Uzbek language, when the teacher addresses the students, calling the student by his last name or first name is a speech norm and is actively used. For comparison, if we analyze the norms of oral educational discourse in English, the lexeme "professor" or "teacher" is used before the surname in relation to university and college teachers. *Sir, Mister,* for males in relation to school-level teachers or other participants in education; and for women, we can see that they add the last name along with the lexemes *Mrs, Miss, Mam*. For example: *Doctor Padgett, Professor Brown. Mrs Sarapin, Miss Cala* and others. Addressing the teacher by name by the student is a violation of the norms of speech etiquette in the educational discourse. According to the English culture, the teacher's address to the student often uses the lexemes *mam, sir* or calls them by name. We can also know from the use of very small language elements belonging to two cultures in the situation of educational discourse that the interaction of representatives of two cultures on the same educational platform creates a conflict of specific cultural and speech norms.

In both societies, the forms of educational discourse cannot go far from the speech etiquette of the society and show sociolinguistic signs resulting from the intersection of language and society. In general, by comparing some lexical semantic groups specific to speech etiquettes in Uzbek and English, and their comparative study, it will be of great importance to reflect the rules of etiquette and culture in these languages.

The typical British etiquette is "very polite" looking, but far from real feelings, more of a "*fake character*". *"Politeness"* is a form of communication for most English people and an important part of British culture. In English speech etiquette, the words "Iltimos" (Please), "Rahmat" (*Thank you*) and "Uzr" (*Sorry*) are regularly used.

Respecting the elders and honoring the youth is one of the ancient customs of the eastern peoples, including the Uzbeks, and this custom has been going on since the time of the primitive community system. The first forms of education formed in the land of Turkestan, which is the cradle of Eastern civilization or renaissance, show that in madrasa education, respect for teachers was very high, and in Uzbek, phrases such as *"Teacher is as great as your father" and "Piri komil".* It is observed that the ratio is given through, and units such as *tolibi ilm, shogird, o'quvchi* are used in relation to students. It is a historical fact that in the Uzbek cultural life, parents emphasize that *"the flesh is ours, and the bones are yours",* and the above-mentioned demanding style is the leader in the treatment and attitude towards the student.

Another linguistic and cultural feature that emerges in the oral educational discourse is the expression of the social situation and the social functions of communication. Science and education cannot exist completely apart from the social life of the people. One of the most actively used teaching techniques in the educational process today is the use of metaphors. Naturally, teaching methods of metaphors require taking examples from social life. A collection of content knowledge related to social life cannot exist without national culture. For example: if we imagine the example of the educational discourse in Uzbekistan, the communication of content knowledge related to a specific social situation by the teacher to the students requires background knowledge of the intended topic from the communicators.

Oral communication is an art that can be learned and honed through study, presentation skills, and practice. Intellectual interest should be at the forefront of oral communication. It is a means of developing good communication skills. A person who has enough knowledge can communicate better because content is the soul of the communication process. It should also have an attitude of discussion and reflection, as this improves intellectual skills and at the same time contributes to effective communication. Effective writing skills and good oral communication skills go hand in hand. A student with good writing skills will be able to organize and present his thoughts in a systematic way. Many teachers effectively use teaching methods that are understandable to all students in the process of educational discourse. Many teachers create a positive classroom culture where differences become strengths. Many teachers understand how their own cultural

beliefs and attitudes affect their interactions with students, and they continually develop the ability to see each student's perspective in their classroom.

5 Conclusions

Linguistic and cultural features of oral educational discourse in the process of mutual reference between the teacher and the student: asking for permission, giving permission, requesting, in the process of discussion, as well as in the communication of students with each other, student and education appears more vividly in discursive situations between responsible others. Although educational discourse is considered to be closer to literary language and scientific method than to street-style colloquialism because it works with a specific content, it is in discourse that the learner or the giver is a representative of another culture or speech etiquette. it creates cultural spaces specific to intercultural communication. These cultural spaces are often used to describe a specific social situation, use lacunae and realities, phraseological units of a linguistic and cultural nature, dialect elements, paremiological units, non-verbal language elements that are associated differently in different cultures, and language and nation-specific elements, although expressed through the same sign. is more obvious in the standards of speech etiquette. In the form of distance education, the social features of oral discourse are clearly visible and cause certain cultural communication norms to be agreed between the addressee and the addressee.

There are notable disparities in communication techniques between Uzbek and English educational discourses, which can be attributed to different social and cultural standards. These variations emphasize how crucial context-specific teaching and learning strategies are. They also need to create a welcoming environment that transcends cultural divides. Good educational discourse aims to improve the learning process by fostering meaningful, culturally sensitive relationships in addition to imparting knowledge. To keep up with these developments, one must pursue ongoing professional growth.

References

1. Сафаров Ш. Паралингвистика. Тошкент:ЎзМУ, 2008. 210- б.
2. Neacșu, I. (1999). Training and learning. the second edition. Bucharest: E.D.P.
3. Soitu, L. (2001). Pedagogy of communication. Iasi: European Institute.
4. Halliday, M. A. K. (1957) ‘Some aspects of systematic description and comparison in grammatical analysis’, Studies in Linguistic Analysis, Special Volume of the Philological Society. Blackwell, 54–67p.
5. Леонтович О.А. Русские и американцы: парадокс межкультурного общения «Русские и американцы: парадокс межкультурной коммуникации». –191 с.
6. Keith Brown, Jim Miller. The Cambridge dictionary of linguistics, Cambridge university press, 2013.
7. Lakoff G. Women, Fire, and Dangerous Things. University of Chicago Press. – Chicago. 1987. – P. 632.
8. Lakoff R. // Language and woman’s place. New York: Cambridge 1975.
9. Leech G. Principles of pragmatics. – London; New York, 1983. – P. 250.
10. Bobojonova, S. (2023). PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF EDUCATIONAL DISCOURSE. *Новости образования: исследование в XXI веке*, *1*(9), 1321- 1323.
11. Маслова В. Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие М., 2001.–183 с.
12. Shahnoza Yo‘ldosh Qizi Bobojonova (2023). TA’LIMIY DISKURS VA UNING LINGVISTIK TAHLILI. Academic research in educational sciences,4 (TMA Conference), 135-137.
13. Nabiyeva D.A., & Akhmedov B.R. Expressing of Subjective Assessment by Paralinguistic Means and Their Gender Peculiarities. *European Multidisciplinary Journal of Modern Science*, *1*, 2021. – P. 9–15.
14. Пирс Ч.С. Избранные философские произведения. – М.: Логос, 2000. – С. 448.
15. Арутюнова Н.Д. Дискурс. В кн.: Лингвистическая энциклопедия. – М., 1990-С.137.