SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN:2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imird Volume 12. issue 04 (2025)

## A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PARALINGUISTIC MEANS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: A LINGUOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Bozorova O'g'iloy Qurbonali qizi

Magistratura talabasi

O'zbekiston Davlat Jahon Tillari universiteti

bozorovaogilov@77gmail.com

Abstract: Paralinguistics is considered interdisciplinary field of modern linguistics, referring to the non-verbal cues including tone, pitch, body language, and facial expressions that are utilized consciously and unconsciously while communicating. These non verbal aspects of communication serve transmitting and modifying meaning, conveying attitude and emotions, showing cultural intend of communication. This study focuses on comparative analysis of paralinguistics tools in both Uzbek and English languages according to three types of paralinguistic means: phonotion, kinetic and graphic elements. Drawing on linguistic, cultural and semiotic framework, the article explores universal and cultural specific features of paralinguistic communication. The research is based on descriptive-analytical and contrastive methods, integrating both theoretical and observational approaches. Observations indicated that paralinguistic features operate differently owing to various sociocultural boundaries and linguistic traditions.

**Key words:** Paralinguistics; non-verbal communication; cross-cultural comparison; phonation; kinesics; graphic elements; Uzbek and English language

Annotatsiya: Paralingvistika zamonaviy lingvistikadagi tarmoqlararo soha hisoblanib, muloqot davomida ongli va ongsiz tarzda qoʻllaniladigan ovoz ohangi, balandlik, tana tili hamda yuz ifodalari kabi ogʻzaki boʻlmagan ishoralarni oʻrganadi. Bu ogʻzaki boʻlmagan unsurlar ma'no yetkazish, uni oʻzgartirish, munosabat va hissiyotlarni ifodalash, shuningdek, muloqotdagi madaniy niyatni koʻrsatishda muhim rol oʻynaydi. Ushbu maqolada oʻzbek va ingliz tillaridagi paralingvistik vositalar fonotik, kinetik va grafik elementlar boʻyicha taqqoslanib, tahlil qilinadi. Lingvistik, madaniy va semiotik yondashuv asosida bu vositalarning universal va madaniy xususiyatlari oʻrganiladi. Tadqiqotda tavsifiy-analitik hamda kontrasitiv metodlardan foydalanilgan boʻlib, nazariy va kuzatuv asosidagi yondashuvlar uygʻunlashtirilgan. Kuzatuv natijalariga koʻra, paralingvistik xususiyatlar turli sotsiomadaniy chegaralar va lingvistik an'analar tufayli farqli tarzda namoyon boʻladi.

**Kalit soʻzlar:** Paralingvistika; ogʻzaki boʻlmagan muloqot; madaniyatlararo taqqoslash; fonatsiya; kinezika; grafik elementlar; oʻzbek va ingliz tillari

Аннотация: Паралингвистика рассматривается как междисциплинарная область современной лингвистики, изучающая невербальные сигналы, такие как тон, высота звука, язык тела и мимика, используемые сознательно и бессознательно в процессе общения. Эти невербальные аспекты коммуникации служат для передачи и модификации смысла, выражения отношения и эмоций, а также демонстрации культурных намерений общения. В данной статье представлен сравнительный анализ паралингвистических средств в узбекском и английском языках по трем основным категориям: фонационные, кинетические и графические элементы. Основываясь на лингвистических, культурных и семиотических подходах, исследование выявляет как универсальные, так и культурно специфические особенности паралингвистической коммуникации. Методология включает

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN:2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

в себя описательно-аналитический и контрастивный методы, сочетающие теоретический и наблюдательный подходы. Наблюдения показали, что паралингвистические особенности функционируют по-разному в зависимости от социокультурных границ и языковых традиций.

**Ключевые слова:** Паралингвистика; невербальная коммуникация; межкультурное сравнение; фонация; кинесика; графические элементы; узбекский и английский языки

#### Introduction

The study of paralanguage is known as paralinguistics and was invented by George L. Trager in the 1950s, while he was working at the Foreign Service Institute of the U.S. Department of State. His colleagues at the time included Henry Lee Smith, Charles F. Hockett (working with him on using descriptive linguistics as a model for paralanguage), Edward T. Hall developing proxemics, and Ray Birdwhistell developing kinesics.[1] All subsequent study, particularly that which examines the connection between paralanguage and culture (since paralanguage is learnt, it varies by language and culture), has been based on his work. In speech communication, paralinguistics is 1) interdisciplinary a branch of linguistics that studies nonverbal (non-verbal-linguistic) ways to supplement verbal means with additional information; and 2) the collection of nonverbal means utilised in verbal communication. A branch of linguistics that examines interactional elements like speech patterns, facial expressions, and gestures. According to linguistics, communication is a complex process in which significant meaning load is carried by both verbal and nonverbal cues. These signals, also known as paralinguistic means, include a variety of kinetic, visual, and phonetic elements that support and improve spoken language. In addition, in speech communication, paralinguistics is 1) interdisciplinary a branch of linguistics that studies nonverbal (non-verbal-linguistic) ways to supplement verbal means with additional information; and 2) the collection of nonverbal means utilised in verbal communication. A branch of linguistics that examines interactional elements like speech patterns, facial expressions, and gestures. The comparative study of paralinguistic components in Uzbek and English-languages from two different linguistic and cultural domains—is the main objective of this work.

Uzbek has more implicit communication standards and is based on collectivist traditions, whereas English is widely spoken in a variety of international situations and is frequently linked to directness and individualism. Because of this discrepancy, studying their distinct paralinguistic systems is beneficial both academically and practically in the context of translation studies, intercultural communication, and foreign language instruction.

#### Litereture review

Paralinguistics was first studied in England in 1644 in D. Bulwer's work

"Natural Language and the Chronology of the Hand Expressing Gestures of Speechand Communicative Speech." Based on his scientific theory, studies of paralinguistic phenomena by I. Schlesinger, L. Namir, R. Birdwhistle, E. Klim, W. Stokoeva, and W. Belludzhik were published between 1650 and 1670.[2] According to Dukes Daniel and Abrams, Paralinguistics is defined ex negativo: It is not linguistics but 'alongside linguistics' (from the Greek preposition  $\pi\alpha\rho\alpha$ ). Its subject area is not phonetics, grammar, or semantics 'as such'; it is not about what you say but howyou say something. It is about connotations and not about denotations: A denotation of a word is its literal, primary meaning ('plain' semantics) that can be found in a simple dictionary; a connotation of a word is everything what else is meant by it – i. e., positive, neutral, or negative

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN :2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

valence. We can expand 'word' onto any chain of words, and onto vocal productions that do not have a clear denotation but only connotations.[3]

Three primary categories of paralinguistic means in uzbek and english languages are distinguished by Salokhiddinova S.A.

- Phonation: Components like as timbre, loudness, pitch, intonation, and pauses.
- Kinetic: Silence, postures, facial emotions, and gestures.
- Graphic: Visual elements of written communication, like handwriting styles and punctuation

#### Research methodology

The study uses qualitative, descriptive-comparative approach. This approach allows us to study the relationships and different features of paralinguistic means of both languages in cross-cultural context. Similarities and differences of phonetic, kinetic and graphic means of paralanguage are analysed. At the same time, cross-cultural observation of English and Uzbek speakers and corpus analysis of written and spoken language are employed. With the help of these methods, a comparative analysis of the paralinguistic tools of English and Uzbek is studied in more depth and allows for a better understanding of the 2 cultures.

Data collection With the help of these methods, a comparative analysis of the grammatical systems of

English and Uzbek is studied in more depth and allows for a better understanding of the grammatical features of the two languages

Data were gathered from 2 main sources: observation and theoretical and emperical findings. You tube vlogs, Tv interviews, formal speeches live communicative encounters were observed. Phonation patterns (tone, pitch, loudness), kinesics (posture, eye contact, gestures), and pauses/silence in a variety of speaker roles were analysed as a main subject of the observation.

Additional references from ethnolinguistics, communication studies, and cognitive linguistics are taken in order to understand Uzbek and English cultures from linguistic point of view.

#### Data analysis

Collected data was analysed according to classification of paralinguistic tools including phonotation, kinetic and graphic. Contextual interpretation of each category is identifyed within cultural and communicative contexts.

#### Comparative analysis of Paralinguistic means

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN:2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

The comparative study of paralinguistic means in English and Uzbek, two languages that reflect diverse cultural mindsets and are members of separate linguistic families (Germanic and Turkic, respectively), is the main subject of this article. As an international language, English is typically associated with individualistic and expressive communication styles. Deeply rooted in Central Asian customs and collectivist principles, Uzbek people admire subtlety, indirectness, and respect in nonverbal communication. Three primary categories of paralinguistic factors serve as the foundation for the comparison: Phonation, kinetic, graphic

In an era of globalisation, where cross-cultural interactions are common and frequently rely on both verbal and non-verbal clues, it is particularly critical to comprehend these distinctions and similarities. When it comes to cross-cultural communication, confusing paralinguistic cues can cause misunderstanding or even offence. Therefore, by examining how Uzbek and English speakers use paralinguistic aspects in everyday conversation, this comparative study focuses on improvement of linguistic and cultural competency. The this study can be applied in the domains of intercultural studies, international business, translation, and language instruction, providing professionals and students with tools for more respectful and nuanced communication.

**1.Phonation**- units such as tempo, timbre, pitch, and volume, which belong to both verbal and nonverbal means, are called paralinguistically phonation instruments. Exactly, phonation means should be one of the central issues of paralinguistics.[4] Professor A.Nurmanov said the external side of speech is related to the state of speech, different

intonation modulation of voice, the tempo of speech, sound colour belongs to the paralinguistics.[5]

Features	English	Example	Uzbek	Example
Intonation& Pitch	It impacts the tone and rhythm of English speech, and it's what natives speakers use to convey their intentions, sarcasm and emotions.[6]	another Monday!" – said with rising pitch and exaggerated		"Assalomu alaykum, hurmatli mehmonlar." — spoken in a calm, steady, soft tone.
Pauses	Pauses are not merely moments of silence; they are strategic	"Your time is limited so don't	Pauses often signal contemplation or politeness	Interviewer: "Bugungi yoshlarga nima degan

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN :2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

breaks that can enhance clarity, convey emotions, and captivate	waste it living someone else's life."[8]	boʻlardingiz?"  ("What would you like to say to today's youth?")
listeners.[7]		Elder's Response (with strategic pauses):  "Yoshlar hmm avvalo, ota-onani hurmat qilishsin
		keyin oʻzlarini ilmga, ma'rifatga bagʻishlashsin"

2. **Kinetic**-gestures, posture, facial expressions of the speaker.[9]

Features	English	Uzbek	
Gestures	In casual contexts, pointing with the index finger is normal and usually not regarded as disrespectful.	It is considered impolite to point with the finger, especially toward other people.	
Facial expression	Smiling means politeness, even to strangers while raised eyebrows shows surprise, emphasis	Smiling is context- sensitive, showing sinceritiness to close people while raised eyebrows means hesitation subtle disagreement	

3. Graphic- features of handwriting, graphic addition to letters, substituties for letters

Features	English	Example		Uzbek	Example
Punctuation	The usage of capital letters, bold punctuation (?!) may		d	The usage of ellipses menas disappointment, confusion	- 1

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN:2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

	emphasis shock, anger or disbelief.			
Repitation and capital letters	Strong emphasis	I told you NO.NO.NO	Strong praise	Gap yo'q,gap yo'q , gap yo'q.

**Results & Analysis** 

The study shows the results of descriptive-comparative analysis of Uzbek and English paralinguistic means in culturally-specific application according to three main categories: phonation, kinetic and graphic. Video materials, observational data, texts, and corpus examples are used to illustrate differences and similarities of paralinguistic tools.

1.Pitch, pace, intonation, and pauses are examples of phonetic factors that significantly influence spoken interaction in both languages. These characteristics' expressive range and cultural purposes, however, vary greatly.

Phonation in English is frequently characterized by a broad range of intonation and pitch, which is used to express rhetorical attitudes like sarcasm or excitement as well as emotional complexity. For instance, statements like "Oh great, another Monday!" that use high pitch and excessive stress express sarcasm and discontent. Additionally, pauses can be employed rhetorically to emphasize a point or produce a dramatic impact. Strategic silences in public speaking, like Steve Jobs' "Your time is limited... so don't waste it..." speech, help to direct audience participation and heighten the emotional appeal of the message. In contrast, Uzbek phonation is typically more consistent, particularly in formal speech situations. The comparatively flat intonation reflects the social politeness, calmness that are cultural norms. In order to convey humility and respect, phrases such as "Assalomu alaykum, hurmatli mehmonlar" are usually said in a calm, gentle tone. In Uzbek discourse, pauses frequently indicate consideration or regard. In intergenerational communication, for instance, an elder may stop noticeably when speaking—"Yoshlar... hmm... avvalo, ota-onani hurmat qilishsin..."—signaling formality and reflection rather than performance.

These patterns highlight a cultural divide: Uzbek speakers employ phonation to promote interpersonal sensitivity and social harmony, while English speakers utilize it to strengthen individuality and expressiveness.

2. Physical distance, posture, facial expressions, and gestures are examples of kinetic paralinguistic means. These tools can lead to miscommunication in cross-cultural interactions since they differ greatly between cultures.

Gestures like pointing with the index finger are common in English-speaking countries and serve as instruments of emphasis or clarity. Common and easily observable indicators of emotion and receptivity to others are facial gestures like smiling and lifting eyebrows. Raised eyebrows might convey surprise or emphasis, although a grin is the standard gesture of politeness, even when interacting with strangers. On the other hand, in Uzbek culture pointing with the finger is considered rude or even unpleasant, especially when directed at people. The absence of a smile in public circumstances may not be interpreted as rudeness but rather as modesty or respect. Smiling is more selective and expresses sincerity mainly in familiar settings. Raised eyebrows can convey

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN:2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

a more indirect communication style by subtly expressing disagreement or hesitation as opposed to surprise.

3. The use of punctuation, capitalization, and stylistic repetition are examples of graphic paralinguistic means in written communication. These tools provide important emotional and practical information, although being frequently disregarded.

Bold punctuation and capitalization are commonly used in English writing to give emotional impact. For example, the phrase "You did WHAT?!" conveys astonishment or surprise by using capital letters and an interrobang. For dramatic impact and intensity, repetition and formatting are used, as in "I told you NO. NO." Though their shape and meaning are different, visual elements in Uzbek also serve expressive purposes. Word repetition is frequently used to communicate emphasis or respect. For example, the phrase "Gap yoʻq, gap yoʻq" conveys high praise or shock. Ellipses can be used, especially in casual correspondence, to convey hesitancy, disappointment, or doubt.

#### Conclusion

From the point of linguocultural perspective, this article has examined the comparative aspects of paralinguistic means in Uzbek and English. The study emphasizes how linguistic activities are influenced by both cultural values and language structures by classifying nonverbal communication into phonation, kinetic, and graphic domains.

The results demonstrate that Uzbek phonation is defined by collectivist values, and a polite tone, while English phonation patterns prioritize emotional expressiveness, individualism, and rhetorical clarity. In Uzbek culture, kinetic elements like gestures and facial expressions are more regulated and context-dependent, frequently conveying subtle messages of politeness, humilityt. In English, on the other hand, these features are more open and frequently employed for social connection. Similar to how English utilizes punctuation and capitalization to indicate passion and expression, Uzbek uses repetition and ellipses to convey indirect emotional cues or high appreciation. Graphic components in written communication also represent cultural orientation.

This reserch is significantly important for cross-cultural communication.

Misinterpretation of paralinguistis cues in foreign language translation, international business, diplomacy could be huge problem. Understanding such cultural encode help tham to success in their communication environment.

One limitation of this work is emphasis on literary and observable examples rather than a quantitative examination of speech acts or statistical corpus-based validation. Even while the qualitative method offers a wealth of information, more empirical research with bigger speaker populations and controlled tests may yield findings that are more broadly applicable.

#### References

- 1. Abduazizova, Durdona. Filological Science, issues 15–16.
- 2.Batliner, Anton. (2024). Paralinguistics. In: Speech Sciences Entries. Speech Prosody Studies Group. Disponível em: <a href="https://gepf.falar.org/entries/63">https://gepf.falar.org/entries/63</a>
- 3.Burkxanova, Mashkhurakhon Muhammadovna, & Akhmedova, Madinakhon Muradkhon qizi. (2022). Modern Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, Vol. 5. ISSN: 2795-4846. <a href="https://mjssh.academicjournal.io/index.php/mjssh">https://mjssh.academicjournal.io/index.php/mjssh</a>

SJIF 2019: 5.222 2020: 5.552 2021: 5.637 2022:5.479 2023:6.563 2024: 7,805 eISSN :2394-6334 https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd Volume 12, issue 04 (2025)

- 4.Jobs, Steve. (2005). Stanford Commencement Speech.
- 5.Leeds-Hurwitz, Wendy. (1990). Notes in the history of intercultural communication: The Foreign Service Institute and the mandate for intercultural training. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 76, 262–281.
- 6. Nurmonov, A. (2012). Tanlangan asarlar. III zhildlik. I Zhild. Tashkent: Academnashr, p. 22.
- 7.Salokhiddinova, S.A. (2025). American Journal of Education and Learning, Vol. 3, Issue 2. Published: 28-02-2025. ISSN: 2996-5128 (online). ResearchBib Impact Factor: 9.918.
- 8. Simpson, Eliza. Speech & Accent Coach. Bold Voice. www.boldvoice.com
- 9. Warren, Michael Robert. Language Lounge. www.languagelounge.net