

DIFFERENCES IN THE USE OF VERBAL AND NON-VERBAL COMMUNICATION MEANS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Dono Usmonova Sotvoldiyevna.

*Farg'ona davlat universiteti chet tillari fakulteti Ingliz tili amaliy kursi kafedrasini
mudiri*

Ergasheva Shaxnoza Erkinovna

Ingliz tili amaliy kursi kafedrasini o'qituvchisi

Abstract: *From both language and culture viewpoint, this paper discusses the similarities and differences of English and Uzbek in terms of their verbal and non-verbal communication methods respectively. The study not only helps to confirm the cross-cultural communication theory but also provides guidance on translation studies, intercultural competence development, and foreign language teaching.*

Keywords: *verbal communication, paralinguistics, gesture systems, communicative competence, intercultural communication, contrastive linguistics*

Аннотация: *Данная статья исследует сравнительные характеристики вербальных и невербальных средств коммуникации в английском и узбекском языках с лингвистической и культурной точки зрения. Исследование вносит вклад в теорию межкультурной коммуникации и имеет практическое значение для переводоведения, развития межкультурной компетенции и методики преподавания иностранных языков.*

Ключевые слова: *вербальная коммуникация, паралингвистика, система жестов, коммуникативная компетенция, межкультурная коммуникация, контрастивная лингвистика*

Annotatsiya: *Ushbu maqola ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi og'zaki va og'zaki bo'lmagan muloqot vositalarining qiyosiy xususiyatlarini lingvistik va madaniy nuqtai nazardan o'rganadi. Tadqiqot madaniyatlararo muloqot nazariyasiga hissa qo'shadi va tarjimashunoslik, madaniyatlararo kompetentsiyani rivojlantirish hamda ikkinchi tilni o'qitish metodikasi uchun amaliy ahamiyatga ega.*

Kalit so'zlar: *og'zaki muloqot, paralingvistika, imo-ishora tizimlari, kommunikativ kompetentsiya, madaniyatlararo muloqot, qiyosiy tilshunoslik*

Introduction. The comparison of verbal and non-verbal communication differences between languages is one of the most important topics in modern linguistics. This is especially true because the world is becoming more globalized and there is more intercultural contact. Communication is a complex multimodal phenomenon that involves much more than just the linguistic code. It includes a very complex array of paralinguistic, kinesic, proxemic, and contextual elements that work

together to construct and interpret meaning [1]. While English has been shaped by Western cultural frameworks which put emphasis on individual agency, explicit verbalization, and low-context communication, Uzbek has been formed in Central Asian cultural settings with collectivist values, hierarchical social structures, and high-context communication as their main characteristics [2]. Studies have shown that non-verbal communication can account for 65–93% of the total communicative meaning in face-to-face interactions, though this proportion differs widely across cultures [3].

Methodology and Literature Review. The present research relies on a qualitative comparative technique that consists of a systematic literature review and a contrastive discourse analysis to investigate the differences in communication orally and non-orally between English and Uzbek languages. The literature review covers academic publications in English, Russian, and Uzbek, relying on the, by now, classical theories in intercultural communication theory, especially Hall's high-context vs. low-context cultural dimension [4], and Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory with its bearing on communicative behavior [5]. The literature review discloses that the studies of English communications have thoroughly reported that the relatively low dependence on contextual and non-verbal cues in Anglo-American communication is due to cultural values of individualism, egalitarianism, and explicit verbalization being placed on it [6]. In contrast, the studies on Central Asian, including Uzbek, communication patterns, reveal the opposite that there is a much stronger orientation to communicate indirectly, much more attention to the hierarchical relationships among people and a greater complexity of non-verbal signaling systems [7]. The analysis of gesture systems shows that while one of the English speaker's usages of gestures is for emphasis and clarification mainly, the other, the Uzbek, speaker has more elaborate and specific as well as cultural gesture repertoires that are independent of the spoken language and perform the required function [8]. Proxemic research has found that communication in the Uzbek language is usually accompanied by physical contact more frequently and interpersonal distances closer than English communication, especially in same-gender interactions [9]. The role of silence also differs markedly: in English discourse, silence often signals discomfort or communication breakdown, whereas in Uzbek communication, silence functions as a meaningful communicative resource expressing respect, contemplation, or emotional depth [10].

Results and Discussion. The crucial dimensions of verbal and non-verbal means usage in English and Uzbek communication systems are shown through the comparison analysis. At the level of linguistic structure, English grammar, and vocabulary show more accuracy, employing overt subject pronouns, using auxiliary verbs extensively to mark time and modality, and preferring direct syntactic constructions. On the other hand, in Uzbek, subject pronouns are often dropped when recoverable from context, the language's main focus is on the morphological marking by means of agglutinative suffixes, and it also has the skill of using indirect sentence

structures that need greater contextual interpretation. This structural difference also correlates with general communicative patterns: the English speakers are generally accustomed to verbalizing information whereas the Uzbek speakers are more relying on the context and non-verbal cues. There are major differences in the paralinguistic aspects between the two languages, such as intonation, tempo of speech, and even the loudness of the speaker.

English intonation serves primarily grammatical and attitudinal functions with relatively predictable patterns for questions, statements, and emphasis. Uzbek intonation carries heavier pragmatic loading, with subtle pitch variations conveying nuanced meanings related to respect levels, emotional states, and interpersonal relationships that would require explicit verbal expression in English. Speech tempo in formal English contexts tends toward moderate pace with clear articulation, while Uzbek formal speech often employs slower, more measured delivery as a marker of respect and thoughtfulness, with rapid speech potentially interpreted as disrespectful or thoughtless regardless of content. The gesture systems of the two languages demonstrate marked divergences. English gestures are predominantly illustrative and emphatic, supplementing verbal content without carrying independent semantic weight. Common English gestures include pointing for reference, open palm gestures for honesty or openness, and various emblematic gestures with culture-specific meanings.

Uzbek communication norms accept and even expect closer proximity, particularly among same-gender interlocutors, with physical distance sometimes correlated with emotional distance or formality rather than mere social convention. Touch patterns differ correspondingly: while English professional communication minimizes physical contact beyond formal handshakes, Uzbek communication may incorporate touching arms, shoulders, or hands as expressions of connection and sincerity, though strictly regulated by gender and status considerations. Eye contact norms present another area of divergence. English communication generally values sustained eye contact as indicating honesty, attention, and confidence, with gaze aversion potentially interpreted negatively. Uzbek communication norms are more complex and context-dependent: while mutual gaze between status equals signifies engagement, prolonged direct eye contact from younger to older interlocutors or from subordinates to superiors may be interpreted as disrespectful challenge rather than attentiveness, requiring periodic gaze aversion as a sign of respect.

Conclusion. This comparative analysis has demonstrated that English and Uzbek languages exhibit substantial and systematic differences in the deployment and interpretation of verbal and non-verbal communication means, differences that extend beyond surface linguistic features to reflect fundamental divergences in cultural communication philosophies and social organization principles. The research has identified key dimensions of difference including explicitness versus implicitness in

verbal encoding, the semantic weight assigned to non-verbal channels, proxemic and haptic norms, paralinguistic variation, gesture repertoires, and the functional roles of silence and contextual information. English communication operates primarily as a low-context system privileging explicit verbal articulation, individual clarity, and channel separation, while Uzbek communication functions as a high-context system integrating multiple communicative channels, emphasizing implicit understanding, and requiring sophisticated contextual interpretation. These differences are not merely stylistic preferences but constitute fundamentally different communicative logics rooted in divergent cultural values regarding individualism versus collectivism, egalitarianism versus hierarchy, and direct versus indirect expression.

References

1. Knapp, M.L., Hall, J.A., & Horgan, T.G. (2013). *Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction*. Cengage Learning.
2. Hofstede, G., Hofstede, G.J., & Minkov, M. (2010). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. McGraw-Hill.
3. Mehrabian, A. (2017). *Nonverbal Communication*. Routledge.
4. Hall, E.T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books.
5. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications.
6. Ting-Toomey, S., & Chung, L.C. (2012). *Understanding Intercultural Communication*. Oxford University Press.
7. Rasulova, M.I. (2019). Особенности невербальной коммуникации в узбекской культуре. *Вестник НУУз*, 3(2), 156-162.
8. Kendon, A. (2004). *Gesture: Visible Action as Utterance*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Hall, E.T. (1966). *The Hidden Dimension*. Doubleday.
10. Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., McDaniel, E.R., & Roy, C.S. (2015). *Communication Between Cultures*. Cengage Learning.