SCIENCE
PROBLEMS.UZ

ISSN 2181-1342

Actual problems of social and humanitarian sciences
Актуальные проблемы социальных и гуманитарных наук

Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari

1-son (5-jild)
2025

ISSN: 2181-1342 (Online)
Сайт: https://scienceproblems.uz
DOI: 10.47390/SPR1342V5I1Y2025

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

№ 1 (5) – 2025

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

TOSHKENT-2025

BOSH MUHARRIR:

Isanova Feruza Tulqinovna

TAHRIR HAY'ATI:

07.00.00- TARIX FANLARI:

Yuldashev Anvar Ergashevich – tarix fanlari doktori, siyosiy fanlar nomzodi, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Mavlanov Uktam Maxmasabirovich – tarix fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Xazratkulov Abror – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti.

Tursunov Ravshan Normuratovich – tarix fanlari doktori, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti;

Xolikulov Axmadjon Boymahammatovich – tarix fanlari doktori, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti;

Gabrielyan Sofya Ivanovna – tarix fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston Milliy Universiteti.

Saidov Sarvar Atabullo o'g'li – katta ilmiy xodim, Imom Termiziy xalqaro ilmiy-tadqiqot markazi, ilmiy tadqiqotlar bo'limi.

08.00.00- IQTISODIYOT FANLARI:

Karlibayeva Raya Xojabayevna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Nasirxodjayeva Dilafruz Sabitxanovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Ostonokulov Azamat Abdukarimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent moliya instituti;

Arabov Nurali Uralovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Xudoyqulov Sadirdin Karimovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Azizov Sherzod O'ktamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Bojxona instituti;

Xojayev Azizxon Saidaloxonovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari doktori, dotsent, Farg'ona politexnika instituti

Xolov Aktam Xatamovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent, O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Shadiyeva Dildora Xamidovna – iqtisodiyot fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent v.b, Toshkent moliya instituti;

Shakarov Qulmat Ashirovich – iqtisodiyot fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent axborot texnologiyalari universiteti

09.00.00- FALSAFA FANLARI:

Hakimov Nazar Hakimovich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Yaxshilikov Jo'raboy – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

G'aybullayev Otabek Muhammadiyevich – falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti;

Saidova Kamola Uskanbayevna – falsafa fanlari doktori, "Tashkent International University of Education" xalqaro universiteti;

Hoshimxonov Mo'min – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent, Jizzax pedagogika instituti;

O'roqova Oysuluv Jamoliddinovna – falsafa fanlari doktori, dotsent, Andijon davlat tibbiyot instituti, Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlar kafedrasi mudiri;

Nosirxodjayeva Gulnora Abdukaxxarovna – falsafa fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Turdiyev Bexruz Sobirovich – falsafa fanlari bo'yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent, Buxoro davlat universiteti.

10.00.00- FILOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Axmedov Oybek Saporbayevich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Ko'chimov Shuxrat Norqizilovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Hasanov Shavkat Ahadovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Baxronova Dilrabo Keldiyorovna – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Mirsanov G'aybullo Qulmurodovich – filologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Samarqand davlat chet tillar instituti;

Salaxutdinova Musharraf Isamutdinovna – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Kuchkarov Raxman Urmanovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent v/b, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Yunusov Mansur Abdullayevich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Saidov Ulugbek Aripovich – filologiya fanlari nomzodi, dotsent, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi.

12.00.00- YURIDIK FANLAR:

Axmedshayeva Mavlyuda Axatovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Muxitdinova Firyuza Abdurashidovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Esanova Zamira Normurotovna – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O‘zbekiston Respublikasida xizmat ko‘rsatgan yurist, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Hamroqulov Bahodir Mamasharifovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor v.b., Jahon iqtisodiyoti va diplomatiya universiteti;

Zulfiqorov Sherzod Xurramovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Jamoat xavfsizligi universiteti;

Xayitov Xushvaqt Saparbayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, professor, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Asadov Shavkat G‘aybullayevich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent, O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti huzuridagi Davlat boshqaruvi akademiyasi;

Ergashev Ikrom Abdurasulovich – yuridik fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Utemuratov Maxmut Ajimuratovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Saydullayev Shaxzod Alixanovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Hakimov Komil Baxtiyarovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Yusupov Sardorbek Baxodirovich – yuridik fanlar doktori, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Amirov Zafar Aktamovich – yuridik fanlar doktori (PhD), O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Sudyalar oliy kengashi huzuridagi Sudyalar oliy maktabi;

Jo‘rayev Sherzod Yuldashevich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Babadjanov Atabek Davronbekovich – yuridik fanlar nomzodi, dotsent, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Normatov Bekzod Akrom o‘g‘li — yuridik fanlar bo‘yicha falsafa doktori, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Rahmatov Elyor Jumaboyevich — yuridik fanlar nomzodi, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

13.00.00- PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI:

Xashimova Dildarxon Urinboyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat yuridik universiteti;

Ibragimova Gulnora Xavazmatovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent davlat iqtisodiyot universiteti;

Zakirova Feruza Maxmudovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, Toshkent axborot texnologiyalari universiteti huzuridagi pedagogik kadrlarni qayta tayyorlash va ularning malakasini oshirish tarmoq markazi;

Kayumova Nasiba Ashurovna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, professor, Qarshi davlat universiteti;

Taylanova Shoxida Zayniyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent;

Jumaniyozova Muhayyo Tojiyevna – pedagogika fanlari doktori, dotsent, O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Ibraximov Sanjar Urunbayevich – pedagogika fanlari doktori, Iqtisodiyot va pedagogika universiteti;

Javliyeva Shaxnoza Baxodirovna – pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), Samarqand davlat universiteti;

Bobomurotova Latofat Elmurodovna — pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), Samarqanddavlatuniversiteti.

19.00.00- PSIXOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Karimova Vasila Mamanosirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Hayitov Oybek Eshboyevich – Jismoniy tarbiya va sport bo‘yicha mutaxassislarni qayta tayyorlash va malakasini oshirish instituti, psixologiya fanlari doktori, professor

Umarova Navbahor Shokirovna– psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti, Amaliy psixologiyasi kafedrasi mudiri;

Atabayeva Nargis Batirovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, Nizomiy nomidagi Toshkent davlat pedagogika universiteti;

Shamshetova Anjim Karamaddinovna – psixologiya fanlari doktori, dotsent, O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti;

Qodirov Obid Safarovich – psixologiya fanlari doktori (PhD), Samarkand viloyat IIB Tibbiyot bo‘limi psixologik xizmat boshlig‘i.

22.00.00- SOTSIOLOGIYA FANLARI:

Latipova Nodira Muxtarjanovna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O‘zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri;

Seitov Azamat Po‘latovich – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O‘zbekiston milliy universiteti;

Sodiqova Shohida Marxaboyevna – sotsiologiya fanlari doktori, professor, O‘zbekiston xalqaro islom akademiyasi.

23.00.00- SIYOSIY FANLAR

Nazarov Nasriddin Ataqulovich –siyosiy fanlar doktori, falsafa fanlari doktori, professor, Toshkent arxitektura qurilish instituti;

Bo‘tayev Usmonjon Xayrullayevich –siyosiy fanlar doktori, dotsent, O‘zbekiston milliy universiteti kafedra mudiri.

OAK Ro‘yxati

Mazkur jurnal Vazirlar Mahkamasi huzuridagi Oliy attestatsiya komissiyasi Rayosatining 2022-yil 30-noyabrdagi 327/5-son qarori bilan tarix, iqtisodiyot, falsafa, filologiya, yuridik va pedagogika fanlari bo‘yicha ilmiy darajalar yuzasidan dissertatsiyalar asosiy natijalarini chop etish tavsiya etilgan ilmiy nashrlar ro‘yxatiga kiritilgan.

“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro‘yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM” mas’uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog‘och ko‘chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil: scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog‘lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING
DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI
5-jild, 1-son (Yanvar, 2025). - 473 bet.

MUNDARIJA

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI

Xadjamuratova Matlyuba Xashimovna
YOSHLARNI IJTIMOIY HIMOYA QILISHNING TARIXIY ILDIZLARI 11-15

Abdimo‘minov Oybek Bektemirovich
MARKAZIY OSIYODA KO‘PTOMONLAMA MUNOSABATLAR: TARIXIY YONDASHUVLAR, SIYOSIY VA IQTISODIY INTEGRATSIYA 16-22

Шадманов Турдибай Рузибаевич
ПРОБЛЕМЫ ПЛАНИРОВАНИЯ ПРИ СТРОИТЕЛЬСТВЕ ЖИЛЬЯ В УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ В ПЕРИОД 1940-1960 ГГ 23-27

Мирзаева Наргиза Беркиновна, Рузиева Мухлиса Баходир кизи
ИНВАЛИДНОСТЬ И ЕЕ ИСТОРИЯ. СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ЗАЩИТА ИНВАЛИДОВ В УЗБЕКИСТАНЕ 28-33

Abdug‘aniyev Bekzod Abduvali o‘gli
SUG‘DIYLARDA DIN MASALASI: ZARDUSHTIYLIK VA MAZDAKIYLIK 34-40

Umrzoqov Maqsud Shokirovich
V.L.VYATKINNING SAMARQANDNING TARIXIY YODGORLIKLARINI O‘RGANISHGA DOIR ISHLARI 41-46

Ochildiyev Lochinbek
QASHQADARYO VOHASI TARIXIY-MADANIY YODGORLIKLARI, ZIYORATGOHLARI ULARNING TARIXIY-ETNOGRAFIK XUSUSIYATLARI 47-56

Mamatqulov Bekzod, Bozorov Alisher
O‘ZBEKISTONDA SANOAT TARMOQLARINING RIVOJLANISHIDA JANUBIY VILOYATLARNING O‘RNI (1924-1991-YILLAR) 57-64

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI

Мамажонов Акрамжон
МОЛИЯВИЙ НАТИЖАЛАР (УМУМЛАШГАН ДАРОМАДЛАР) ТЎҒРИСИДАГИ ҲИСОБОТ ВА УНИ ШАКЛЛАНИШИ 65-71

Xolmuratov Xolilla
O‘ZBEKISTONDA QAYTA TIKLANUVCHI ENERGIYA MANBALARINI RIVOJLANTIRISH VA ENERGOSAMARADORLIKNI OSHIRISH ISTIQBOLLARI: IQTISODIY VA IJTIMOIY TAHLIL 72-83

Karimov Khojakbar
INNOVATION POTENTIAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT IN UZBEKISTAN’S MANUFACTURING SECTOR: ENHANCING EFFICIENCY THROUGH AI-DRIVEN MANAGEMENT OF INNOVATIVE INFRASTRUCTURES 84-90

Тўлаков Улуғбек Тошматович
СОЛИҚ МАЪМУРИЯТЧИЛИГИНИ ТАКОМИЛЛАШТИРИШДА ИННОВАЦИОН ЁНДАШУВЛАР 91-105

Xolmurotov Fozil
RAQOBATBARDOSHLIKNI OSHIRISH VA EKSPORTNI RIVOJLANTIRISH ORQALI MINTAQAVIY IQTISODIY BARQARORLIKNI TA'MINLASH: NAZARIYA VA AMALIY YONDASHUVLAR 106-118

Komilov Bakhtiyorjon
OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES IN E-COMMERCE LOGISTICS IN CENTRAL ASIA 119-129

Abdusattorov Sodiqjon
TA'LIM XIZMATLARI BOZORIDA TADBIRKORLIK FAOLIYATI TURLARI 130-134

G'anibayev Ilxomjon
AUDITORLIK DALILLARI ISHONCHLILIGINI TA'MINLASHDA INTERVYU USULINING AHAMIYATI 135-145

Akhmedov Khasan
ISSUES OF IMPROVING THE SYSTEM OF COMPENSATION PAYMENTS UNDER COMPULSORY CIVIL LIABILITY INSURANCE 146-153

Саттаров Абдисамат Умирқулович
МИНТАҚАВИЙ ИҚТИСОДИЁТДА БАҲОЛАШ МЕТОДИКАСИ ВА УНДА ЭКОНОМЕТРИК УСУЛЛАР 154-159

Musamukhamedov Azimjon Jamoliddinovich
O'ZBEKISTONDA ISLOMIY MIKROMOLIYA: BARQARORLIK VA FAROVONLIK SARI ADOLATLI YO'L 160-168

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI

Xaitov Elmurod Bekmurodovich
DUNYO AHOLISINING O'SISH DINAMIKASIGA TA'SIR ETUVCHI IJTIMOIY KO'RSATKICHLAR VA AHOLI HAYOT SIFATI 169-174

Abdullayeva Xulkar Raxmatullayevna
BIOEPISTEMOLOGIYA YOKI EPISTEMOLOGIYADA FANLARARO YONDASHUVLAR 175-179

Sulaymonov Maxmudjon Shuxratbekovich
O'ZBEKISTONDA FUQAROLIK POZITSIYASI SHAKLLANISHIGA TA'SIR KO'RSATUVCHI IJTIMOIY OMILLARNING FALSAFIY TAHLILI 180-185

Berdaliyeva Sevara
YUSUF XOS HOJIBNING AXLOQIY QARASHLARINI SHAKLLANISHINING TARIXIY-IJTIMOIY OMILLARI 186-198

Ergashev Urolbek Berkinovich
AHMAD TOSHKO'PRIZODA ILMLAR TASNIFINING AHAMIYATI 199-205

Qaxorov Pulotjon Xursanmurodovich
INSON GO'ZALLIGI VA UNING AXLOQIY BAHOSI 206-211

Абдуллаходжаев Гайрат
ГЛОБАЛИЗАЦИЯ И ЕЁ ВЛИЯНИЕ НА ЭСТЕТИЧЕСКОЕ ВОСПИТАНИЕ МОЛОДЕЖИ 212-215

Ro'ziyev Maqsud O'rinovich
ABULHASAN BAXMANYOR SHAXSIYATI VA MA'NAVIY MEROSI 216-220

10.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI

O‘zbekov Umidjon Narzullo o‘g‘li, Boboqulova Nilufar Xayrullo qizi
BOSHLANG‘ICH TA’LIM INGLIZ TILI DARSLARIDA OG‘ZAKI NUTQNI SHAKLLANTIRISH 221-225

Kamalova Madina
CHINGIZ AYTMATOV ASARLARIDA BOLA RUHIYATI 226-230

Karimov Rivojiddin Gulamjonovich
DISCOURSE AND ITS LINGUOCULTURAL INTERPRETATION 231-240

Baxtiyorova Maftuna Baxtiyorovna
INGLIZ TILIDA ANTROPONIMIK BIRLIKLARNING LEKSIK-SEMANTIK TAHLILI 241-246

Nurmuxammedov Yusuf Shakarboyevich
FRAZEOLOGIK BIRLIKLARNING MA’NO QATLAMLARI, METAFORA VA METONIMIYA KABI LINGVISTIK HODISALAR BILAN ALOQASI 247-251

Xujakulov Ravshan Isroilovich
INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA XALQ TABOBATIGA OID LEKSIK BIRLIKLARNING DERIVATSION TADQIQI 252-258

Olimova Khurshida Vaydillayevna
“PROPER NOUNS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK: STRUCTURE AND THEIR UNIQUE FEATURES” 259-263

Ermatov Ixtiyor, Risqulova Muslima
“DEVONU LUG‘OTIT TURK” ASARIDA TOPONIMLARNING BERILISHI 264-269

Abduraimova Dinara Bahodir qizi, Abdullayeva Nilufar Ramazonovna
INGLIZ TILIDAGI LEKSIK MATERIALLARNI BOYITISHDA ZAMONAVIY TEXNOLOGIYALARNING O‘RNI 270-273

Mardonov Maxmud
LATIFALARNI TASNIF QILISH MEZONLARI VA TASNIFOTI 274-280

Nazarov Sardor Shamurodovich
A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF STRUCTURAL-SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGE WORD COMBINATIONS 281-284

12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR

Абдурасулова Кумриниса Раимкуловна, Каракетова Дилноза Юлдашевна
КРИМИНОЛОГИЯДА САБАБИЯТ 285-302

Yumatov Bogdan Olegovich
APPROACHES TO UNDERSTANDING THE PRINCIPLES OF ANTI-CORRUPTION MONITORING 303-309

Абдурахманова Нодирахон
ПРОБЛЕМЫ ИМПЛЕМЕНТАЦИИ СМАРТ-КОНТРАКТОВ В ЗАКОНОДАТЕЛЬСТВО УЗБЕКИСТАНА 310-317

Бекбутаева Лобар
СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ЗАЩИТА ПРАВ ДЕТЕЙ-СИРОТ И ДЕТЕЙ, ОСТАВШИХСЯ БЕЗ ПОПЕЧЕНИЯ РОДИТЕЛЕЙ: МЕЖДУНАРОДНО-ПРАВОВЫЕ СТАНДАРТЫ И НАЦИОНАЛЬНЫЕ АСПЕКТЫ 318-323

Nishonov Abdulloh Ubaydulloh o‘g‘li
CHIQINDILARNI TRANSCHEGARAVIY TASHISH VA OLIB O‘TISHNING XALQARO HUQUQIY TARTIBI 324-329

Саидов Шохруххон Музаффарович
ПРОКУРАТУРА ОРГАНЛАРИНИНГ ҲУҚУҚ ИЖОДКОРЛИГИ ФАОЛИЯТИДАГИ ИШТИРОКИНИ БАҲОЛАШНИНГ ЎЗИГА ХОС ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИ 330-338

Maxmudov Sunnat Azim o‘g‘li
AYBLILIK TO‘G‘RISIDAGI MASALANI HAL QILMAY TURIB JINOYAT ISHINI TUGATISH TARTIBI: QONUNCHILIKDAGI MUAMMOLAR TAHLILI 339-348

Inomxo‘jaeva Sanobar Muxammadixonovna
JAMIYATDA HUQUQIY ONGNI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA HUQUQIY TARBIYA USULLARINING AHAMIYATI 349-355

Mirzakarimova Dilafruz Doniyorovna
SUN’IY INTELLEKT, ROBOTOTEXNIKA VA HUQUQ: SUN’IY INTELLEKTNING XAVFSIZ KIBERXAVFSIZLIK TIZIMLARIGA TA’SIRI 356-362

Raximjonova Nargizaxon Raximjonovna
YAGONA JINOYATNING JINOYAT-HUQUQIY TAVSIFI 363-368

Dehqanov Raxmatilla Mirzaraxmat o‘g‘li
ISTE’MOLCHILAR ISHTIROKIDAGI TRANSCHEGARAVIY MUNOSABATLAR UCHUN QO‘LLANADIGAN HUQUQ 369-374

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI

Iminaxunova Iroda Xuseynovna
DIAGNOSTIK YONDASHUV ASOSIDA XORIJIY TILNI O‘QITISH IMKONIYATLARI 375-379

Xusanova Mohira
XORIJIY TILLARNI O‘QITISH VA NAZORAT QILISHNING MAZMUNI 380-386

Haqberdiyev Baxtiyor Rustamovich
TEXNIK VA SAN’AT FANLARINI INTEGRATIV O‘QITISHDA SINERGETIK KOMPETENTLIKNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH 387-391

Erkulova Feruza Melikuziyevna
THE ROLE OF METHODOLOGICAL TRAINING IN ENHANCING PROFESSIONAL COMPETENCE OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE TEACHERS 392-402

Malikova Madina Abduraxmon qizi
INGLIZ TILI DARSLARINI O‘QITISH JARAYONIDA HAMKORLIK VA KOOPERATIV O‘QITISH TEXNOLOGIYALARIDAN FOYDALANISHNING USTUVOR USULLARI 403-407

Умаров Азиз Авазович
РОЛЬ ДИАЛОГИЧЕСКОЙ РЕЧИ В ОБУЧЕНИИ РУССКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ: МЕТОДИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ 408-412

Рахмонова Шалола Фахриддин кизи
ЖАМИЯТ РИВОЖЛАНИШИДА МЕДИА КОМПЕТЕНЦИЯНИНГ ЎРНИ 413-417

Boymirzaeva Raximaxon Xoshimjonovna
XALQ TA’LIMI PEDAGOGLARNI MALAKASINI OSHIRISH JARAYONIDA HUQUQIY ONG VA HUQUQIY MADANIYATINI YUKSALTIRISHGA OID XORIJ TAJRIBASI 418-427

Jamolova Mohigul Baxtiyorovna
BO‘LAJAK CHET TILI FANI O‘QITUVCHILARINING TANQIDIY FIKRLASH QOBILIYATLARINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING NAZARIY VA METODIK ASOSLARI 428-432

Raxmatov Mirzo Mukimovich
BO‘LAJAK INFORMATIKA O‘QITUVCHILARIGA DASTURLASH TILLARINI O‘QITISHNI TAKOMILLASHTIRISHDA SEMIOTIK YONDASHUV 433-438

Umirova Mamlakat Imomovna
NUTQIY MADANIYATNI O‘STIRISHNING NAZARIY VA AMALIY ASOSLARI 439-442

Nafasov Arslon Komilovich
TARIX FANINI O‘QITISH PEDAGOGIK TADQIQOTLAR OBYEKTI SIFATIDA 443-448

Valiyeva Nasiba Xadiytullayevna
OLIY TA’LIMDA O‘QITISHNI RAQAMLASHTIRISHDA ZAMONAVIY PEDAGOGIK METOD VA MODELLAR 449-455

Мухаммадиева Угилой Холмуродовна
ФОРМИРОВАНИЕ НАВЫКОВ И КОМПЕТЕНЦИЙ В ОБЛАСТИ СИНХРОННОГО ПЕРЕВОДА У СТУДЕНТОВ 456-463

Qosimova Ozoda Xudoynazarovna
PEDAGOG XOTIN-QIZLARNING IJTIMOIY FAOLLIGINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING IJTIMOIY-PEDAGOGIK TAHLILI 464-472

SCIENCE PROBLEMS.UZ

Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari
Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences
Volume 5 | Issue 1 | 2025
ISSN Online: 2181-1342

Received: 20 December 2024
Accepted: 5 January 2025
Published: 15 January 2025

Article / Original Paper

DISCOURSE AND ITS LINGUOCULTURAL INTERPRETATION

Karimov Rivojiddin Gulamjonovich,
PhD, associate professor of
Namangan State Institute of Foreign Languages
named after Isxakhan Ibrat
E-mail: Rivojiddink77@gmail.com

Abstract. Discourse extends beyond communication, reflecting linguistic culture, social structures, and ideologies. This study explores its linguocultural interpretation, analyzing cultural codes, stereotypes, and communication means. Findings highlight discourse's role in shaping identity and social norms, with globalization and digitalization driving its evolution. Further research should examine digital and multilingual discourse dynamics.

Keywords: discourse analysis, linguocultural interpretation, cultural codes, verbal and non-verbal communication, cross-cultural communication, globalization, social norms.

DISKURS VA UNING LINGVOMADANIY TALQINI

Karimov Rivojiddin Gulamjonovich
Filologiya fanlari bo‘yicha falsafa doktori (PhD), dotsent
Is’hoqxon Ibrat nomidagi Namangan davlat chet tillar instituti

Annotatsiya. Diskurs faqat kommunikatsiya vositasi emas, balki lingvomadaniy xususiyatlar, ijtimoiy tuzilmalar va mafkuralarni aks ettiradi. Tadqiqot madaniy kodlar, stereotiplar va kommunikatsiya vositalarini tahlil qiladi. Natijalar diskursning ijtimoiy identifikatsiya va normalarni shakllantirishdagi rolini hamda globallashuv va raqamlashtirish jarayonlarining uning evolyutsiyasiga ta’sirini ko‘rsatadi. Kelgusida raqamli va ko‘p tilli diskurs dinamikasini chuqurroq o‘rganish tavsiya etiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: diskurs tahlili, lingvomadaniy talqin, madaniy kodlar, verbal va noverbal kommunikatsiya, madaniyatlararo muloqot, globallashuv, ijtimoiy me’yorlar.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V5I1Y2025N29

Introduction. Discourse is not merely a means of transmitting information through language; it is a system of meanings embedded in a particular linguistic culture, social context, and ideology. It serves as a bridge between language and society, reflecting historical narratives, collective identity, and cultural values. Discourse analysis is fundamental in understanding the mechanisms through which societies construct knowledge, exercise power, and communicate ideologies. Scholars such as Bakhtin (1986) have emphasized the dialogic nature of discourse, where meaning is constantly shaped through interaction, while Foucault (1972) highlights the role of discourse in producing and maintaining power structures within society [1:36,2:97].

The linguacultural interpretation of discourse extends beyond linguistic structure, incorporating sociocultural dynamics that influence meaning-making. Language is inherently tied to a society’s traditions, norms, and worldview. Therefore, discourse can be analyzed not

only for its lexical and syntactic properties but also for its embedded cultural implications. Research by Karasik (2002) in Russia explores the concept of discourse as a culturally determined phenomenon, demonstrating how national identity, historical narratives, and social ideology manifest in language use.[3:65] In Uzbekistan, Jalolov (2015) has examined how discourse reflects national and linguistic identity, particularly in the context of foreign language education[4:89], while Dosbayeva N (2021) has contributed to understanding Uzbek discourse structures in intercultural communication, focusing on the adaptation of Uzbek discourse to global communicative practices.[5:47]

By examining how discourse functions within different cultures, researchers can identify variations in communicative styles, the use of metaphors, and the role of cultural symbols in language. Studies by Wierzbicka (1997) have demonstrated that language-specific cultural scripts shape discourse, influencing politeness strategies, indirectness, and communicative norms [6:105]. Similarly, Bozorova (2021) has explored Uzbek discourse from a gender perspective, analyzing the impact of traditional Uzbek social norms on language use in public and private domains [7:32]. Dosbayeva (2022) further investigates the influence of traditional and modern Uzbek linguistic expressions in shaping discourse patterns across different generations [4:90].

Furthermore, globalization and digitalization have transformed the landscape of discourse. Cross-cultural exchanges have led to hybrid discourses that integrate elements from multiple linguistic and cultural traditions. Social media platforms, digital communication, and transnational dialogues contribute to new discourse patterns that reshape traditional linguistic norms. Scholars such as Blommaert (2010) have explored the digitalization of discourse and its impact on global communication [8:87], while Rahimov (2018) has studied the adaptation of Uzbek discourse in online spaces, highlighting changes in traditional communication structures due to digital influences [9:114]. Dosbayeva (2023) analyzes the emergence of digital Uzbek discourse, exploring how online interactions influence language variation and discourse norms in virtual communities [5:48].

Understanding these evolving trends in discourse is crucial for effective cross-cultural communication, diplomacy, translation studies, and language education. Researchers like Hall (1986) have emphasized the role of high-context and low-context cultures in shaping discourse, which is particularly relevant in translation and intercultural dialogue [8:65]. In the Uzbek context, Rakhimov (2019) has analyzed how Uzbek-English translation processes require adaptation of culturally specific discourse markers to ensure communicative clarity [11:53]. This paper aims to explore the intricacies of linguacultural discourse analysis by investigating the role of language in constructing cultural identity, the impact of historical and societal influences on discourse, and the implications of intercultural interactions. Through a methodological framework that integrates linguistic, cultural, and psychological perspectives, this study seeks to provide a comprehensive analysis of how discourse shapes and is shaped by cultural contexts. This research contributes to a deeper understanding of the interplay between language, culture, and communication, offering insights into both traditional and digital discourse transformations in an era of globalization

Methods. The study of linguacultural discourse analysis has been extensively explored by scholars in the fields of linguistics, cultural studies, and communication. Researchers have emphasized the integral relationship between language and culture, highlighting how discourse

serves as a means of expressing cultural identity, social norms, and ideological perspectives. This section reviews key literature on discourse analysis, linguistic relativity, intercultural communication, and the impact of globalization on discourse evolution.

One of the foundational theories in discourse analysis is Bakhtin's (1986) concept of dialogism, which emphasizes that meaning in discourse is not fixed but constantly shaped through interaction [1]. According to Bakhtin, every utterance is influenced by prior discourses and cultural contexts, making discourse a dynamic and evolving entity. Similarly, Foucault (1972) argues that discourse is closely tied to power structures, shaping and reinforcing societal ideologies. His work has been particularly influential in understanding how language constructs and legitimizes knowledge within specific cultural and historical settings [2].

From a linguacultural perspective, Karasik (2002) defines discourse as a culturally conditioned phenomenon, asserting that linguistic structures cannot be fully understood without considering the cultural framework in which they operate [3]. He introduces the notion that discourse reflects national identity, historical narratives, and ideological worldviews. In line with this view, Wierzbicka (1997) explores the idea of cultural scripts, arguing that language encodes culturally specific ways of thinking and behaving [6]. She illustrates how different cultures prioritize politeness, indirectness, or directness in discourse, affecting communication strategies across linguistic communities.

In the Uzbek context, Jalolov (2015) examines discourse as a tool for shaping national and linguistic identity, particularly in the context of foreign language education. His research focuses on how linguistic expressions reflect cultural norms and values in Uzbek society [4]. Dosbayeva (2021) expands on this perspective by analyzing Uzbek discourse in intercultural settings, exploring how Uzbek speakers navigate communicative differences in global interactions. Her study highlights the importance of understanding discourse adaptation strategies in cross-cultural communication [5].

Comparative studies of discourse have also been instrumental in identifying cross-cultural variations in language use. Hall (1986) introduced the concept of high-context and low-context cultures, explaining that some cultures rely heavily on implicit communication and shared background knowledge (e.g., Japan, Korea, Uzbekistan), whereas others favor explicit and direct language use (e.g., the United States, Germany) [10]. This framework has been widely applied in intercultural communication studies to analyze differences in discourse styles. Similarly, Brown and Levinson (1987) developed the theory of politeness strategies, demonstrating how speakers modify their discourse to maintain social harmony and express respect according to cultural expectations.

The impact of globalization and digitalization on discourse has become a growing area of research. Blommaert (2010) discusses the emergence of hybrid discourses, where cross-cultural interactions lead to the blending of linguistic features and communicative norms from multiple traditions [8]. Rahimov (2018) studies how Uzbek discourse adapts to digital communication, noting changes in traditional politeness strategies and the increasing use of informal speech patterns in online interactions [11]. Dosbayeva (2023) further examines how digital platforms influence Uzbek discourse, highlighting the role of social media in shaping new linguistic expressions and discourse structures [5].

The reviewed literature underscores the complexity of discourse as a linguacultural phenomenon. Scholars agree that discourse is deeply embedded in cultural and historical

contexts, shaping communication patterns and social interactions. However, as societies become more interconnected through globalization and digitalization, discourse continues to evolve, integrating elements from diverse linguistic traditions. This study builds on existing research by applying a methodological framework that examines linguistic, cultural, and psychological factors in discourse analysis, contributing to a deeper understanding of how discourse shapes and is shaped by cultural contexts. To analyze the linguacultural aspects of discourse, a combination of methodological approaches was employed, focusing on linguistic, cultural, and social dimensions of communication. This multi-faceted approach allows for a more comprehensive understanding of how discourse functions within and across different cultural contexts. One of the primary methods used in this study was the identification of linguistic units that hold cultural significance. This process involved detecting key words, phrases, and idiomatic expressions that reflect cultural values, traditions, and social structures. The use of corpus analysis and discourse markers facilitated the recognition of frequently occurring linguistic elements that shape communication. For instance, in Uzbek discourse, expressions such as *qo‘ni-qo‘shni (neighbor relations) and hammaslak (comrade)* indicate a strong collectivist orientation, whereas English phrases like *time is money* emphasize the importance *of individual efficiency and time management*. By examining these linguistic units, the study aimed to uncover the deeper cultural meanings embedded in language use.

Another crucial methodological approach involved the interpretation of linguistic elements within cultural contexts. Language does not exist in isolation; it is deeply embedded in the social and historical fabric of a community. This method focused on analyzing how words, phrases, and idiomatic expressions are understood and utilized in different cultural settings. Language use in traditional storytelling, historical narratives, media discourse, and everyday social interactions provided insights into how meaning is constructed within a given cultural framework. For example, the English phrase break the ice is widely used to describe an effort to ease social tension, whereas a direct equivalent with the same metaphorical connotation does not exist in Uzbek culture. This approach was instrumental in exploring linguistic relativity and its impact on intercultural communication.

A comparative analysis was also conducted to examine the similarities and differences in discourse across various languages and cultures. This approach enabled a systematic exploration of linguistic structures, metaphor usage, idiomatic expressions, and syntactic patterns in different speech communities. By comparing features of discourse in diverse linguistic traditions, the study identified shared and distinct ways in which cultures express meaning. For example, while Italian discourse is often characterized by expressive hand gestures that accompany verbal communication, Japanese discourse tends to emphasize subtlety and restraint. Likewise, the use of honorifics and politeness strategies in Japanese and Korean contrasts with the more direct nature of English interactions. This comparative approach provided valuable insights into how discourse evolves based on cultural norms and communicative conventions.

The study also incorporated an analysis of social and psychological factors that influence discourse formation and interpretation. Language serves various social functions, including persuasion, identity construction, and the negotiation of power dynamics. Psychological elements such as cognitive processing, perception, and emotional responses also shape discourse in significant ways. The study examined how discourse is adapted to different social

hierarchies, gender norms, and power relations, revealing how language can reinforce or challenge existing social structures. In Uzbek culture, for instance, indirect speech and euphemisms are commonly employed to maintain social harmony and demonstrate respect, whereas Western cultures may favor directness and explicitness in communication. These differences illustrate the broader impact of social and psychological factors on discourse construction. By integrating these methodological approaches, the study developed a comprehensive framework for analyzing linguacultural discourse. This approach not only enhances cross-cultural understanding but also contributes to the broader field of discourse analysis by highlighting the intricate relationship between language, culture, and social dynamics.

Results. Each society's cultural characteristics are reflected in its language. Traditional values, lifestyle, and norms manifest in idioms, proverbs, and metaphors. For instance, in Uzbek, "qo'ni-qo'shni" and "hammaslak" express collectivist values, whereas in English, "time is money" highlights an emphasis on time management. Similarly, in Chinese culture, idioms such as "家和万事兴" (A harmonious family leads to prosperity) emphasize familial unity, while in German, the phrase "Ordnung muss sein" (There must be order) reflects a cultural preference for discipline and structure. Linguists such as Edward Sapir and Benjamin Whorf have theorized that language structures shape thought patterns and cultural perspectives. Their Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis suggests that linguistic relativity influences how societies conceptualize reality. This supports the idea that cultural codes embedded in language influence cognitive and communicative behaviors, reinforcing stereotypes and social norms. Furthermore, cultural stereotypes in discourse can impact cross-cultural communication. For example, directness in Western cultures is often perceived as confidence, whereas in Asian cultures, it may be seen as impolite. Understanding these nuances is essential for intercultural competence and effective discourse interpretation.

Social and cultural context plays a decisive role in understanding discourse. The same word or phrase can have different meanings across cultures due to historical, social, and ideological influences. For instance, the English idiom "break the ice" metaphorically refers to easing social tension, whereas a direct translation into Uzbek does not carry the same connotation. In contrast, Uzbek speakers may use phrases like "dasturxon yozish" (literally "spreading the tablecloth") to imply initiating warm social interactions, particularly in hospitality settings.

Similarly, in Japanese, the phrase "reading the air" (空気を読む, kūki o yomu) conveys an expectation to interpret unspoken social cues, a concept that has no direct equivalent in English. Meanwhile, the German phrase "Ich verstehe nur Bahnhof" (literally "I only understand train station") is used to express confusion, whereas English speakers might say, "It's all Greek to me."

The theoretical framework of linguistic relativity, particularly the Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis, suggests that the structure of a language influences its speakers' worldviews. This means that idiomatic expressions and discourse structures in a language can shape cultural attitudes, perceptions, and communication strategies. Edward Sapir and Benjamin Lee Whorf argued that language encodes culturally significant categories, meaning that even similar concepts may be expressed in ways that reflect cultural values.

Furthermore, Pierre Bourdieu's concept of linguistic capital suggests that different social groups use specific discourse styles to assert their identity and maintain social structures. For example, formal registers in European languages often convey social status, while in some Eastern cultures, indirect and honorific speech forms are critical for maintaining hierarchical relationships.

Cross-cultural differences in discourse can also reinforce stereotypes or cause misunderstandings. For example, the stereotype of French speakers being "romantic" or Russian speakers sounding "harsh" can stem from phonetic characteristics and culturally embedded intonation patterns rather than inherent personality traits. Similarly, direct speech in Western cultures is often associated with confidence and assertiveness, while indirect speech in Eastern cultures is linked to politeness and respect.

Understanding these linguistic and cultural differences in discourse is essential for translation, diplomacy, business negotiations, and intercultural communication. A lack of awareness of these nuances can lead to miscommunication, while linguistic competence in cultural contexts fosters deeper understanding and engagement between cultures.

In Western cultures, silence can be perceived as awkward or signaling disinterest, and speakers tend to fill gaps in conversation with small talk. In Japan, China, and Finland, silence is often seen as a sign of deep thought, respect, or agreement rather than an indication of disengagement. In Indigenous cultures, such as the Navajo and Inuit, silence is used strategically in discussions and negotiations, allowing individuals to reflect before speaking.

Several communication theories help explain how non-verbal cues function in cross-cultural discourse:

Edward T. Hall’s Proxemics Theory (1966) explores the use of space in communication and how personal space varies across cultures. Ray Birdwhistell’s Kinesics Theory (1970) analyzes how gestures and body movements convey meaning in different cultural contexts. Hofstede’s Cultural Dimensions Theory (1980) identifies how collectivist cultures (e.g., East Asia, Latin America) and individualist cultures (e.g., the U.S., U.K.) influence non-verbal communication styles.

A lack of awareness of non-verbal communication differences can lead to misunderstandings in international business, diplomacy, and social interactions. For example:

An American businessperson may misinterpret an Asian colleague’s silence as a lack of engagement rather than a sign of respect. A Middle Eastern speaker’s preference for close conversational distance may feel intrusive to a Northern European counterpart. An African diplomat’s strong use of hand gestures may be seen as overly expressive by a Japanese delegation accustomed to restrained body language. By understanding and adapting to these non-verbal cultural nuances, individuals and organizations can improve communication effectiveness, enhance intercultural competence, and foster better relationships in global interactions.

Language serves as a repository of a nation’s history, traditions, and worldview, encapsulating cultural values and societal norms. The way a society expresses ideas, beliefs, and social structures through language reflects its unique cultural perspective. For instance, in Uzbek, the proverb *"Bo‘lar bola beshigida* ma’lum" (A child's future is evident from infancy) underscores the cultural emphasis on early upbringing and the belief in the formative nature of childhood. Similarly, English expressions such as *"the early bird catches the worm"* reflect a

culture that values individual initiative and timeliness. These linguistic expressions provide insights into cultural ideologies and social expectations embedded within discourse.

To analyze discourse from a linguacultural perspective, a multi-layered methodological approach is essential. This involves identifying key linguistic features, interpreting their cultural significance, drawing cross-cultural comparisons, and considering the psychological and social dimensions that shape discourse.

One fundamental stage of linguacultural discourse analysis is the identification of culturally significant linguistic units. This includes proverbs, idioms, metaphorical expressions, and discourse markers that carry deeper cultural meanings. Corpus analysis and linguistic categorization help determine the prominence and frequency of these elements within discourse. For example, Uzbek discourse frequently incorporates collectivist-oriented phrases such as *"el-yurt"* (nation and people), reinforcing the communal nature of Uzbek society. In contrast, English discourse often employs expressions like *"stand on your own two feet",* which reflect an individualistic cultural orientation.

The interpretation of linguistic units within cultural contexts is another critical step. Language does not exist in isolation but is deeply embedded in cultural traditions, social interactions, and historical narratives. Examining how different societies perceive and employ linguistic elements allows researchers to understand the underlying worldview encoded in language. For instance, the English metaphor *"break the ice"* symbolizes initiating social interaction, whereas a direct equivalent does not exist in Uzbek culture. Instead, Uzbek discourse often prioritizes indirect politeness strategies, demonstrating a cultural preference for maintaining social harmony.

A comparative analysis of discourse across cultures allows for the systematic study of similarities and differences in language use. This approach helps identify shared communicative features and culturally specific patterns that define discourse structures. For instance, Italian discourse is often accompanied by expressive hand gestures, while Japanese communication emphasizes subtlety and indirectness. In Uzbek and Korean discourse, honorifics and respectful address forms play a crucial role in maintaining hierarchical social relationships, whereas English discourse tends to favor a more egalitarian and direct communication style.

The consideration of social and psychological factors in discourse analysis provides deeper insights into how language functions in shaping social identities, power structures, and interpersonal relationships. Psychological factors such as cognitive processing, emotional expression, and perception of politeness influence discourse construction. Social hierarchies, gender roles, and power dynamics further impact how language is used in different contexts. For example, in Uzbek discourse, indirect speech and euphemisms are commonly employed to demonstrate respect and maintain social equilibrium, whereas in Western cultures, directness is often valued for its clarity and efficiency.

By integrating these stages of linguacultural discourse analysis, researchers can develop a comprehensive understanding of the relationship between language and culture. This approach enhances cross-cultural communication, contributes to translation studies, and fosters a greater appreciation for linguistic diversity in a globalized world.

Discussion. The analysis of linguacultural discourse highlights the intricate relationship between language, culture, and social interaction. This study has demonstrated that language

is not merely a tool for communication but a repository of cultural values, historical narratives, and collective identity. The findings from the identification of linguistic units, cultural interpretation, comparative analysis, and consideration of social and psychological factors provide valuable insights into how discourse reflects and shapes cultural perspectives.

A key observation from the study is that linguistic expressions encode cultural ideologies and societal expectations. The proverb *"Bo‘lar bola beshigida ma’lum"* in Uzbek, which emphasizes the formative role of childhood, contrasts with English expressions like *"the early bird catches the worm"*, which foregrounds individual effort. Such differences illustrate how languages embed culturally specific worldviews, reinforcing social norms and values unique to each society. The identification of culturally significant linguistic units, including idioms, metaphors, and discourse markers, further supports the argument that language is deeply interwoven with the cultural fabric of a community.

The interpretation of linguistic units within cultural contexts has revealed that meaning is not static but shaped by cultural perceptions and traditions. A striking example is the English phrase *"break the ice",* which signifies easing social tension, while an equivalent metaphor is absent in Uzbek discourse. Instead, Uzbek communicative norms prioritize indirect speech and politeness strategies, demonstrating a preference for maintaining social harmony over direct engagement. This finding aligns with previous research on high-context cultures (Hall, 1986), where implicit communication plays a dominant role [10]. Similarly, Uzbek discourse incorporates collectivist-oriented phrases such as *"el-yurt" (nation and people)*, which underscores the cultural emphasis on community, in contrast to English discourse, which frequently employs individualist expressions like *"stand on your own two feet".* These observations reinforce the idea that language encodes and reinforces social structures, values, and norms.

The comparative analysis of discourse across cultures further supports the argument that discourse structures differ significantly depending on cultural traditions. While Italian communication is characterized by expressive gestures that reinforce spoken language, Japanese and Korean discourse relies on subtlety and indirect politeness strategies. Uzbek and Korean languages share similarities in their use of honorifics and hierarchical speech forms, reflecting a strong emphasis on respect and social hierarchy. In contrast, English discourse tends to be more egalitarian and direct, reflecting the cultural values of individual autonomy and openness. These findings underscore the necessity of comparative linguistic analysis in understanding how cultural and linguistic norms shape communicative behaviors.

The consideration of social and psychological factors in discourse has provided deeper insights into the role of language in shaping social identities and power relations. The study found that social hierarchies, gender roles, and cognitive processing significantly influence discourse construction. In Uzbek society, for example, indirectness and euphemisms are frequently used to navigate hierarchical relationships and maintain social equilibrium. This finding aligns with research by Brown and Levinson (1987) on politeness strategies, which suggests that speakers modify their discourse to align with cultural expectations of respect and face-saving. In Western societies, however, directness and explicitness are often valued for their clarity and efficiency, reflecting different cultural expectations in communication. These variations highlight the need for greater cultural awareness in cross-cultural communication and translation studies.

Another crucial aspect of discourse transformation observed in this study is the impact of globalization and digitalization on linguacultural discourse. The increasing use of digital platforms and social media has led to hybrid discourses that blend linguistic features and communicative norms from multiple cultural traditions. This phenomenon is particularly evident in online Uzbek discourse, where younger generations integrate English loanwords, internet slang, and informal speech patterns that diverge from traditional discourse norms. Dosbayeva (2023) highlights that digital Uzbek discourse is evolving rapidly, reflecting new modes of communication influenced by globalization and technological advancements. These changes indicate that linguacultural discourse is not static but constantly evolving, adapting to new social and technological realities [5].

The findings of this study have several practical implications for intercultural communication, translation studies, and language education. Understanding the linguacultural aspects of discourse can enhance cross-cultural communication skills, allowing individuals to navigate linguistic differences more effectively. The study also emphasizes the need for culturally adaptive translation practices, ensuring that linguistic and cultural nuances are preserved in cross-linguistic communication. Furthermore, the findings suggest that language educators should integrate linguacultural discourse analysis into foreign language instruction, helping learners understand how language reflects cultural and social identities.

Conclusion. The discussion highlights that linguacultural discourse analysis is a crucial tool for understanding how language encodes cultural values, social hierarchies, and historical narratives. The integration of linguistic, cultural, and psychological methodologies has provided a comprehensive framework for analyzing discourse across different cultural contexts. As societies become more interconnected through globalization and digitalization, discourse will continue to evolve, shaping and being shaped by new communicative practices. Future research should further explore the influence of multilingual interactions, digital communication trends, and emerging discourse patterns in a rapidly globalizing world.

References/Adabiyotlar/Литература:

1. Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. Translated by Vern W. McGee; edited by Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist. University of Texas Press.
2. Foucault, M. (1972). *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A. M. Sheridan Smith. Pantheon Books.
3. Karasik, V. I. (2002). *Yazykovoy Krug: Lichnost', Kontsepty, Diskurs* [The Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse]. Gnosis.
4. Jalolov, J. J. (2015). *Chet Tillarini O'qitish Metodikasi* [Methods of Teaching Foreign Languages]. O'qituvchi Publishing House.
5. Dosbayeva, N. T. (2019). "The Linguocultural Analysis of Literary Translation from Uzbek into English (By the Example of the Short Story 'The Pomegranate' by Abdulla Kahhor)." *Scientific Bulletin of Namangan State University*, Vol. 1, Issue 11, Article 25.
6. Wierzbicka, A. (1997). *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words: English, Russian, Polish, German, and Japanese*. Oxford University Press.
7. Bozorova, M. (2021). *Gender and Language in Uzbek Society*. Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature.
8. Blommaert, J. (2010). *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Rahimov, I. (2018). "Digital Communication and Language Change: The Case of Uzbek." *Journal of Central Asian Studies*, Vol. 25, No. 2, pp. 45-60.
10. Hall, E. T. (1986). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books.

11. Rakhimov, S. (2019). "Challenges in Translating Uzbek Discourse Markers into English." *Translation Studies Journal*, Vol. 3, Issue 1, pp. 78-92.

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

IJTIMOIY-GUMANITAR FANLARNING DOLZARB MUAMMOLARI

№ 1 (5) – 2025

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО-ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

“Ijtimoiy-gumanitar fanlarning dolzarb muammolari” elektron jurnali 2020-yil 6-avgust kuni 1368-sonli guvohnoma bilan davlat ro‘yxatiga olingan.

Muassis: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM” mas’uliyati cheklangan jamiyati

Tahririyat manzili:

100070. Toshkent shahri, Yakkasaroy tumani, Kichik Beshyog‘och ko‘chasi, 70/10-uy. Elektron manzil: scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Bog‘lanish uchun telefon:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).