

## GENERAL AND SPECIFIC CHARACTERISTICS OF FAMILY DISCOURSE (in the example of English and Uzbek family discourse).

**Azimova Shahrinoz Ikromovna**

Bukhara state university

[shahrinoz.8882@gmail.com](mailto:shahrinoz.8882@gmail.com)

### **ABSTRACT**

*This article highlights the speech communication of the family as a discursive activity. It determines the need for linguistic study of family discourse and its place in discursive practices. The common and different aspects of the English and Uzbek family discourse are analyzed, and the linguistic units used in the conversations are compared during the study of family conversations of representatives of two peoples belonging to different cultures.*

**Key words:** family discourse, communication, discourse, family, speech situation.

### **INTRODUCTION**

In recent years, the understanding of the general problems of speech communication has led to the growth of research aimed at studying discursive (speech) communication in modern society, and the need to study the linguistic, pragmatic and linguocultural aspects of interpersonal relations. Considering speech as a set of organized, functional contextual units of "language in action" has increased attention to the study of everyday speech, while discursive analysis, the emergence of speech act theories, and a wide range of communication principles. As a result of research, the field of everyday speech has become a subject of research.

The special features of everyday communication are reflected in family discourse. Krasik defines family discourse as "the initial type of discourse, naturally formed from childhood<sup>1</sup>".

Family discourse reflects not only the lexical competence of the people living in this family, social-psychological relations and personal qualities between them, but also the unique culture and social characteristics of the whole nation. Family discourse has its own ethnic and cultural characteristics for each socio-historical community.

---

<sup>1</sup> Карасик В.И. О типах дискурса. // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. науч. тр. - Волгоград, 2000а. - С. 5.

## LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODS

Discursive theories are studied in linguistics in the works of foreign scientists K. Brown and G. Yule, D. Schiffrin, M. Halliday, J. Cutting, V. Grigoryeva, V. Karasik, M. Makarov<sup>1</sup>, in Uzbek linguistics the theory are widely analyzed by Sh. Safarov, L. Raupova, G. Toirova<sup>2</sup> and in others' works.

Linguistic, sociolinguistic features of family communication were specially researched by Sh. Blum-Kulka, E. Ochs and C. Taylor, lexical, parameological features of family communication by A. Baykulova, V. Anokhina, S. Ruziyeva.

Discourse is the process of expressing an opinion, the written or oral form of linguistic possibilities, the material event, the joint use of linguistic and non-linguistic means, a set of linguistic-ethno-psycho-situational factors. Discourse is a unique complex system, a system formed from the totality of various linguistic and non-linguistic factors. Discourse is a text with linguistic and non-linguistic factors (pragmatic, socio-cultural, spiritual); text viewed from the point of view of the event; discourse viewed as a purposeful social action. Discourse is the area of creativity (pattern) of the speaker, in turn, the result of a new idea, communicative purpose (intention)"<sup>3</sup>.

Family discourse refers to the communication of people who are connected by blood and kinship ties, have entered into family relations, and live together.<sup>4</sup>

There are common and specific features of family discourse in English and Uzbek culture, as well as different and similar aspects. We used two theories as a basis for determining such characteristics. These are the results of the comparative study of the discourse proposed by V. B. Kashkin and the parametric analysis of the discourse conducted by M. Halliday.

According to V. Kashkin, discourse is the result of the speech activity of the subject, which occurs in the process of mutual linguistic influence of the dialogue participants. Therefore, the speech effect between communicants is very important in any discursive process, including family discourse.

---

<sup>1</sup> Brown K & Yule G. (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge.: Cambridge University Press.; Schiffrin D. *Approaches to Discourse* (1994). Oxford: Blackwell.; Макаров, М.Л. *Основы теории дискурса* / М.Л. Макаров. – М.: Гнозис, 2003. – 277 с.; Григорьева В.С. *Дискурс как элемент коммуникативного процесса: прагмалингвистический и когнитивный аспект (монография)*. – Тамбов; Изд-во Тамб. гос. тех. ун-та, 2007. – С. 8-9.; Карасик В.И. *Языковой круг: Личность, концепты, дискурс: (монография)*. - М.: Гнозис, 2004. 194 с.

<sup>2</sup> Сафаров Ш. *Прагмалингвистика*. – Тошкент, “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси”. 2008. 300-бет. Раупова Л. *Диалогик нутқнинг дискурсив талқини: Монография*. – Тошкент. Фан. 2011. – Б 180.

<sup>3</sup> Тоирова Г. “Прагмалингвистика” лугати. – Тошкент: «Akademnashr» 2016 й. 9 б

<sup>4</sup> Байкулова А. Н. *Речевое общение в семье : роль в нем животных, растений и предметов вещного мира* // Известия Саратовского ун-та. Новая серия. 2008 в. Т. 8. Серия Филология. Журналистика, вып. 2. С. 14-20.

## DISCUSSION

Everyday speech is everyday communication presented mainly in the form of oral conversation, and it belongs to the second type of two types of discourse - institutional and non-institutional - occurring in a certain communication field. That is, everyday speech as a non-institutional discourse reflects informal colloquial speech on everyday topics.

An example of daily communication speech is speech between close friends, peers, colleagues, or speech based on marriage and kinship relations. Because extralinguistic factors greatly influence the structure and content of everyday speech, the choice of verbal and non-verbal means of communication. These are factors such as addresser (speaker) and addressee (listener), their proximity to each other, speakers' common knowledge base, speech situation.

Person becomes a member of various social groups during his life and communicates with those around him within these groups. The place that gives a person the greatest freedom to express his linguistic individuality is the family. A person's first language experiences are also formed in the family.

Family is a universal human value. Family and marriage relations, duties and responsibilities between spouses, parents and children are manifested in different ways in different peoples and nations based on their national mentality, customs, traditions, and values. Between parents and children in the Western family attitude is based on extreme freedom. Children who grow up in the East also follow the rules of Eastern etiquette in their relationship with their parents. This means asking for parents' blessing while going to work in the morning, asking how they are after work in the evening, not reaching out to the table before parents,

It is manifested in such things as not looking directly into the eyes of parents, not talking back, not interrupting their conversation, and not speaking loudly in front of them.

In the family, children also have duties to their parents. In the East, the following requirements for honoring parents have been passed down from generation to generation. These are always respecting parents, cooking sweet food for them, taking care of their health, not doing things that displease them, following their advice, always being aware of their condition, marrying with their consent.

## RESULTS

The tactical organization of the family discourse, its connection with the general strategy of speech interaction is determined by the social status, psychological characteristics and communicative purpose of the participants of the dialogue. The set

of language units used by family members in family discourse may differ depending on the hierarchical position of the speakers and their age characteristics.

When studying the general and specific features of the family discourse in the English and Uzbek cultures, first of all, it is necessary to look at the expression of the concept of "*family/oila*" in the mentality of two nations.

The commonality of the concept of *family/oila* in the culture of English and Uzbek languages is seen in the lexical units associated with this concept. For example: *home/uy*, *children/bolalar*, *parents/ota-ona*, *wedding/to'y*, *love/sevgi*, *muhabbat*, *obedience/bo'ysunish*. All these concepts have a common connection, and they unite around the concept of family. Also, the family concept consists of several other frames common to representatives of both cultures. These are the *head of the family/oila boshlig'i*, *family members/oila a'zolari*, *family rules/oila nizomi*, *family roles/oilaviy rollar*, *family commitment/oilaviy majburiyatlar*, *family relationships/oilaviy munosabatlar*, *family conflicts/oilaviy nizolar*. In family discourse, these concepts are signs of a certain type of discourse.

There are also specific national characteristics of the concept of family, which differ within a certain nation or region. For example, for representatives of Western culture, the concept of "my family" has a narrower meaning than the concept of "my family" in the Uzbek or Central Asian nations. Usually in European nations, family means husband, wife and their children. In Uzbeks, a husband and wife, their children, grandparents, brothers, and sisters are considered one family.

The participants of the family discourse are members of the same family, their legal structure is the same in English and Uzbek society, and their status and role tasks are basically similar. That is, parents are responsible for their children's upbringing and economic and social support until they grow up and start an independent life. Children also depend on their parents until they reach adulthood. This aspect is also reflected in their communication. That is, until they reach adulthood, children communicate with respect towards their parents or senior members of the family, respect and obey the decisions made by them.

Differences and similarities in the English and Uzbek family discourse are also visible in the forms of address between family members. Addressing the mother-in-law (husband's mother), father-in-law (husband's father) or husband in the English family discourse is completely different from the Uzbek family discourse. In Uzbek family discourse they are not addressed with their name. In the Uzbek family discourse, the husband is addressed as *dadasi/begim/azizim*, the mother-in-law is addressed as *oyijon*, and the father-in-law is addressed as *dadajon* (*uncle* in some regions). Differences between brothers and sisters are hardly noticeable. Family references are mainly chosen depending on the speech situation.

## CONCLUSION

As previously stated, language is a means of communication is only one of its many functions. In fact, language is, first of all, a means of seeing, hearing, knowing and perceiving the world. In addition, language is a factor that expresses the inner world and spirituality of each person and the entire nation. The manifestation of these factors is directly related to the factor that ensures the moral, spiritual and psychological health of family members - interpersonal relations and the process of mutual communication in the family.

Thus, a comparative analysis of cultural characteristics, including in the field of family relations, showed that it is determined by the hermeneutics of culture. Its study is most effectively carried out from the point of view of linguistic and cultural studies of communication.

## REFERENCES

1. Карасик В.И. О типах дискурса. // Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс: сб. науч. тр. - Волгоград, 2000а. - С. 5.
2. Brown K & Yule G. (1983). Discourse analysis. Cambridge.: Cambridge University Press.; Schiffrin D. Approaches to Discourse (1994). Oxford: Blackwell.; Макаров, М.Л. Основы теории дискурса / М.Л. Макаров. – М.:Гнозис, 2003.-277 с.; Григорьева В.С. Дискурс как элемент коммуникативного процесса: прагмалингвистический и когнитивный аспект (монография). – Тамбов; Изд-во Тамб. гос. тех. ун-та, 2007. – С. 8-9.; Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: Личность, концепты, дискурс: (монография). - М.: Гнозис, 2004. 194 с.
3. Сафаров Ш. Прагмалингвистика. – Тошкент, “Ўзбекистон миллий энциклопедияси”. 2008. 300-бет. Раупова Л. Диалогик нутқнинг дискурсив талқини: Монография. – Тошкент. Фан. 2011. – Б 180.
4. Тоирова Г. “Прагмалингвистика” луғати. – Тошкент: «Akademnashr» 2016 й. 9-б
5. Байкулова А. Н. Речевое общение в семье : роль в нем животных, растений и предметов вещного мира // Известия Саратовского ун-та. Новая серия. 2008 в. Т. 8. Серия Филология. Журналистика, вып. 2. С. 14-20.
6. Azimova Sh.I. Оила дискурсининг замонавий тилшунослик йўналишлари доирасида ўрганилиши.//Таълимда инноватив-креатив технологияларнинг қўлланилиши, нейролингвистик дастурлашнинг амалий асослари// Бухоро – 2021. Б 570-573.