

LINGUOCOGNITIVE FACTORS THAT ACTUALIZE ASSERTIVE SPEECH ACTS IN THE TEXT OF COMMUNICATION (ON THE EXAMPLE OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES)

Abbasova Mukaddas Bakhtiyorovna

teacher of the Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: This article examines the linguocognitive mechanisms that shape and actualize assertive speech acts in communicative texts, focusing on the comparative features of English and Uzbek. The study analyzes how cognitive models, cultural norms, discourse practices, and linguistic structures influence the production and interpretation of assertive acts in both languages. Findings show that assertive acts are not merely linguistic structures but cognitively grounded and culturally conditioned communicative strategies that reflect speakers' worldviews, epistemic stances, and sociocultural expectations.

Keywords: assertive speech acts linguocognitive factors discourse pragmatics epistemic stance English Uzbek

Introduction

Assertive speech acts constitute one of the most fundamental categories in pragmatic theory, as they serve to represent states of affairs, express the speaker's beliefs, and convey factual or inferential judgments about reality. Contemporary linguistics views language as an integrated cognitive system in which communication is shaped by mental models, conceptual structures, and cultural experience. Therefore, the study of assertive acts requires a linguocognitive approach that considers not only linguistic forms but also how speakers conceptualize, evaluate, and encode information within discourse.

English and Uzbek provide a rich comparative platform due to their typological differences and culturally distinct communicative norms. English, with its analytical structure and explicit epistemic markers, tends to express assertiveness through clearly identifiable linguistic cues. Uzbek, on the other hand, employs context-sensitive, socially nuanced, and often indirect strategies rooted in cultural norms of politeness and collective harmony. Investigating these differences reveals how languages encode cognition, how speakers manage certainty and evidence, and how cultural frameworks influence the expression of factual meaning.

The actualization of assertive speech acts is closely linked to the speaker's conceptual knowledge and the cognitive schemas that guide interpretation.

In English, conceptual boundaries tend to be sharply defined, encouraging speakers to articulate facts in a direct, logically structured manner. Expressions such as *I believe*, *I think*, *It is clear that*, or *It seems* signal the speaker's epistemic position explicitly, providing the listener with clear cues for processing the information. This reflects a cognitive preference for transparency and linear argumentation. The actualization of assertive speech acts is grounded in the cognitive processes through which speakers perceive, categorize, and interpret reality. These processes rely on mental representations known as frames, scripts, and conceptual schemas.

English and Uzbek differ in how these cognitive structures are reflected linguistically, resulting in distinctive patterns of assertive expression. In English, assertive acts are typically anchored in stable epistemic frames that highlight factual precision and analyticity. This encourages speakers to express information in a linear, argument-based manner where claims are directly

connected to evidence or observable reality. In contrast, Uzbek relies more heavily on holistic and context-bound frames in which meaning emerges from shared cultural experience rather than explicit textual cues.

Another essential linguocognitive factor is the role of conceptual salience, which determines what aspects of an event or idea are foregrounded in communication. English tends to foreground the propositional content—the bare fact or claim—thus reinforcing the assertive act's logical structure. Uzbek often foregrounds relational or situational aspects, embedding assertive statements within broader social or affective contexts. This can make Uzbek assertives appear more layered, where the explicit claim is complemented by implicit interpersonal signals. Memory and cognitive accessibility also shape assertive acts. Speakers rely on stored knowledge structures and culturally shaped prototypes when expressing facts or judgments. English discourse favors the retrieval of specific, atomistic information, often supported by evidential markers or explicit references to data. Uzbek discourse promotes the activation of cultural scripts and collective memory, enabling speakers to express assertiveness through culturally recognizable patterns rather than isolated factual units. This highlights how cognition, shaped by cultural learning, influences the linguistic realization of assertive acts.

The interplay between linguistic encoding and cognitive construal is also evident in how the two languages manage epistemic gradation. English provides a diverse set of lexical and grammatical resources that allow speakers to precisely calibrate the degree of certainty attached to a proposition. Modal verbs such as *must*, *may*, and *might*, and adverbs such as *obviously*, *possibly*, or *undoubtedly* are used to fine-tune epistemic force. Uzbek also possesses epistemic markers like *balki*, *albatta*, *ehtimol*, and *shubhasiz*, yet the pragmatic force of these markers is more dependent on the communicative context, the relationship between interlocutors, and the level of social distance. This reflects a linguocognitive tendency to integrate social meaning into factual expression.

Discourse coherence is another area where linguocognitive differences emerge. English emphasizes explicit logical connectors, enabling clear progression in argumentation. Uzbek discourse, shaped by oral traditions and narrative styles, permits more flexibility in cohesion; coherence often emerges through culturally familiar sequencing patterns or through subtle pragmatic cues rather than grammatical markers. These differences influence how assertive acts are interpreted: in English, the assertiveness is embedded in the propositional logic of the discourse, whereas in Uzbek it is grounded in shared cultural reasoning and contextual continuity.

The emotional-cognitive dimension also contributes to assertive actualization. English largely separates factual content from emotional resonance in formal communication, maintaining a distinction between assertive acts and expressive acts. Uzbek, however, allows emotional and evaluative undertones to coexist with assertive meaning, reflecting a cognitive style where emotion and information are not rigidly partitioned. This can be seen in assertive statements that incorporate culturally valued expressions of respect, modesty, or empathy.

Furthermore, cultural models of communication shape the cognitive expectations that guide the interpretation of assertive acts. In English-speaking cultures, communication is guided by low-context norms, meaning that responsibility for clarity lies primarily on the speaker. This compels speakers to encode assertive meaning explicitly and anticipate potential ambiguities. In Uzbek culture, which is more high-context, listeners are expected to infer meaning based on shared cultural knowledge, social roles, and subtle cues. Consequently, Uzbek assertive acts may appear less direct but cognitively richer, relying on the listener's situational awareness.

Metapragmatic awareness also plays a role in how assertive acts are conceptualized and executed. English speakers are encouraged to verbalize their thought processes through phrases like in my view or to be honest, which explicitly guide the listener's interpretation. Uzbek speakers often rely on culturally embedded politeness formulas or indirectness strategies that serve metapragmatic functions without explicitly commenting on the speech act. These strategies reflect differing cognitive orientations toward the transparency of communication.

Taken together, these linguocognitive factors demonstrate that assertive speech acts in English and Uzbek embody distinct ways of conceptualizing knowledge, evaluating evidence, and structuring discourse. They highlight the interplay of cognition, culture, and linguistic form in shaping how speakers represent reality within communication.

In Uzbek, conceptualization is often shaped by contextual background, communal experience, and social hierarchy. Consequently, assertive acts may rely heavily on the communicative situation rather than explicit linguistic markers. Phrases such as *menimcha*, *ko'rinadiki*, or *shekilli* express degrees of certainty but also allow space for interpersonal sensitivity. This demonstrates a cognitive style that values relational harmony and shared understanding, where assertiveness does not necessarily correspond to directness.

Inferencing plays a crucial role in both languages but is realized differently. English tends to rely on grammatical and lexical markers to guide inferential interpretation, whereas Uzbek utilizes pragmatic signals and culturally embedded assumptions. These differences influence how assertive meaning emerges in discourse. While an English speaker might explicitly justify a claim, an Uzbek speaker may rely on the listener's background knowledge or social intuition to fill in the implied meaning.

Cognitive metaphors also contribute to the formation of assertive acts. In English, metaphors often support logical structuring and rhetorical precision, even in everyday conversation. Uzbek metaphors, however, frequently intertwine emotional, cultural, and experiential dimensions, adding depth and subtlety to assertive expressions. This reflects a linguocognitive pattern in which factual statements may carry affective nuances and cultural symbolism.

Discourse organization further shapes assertiveness. English discourse typically follows a well-defined pattern of topic development and information distribution, which strengthens the clarity of assertive claims. Uzbek discourse is more flexible, allowing assertiveness to emerge through contextual coherence rather than strict structural rules. This affects how information is foregrounded or backgrounded and how the communicative focus shifts within a text.

Another significant factor is the epistemic stance encoded through modality. English employs a broad range of modal verbs and adverbs such as *definitely*, *certainly*, *probably*, and *obviously*, which calibrate the strength of the assertive act. Uzbek also contains modal expressions such as *aniq*, *albatta*, and *shubhasiz*, but the degree of assertiveness often depends on intonation, speaker-listener relations, and sociocultural expectations rather than grammatical obligation.

Cultural norms play a decisive role in shaping assertive communication. English-speaking communities generally support individualism and autonomy, encouraging speakers to present their opinions confidently and directly. Uzbek culture, grounded in collectivist values and social respect, favors balanced and socially oriented ways of expressing factual information. Hence, an assertive act in English aims for clarity and evidence, while in Uzbek it aims for harmony, appropriateness, and shared understanding.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that assertive speech acts in English and Uzbek are deeply rooted in the linguocognitive systems of each language. While English assertiveness relies on explicit

linguistic markers, logical structure, and individual epistemic positioning, Uzbek assertiveness is shaped by contextual reasoning, sociocultural norms, and the cognitive preference for relational sensitivity. These distinctions highlight that assertive acts are not only expressions of factual meaning but also reflections of how speakers from different linguistic communities conceptualize knowledge, evaluate evidence, and manage interpersonal relations. Understanding these factors is essential for cross-cultural communication, discourse analysis, and the broader study of cognitive pragmatics.

References:

1. Austin J L. How to Do Things with Words. Oxford University Press
Searle J R. Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language. Cambridge University Press
2. Wierzbicka A. Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction
Kövecses Z. Metaphor in Culture: Universality and Variation
Gulomov A. Studies on Uzbek pragmatics and discourse culture