
CONFERENCE ARTICLE

**COMMUNICATIVE-PRAGMATIC FEATURES OF CONSTRUCTION AND ARCHITECTURAL
PROFESSIONAL DISCOURSE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

Burxonov Baxodirjon

Senior Lecturer at Andijan State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This thesis examines the communicative-pragmatic features of construction and architectural professional discourse in English and Uzbek. The study focuses on how specialists use language to describe design decisions, regulate professional actions, express technical accuracy, coordinate participants and maintain institutional responsibility. Construction and architectural discourse is characterised by terminology, directive speech acts, precision, modality, intertextual references to standards and a strong connection between verbal and visual information. In English and Uzbek, this discourse performs similar professional functions, but differs in syntactic structure, terminology formation, politeness strategies and the expression of obligation. The findings show that comparative analysis of this discourse is important for translation, professional communication and the training of specialists in architecture and construction.

KEYWORDS

professional discourse, construction discourse, architectural discourse, pragmatics, communication, terminology, English, Uzbek, speech acts.

INTRODUCTION

Construction and architecture are professional fields in which communication has direct practical consequences. A design instruction, technical report, safety requirement or project explanation may influence the quality, cost and safety of a building. Therefore, professional discourse in this sphere is not only a linguistic phenomenon, but also a form of regulated professional activity. It connects architects, engineers, contractors, clients, supervisors and public authorities within one communicative system.

In English and Uzbek, construction and architectural discourse develops under the influence of professional standards, educational traditions, technical documentation and international cooperation. English often functions as a global language of engineering and architectural practice, while Uzbek serves as an important language of local professional communication, construction documentation and educational training in Uzbekistan. The comparative study of both languages makes it possible to identify common communicative functions and language-specific pragmatic features.

The purpose of this thesis is to analyse the communicative-pragmatic features of construction and architectural professional discourse in English and Uzbek and to determine how professional meaning is expressed through terminology, modality, speech acts and discourse organisation.

The research is based on discourse analysis, comparative linguistic analysis and pragmatic interpretation. The material includes typical fragments of construction and architectural communication, such as design descriptions, technical instructions, project explanations, safety requirements, professional reports and educational texts. The comparative method is used to reveal similarities and differences between

English and Uzbek professional discourse. Pragmatic analysis is applied to identify communicative intentions, speech acts, modality and strategies of professional interaction.

The theoretical basis of the study is formed by works on discourse analysis, genre analysis, pragmatics and professional communication. The study treats discourse as language use in a specific social and professional context. This approach allows construction and architectural texts to be analysed not only according to vocabulary and grammar, but also according to their communicative purpose, institutional function and professional effect.

Construction and architectural professional discourse is primarily characterised by functional precision. In both English and Uzbek, the speaker or writer aims to avoid ambiguity because unclear information may lead to technical mistakes. For this reason, professional texts often contain exact measurements, material names, spatial indicators and references to structural elements. In English, expressions such as "load-bearing wall", "reinforced concrete structure", "floor plan" and "site inspection" are compact and terminologically stable. In Uzbek, equivalent meanings may be expressed through combinations such as "yuk ko'taruvchi devor", "temir-beton konstruksiya", "qavat rejasi" and "qurilish maydonini tekshirish". The Uzbek terms often combine native and borrowed components, while English terms tend to function as internationally standardised professional units.

A significant pragmatic feature of this discourse is the frequent use of directive speech acts. Construction communication often requires action: to install, check, calculate, approve, reinforce, measure or revise. In English, directives may appear in imperative forms or modal constructions such as "must be installed", "should be checked" and "shall comply with the

standard". In Uzbek, obligation is often expressed through forms such as "o'rnatilishi kerak", "tekshirilishi lozim" and "me'yorga muvofiq bo'lishi zarur". These forms do not simply describe an action; they regulate professional behaviour. Thus, modality becomes a pragmatic mechanism of responsibility and control.

Architectural discourse also contains explanatory and persuasive functions. Architects do not only give technical instructions; they justify design concepts, explain spatial solutions and present aesthetic decisions. In English, architectural descriptions often use evaluative and conceptual vocabulary, for example "sustainable design", "functional layout" or "visual harmony". In Uzbek, similar meanings may be conveyed through "barqaror loyiha", "funktsional joylashuv" and "vizual uyg'unlik". The pragmatic purpose here is to convince the client, expert or professional community that the proposed solution is technically, aesthetically and socially appropriate.

Another important feature is the interaction between verbal and visual codes. Construction and architectural discourse usually accompanies drawings, plans, diagrams, models and digital visualisations. The verbal text explains what is shown visually, while the drawing specifies what is expressed verbally. This creates a multimodal discourse structure. In both English and Uzbek, references such as "as shown in the plan" or "chizmada ko'rsatilganidek" demonstrate the dependence of professional meaning on visual evidence. Therefore, the discourse cannot be fully interpreted without considering its graphic context.

The English and Uzbek forms of this discourse also differ in politeness and institutional style. English professional communication often uses neutral and concise formulations, especially in reports and technical specifications. Uzbek professional communication may include more respectful forms in oral interaction, especially when addressing senior specialists, teachers or official representatives. However, in formal documents, Uzbek also tends toward impersonal and normative structures. This shows that pragmatic choices depend on genre, status relations and communicative situation.

Terminological borrowing is another relevant issue. Many architectural and construction terms in Uzbek have entered through Russian or international technical usage. Words connected with project documentation, engineering systems and construction materials often coexist with Uzbek equivalents. This creates variation, but also reflects the historical and practical development of the field. English, by contrast, often serves as a source language for new technical terminology related to digital design, sustainable architecture and building information modelling. As a result, bilingual specialists must understand not only word equivalents, but also the pragmatic context in which terms are used.

The comparative analysis shows that construction and architectural discourse in both languages performs informational, regulatory, explanatory and evaluative functions. Its communicative-pragmatic structure is determined by the need for accuracy, safety, coordination and professional accountability. Differences between English and Uzbek are observed mainly in grammatical expression, term formation, modality and interpersonal strategies.

Construction and architectural professional discourse in English and Uzbek is a complex communicative system that combines technical precision, institutional regulation and professional interaction. Its main pragmatic features include directive speech acts, modality of obligation, terminological density, multimodality and explanatory argumentation. English and Uzbek share the same professional aims, but express them through different linguistic and cultural resources.

The results of this thesis may be useful for comparative linguistics, translation studies, English for Specific Purposes, Uzbek professional terminology and the training of future specialists in architecture and construction. Effective professional communication in this sphere requires not only

knowledge of terms, but also understanding of pragmatic intention, genre conventions and communicative responsibility.

References

1. Fairclough N. *Language and Power*. 2nd ed. – London; New York: Routledge, 2001. – 240 p.
2. Swales J. M. *Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. – 260 p.
3. Bhatia V. K. *Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings*. – London: Longman, 1993. – 246 p.
4. Hyland K. *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. – Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2004. – 240 p.
5. Searle J. R. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1969. – 203 p.
6. Austin J. L. *How to Do Things with Words*. 2nd ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975. – 168 p.
7. Brown P., Levinson S. C. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987. – 345 p.
8. Halliday M. A. K., Matthiessen C. M. I. M. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. 3rd ed. – London: Arnold, 2004. – 689 p.