



INTEGRATION OF VERBAL AND PARALINGUISTIC MEANS IN THE DISCOURSE OF SUCCESS: AN ETHNOLINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

Erkinjonova Laylo Fazliddin qizi

Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages

Masters' student of the 1st course

mlss_fazliddinovna@mail.ru

Abstract. This article analyzes the interrelation of phraseological and paralinguistic means in the success discourse of English and Uzbek languages from a linguacultural perspective. Throughout the research, the manifestation of the success concept in speech situations and speech acts of both cultures is highlighted. In particular, the cognitive foundations of Uzbek national-cultural elements and non-verbal indicators inherent to English culture are revealed.

Keywords: success discourse, paralinguistics, ethnolinguistics, phraseology, integration, kinetic markers, cognitive analysis, speech act.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi muvaffaqiyat diskursida frazeologik va paralingvistik vositalarning o'zaro bog'liqligi lingvokultrologik jihatdan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot davomida har ikki madaniyatdagi muvaffaqiyat konseptining nutqiy vaziyat va nutqiy aktlarda namoyon bo'lishi yoritib berilgan. Xususan, o'zbek milliy-madaniy elementlari hamda ingliz madaniyatiga xos noverbal harakat ko'rsatkichlarining kognitiv asoslari ochib berilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: muvaffaqiyat diskursi, paralingvistika, etnolingvistika, frazeologizm, integratsiya, kinetik markerlar, kognitiv tahlil, nutqiy akt.

INTRODUCTION. The concept of success is widely understood as a socially and culturally constructed phenomenon that reflects the value systems, worldviews, and communicative practices of specific linguistic communities. In modern



linguistic studies, success is no longer treated merely as a lexical or semantic category; rather, it is analyzed within broader discourse-oriented frameworks that integrate both linguistic and extra-linguistic aspects of communication. From this perspective, ethnolinguistic research highlights the strong connection between language, cultural identity, and collective cognition. As D. Abduazizova argues, “Each person is a carrier of his own culture and can transmit it in the process of intercultural communication”.¹ This statement highlights that individuals serve as carriers and conveyors of cultural values in intercultural communication, constructing meaning through the interconnection of different cultural systems and perspectives.

Within the discourse of success, meaning is not conveyed only through linguistic structures but is generated through the complex interaction of different semiotic resources, especially verbal and paralinguistic modes. From a discourse-analytic viewpoint, communication is fundamentally shaped by context, and meaning arises through the continuous interaction between language choices and the situational environment in which they are produced. In expressions related to success, verbal resources typically include lexical items, idiomatic and phraseological expressions, and syntactic constructions that express evaluation, accomplishment, effort, and social recognition. However, these linguistic forms cannot be interpreted independently, as they function within wider pragmatic and sociocultural systems that define how success is conceptualized and communicated in discourse. At the same time, verbal language represents only one component of meaning construction. Communication also operates through paralinguistic channels, where features such as intonation, stress patterns, pauses, speech rhythm, facial expressions, gestures, and eye behavior significantly influence how speaker

¹ Abdulazizova D. Paralinguistic means in intercultural communications, 2022



intention and evaluative meaning are understood. These non-verbal elements act together with spoken language, forming an integrated communicative system that produces a more complete and nuanced message and meaning is not restricted to lexical content but is distributed across both vocal and bodily signals that collectively shape the interpretation of success in interaction.

It is important to note that paralinguistic cues are not interpreted in a universal manner; instead, their meanings are shaped by cultural norms and communicative traditions. The same gesture, tone, or level of eye contact may be understood differently across linguistic communities depending on cultural expectations regarding politeness, emotional expression, and self-presentation. Consequently, behaviors that signal confidence in one cultural setting may be interpreted as arrogance in another, while restrained expression may be viewed either as modesty or lack of assurance depending on cultural context.

This highlights the importance of considering intercultural variation when analyzing paralinguistic behavior. Additionally, multimodal signals are not processed separately but are integrated by interlocutors into a single coherent interpretation of meaning. Speakers and listeners combine verbal and non-verbal cues to construct judgments about attitude, identity, and evaluative stance. It supports the idea that communication operates as a unified semiotic system in which linguistic and paralinguistic elements jointly contribute to meaning-making. Therefore, the discourse of success can be understood as a culturally grounded and multimodal phenomenon in which various communicative resources interact to shape interpretation and social evaluation.

Ethnolinguistically, both verbal and paralinguistic features are shaped by cultural norms and reflect established communicative conventions. As language functions as a “guide to social reality”², communicative behavior inevitably encodes

² Sapir, 1929, p. 209



culturally specific values and patterns. Accordingly, different linguistic communities demonstrate diverse strategies for expressing success, ranging from explicit self-praise to more indirect or modest forms of self-evaluation. In addition, as nonverbal behavior is inherently meaningful within its context³, paralinguistic features play a crucial role in shaping interpretation. Intercultural communication plays a significant role in determining how the concept of success is understood and conveyed. When speakers from different linguistic and cultural backgrounds interact, they inevitably bring with them diverse cultural assumptions, value systems, and communicative patterns.

Mentioned differences can result in variations in the way success is expressed, such as more explicit self-promotion in certain cultures and more restrained or indirect forms of self-presentation in others. This diversity indicates that meaning is jointly constructed in interaction and is shaped not only by linguistic structures but also by shared cultural knowledge and the specific communicative situation. Thus, the discourse of success represents a productive domain for analyzing how linguistic structures and cultural factors interact in the process of meaning construction. This approach fits well with cultural linguistics, which emphasizes that meaning is always connected to cultural knowledge and shared ways of interpreting experience⁴.

MAIN BODY. The linguistic representation of success differs considerably between English and Uzbek linguistic cultures, reflecting distinct cognitive models and value orientations. In English discourse, success is predominantly linked to individual accomplishment, self-progress, and competitive achievement. This is evident in frequently used lexical and phraseological expressions such as “be self-made,” “break through barriers,” and “reach one’s full potential,” which frame success as an ongoing process of self-improvement and upward mobility. Such

³ Birdwhistell, 1970, p. 187

⁴ Sharifian, 2017



linguistic patterns reveal a strong focus on personal agency, independence, and goal-driven behavior. This perspective corresponds to broader cultural frameworks in which ambition, effort, and self-realization are central to social evaluation and identity formation.

By contrast, Uzbek linguistic culture tends to conceptualize success within a more socially and ethically oriented framework. Expressions such as “ishlagan tishlaydi” (hard work pays off), “harakatda barakat” (blessing is in action), and “yuzing yorug‘ bo‘lsin” (may you be honored) emphasize diligence, perseverance, and social recognition. These linguistic units indicate that success is not understood purely as an individual achievement but also as a socially evaluated and morally grounded outcome. In this sense, success is closely tied to collective judgment, where societal approval, family reputation, and ethical conduct significantly contribute to defining what is considered successful.

From a cognitive linguistic viewpoint, these differences suggest that the concept of success is organized through culture-specific conceptual structures. While English discourse tends to associate success with self-development and personal advancement, Uzbek discourse foregrounds effort, process, moral values, and collective harmony. According to conceptual metaphor theory, abstract concepts such as success are structured and understood through more concrete, embodied experiential domains, where human experience is mapped onto familiar physical or spatial schemas such as movement, direction, and goal attainment. In this sense, success is often conceptualized through metaphors like upward motion, journey, or achievement of a target, which help speakers cognitively organize and interpret complex social meanings in more accessible terms. These metaphorical mappings are not universal but vary significantly across linguistic communities depending on culturally dominant experiences, social values, and communicative priorities⁵. For

⁵ Lakoff & Johnson, 1980, pp. 3–6]



instance, while some cultures emphasize competitive upward mobility and individual progress in their metaphorical construction of success, others may highlight stability, endurance, or collective achievement as central interpretative frames. This demonstrates that linguistic expressions are not arbitrary labels but are deeply rooted in culturally and cognitively shaped conceptual systems that influence how individuals perceive, evaluate, and communicate abstract social phenomena such as success.

Furthermore, these conceptual distinctions influence the way identity and achievement are linguistically constructed in discourse. In English communicative practice, success is often articulated through a self-oriented narrative that highlights personal growth, overcoming challenges, and realizing individual potential. In Uzbek communicative tradition, however, success is more commonly framed through relational and social dimensions, where emphasis is placed on respect, effort, and communal acknowledgment. The difference reflects underlying cultural orientations toward individualism and collectivism, as well as varying norms of self-expression and evaluation.

Phraseological expressions and proverbs in both languages serve as culturally embedded carriers of collective knowledge and social values. English idiomatic expressions related to success often emphasize independence, progress, and transformation, whereas Uzbek proverbs tend to highlight perseverance, hard work, and moral integrity. This demonstrates that phraseology functions not merely as ornamental language but as a cognitive repository of cultural experience that shapes worldview and interpretative patterns.

The discourse of success is a multidimensional phenomenon that operates at the intersection of language use, social cognition, and culturally regulated communicative norms. In pragmatics, meaning is not a fixed property of linguistic forms but a context-dependent outcome shaped by speaker intention, situational factors, and shared cultural knowledge. Therefore, success-related expressions are



interpreted not only through their semantic content but also through pragmatic inference, which depends on how speakers position themselves within social interaction. A key pragmatic mechanism in success discourse is politeness and face management. According to Brown and Levinson, speakers adjust their communicative strategies to maintain positive and negative face needs in interaction⁶. For example, in English professional communication, a speaker may say: ***“I successfully led a project that improved efficiency by 20%”***. This form of explicit self-promotion is socially acceptable because it aligns with expectations of clarity, accountability, and individual achievement. In contrast, in Uzbek communication, the same idea is more likely to be expressed indirectly, such as: ***“Jamoa bilan birga yaxshi natijaga erishdik”*** (*We achieved a good result together with the team*), which reduces individual focus and emphasizes collective contribution.

In English communicative culture, success is frequently constructed through direct and self-oriented expression. Statements such as *“I achieved outstanding results in my role”* or *“I exceeded performance targets”* are commonly used in professional contexts such as CVs and interviews. These forms reflect a communicative orientation toward individual agency, self-presentation, and personal visibility as legitimate elements of professional identity. Such discourse practices are closely linked to institutional expectations where individuals are required to explicitly demonstrate competence, measurable outcomes, and personal contribution. In this sense, linguistic performance becomes a strategic tool for career advancement, where the ability to verbalize achievements clearly is itself considered part of professional skill.

⁶ BROWN, P., & LEVINSON, S. C. POLITENESS: SOME UNIVERSALS IN LANGUAGE USAGE. CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS. PP. 61–65. 1987



This communicative style is reinforced by broader socio-cultural values that emphasize autonomy, competition, and self-development. Success is often framed as the result of individual effort and continuous self-improvement, which encourages speakers to highlight personal responsibility in achieving goals. As a result, self-promotion is not typically viewed as inappropriate, but rather as a necessary and expected component of professional interaction. This is particularly evident in contexts such as job applications, performance evaluations, and networking situations, where individuals are evaluated based on how effectively they present their achievements. discourse pattern contributes to the construction of a strong personal identity in professional settings. With explicitly stating accomplishments, individuals position themselves as active agents of success rather than passive participants. This reinforces the idea that linguistic expression plays a crucial role not only in describing success but also in actively constructing it within social and professional discourse.

By contrast, Uzbek communicative practice tends to avoid explicit self-praise. Speakers often employ mitigation strategies by attributing success to external or shared factors. For example: “Ota-onamning duosi va mehnatim bilan bu natijaga erishdim” (with my parents’ blessing and my effort, I achieved this result). This reflects culturally grounded norms of modesty and social harmony, where overt self-promotion may be perceived as inappropriate. From a discourse-analytic perspective, success is constructed through interactional positioning. Meaning is not fixed in utterances but emerges through negotiation between participants. For instance, the statement “*I got promoted last month*” may be interpreted as confidence in one context, but as arrogance in another depending on tone, relationship, and situational expectations. This demonstrates that discourse meaning is contextually negotiated rather than inherently contained in linguistic form. English and Uzbek discourse differ in identity construction patterns. Another example, English discourse tends to construct an autonomous self, as seen in expressions like



“I built my career from scratch,” while Uzbek discourse constructs a relational self, as in “*oilam va ustozlarim yordamida muvaffaqiyatga erishdim*” (*I achieved success with the help of my family and teachers*). These differences reflect broader cultural orientations toward individuality and collectivism, influencing how success is linguistically framed and socially evaluated.

The expression of success is realized not only through verbal language but also through a wide range of paralinguistic and non-verbal resources that significantly influence meaning construction in interaction. These include intonation patterns, stress placement, pauses, rhythm of speech, voice quality, facial expressions, gestures, body posture, and eye behavior. In contemporary discourse studies, communication is therefore understood as a multimodal process in which meaning emerges from the combination of linguistic and non-linguistic signals rather than from verbal content alone.

From a discourse-analytic perspective, paralinguistic features function as evaluative markers that help interlocutors interpret speaker attitude and communicative intention. For example, variations in pitch and tone can signal confidence, hesitation, certainty, or uncertainty when discussing success-related experiences. A stable and controlled tone may strengthen the impression of competence and achievement, while irregular pauses or weak intonation may reduce the perceived authority of the speaker. However, these interpretations are not universal, as their meaning is shaped by culturally specific communicative norms and expectations.

In English communicative culture, paralinguistic cues are often associated with expressiveness and communicative confidence. Direct eye contact, firm tone, and open body language are commonly interpreted as indicators of self-assurance and professional success. Such non-verbal behavior supports verbal self-presentation strategies, especially in professional environments where individuals are expected to demonstrate competence and credibility. In this context, visible confidence is



considered a positive attribute that reinforces the speaker's social and professional identity. In contrast, Uzbek communicative culture tends to regulate non-verbal behavior in a more restrained manner, particularly in formal or hierarchical interactions. Limited gestures, moderate facial expressiveness, and softer vocal delivery are often associated with respect, politeness, and social awareness. When discussing personal success, speakers may intentionally reduce physical expressiveness to avoid appearing arrogant or overly self-focused. This reflects cultural values that prioritize humility, modesty, and social harmony over explicit self-display.

Eye contact is one of the most culturally sensitive non-verbal features in success-related communication. In English-speaking contexts, maintaining steady eye contact is typically interpreted as a sign of confidence, sincerity, and engagement in interaction. It supports the speaker's verbal claims and enhances perceived credibility. In Uzbek communicative practice, however, prolonged or intense eye contact, especially in interactions involving authority figures or elders, may be interpreted as disrespectful or excessively assertive. Instead, moderate or intermittent eye contact is often preferred as a marker of politeness and deference. Body orientation and posture also contribute to the interpretation of success discourse. Upright posture and open positioning of the body are frequently associated with confidence and success in English communicative settings. These physical cues reinforce verbal assertions of achievement and strengthen the speaker's persuasive effect. In contrast, more reserved body posture and reduced physical expansiveness in Uzbek communication may signal respectfulness and social sensitivity rather than lack of confidence. Gestures further illustrate cultural variation in non-verbal expression.

In English communicative behavior, hand gestures are frequently employed to highlight key points, organize discourse, and convey enthusiasm. This level of expressiveness is generally viewed positively in academic and professional



environments. It reflects a communicative style in which verbal language is supported and reinforced by non-verbal elements to improve clarity and strengthen persuasive effect. Gestures assist the listener in tracking the structure of speech, drawing attention to important ideas, and sustaining engagement throughout the interaction. They also contribute to the perception of the speaker as confident and communicatively competent, thereby enhancing credibility. This pattern is also associated with a more interactive style of communication, where speakers actively involve their audience in the process of meaning-making. As a result, speech becomes more dynamic and engaging, which is particularly valued in contexts such as presentations, interviews, and formal discussions. Moderately controlled hand movements are typically interpreted as indicators of confidence and openness, especially when they align with verbal emphasis. At the same time, excessive gesturing can be perceived as distracting or informal, showing that even in expressive communicative cultures, non-verbal behavior is regulated by contextual expectations and situational appropriateness.

CONCLUSION. This study has explored the pragmatic and discursive characteristics of success, focusing on how verbal and paralinguistic resources interact within an ethnolinguistic framework. The analysis shows that success cannot be treated as a stable or purely linguistic category; rather, it represents a culturally shaped and context-sensitive phenomenon that emerges through the interaction of language, cognition, and social conventions. Instead of being expressed only through lexical or grammatical forms, success is constructed in discourse through a combination of verbal language and non-verbal communicative behavior.

The results demonstrate that verbal elements such as vocabulary selection, phraseological expressions, and syntactic patterns are essential in representing success, particularly in relation to achievement, effort, and social evaluation. However, these linguistic forms acquire full meaning only when interpreted together with paralinguistic features, including intonation, stress, pauses, facial expressions,



gestures, and eye behavior. These non-verbal components are not secondary additions to speech; rather, they function as integral parts of communication that can reinforce, adjust, or reshape meaning depending on context and speaker intention.

A comparative analysis of English and Uzbek communicative practices reveals clear cultural differences in the expression of success. English discourse typically emphasizes explicit self-representation and individual achievement, where success is openly articulated and supported by confident paralinguistic behavior. In contrast, Uzbek communicative culture is more inclined toward indirect expression and collective orientation, where direct self-praise is often avoided and communicative behavior tends to be more restrained. In such contexts, values such as modesty, respect, and social balance strongly influence both verbal and non-verbal expression.

The findings also indicate that paralinguistic cues are interpreted through culturally specific frameworks. The same gestures, tone, or eye behavior may be understood differently across cultures depending on established norms of politeness, hierarchy, and interpersonal relations. This confirms that meaning in discourse is not universal but culturally mediated and socially interpreted. The study highlights that discourse practices related to success are closely connected to identity construction processes. Individuals do not merely report achievements; they also position themselves within socially recognized roles through the way they speak and behave. Linguistic and non-linguistic choices together contribute to shaping how a speaker is perceived in terms of confidence, credibility, humility, or competence. This shows that success discourse plays an important role in constructing both personal and social identity in interaction.

The integration of verbal and paralinguistic resources reflects broader cultural ideologies that govern communication. In more individual-oriented communicative systems, success is often performed as a visible and explicit achievement, while in collectivist-oriented systems it is more subtly expressed



through relational and contextual cues. These differences demonstrate that communicative behavior is deeply rooted in cultural value systems that define acceptable forms of self-expression. Overall, the discourse of success is a multimodal construct in which verbal and non-verbal elements function together to produce meaning. Success is not only described through language but also enacted through embodied communicative behavior shaped by cultural values and social expectations. The ethnolinguistic approach adopted in this research emphasizes the necessity of analyzing both linguistic and paralinguistic dimensions to fully understand how meaning is created in different cultural contexts.

REFERENCE

1. Abduazizova, D. Paralinguistic Means in Intercultural Communication. 2022.
2. Birdwhistell, R. L. Kinesics and Context: Essays on Body Motion Communication. University of Pennsylvania Press. p. 187. 1970.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage. Cambridge University Press. Pp. 61–65. 1987
4. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press. Pp. 3–6. 1980
5. Sapir, E. The Status of Linguistics as a Science. Language. Pp. 209. 1929
6. Sharifian, F. Cultural Linguistics: Cultural Categories and Language. John Benjamins Publishing Company. 2017