Hujum zarbasi esa raqib maydoniga ochko olib kelishga xizmat qiladi. Himoyada esa to‘siq qo‘yish va to‘pni qabul qilish muhim o‘rin tutadi.

Voleybolda texnik tayyorgarlik bilan bir qatorda taktik tayyorgarlik ham katta ahamiyatga ega. Jamoa a’zolari o‘yin davomida bir-birining harakatlarini tushunishi, raqibning zaif tomonlarini aniqlashi va tegishli taktika asosida harakat qilishi kerak.

Xulosa

Xulosa qilib aytganda, voleybol inson salomatligini mustahkamlash, jismoniy sifatlarni rivojlantirish va yoshlarni sog‘lom turmush tarziga jalb etishda samarali sport turlaridan biridir. Ushbu sport turi orqali tezkorlik, chaqqonlik, kuch, chidamlilik va koordinatsiya kabi muhim jismoniy sifatlarni rivojlantirish mumkin.

Voleybolning jamoaviy xususiyati esa yoshlar o‘rtasida hamkorlik, o‘zaro hurmat, mas’uliyat va intizomni shakllantirishga yordam beradi. Shu sababli ta’lim muassasalarida voleybol mashg‘ulotlari va musobaqalarini muntazam tashkil etish, yoshlarni ushbu sport turiga keng jalb qilish muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.

Voleybolni ommalashtirish orqali yoshlarning bo‘sh vaqtini mazmunli tashkil etish, ularning jismoniy faolligini oshirish va sog‘lom avlodni tarbiyalashga munosib hissa qo‘shish mumkin.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

1. Ayrapetyans L.R. **Voleybol**. – Toshkent: O‘zbekiston, 2012.
2. Pulatov A.A. **Voleybol nazariyasi va uslubiyati**. – Toshkent, 2018.
3. Jismoniy tarbiya nazariyasi va metodikasi. – Toshkent, 2019.
4. Sport o‘yinlari: voleybol. O‘quv-uslubiy qo‘llanma. – Toshkent, 2020.
5. O‘zbekiston Respublikasining jismoniy tarbiya va sport sohasiga oid me’yoriy-huquqiy hujjatlari.

A CONTRASTIVE STUDY OF IMPLICIT CRITICISM IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK WORKPLACE DISCOURSE

Samatullayev Dilshod Sherzod o‘g‘li

Assistant-teacher Jizzakh Branch of the National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

Abstract: This article examines implicit criticism as a pragmatic phenomenon in English and Uzbek workplace discourse, with particular attention to the linguistic strategies through which negative evaluation is communicated without direct confrontation. The study adopts a contrastive pragmatic approach and considers criticism in relation to face, politeness, power relations, social distance, and culturally established norms of professional interaction. The analysis demonstrates that speakers of both languages employ indirect criticism to reconcile two competing communicative goals: identifying a problem and maintaining an appropriate interpersonal relationship. However, the linguistic realization of this indirectness differs considerably. English workplace discourse frequently employs modal expressions, interrogative constructions, hedges, understatement, and problem-oriented formulations that reduce personal attribution of responsibility. Uzbek workplace communication likewise favors indirectness but tends to rely more

strongly on contextual implication, respectful forms of address, collective reference, depersonalization, and status-sensitive mitigation. Particular attention is given to interactions involving unequal professional status, since criticism directed upward, downward, or between colleagues may require different pragmatic strategies. The findings suggest that implicit criticism cannot be interpreted simply as avoidance of direct expression. Rather, it represents a culturally regulated mechanism for negotiating professional authority, interpersonal respect, and workplace solidarity.

Keywords: implicit criticism, workplace discourse, contrastive pragmatics, politeness, indirectness, face, English, Uzbek, professional communication.

Introduction

Criticism is an indispensable component of professional communication. Employees evaluate proposals, supervisors comment on performance, colleagues identify errors, and team members question decisions. Although such communicative acts contribute to the effective functioning of an organization, they also create interpersonal risk because criticism implies that some aspect of another person's action, decision, competence, or performance is inadequate. For this reason, criticism is frequently expressed indirectly, particularly when maintaining professional relationships is as important as correcting the problem itself.

From a pragmatic perspective, criticism is closely connected with the notion of face. Brown and Levinson describe communicative behaviour in terms of positive and negative face and argue that speakers employ politeness strategies when performing potentially face-threatening acts [1]. A critical remark may threaten positive face because it indicates disapproval, while the corrective implication accompanying criticism may also interfere with the addressee's freedom of action. Consequently, speakers can reduce the interpersonal force of criticism by using linguistic devices that create distance between the negative evaluation and the person being evaluated.

Workplace communication provides a particularly important environment for examining this phenomenon because professional interaction combines institutional objectives with interpersonal relationships. Holmes and Stubbe demonstrate that workplace participants continually negotiate power and politeness while simultaneously attempting to complete professional tasks and preserve collegial relations [2]. Thus, an utterance that appears merely informational on the surface may perform an evaluative or corrective function in context.

Implicit criticism is especially relevant to contrastive pragmatics. Speakers belonging to different linguistic and cultural communities may recognize the need for mitigation but select different linguistic resources to achieve it. A strategy interpreted as appropriately diplomatic in one workplace culture may appear excessively vague, unusually formal, or even critical in another. This problem becomes increasingly significant in international organizations, universities, multinational companies, and other professional environments where English and Uzbek speakers interact.

The purpose of this study is therefore to compare the principal pragmatic mechanisms through which implicit criticism is realized in English and Uzbek

workplace discourse. The analysis focuses on the relationship between linguistic form, pragmatic function, professional hierarchy, and culturally conditioned expectations of politeness.

Theoretical Background

Implicit criticism may be defined as a communicative act in which a negative evaluation is recoverable from context although it is not expressed through an unambiguously critical proposition. Compare the direct English statement “You prepared this report incorrectly” with the less direct “There seem to be a few points in the report that might need another look.” The second formulation does not explicitly accuse the addressee of poor performance, yet in an appropriate workplace context its corrective and evaluative meaning is readily inferable.

Such indirectness should not automatically be equated with politeness. The interpretation of an utterance depends on its linguistic form, sequential position, participants' relationship, institutional roles, and local communicative norms. Contemporary workplace pragmatics consequently examines meaning in relation to professional identity, communities of practice, organizational culture, and power [3]. Research on workplace interaction has shown that politeness and relational behaviour are embedded in locally negotiated professional practices rather than being reducible to isolated linguistic formulas.

For implicit criticism, three variables are particularly relevant: power, social distance, and degree of imposition. A manager evaluating a subordinate possesses institutional authority to provide corrective feedback. A subordinate criticizing a manager faces a substantially different pragmatic situation. Criticism between colleagues of equal status is again different because solidarity and ongoing collaboration may become central considerations.

Research into English workplace interaction indicates that power and politeness coexist rather than exclude one another. Professional speakers can exercise authority while simultaneously attending to interpersonal relationships [2]. English workplace discourse therefore provides numerous linguistic resources for presenting criticism as a suggestion, question, observation, or shared problem rather than a direct judgement of an individual.

Studies comparing English and Uzbek professional or institutional communication likewise point to culturally meaningful differences in the realization of politeness. English professional discourse is often associated with modal and negative-politeness resources, while Uzbek interaction places greater emphasis on relational considerations, respectful forms, and status-sensitive communication [4; 5]. These tendencies should not be treated as absolute characteristics of either language; nevertheless, they provide a useful basis for examining how speakers manage criticism in comparable professional situations.

Materials and Methods

The study employs a qualitative contrastive-pragmatic method. Rather than claiming statistical generalizations about all English- and Uzbek-speaking workplaces, it identifies recurrent linguistic patterns that can realize implicit criticism in representative professional situations. The analytical model draws on

politeness theory [1], workplace discourse research [2; 3], and contrastive studies of English and Uzbek pragmatic behaviour [4; 5]. The analysis considers four principal parameters: (1) degree of explicitness, (2) linguistic mitigation, (3) attribution of responsibility, and (4) sensitivity to professional hierarchy. Functionally comparable English and Uzbek examples are used to demonstrate how criticism may be encoded through different pragmatic resources. The examples are analytical illustrations of workplace situations rather than quotations from a recorded corpus; they are therefore used to demonstrate pragmatic patterns, not to make numerical claims about frequency.

Contrastive Analysis and Discussion

One prominent strategy in English workplace discourse is interrogative criticism. Instead of explicitly identifying an error, the speaker may ask: “Have we checked the figures in the final section again?” The literal speech act is a request for information. In a context where an incorrect figure has already been noticed, however, the utterance can indirectly communicate that the figures are problematic. The first-person plural pronoun we further distributes responsibility and avoids directly attributing the error to the addressee.

A functionally comparable Uzbek utterance may be: “Oxirgi qismdagi raqamlarni yana bir ko‘rib chiqsak qanday bo‘larkin?” (“How would it be if we looked at the figures in the final section once more?”). Here criticism is embedded in a suggestion involving the inclusive first-person plural. The problematic element is not explicitly labelled wrong. Instead, the need to revisit it allows the addressee to infer the negative evaluation. The Uzbek construction -sak qanday bo‘larkin? contributes to mitigation by presenting corrective action as a possibility for joint consideration rather than an order.

A second strategy involves hedged evaluation. An English manager may say: “I’m not sure this section is quite clear enough yet.” The expression I’m not sure reduces categorical commitment, quite moderates the evaluation, and yet frames the problem as potentially temporary. Nevertheless, the practical meaning remains clear: the section requires revision. A comparable Uzbek expression is: “Bu qismni biroz aniqroq qilish kerak shekilli” (“It seems this section needs to be made a little clearer”). The adverb biroz and epistemic marker shekilli reduce the force of the negative evaluation. Both languages therefore permit object-oriented criticism, in which the problematic product, document, proposal, or procedure is foregrounded while personal responsibility is backgrounded.

A third important mechanism is depersonalization. English speakers may use “There seems to be a problem with the way the results have been presented,” while an Uzbek equivalent can be “Natijalarni berishda sal kamchilik bo‘lganga o‘xshaydi” (“There seems to be a slight shortcoming in the presentation of the results”). Neither formulation explicitly identifies the person responsible. The English existential construction there seems to be and the Uzbek expression -ganga o‘xshaydi both distance the speaker from an absolute judgement. Uzbek sal additionally minimizes the apparent severity of the criticism.

The role of professional hierarchy reveals a more noticeable contrast. Uzbek professional interaction can attach considerable pragmatic importance to age, rank, institutional status, and respectful address. Consequently, upward criticism may be surrounded by explicit markers of deference: “Ustoz, balki bu masalani yana bir marta ko‘rib chiqish ma’qulroq bo‘larmidi?” (“Perhaps it might be better to reconsider this issue once more”). The address term ustoz, the hedge balki, and the conditional-interrogative form ma’qulroq bo‘larmidi? combine to create several layers of mitigation. The actual criticism—the current decision may be problematic—is largely inferential.

English upward criticism may also be highly mitigated, but it commonly uses modal and epistemic resources: “Perhaps we could revisit this point before making the final decision.” Here perhaps, could, and the inclusive we soften disagreement while preserving the speaker's ability to challenge the proposal. English mitigation thus often operates through modality and tentative propositional framing, whereas Uzbek may combine modality with address forms and stronger sensitivity to interpersonal status.

A further difference concerns collective framing. Uzbek criticism can be reformulated as a collective obligation: “Bu joyini yana bir ko‘rib chiqishimiz kerak bo‘ladi” (“We will need to look at this part again”). The plural form incorporates both speaker and addressee into the corrective process. Responsibility is thereby presented as shared even when the contextual source of the problem may be one participant's work. English uses the same pragmatic mechanism through inclusive we, as in “We may need to rethink this section,” although its realization is primarily pronominal and modal.

Pragmatic feature	**English workplace discourse**	**Uzbek workplace discourse**
Hedging	perhaps, maybe, I think, I’m not sure	balki, shekilli, menimcha, biroz/sal
Modality	could, might, may, would	conditional and possibility constructions
Interrogative criticism	problem-oriented questions	questions combined with deferential/conditional forms
Depersonalization	passive/existential and problem-focused constructions	impersonal, evidential and object-focused constructions
Collective framing	inclusive we	first-person plural forms and shared-action framing
Status marking	often indirectly encoded	may be explicitly reinforced through address and deference
Main interpersonal effect	reducing imposition and personal attribution	maintaining respect, harmony and hierarchical appropriateness

The comparison should be understood as a description of pragmatic tendencies rather than rigid national characteristics. Workplace discourse is affected by organizational culture, profession, age, individual communicative style, familiarity, and the immediate communicative purpose. Workplace research emphasizes that interactional norms are developed within particular communities of practice [3].

Nevertheless, the contrast has practical consequences. An English speaker communicating with Uzbek colleagues may interpret highly mitigated criticism as uncertainty rather than deliberate politeness. Conversely, an Uzbek professional communicating in English may transfer extensive status-sensitive mitigation into an environment where a shorter problem-oriented formulation is expected. Pragmatic competence therefore involves not only grammatical correctness but also the ability to infer what degree and type of indirectness is appropriate in a particular professional community.

Conclusion

The contrastive analysis demonstrates that implicit criticism performs an important interpersonal and institutional function in both English and Uzbek workplace discourse. Speakers need to identify errors, question decisions, and encourage improvement while simultaneously protecting professional relationships. Indirect criticism enables these potentially conflicting objectives to be negotiated.

English workplace discourse commonly realizes implicit criticism through modal verbs, epistemic hedges, interrogative constructions, understatement, inclusive pronouns, and problem-oriented formulations. Such devices reduce the degree to which criticism is attached directly to the addressee. Uzbek workplace discourse employs many functionally similar mechanisms, including hedging, interrogatives, collective framing, and depersonalization, but these resources frequently interact with explicit respect marking and greater sensitivity to professional and interpersonal hierarchy.

The most important contrast is therefore not that one language is indirect while the other is direct. Both languages provide sophisticated mechanisms for indirect negative evaluation. The difference lies primarily in how indirectness is linguistically constructed and socially interpreted. English professional interaction often foregrounds tentative evaluation and minimized imposition, whereas Uzbek interaction may combine indirectness with relational solidarity, respectful address, collective responsibility, and status-sensitive mitigation.

These findings have implications for intercultural professional communication and foreign-language teaching. Teaching workplace English or Uzbek should extend beyond vocabulary and grammatical competence to include pragmatic interpretation. Learners need to recognize when an apparently neutral question, suggestion, or observation functions as criticism and how culturally appropriate mitigation can be produced. Further research based on comparable recordings of naturally occurring English and Uzbek workplace interactions would allow these qualitative observations to be tested quantitatively and would clarify

how institutional rank, organizational culture, and professional field influence the realization of implicit criticism.

References

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). Politeness: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press.
2. Holmes, J., & Stubbe, M. (2015). Power and politeness in the workplace: A sociolinguistic analysis of talk at work (2nd ed.). Routledge.
3. Marra, M., Vine, B., & Holmes, J. (2022). Workplace interaction. In Handbook of Pragmatics Online. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
4. Nosirov, N. (2025). Discursive analysis of politeness strategies in English and Uzbek professional communication. O‘zbekiston Milliy universiteti xabarlari.
5. Abdubokieva, D. (2026). Politeness strategies as stylistic devices: Pragmatic functions of honorifics and modality English vs. Uzbek academic discourse. Qo‘qon Universiteti Xabarnomasi, 17.
6. Holmes, J., Marra, M., & Vine, B. (2012). Politeness and impoliteness in ethnic varieties of New Zealand English. Journal of Pragmatics, 44(9), 1063–1076.
7. Holmes, J., & Marra, M. (2004). Relational practice in the workplace: Women’s talk or gendered discourse? Language in Society, 33, 377–398.

SUN’IY INTELLEKT VOSITALARI ASOSIDA BO‘LAJAK CHET TILI O‘QITUVCHILARINING KASBIY-METODIK KOMPETENSIYASINI RIVOJLANTIRISH IMKONIYATLARI

Abduraxmanova Zilola Yoqubjon qizi
Mirzo Ulug‘bek nomidagi O‘zbekiston Milliy universiteti Jizzax filiali
abduraxmanova@jbnuu.uz

Annotatsiya. Mazkur tezisda sun’iy intellekt vositalaridan bo‘lajak chet tili o‘qituvchilarining kasbiy-metodik kompetensiyasini rivojlantirishda foydalanish imkoniyatlari tahlil qilinadi. Kasbiy-metodik kompetensiya bo‘lajak o‘qituvchining pedagogik va lingvodidaktik bilimlarini amaliy faoliyatda qo‘llashi, darsni loyihalashi, o‘quv materiallarini tanlashi va moslashtirishi, baholash hamda refleksiyani amalga oshirishi bilan bog‘liq integrativ kasbiy sifat sifatida talqin etiladi. Sun’iy intellekt vositalarining darsni rejalashtirish, o‘quv materiallari yaratish, differensial topshiriqlar tayyorlash, teskari aloqa va pedagogik refleksiyani tashkil etishdagi imkoniyatlari ochib beriladi. Bo‘lajak chet tili o‘qituvchilarining AI integratsiyalashgan kasbiy-metodik kompetensiyasini motivatsion-aksiologik, kognitiv, amaliy-metodik, raqamli-AI hamda refleksiv-etik komponentlar asosida rivojlantirish taklif etiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: sun’iy intellekt, kasbiy kompetensiya, kasbiy-metodik kompetensiya, bo‘lajak chet tili o‘qituvchisi, raqamli kompetensiya, generativ sun’iy intellekt, metodik tayyorgarlik, refleksiya.

Zamonaviy ta’lim tizimining raqamli transformatsiyasi o‘qituvchilarning kasbiy faoliyatiga qo‘yilayotgan talablarning yangilanishiga olib kelmoqda. Ayniqsa, generativ sun’iy intellekt texnologiyalarining rivojlanishi o‘quv materiallarini yaratish, darsni rejalashtirish, topshiriqlar ishlab chiqish, baholash va