

PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF STYLISTIC DEVICES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK TEACHING METHOD

Karimova Halima Po'latvoy qizi

Namangan shahar 44- maktab o'qituvchi

Annotatsiya: *Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o'zbek tillari o'qitish metodikasi doirasida stilistik vositalarning pragmatik tahlili amalga oshiriladi. Tadqiqotda tilning uslubiy xususiyatlari orqali ta'limiy jarayonda semantik va kontekstual aniqlikni ta'minlash yo'llari yoritilgan. Xususan, metafora, ironiyadan foydalanish, leksik-emosion birliklarning rolini baholash va bularning kommunikativ kompetensiyani rivojlantirishdagi o'rni ko'rib chiqiladi. O'zbekistondagi ko'p tillilik va madaniyatlararo muloqot sharoitida stilistik vositalarning o'qituvchidan va o'quvchidan qanday pragmatik yondashuvni talab etishi tahlil qilinadi. Bu borada ilg'or xorijiy tajriba va zamonaviy lingvistik qarashlar bilan uyg'un metodik yechimlar muhokama etiladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *stilistik vositalar, pragmatika, ingliz tili o'qitish, o'zbek tili, kommunikativ kompetensiya, metodika, semantika.*

Аннотация: *В данной статье рассматривается прагматический анализ стилистических средств в контексте преподавания английского и узбекского языков. Акцент сделан на семантическую точность, культурную релевантность и функциональную уместность метафор, иронии и экспрессивных единиц в образовательной коммуникации. Исследование выявляет специфику преподавания в многоязычной среде Узбекистана и предлагает методические подходы к формированию прагматической компетенции учащихся. В статье также проведено сопоставление отечественных и зарубежных научных взглядов на использование стилистических приёмов в обучении иностранным языкам.*

Ключевые слова: *стилистические средства, прагматика, преподавание английского языка, узбекский язык, коммуникативная компетенция, методика, семантика.*

Abstract: *This article presents a pragmatic analysis of stylistic devices within the methodology of teaching English and Uzbek. The focus is placed on how metaphors, irony, and emotive lexical units influence communicative clarity and pedagogical efficiency in a multilingual educational context. The study highlights the challenges and opportunities of applying stylistic tools in language instruction in Uzbekistan, drawing on both local experience and international perspectives. It also explores strategies for enhancing students' pragmatic and communicative competence through contextually appropriate stylistic usage.*

Keywords: *stylistic devices, pragmatics, English language teaching, Uzbek language, communicative competence, methodology, semantics.*

INTRODUCTION

In the era of communicative language pedagogy, teaching stylistic devices is no longer considered a secondary element but an integral part of pragmatic competence development. Contemporary linguistic didactics increasingly emphasize the importance of equipping learners not only with lexical and grammatical skills but also with the ability to interpret and apply stylistic means within appropriate sociocultural and communicative contexts. In both English and Uzbek language instruction in Uzbekistan, the integration of stylistic devices into curricula remains a methodological challenge, especially in terms of their pragmatic functionality - such as implicature, politeness strategies, evaluative expression, and emotional nuance. The urgency of this issue is underscored by recent state educational reforms in Uzbekistan, particularly the National Strategy for the Development of Foreign Language Teaching 2020–2030, which calls for the modernization of language instruction through context-based and communicative methodologies¹. While stylistic elements like metaphor, irony, euphemism, and parallelism are commonly discussed in literature classes, their pedagogical potential in language teaching is underutilized - especially from the perspective of speech act theory, conversational implicature, and pragmatic stylistics² (Leech, 1983).

In Uzbek school classrooms, particularly in secondary education, English is often taught with an overemphasis on accuracy and structural knowledge. In contrast, the emotional, cultural, and stylistic richness of texts is rarely explored in depth. Similarly, in native Uzbek language instruction, stylistic devices are predominantly examined as literary features rather than as functional tools of communication. This leads to limited development of learners' pragmatic awareness - their ability to interpret meaning beyond the literal level. Therefore, a comparative pragmatic analysis of stylistic devices used in English and Uzbek language teaching can serve to improve methodological practices, align teaching with communicative goals, and foster intercultural competence.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

This literature-based research follows a qualitative descriptive and analytical method, grounded in comparative pragmatics and pedagogical stylistics. The main objective of this review is to critically examine how stylistic devices are understood, classified, and pedagogically applied in the teaching of English and Uzbek languages, with a specific focus on their pragmatic function within classroom discourse and textbook design.

The literature included in this review was selected using a purposeful sampling strategy. Sources were drawn from three main categories:

1. Foundational works in pragmatics and stylistics – including seminal studies by H.P.Grice³, G.N.Leech⁴, and J.R.Searle⁵, which provide theoretical underpinnings for the pragmatic analysis of language use and stylistic variation;

¹ O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining PQ-2905-son qarori, 2022

² Leech, G. (1983). *Principles of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

³ Грайс, Г. П. *Logic and Conversation* // Cole P., Morgan J.L. (eds.) *Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3: Speech Acts*. New York: Academic Press, 1975. С. 41–58 ([John Benjamins Publishing Catalog](#))

2. Pedagogical applications of stylistic analysis – with particular focus on English Language Teaching (ELT), including works by Carter & Nash⁶, Widdowson⁷, and Crystal⁸, as well as contemporary ESL/EFL teaching guides;

3. Uzbek linguistics and education research – including monographs and scholarly articles published in Uzbekistan that address stylistics in Uzbek language teaching, such as works by Rasulova⁹, Qo'shjonov¹⁰, and materials from the Tashkent State Pedagogical University's journal «Til va Adabiyot Ta'limi».

For analysis, the selected literature was subjected to thematic content analysis, identifying key categories such as:

- Stylistic device types and functions;
- Pedagogical approaches to teaching style and register;
- Cross-cultural pragmatics in language teaching;
- Challenges in stylistic instruction in multilingual settings.

Comparative synthesis was applied to identify methodological convergence and divergence between English and Uzbek pedagogical traditions. The focus was not on evaluating empirical data but on constructing a conceptual map of how stylistic devices are positioned in classroom instruction and how their pragmatic aspects are foregrounded or overlooked. This method also recognizes the sociolinguistic context of Uzbekistan, where language education is shaped by multilingual realities, centralized curricula, and the shift toward communicative and competency-based education models¹¹.

Literature Review

The intersection of pragmatics and stylistics has been a subject of active research since the 1970s, particularly in Anglo-American linguistics. The foundational premise is that stylistic devices do not simply embellish texts but perform pragmatic functions—they signal speaker intention, modify the illocutionary force of utterances, shape implicature, and manage politeness and social roles. For instance, metaphors are seen not only as poetic expressions but as tools for conceptual mapping in discourse¹², while irony and hyperbole function to negotiate stance and emotional affect. Leech (1983) proposed the Politeness Principle and outlined six maxims that interact with stylistic expression, emphasizing the speaker's role in managing interpersonal relations. Similarly, Grice's Cooperative Principle (1975) and its conversational maxims—quantity, quality, relevance, and manner—serve as a framework for analyzing how stylistic variation can flout or reinforce communicative

⁴ Leech G.N. *Principles of Pragmatics*. London; New York: Longman, 1983. 250 p. ([Taylor & Francis](#))

⁵ Searle J.R. *Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. xiv + 187 p. ([Cambridge University Press & Assessment](#))

⁶ Carter R. & Nash W. *Seeing through Language: A Guide to Styles of English Writing*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

⁷ Widdowson H.G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

⁸ Crystal D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.

⁹ Rasulova D. *O'zbek tilida metafora va evfemizmlarning kommunikativ funksiyasi*. Toshkent: TDPU nashriyoti, 2019.

¹⁰ Qo'shjonov Z. "O'quv jarayonida stilistik birliklarning pedagogik va pragmatik tahlili" // *Til va Adabiyot Ta'limi*, № 1 (2021), c. 23–31.

¹¹ O'zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining PQ–5117-son qarori, 2021

¹² Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (2001). *Working with Words: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Vocabulary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

expectations. Stylistic shifts, register variation, and marked forms are thus understood as pragmatically motivated strategies.

These insights laid the groundwork for what later became known as Pragmatic Stylistics, which focuses not only on literary texts but on spoken discourse, classroom interactions, media, and even textbook language. In this paradigm, stylistic devices are seen as context-bound, functionally dynamic, and socially embedded linguistic phenomena. In English Language Teaching (ELT), stylistics has traditionally occupied a marginal position, often confined to literature-based syllabi. However, since the 1990s, a shift toward communicative stylistics has redefined its role. Carter and Nash¹³ argued for the inclusion of stylistic awareness in general language instruction, suggesting that learners benefit from analyzing authentic language use and stylistic variation in real-world contexts. Textbooks such as «Language Through Literature» and «Teaching Language as Communication»¹⁴ (Widdowson, 1978) emphasized that stylistic devices could enhance learners' pragmatic awareness and critical literacy.

Moreover, stylistic pedagogy in ELT has embraced multimodal pragmatics, where stylistic devices are not only found in verbal texts but also in visual and digital media¹⁵ (Kress & van Leeuwen, 2001). This approach reflects the realities of 21st-century communication and the need for learners to navigate complex, layered meanings. Recent empirical studies confirm the effectiveness of stylistic training in developing pragmatic competence. For instance, Ahmed & Alamin (2022) demonstrated that Saudi EFL learners who received explicit instruction in metaphor and irony performed significantly better on discourse interpretation tasks. Similarly, Fricke & Knoop (2021) found that German EFL students improved their sociopragmatic sensitivity after exposure to stylistically rich texts.

Despite these advances, challenges remain. Many ELT teachers lack formal training in stylistics, and curriculum developers often avoid stylistic content due to assessment constraints and time limitations. Thus, while stylistics is increasingly recognized as a valuable tool in ELT, its implementation is uneven and requires further methodological refinement.

In contrast to the ELT context, stylistics in Uzbek language instruction is deeply rooted in literary tradition. School curricula emphasize stylistic devices primarily within the study of poetic and prosaic texts by classical authors (Alisher Navoiy, Furqat, Cho'lpon), often focusing on identifying tropes rather than interpreting their communicative function. While this fosters cultural literacy, it may limit students' understanding of how style functions in everyday language use. Leading Uzbek linguists such as Jo'rayev¹⁶ have emphasized the importance of linking stylistics with communicative practices. Rasulova (2019) highlights that metaphor and euphemism in Uzbek are not only literary tools but also reflect national worldview, politeness strategies, and gender norms. Similarly, Qo'shjonov (2021) analyzes classroom discourse and finds that rhetorical questions, repetition, and diminutives are

¹³ Carter R. & Nash W. *Seeing through Language: A Guide to Styles of English Writing*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.

¹⁴

¹⁵

¹⁶ Jo'rayev A. *O'zbek tilshunosligida stilistik birliklarning diskursiv talqini*. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti, 2018.

often used to manage power relations and build rapport in teacher-student interactions. However, despite these insights, pragmatic stylistics has not yet been institutionalized in Uzbek language teaching. Teacher training programs rarely address pragmatic function, and national textbooks largely maintain a formalist, taxonomic approach to stylistic devices. Moreover, as the Uzbek educational system undergoes reform-shifting toward competency-based models (Vazirlar Mahkamasi qarori, 2021)-there is an urgent need to reconceptualize stylistics not merely as a component of literature classes but as a functional part of communicative competence. When comparing stylistic pedagogy in English and Uzbek contexts, several key contrasts emerge. First, ELT materials increasingly incorporate pragmatic goals, using stylistic devices to simulate authentic interaction, while Uzbek materials remain largely text-centered and focused on form. Second, ELT emphasizes learner agency and interpretation, encouraging students to analyze speaker intention, tone, and nuance, whereas Uzbek instruction prioritizes memorization and classification of stylistic forms.

Nevertheless, there are also convergences. Both systems value stylistic richness as part of cultural heritage and national identity, and both recognize the motivational power of expressive language. The potential for integrated pragmatic stylistics is considerable - especially in bilingual classrooms in Uzbekistan, where English and Uzbek are taught side by side. Recent initiatives by Uzbek scholars to bridge this gap are promising. For example, Ismoilova (2022) proposed a model for teaching metaphor through contrastive analysis of English and Uzbek idioms, linking linguistic forms to pragmatic meanings. Likewise, TSPU's experimental textbook series includes new sections on style in media discourse, though practical application in schools remains limited.

CONCLUSION

The conducted theoretical and comparative review of the pragmatic analysis of stylistic devices in English and Uzbek language teaching methods reveals the importance of integrating pragmatic awareness into language instruction. The study demonstrates that stylistic devices-such as metaphors, irony, euphemisms, and idioms-not only serve aesthetic purposes but also function as pragmatic tools that influence discourse interpretation, social interaction, and communicative competence. English language pedagogy increasingly incorporates pragmatic and stylistic components to develop learners' critical thinking and intercultural skills, Uzbek language instruction often remains limited to structural and grammatical norms. Bridging this gap requires a systemic shift toward discourse-based teaching models, which prioritize context, function, and speaker intention. Furthermore, the review uncovers a need for a localized, culturally sensitive framework in Uzbekistan that aligns with international best practices but remains rooted in national linguistic identity. Incorporating pragmatic stylistic training in teacher education programs and curriculum development is essential to prepare students for real-world communication across diverse sociolinguistic contexts.

REFERENCES:

1. Carter R. & Nash W. Seeing through Language: A Guide to Styles of English Writing. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990.
2. Cook, G. (1994). Discourse and Literature: The Interplay of Form and Mind. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
3. Crystal D. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
4. Gairns, R., & Redman, S. (2001). Working with Words: A Guide to Teaching and Learning Vocabulary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
5. Harmer J. The Practice of English Language Teaching. Harlow: Longman, 2007.
6. Ismoilova M. “Kontrastiv usul orqali metaforani o’rgatish: ingliz va o’zbek tillari misolida” // Filologiya va Til Ta’limi, № 2 (2022), c. 44–49.
7. Jo’rayev A. O’zbek tilshunosligida stilistik birliklarning diskursiv talqini. Toshkent: Fan nashriyoti, 2018.
8. Karimova, D. (2022). “O’zbek tilining stilistik pragmatik xususiyatlari ta’lim jarayonida,” Ta’lim va innovatsion tadqiqotlar, №1(5), pp. 88–96.
9. Leech G.N. Principles of Pragmatics. London; New York: Longman, 1983. 250 p. (Taylor & Francis)
10. Levinson, S. C. (1983). Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
11. Mey, J. L. (2001). Pragmatics: An Introduction. Oxford: Blackwell.
12. O’zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidentining PQ-2905-son qarori, 2022
13. Qo’shjonov Z. “O’quv jarayonida stilistik birliklarning pedagogik va pragmatik tahlili” // Til va Adabiyot Ta’limi, № 1 (2021), c. 23–31.
14. Rasulova D. O’zbek tilida metafora va evfemizmlarning kommunikativ funksiyasi. Toshkent: TDPU nashriyoti, 2019.
15. Searle J.R. Expression and Meaning: Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979. xiv + 187 p. (Cambridge University Press & Assessment)
16. Грайс, Г. П. Logic and Conversation // Cole P., Morgan J.L. (eds.) Syntax and Semantics: Vol. 3: Speech Acts. New York: Academic Press, 1975. C. 41–58 (John Benjamins Publishing Catalog)