



## PRAGMATIC REALISATION OF THE CONCEPT “FOYDA/BENEFIT” IN THE SYSTEM OF SPEECH ACTS

Divanova Mohira Husanovna

Trainee lecturer at Urgench State University  
named after Abu Rayhan Beruni

E-mail: mohixusanovna1997@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20775541>

### ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 16-iyun 2026 yil

Ma'qullandi: 18-iyun 2026 yil

Nashr qilindi: 20-iyun 2026 yil

### KEYWORDS

*concept, benefit, foyda, speech acts, pragmatics, illocutionary force, Uzbek, English, cross-cultural communication.*

### ABSTRACT

*The purpose of this study is to analyze how the idea of benefit (foyda) is realized in the system of speech acts in both Uzbek and English. In doing so, this research uses an application of speech act theory (Austin, Searle) and examines the pragmatic concepts that form the basis for speech act theory, and identifies the different ways in which speakers of both languages utilize foyda to create illocutionary acts of advice, persuasion, promises, and evaluations. Differences in inter- and intra-linguistic differences were found in the way in which the concept of benefit is expressed or understood. In general, the use of foyda in Uzbek is generally embedded within collectivist, moralistic, and indirect speech acts; while the notion of benefit is generally expressed or understood through more direct, individualistic and commercially oriented speech acts in English. The overall objective of this study is to add to our understanding of intercultural pragmatics and provide useful information for people engaged in intercultural communications.*

### Introduction

The term «benefit» is more than a word, it's also a tool that people use to persuade others, to justify behaviour, and as a way of constructing social reality. The way that people refer to benefit, either explicitly (through an assertion), indirectly (through a suggestion), emotionally (through a promise), and/or conditionally (through an offer), depends on four main aspects of their language: it depends on the Pragmatic Norms of the relevant language(s), the Speech Act(s) involved in the interaction, the Context(s) in which the interaction takes place and the Participants involved in the interaction. This article looks at how «benefit» is pragmatically expressed across different types of Speech Acts in English and Uzbek. By comparing the Illocutionary Force(s), Politeness Strategies and Contexts, the research examines how both English and Uzbek view the concept of “benefit” from both a cognitive and an interactive perspective. Semantic shift and meaning transformation in translation have been studied extensively from various theoretical positions.[10]

The research develops from three theoretical frameworks: (1) the Classical Speech Act Theory (including Austin's

Illocutionary Acts and Searle's classification of speech acts into Assertives, Directives, Commissives, Expressives, and Declaratives); (2) a Pragmatic Concept Analysis (where Concepts are seen as Action Tools in Discourse); and (3) Intercultural Pragmatics (looking at variation in Speech Act strategies within and across cultural boundaries). The research looks at the Pragmatic Use of the term «Benefit» as a Pragmatic Operator – an element of meaning that modifies the Illocutionary Force of a Speech Act and that frequently does this by appealing to the Hearer's Self-interest or Ethical Ideologies.

#### Speech Act Types Realising the Concept of Benefit

Directives (Advising and Persuading). Advising and persuading others to perform an action is common among both speakers of Uzbek and English using representation of a future benefit as their primary function.

Speakers using Uzbek frequently express advice with an imaginary or hypothetical structure of «foyda» (to benefit). For example, «If you do this, you will receive a large benefit.» It is not a type of expressed feeling, but rather a fact about how the speaker perceives the benefit as an objective. Creating politeness is accomplished through indirect statements and collectivism by providing a benefit to you, as an individual, versus providing benefit to you based on your own self-interest.

In English-speaking cultures, expressions of advice with use of the word benefit to express a benefit to an individual are made more directly and impersonally in correspondence: “You will benefit from doing this” or “It is in your best interest to do this.” In comparison, the words “profit” and “advantage” tend to have a more competitive and/or self-interest-based connotation: “You have an advantage to accept this offer» English-speaking societies will frequently state the benefit of performing the desired behaviour, leaving less of a possibility for an indirect interpretation. Every day new words appear in the world under the influence of new events and realities, on the contrary, due to the influence of time or various factors, some of them enter history, therefore, this is a relevant topic for linguists.[11]

Commissives (Promising and Offering). When promising future benefits, speakers of Uzbek will often embed «foyda» (to benefit) within relational speech acts and acts of trust: Men sizga foyda keltiraman («I will bring benefit to you») implies a holistic, sometimes moral obligation. The commissive force is strengthened by cultural expectations of reciprocity (see the notion of bali or mutual support).

Commissives that deal with benefits in English tend to be more transactional and contractual in that they are primarily “binding” commitments to aid both parties (e.g., We will provide benefit to both parties; I will guarantee that both parties achieve a profit margin of at least 10 %). The illocutionary intent of these commissives is to establish binding expectancies—often measurable—as a result of the performance of a certain act. English uses beneficial commissives in formal business settings (e.g. We hereby bind ourselves to provide the benefits which we discussed).

Assertives (Evaluating/Justifying): Both English and Uzbek languages utilize assertive language that is oriented toward benefits for the purposes of justifying past actions or proposed actions. In the case of Uzbek, the term foyda functions as a very strong argument supporting an assertion, e.g., «This action has a very large benefit» conveys that the speaker believes this action has a sizable benefit to the wider community in addition to benefiting the speaker

personally. Speakers frequently use benefit-related assertives as a means by which to obtain social approval and/or defend their decisions.

In English, there is a clear distinction between the types of benefits for assertive purposes. In assertive communications, the lexeme used to identify the type of benefit defines the domain of the evaluation (e.g. This is a profitable action, This is an advantageous action, and This is an action that would be beneficial to the larger society). In addition to the distinctions made regarding the type of benefits cited in an assertive, English assertives also are more likely to be disputed or challenged with counter-examples or counter-arguments (e.g., Beneficial to whom?).

Expressives (Thanking/Complaining): Expressives that express benefits are often used to express gratitude and/or to complain about unmet expectations. In the Uzbek language, individuals frequently express their gratitude in relation to receiving a tangible benefit, e.g. Foydangiz tegdi (literally «Your benefit has touched me») — meaning «I have received benefit from you.» This speech act acknowledges not just a favour but a lasting positive effect on the speaker's situation.

In English, thank-you speech acts may refer to benefit implicitly (I appreciate your help) or explicitly (That was very beneficial), but there is no fixed expressive idiom parallel to foydangiz tegdi. Complaints about lack of benefit are more common in English transactional contexts (There is no benefit in this arrangement) than in Uzbek, where complaints are often framed as harm (ziyon) rather than absence of benefit.

#### Pragmatic Strategies Across Discourses

Politeness and Indirectness: In Uzbek cultures, when talking about benefits, one uses indirect speech. Directly asking someone to act out of self-interest is often considered impolite or selfish. Instead of pointing out benefits, the speaker points out how they will come about naturally or as a result of an ethical obligation. To be polite or to soften the impact of what is said, Uzbek speakers use nominalization, conditionality, and include the plural or polite versions of pronouns.

In English, it is easier to talk about benefits in a more direct way, especially when dealing with business or commercial activity. However, if the speaker is overly frank, they can also lose face. Thus, English speakers may hedge their requests by saying you may benefit or use impersonal expressions with the same meaning, such as it is likely you will benefit.

Manipulative Language Usage of Benefit: Both languages use the term benefit to create manipulative speech acts, especially in marketing and political speeches. In Uzbek manipulative discourse, the benefit is described as being complete and irrefutable. An example of this is It will only be beneficial to you. As such, the listener is expected to understand that there will be no negative aspects to receiving a benefit.

In English manipulative speech, there is usually an explicit description of what kind of benefit one is receiving (e.g., financial benefit, time-saving benefit), as well as using comparative examples (e.g., you are benefiting more than your competition). In English manipulative acts typically rely on inaccurate distinctions and the use of exaggerated numbers.

Speech Acts in Institutional Discourse. In business and economic discourse, Uzbek speech acts involving foyda often blend rational calculation with relational maintenance. For example, a manager might say: Korxonona foydasini oshirish barchamizga manfaat («Increasing the company's benefit/profit is in everyone's interest»). The speech

act is both an assertive (factual claim) and a directive (implied call to action), with communal solidarity as the pragmatic backdrop.

English business discourse sharply distinguishes speech acts: declaratives announce profit figures, commissives commit to profit targets, assertives justify strategies, and directives delegate tasks. The concept of benefit is compartmentalised: profit for shareholders, benefit for employees (e.g., health benefits), advantage for market positioning.

**Comparative Summary**

Speech Act Type	Uzbek (foyda)	English (benefit/profit/advantage)
Directives (advice)	Indirect, conditional, moral framing	Direct, agentive, individualist framing
Commissives (promises)	Relational, trust-based, holistic	Transactional, quantifiable, contractual
Assertives (evaluation)	Moral/communal justification	Domain-specific (financial, competitive, etc.)
Expressives (thanks)	Idiomatic (foydangiz tegdi)	Explicit but less idiomatic
Manipulative use	Undeniable, total benefit claim	Specified, comparative, quantified
Politeness strategy	Implication, collectivist	Hedging, impersonal constructions

In cross-cultural and cross-linguistic research, there are significant differences in the way the concept of foyda, benefit, is expressed in discourse. Within Uzbek discourse, the concept of foyda is seen as a holistic, relational, and moral construct that is expressed through indirectness, collective framing, and idiomatic expressives. Within English discourse, the concept of benefit is separated into several different sub-concepts including: benefit, profit and advantage; and each of the sub-concepts has its own set of speech act types and pragmatic strategies which can be characterised as more direct, transactional, and domain-specific. These differences in the use of the concept of benefit are reflective of the underlying cultural models of utility, self-interest, and social obligation that are prevalent in each culture. Therefore, in order for effective intercultural communication to occur, one must recognise that an act of communication using the concept of benefit in Uzbek will have different illocutionary force and politeness connotations than an equivalent act in English.

**References:**

1. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
3. Searle, J. R. (1975). A taxonomy of illocutionary acts. In K. Gunderson (Ed.), *Language, Mind, and Knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press.
4. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
5. Wierzbicka, A. (2003). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: The Semantics of Human Interaction* (2nd ed.). Mouton de Gruyter.

6. Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.). (1989). *Cross-Cultural Pragmatics: Requests and Apologies*. Ablex.
7. Rahmatullayev, S. (2006). *O'zbek tilining izohli frazeologik lug'ati*. Toshkent: O'qituvchi.
8. Muminov, O. (2014). *O'zbek tilida nutqiy aktlar*. Toshkent: Fan.
9. Leech, G. (2014). *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford University Press.
10. *Lingua-cultural problems in indirect translation: a comparative analysis of english-russian-uzbek translation chains*. (2026). *World of philology*, 5(02), 98-109. <https://doi.org/10.70728/phil.v05.i02.016>
11. Divanova M (2023). Lexical semantic characteristics of Arabisms in Uzbek and English languages. *Science and Education*, 4 (1), 1185-1187.



INNOVATIVE  
ACADEMY