



THE CONTEXTUAL USE OF FAMILY UPBRINGING TERMINOLOGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LITERARY PEDAGOGICAL AND PUBLICISTIC TEXTS

Sarvinoz Rashidova Ilhom qizi

Karshi State University, Foreign Language Faculty

Lecturer, Department of Practical English

sarvinoz1.rashidova@gmail.com

Abstract

This article explores the contextual and pragmatic use of family upbringing terminology in English and Uzbek literary, pedagogical, and publicistic texts. The study aims to identify how these terms reflect cultural values, communicative intentions, and moral concepts across two linguocultural traditions. Through comparative linguistic and discourse analysis, the research demonstrates that while English family-related terms emphasize individuality, independence, and personal responsibility, Uzbek equivalents prioritize collectivism, respect, and moral upbringing. The results show that the contextual meanings of family upbringing terms reveal not only linguistic but also deep cultural and value-based divergences.

Keywords: Family upbringing, terminology, pragmatics, discourse, context, English, Uzbek, comparative linguistics.

Introduction

Language serves not only as a means of communication but also as a mirror that reflects the cultural, moral, and ideological worldview of a community. Within this framework, the terminology of **family upbringing** occupies a central position, as it encapsulates the fundamental values that govern human relations, moral education, and socialization processes. The concept of *upbringing* which in English linguistic tradition is closely associated with notions of *education*,



discipline, care, and moral development finds its cultural counterpart in the Uzbek term *tarbiya*, which integrates ethical, spiritual, and collective dimensions of personality formation.

The importance of studying family upbringing terminology lies in its ability to reveal the **linguocultural identity** of nations. Each linguistic community expresses its cultural values, norms of behavior, and parental roles through specific lexical and semantic structures. According to Sapir (1921) and Whorf (1956), language shapes the perception of reality; therefore, the way family and moral upbringing are conceptualized linguistically determines how societies understand the roles of parents, children, and moral authority. In this sense, the comparative study of English and Uzbek terms associated with family upbringing provides valuable insights into the cognitive and axiological foundations of both cultures.

Previous studies (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Wierzbicka, 1997) have shown that **conceptual metaphors** play a crucial role in representing social and moral ideas. For instance, in English, metaphors such as *home is a shelter*, *family is a team*, or *parents are guides* emphasize independence, cooperation, and responsibility. In contrast, Uzbek linguistic culture employs metaphors like *oila hayot maktabi* (“the family is a school of life”) and *tarbiya ildizdan boshlanadi* (“upbringing begins at the root”), which foreground the continuity of tradition and moral inheritance. These figurative conceptualizations demonstrate that the semantics of family upbringing is deeply embedded in each nation’s worldview and moral code.

The **sociolinguistic dimension** of family upbringing terminology reveals how linguistic forms change depending on communicative context, genre, and discourse type. In literary texts, such terms often carry emotional and moral overtones, illustrating the author’s ethical stance or social critique. In pedagogical discourse, the same terms serve as theoretical constructs reflecting national models of education and moral formation. In publicistic (journalistic) discourse, they function as persuasive tools, shaping public opinion about family, morality, and social responsibility.

From a **comparative linguistic** perspective, English and Uzbek differ significantly in the pragmatic use of family-related terms. English discourse,



influenced by individualistic cultural values, tends to emphasize *personal autonomy, psychological development, and moral reasoning*. Conversely, Uzbek discourse, shaped by collectivist traditions, prioritizes *respect for elders, social harmony, and moral obligation* as key components of upbringing. These contrasts manifest not only at the lexical level but also in collocational patterns and contextual meanings, demonstrating how each language encodes culturally specific attitudes toward family and morality.

Consequently, this study aims to conduct a **systematic comparative analysis** of the contextual use of family upbringing terminology in English and Uzbek across **three major discourse types literary, pedagogical, and publicistic**. The main objectives of the research are:

1. To identify the lexical-semantic fields of family upbringing in both languages.
2. To analyze the pragmatic and contextual variations of these terms in different discourses.
3. To determine the cultural, moral, and communicative factors influencing their use.

By integrating semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-based approaches, the study seeks to contribute to the broader field of **comparative linguistics, cultural pragmatics, and translation studies**, providing new insights into how language encodes moral and educational values across societies.

Methods

The methodological foundation of this research is based on an **interdisciplinary approach** that integrates comparative, semantic, and discourse-analytical methods. The study employs both **qualitative and descriptive** research techniques in order to examine the contextual, pragmatic, and cultural dimensions of family upbringing terminology in English and Uzbek. The methodological framework was designed to ensure a comprehensive and reliable analysis of how family upbringing terms function across different discourse types.

The **comparative method** was employed to identify both similarities and differences between English and Uzbek family upbringing terminology. This approach enabled the researcher to trace equivalent and non-equivalent lexical



units, to analyze their semantic structures, and to observe how their meanings vary depending on cultural and communicative contexts. For example, English terms such as *discipline*, *obedience*, and *childcare* were compared with their Uzbek counterparts *intizom*, *itoat*, and *bolani parvarishlash*.

The **semantic analysis** focused on revealing the denotative and connotative meanings of these terms, exploring their metaphorical extensions, and determining the shifts in meaning that occur across various discourses. The analysis also examined polysemy, synonymy, and semantic narrowing or broadening in both linguistic systems.

The corpus of the study consisted of more than 100 authentic examples extracted from **literary, pedagogical, and publicistic texts** in both languages.

Literary texts included works such as Charles Dickens' *Hard Times*, Louisa May Alcott's *Little Women*, and Abdulla Qodiriy's *O'tkan kunlar*. These sources provided emotionally and culturally rich contexts reflecting moral and familial ideals.

Pedagogical texts were selected from John Dewey's *Experience and Education* (1938) and Abdulla Avloni's *Turkiy Guliston yoxud axloq* (1913), as these texts directly address moral education, character formation, and social upbringing.

Publicistic texts were drawn from English-language newspapers and Uzbek journals such as *The Guardian*, *BBC Parenting*, *Oila va Jamiyat*, and *Ma'rifat*, where family and education-related topics are frequently discussed in modern socio-political contexts.

Each text was carefully examined to identify **key lexical items** associated with family upbringing (e.g., *family*, *care*, *discipline*, *moral education*, *respect*, *responsibility*, *tarbiya*, *odob*, *hurmat*, *mehr-muruvvat*). These units formed the empirical basis for further contextual and pragmatic analysis.

The **discourse analysis** focused on how family upbringing terminology operates within various types of discourse. Special attention was given to:

1. The **communicative function** of terms (didactic, persuasive, narrative, or evaluative);
2. The **contextual meaning and pragmatic implications** of terms in relation to the speaker's or writer's intention;



-
3. The **cultural markers** embedded in linguistic expressions reflecting national values and social norms.

Following Halliday's (1978) functional linguistics perspective, the study viewed language as a social semiotic system, where lexical choice is motivated by communicative purpose and social context. Accordingly, both English and Uzbek examples were analyzed to identify how the same concept such as *upbringing* or *tarbiya* can carry different pragmatic loads depending on situational, emotional, and cultural factors.

The collected data were organized in tables and analyzed qualitatively to identify dominant tendencies and distinctive features. Particular attention was paid to translation equivalents and potential semantic gaps that occur between English and Uzbek due to cultural or conceptual divergence.

To ensure the **validity** of results, only authentic and contextually rich sources were selected, representing both classical and contemporary usage. The **reliability** of analysis was maintained by cross-verifying term meanings in authoritative dictionaries such as *The Oxford English Dictionary* (OED, 2023), *Cambridge Dictionary*, and *O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati* (2020). The comparative semantic interpretations were also supported by established theoretical frameworks from linguocultural and pragmatic studies (Lakoff & Johnson, 1980; Nizomova, 2021).

Results

The results of the study reveal that the terminology of family upbringing in English and Uzbek demonstrates not only lexical-semantic variation but also profound cultural, pragmatic, and emotional differences. Across the three discourse types literary, pedagogical, and publicistic the contextual usage of these terms reflects distinctive cultural attitudes toward morality, family structure, and the educational role of parents.

The analysis of literary sources indicates that English and Uzbek writers conceptualize family upbringing through differing value systems. In English literature, the terminology of family upbringing is closely connected with individual self-development, moral autonomy, and the ethics of personal freedom. Authors such as Louisa May Alcott and Charles Dickens use family



contexts to reflect social values and to critique existing moral or social hierarchies. For instance, in Alcott's *Little Women* (1868), lexical items like *independence*, *self-discipline*, *responsibility*, and *moral guidance* are used to construct the image of an ideal family based on freedom and personal growth. Alcott's depiction of Mrs. March as a moral educator demonstrates the Victorian ideal of self-cultivation through moral reflection. Similarly, Dickens, particularly in *Hard Times* (1854) and *David Copperfield* (1850), employs terms such as *home education*, *duty*, *kindness*, and *moral nurture* to critique the industrial society's neglect of emotional upbringing. His characters illustrate that the absence of affection and moral education leads to social alienation, showing how lexical items related to family have strong moral connotations.

In Uzbek literature, however, the conceptual focus of upbringing terminology differs significantly. The dominant lexemes *tarbiya*, *odob*, *hurmat*, *mas'uliyat*, and *ehtirom* reflect collective responsibility, respect for elders, and the preservation of moral integrity within the family. Abdulla Qodiriy's *O'tkan kunlar* (1926) portrays family as the moral nucleus of society, where *tarbiya* is inseparable from honor (*izzat*) and social reputation (*obro'*). The expressions *ota-onaning duosi*, *farzand tarbiyasi*, and *odobli qiz* function not only as linguistic markers of moral upbringing but also as cultural signifiers of national identity and ethical hierarchy.

In short, the literary discourse comparison shows that while English texts associate upbringing with individual ethics and psychological independence, Uzbek texts conceptualize it as a moral and communal duty.

In the pedagogical discourse, the study found considerable variation in how upbringing is linguistically represented and ideologically constructed.

In English pedagogical tradition, upbringing terminology emphasizes *personal development*, *critical thinking*, and *emotional intelligence*. Educational theorists such as John Dewey (1938) use terms like *moral education*, *experiential learning*, and *character building* to promote the idea that the role of education is to nurture autonomy and self-awareness rather than impose moral codes. This linguistic framing positions the family as an environment of freedom and exploration rather than strict discipline. The term *upbringing* thus often co-occurs with *child-*



centered education and individual growth, showing the cultural preference for self-directed learning and independence.

Conversely, in Uzbek pedagogical discourse, especially in the works of Abdulla Avloni (1913) and Abdurauf Fitrat (1918), upbringing (*tarbiya*) is seen as a spiritual and moral process intertwined with national and religious values. Avloni's notion of *axloqiy tarbiya* (moral upbringing) and *milliy qadriyatlar asosida tarbiya* (education based on national values) emphasizes the collective dimension of human formation. The lexical collocations *yaxshi odob*, *hurmat-ehtirom*, and *mehnatsevarlik ruhida tarbiya* express the moral obligations of parents and teachers to raise children who are both morally upright and socially responsible.

Pedagogical texts in Uzbek typically use affective and evaluative language to reinforce moral ideals, whereas English educational discourse tends to favor neutral, analytical, and psychologically oriented expressions. Thus, while English education discourse views the child as an independent learner, Uzbek pedagogical tradition frames the child as a moral subject within a social and spiritual hierarchy. The third corpus segment publicistic discourse shows how family upbringing terminology functions in modern mass communication and reflects contemporary social ideologies. In modern English media, lexical units such as *childcare*, *parental control*, *family ethics*, and *work-life balance* dominate the public discourse. These terms are used predominantly in an analytical and socially neutral tone, focusing on practical and psychological aspects of family life. For example, *The Guardian* and *BBC Parenting* articles discuss *effective communication*, *parental engagement*, and *positive discipline* without overt moral or emotional evaluation. The lexicon emphasizes functionality and mental well-being rather than moral duty, illustrating the rational, secular, and pragmatic orientation of modern English family discourse.

In contrast, Uzbek publicistic discourse (represented by sources such as *Oila va Jamiyat* and *Ma'rifat* newspapers) retains an emotionally charged and value-laden vocabulary. Commonly used expressions like *mehr-muruvvat*, *ota-ona mas'uliyati*, *axloqiy tarbiya*, and *tarbiya o'chog'i sifatida oila* emphasize the family's sacred and moral role in maintaining societal harmony. The recurrence of emotionally colored lexemes such as *mehr* (love), *ehtirom* (respect), and



mas'uliyat (responsibility) reveals that Uzbek journalistic discourse remains deeply rooted in traditional ethics and collective cultural values. Unlike English journalism, which tends to adopt a gender-neutral and professional style, Uzbek media often uses didactic and moralizing tones, reflecting a strong social expectation for families to uphold spiritual and moral ideals. Thus, in publicistic contexts, Uzbek terms carry both moral and religious connotations, while English equivalents retain neutrality and functionalism.

The comparative results across all three discourse types demonstrate that:

- ✓ English discourse frames *upbringing* primarily as a psychological and individual developmental process, whereas Uzbek discourse interprets *tarbiya* as a moral, social, and collective responsibility.
- ✓ In literary texts, English emphasizes freedom and personal ethics, while Uzbek literature underscores obedience, morality, and respect.
- ✓ In pedagogical contexts, English terms are analytical and learner-centered, while Uzbek terms are value-based and community-centered.
- ✓ In publicistic discourse, English employs neutral, pragmatic terminology, while Uzbek continues to use emotional, moralistic, and evaluative vocabulary.

Discussion

The comparative analysis of English and Uzbek family upbringing terminology confirms that linguistic expressions related to moral education, family relations, and parental responsibility are **deeply embedded in cultural, social, and ideological frameworks**. The study reveals that these terms are **not universal linguistic categories**, but rather **culture-bound concepts** whose meaning and pragmatic function depend heavily on historical experience, worldview, and communicative traditions.

In the English linguistic worldview, the concept of **upbringing** is shaped by principles of *individualism*, *autonomy*, and *self-discipline*. Such orientation reflects the broader Anglo-American value system described by Hofstede (2001), where **individualism and personal responsibility** are central to social behavior. Consequently, English discourse tends to employ terminology emphasizing *independent moral reasoning*, *personal choice*, and *psychological awareness*.



For example, the frequent use of lexical combinations such as *moral development*, *personal growth*, and *parental guidance* illustrates the cognitive model of upbringing as a process of *self-realization* guided by rationality and self-control. In contrast, the Uzbek conceptual equivalent *tarbiya* reflects a **collectivist and moral-communal worldview**. It integrates notions of *respect (hurmat)*, *obedience (itoat)*, *gratitude (minnatdorlik)*, and *spiritual purity (poklik)*, which collectively form the moral foundation of Uzbek culture. This worldview is consistent with the collectivist dimension of Central Asian societies described by Hofstede, where social harmony, family honor, and moral interdependence are prioritized over individual autonomy.

As observed in Uzbek literary and pedagogical discourse, *tarbiya* is perceived not merely as a process of education but as a **moral and spiritual responsibility shared by the entire community** parents, teachers, and society at large. Furthermore, the **pragmatic nuances** of the two languages demonstrate that linguistic choices reflect culturally specific attitudes toward communication and morality. In English discourse, politeness strategies are often realized through *psychological distance*, *emotional moderation*, and *individual respect* (Leech, 2014). In contrast, Uzbek pragmatic norms display *emotional proximity*, *warmth*, and *didactic moralism*, where expressions of care, affection, and admonition coexist harmoniously within communicative interactions. Terms such as *mehr-muruvvat* and *ota-onaning duosi* carry deep emotional resonance that cannot be fully captured through literal English equivalents.

This contrast underlines the necessity of **context-sensitive interpretation and translation**. As Nizomova (2021) emphasizes, translation of culturally loaded terminology requires attention to **pragmatic equivalence** rather than formal correspondence. A literal translation of *tarbiya* as *upbringing* may ignore its embedded moral and religious connotations, just as translating *self-discipline* into *intizom* may miss the psychological aspect inherent in the English concept. Therefore, lexicographic representation of such terms should not only provide semantic equivalence but also include **cultural annotations** to reflect pragmatic and emotional differences.

The findings hold important implications for **translation studies, lexicography, and intercultural pedagogy**. Translators must consider both semantic and



pragmatic equivalence, ensuring that the emotional and moral undertones of family upbringing terminology are accurately represented. In lexicography, bilingual dictionaries should include **contextual notes** and **usage examples** that highlight sociocultural distinctions. In education, comparative linguistic awareness can foster greater intercultural competence, allowing learners to understand how language conveys values and moral codes in diverse cultural settings.

Conclusion

The conducted comparative study demonstrates that **family upbringing terminology** functions as a crucial linguistic and cultural bridge between the moral traditions, social norms, and educational philosophies of the English- and Uzbek-speaking communities. Far from being merely lexical units, these terms encapsulate the **collective moral consciousness** of each nation and serve as a means of transmitting ethical values from one generation to another.

The analysis reveals that both English and Uzbek languages conceptualize *upbringing* as a **multifaceted moral and social phenomenon**, yet they diverge significantly in their **axiological orientation and pragmatic realization**. English discourse, shaped by the values of *individualism*, *rational autonomy*, and *psychological balance*, encodes upbringing through terms that emphasize personal development and emotional awareness. In contrast, Uzbek discourse, grounded in *collectivism*, *moral duty*, and *spiritual respect*, expresses upbringing as a process of cultivating ethical integrity and social responsibility within the family and community.

These distinctions confirm that **language reflects the moral architecture of culture**. In the English linguistic worldview, the family is portrayed as a nurturing environment for self-reliant individuals; in the Uzbek worldview, it represents a sacred space where collective morality and mutual respect are preserved. The comparative findings thus support the theoretical position of Hofstede (2001) and Wierzbicka (1997) that linguistic variation mirrors deeper cultural dimensions and value hierarchies.

From a **pragmatic and lexicographic perspective**, the study underscores the necessity of adopting **culture-sensitive approaches** to the interpretation,



translation, and dictionary representation of family upbringing terminology. Literal translation often fails to convey the embedded emotional, moral, and spiritual meanings of culturally specific terms such as *tarbiya*, *hurmat*, or *mehr-muruvvat*. Therefore, bilingual lexicographers and translators should integrate explanatory notes, pragmatic comments, and contextual examples to ensure equivalence at both semantic and cultural levels.

The study affirms that **family upbringing terminology is a key linguistic manifestation of cultural identity**. Its analysis not only deepens our understanding of how languages encode moral and social realities but also reinforces the idea that true communication between cultures requires recognition of the **pragmatic, emotional, and ethical dimensions** of words. Future research may expand this study by exploring the evolution of such terminology in digital discourse, contemporary education, and intercultural translation, thereby enriching our comprehension of language as a living expression of human values.

References

1. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. *Metaphors We Live By*. University of Chicago Press, **1980**.
2. Wierzbicka, A. *Understanding Cultures Through Their Key Words*. Oxford University Press, **1997**.
3. Hofstede, G. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Sage Publications, **2001**.
4. Avloni, A. *Turkiy Guliston yoxud Axloq*. Tashkent: O'qituvchi, **1913**.
5. Nizomova, M. B. *Pragmatik va sotsiolingvistik yondashuvlar o'zbek terminologiyasida*. Tashkent: Fan nashriyoti, **2021**.
6. Dewey, J. *Experience and Education*. New York: Macmillan, **1938**.
7. Qodiriy, A. *O'tkan kunlar*. Tashkent: Davlat nashriyoti, **1926**.
8. Halliday, M. A. K. *Language as Social Semiotic The Social Interpretation of Language and Meaning*. London: Edward Arnold, **1978**.
9. Leech, G. *The Pragmatics of Politeness*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, **2014**.
10. Fitrat, A. *Oila yoki Oilaviy hayot*. Fan nashriyoti, **1918**.