ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

SOCIOPRAGMATIC FEATURES OF VERBAL AND NONVERBAL COMMUNICATION IN THE SPEECH OF DRAMA CHARACTERS

Mavlanova Xafiza Gulmurodova
Lecturer, Renaissance University
E-mail: hafizamavlonova9@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-2998-9972
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23202144

Abstract: In the article, the influence on the stylistic and linguistic features of dramatic speech directly relates to the polylogic aspects of plot-compositional features. Polylogic conversation is a conversation between several characters at the same time; such a conversation ensures a dynamic exchange of short remarks, multi-vector action, as well as the depiction of multiple characters in the work simultaneously.

In dramatic discourse, the author describes states such as the character's way of life, interests, material condition and mood through nonverbal components. In Uzbek dramatic works, nonverbal means related mainly to the face, head and hand movements are actively used. Moreover, appearance serves in Uzbek dramas to show the degree of material condition, psychological state and level of the character. Thus, nonverbal means in Uzbek dramatic works cause information not expressed in speech to be shown involuntarily.

Keywords: drama, character, speech, verbal, nonverbal, communication, relations, sociopragmatics, discourse, image, competence, personage.

Introduction. With its distinctiveness in choosing its methods and means of communication, humankind has developed many and varied methods, unlike certain living beings known to us on planet Earth. Animals also possess, in a certain sense, a method of establishing communicative contact. However, the communicative contact existing in them is realized only through the exchange of signals. Human communication also takes place through various signals, verbal communication, correspondence, and nonverbal components. In each of the literary genres, the method of human communication is depicted differently. In dramatic speech, however, communication is depicted in harmony with action.

Communication is divided into the following stages:

STAGES OF COMMUNICATION

If any link of the communication act goes astray, the speaker cannot achieve the results expected from the communication.

Communication does not exist in human life as a separate process or an independent form of activity. It enters into individual or group practical activity that does not arise without vigorous and multifaceted communication.

The most important types of communication between people are verbal and nonverbal communication. At this point, N. Khursanov [1], who analyzed in monographic form the verbal and nonverbal means forming communication/speech in dramatic discourse (discourse) and their

linguocultural, cognitive, pragmatic and social aspects, describes them in the form of the following table.

FORMS OF REALIZATION OF COMMUNICATION IN DRAMATIC DISCOURSE

Accordin to the research of N. Khursanov, nonverbal communication is a complex form of contact that does not rely on the phonetic or lexical means of language, but occupies an important place in the processes of human social interaction. This type of communication is realized through facial expressions, gestures, pantomimic movements, as well as body posture and sensory channels (sight, hearing, tactile sense and smell). One of the main features of nonverbal communication is its innate character, which ensures emotionally and behaviorally based mutual understanding not only between people, but also with other living organisms. This process is of particular importance, for example, in achieving pragmatic goals in the speech of drama characters, that is, in conveying emotions, emphasizing social roles or increasing the effectiveness of communication in a specific context.

Research methodology. In this research, a complex linguistic approach was used to identify and describe the sociopragmatic features of verbal and nonverbal communication in the speech of drama characters. The methodological basis of the research is constituted by anthropocentric, communicative-pragmatic, linguocultural and sociolinguistic approaches. In this framework, dramatic discourse was analyzed in close connection with the human factor, social position, communicative purpose, cultural affiliation and speech behavior of a person.

As the object of the research, the verbal and nonverbal communicative behaviors of characters in Uzbek dramatic discourse were determined; as the subject — the sociopragmatic functions of these means, their socio-cultural content and the features of their realization in a communicative situation. As research materials, dialogues, polylogues, monologues and author's stage directions (remarks) in dramatic works related to Uzbek dramaturgy were used. In the process of analysis, alongside the speech activity of the characters, their facial expressions, gestures, body posture, gaze, keeping of distance, voice tempo, loudness, pauses and intonational changes were also considered as communicative units.

On the basis of the descriptive method, the verbal and nonverbal means occurring in the speech of drama characters were identified, and their formal and functional features were described. In analyzing verbal means, attention was paid to the lexical choices of the characters, forms of address, modal units, exclamations, phraseological units, dialectisms, syntactic constructions and individual-stylistic features of speech. Nonverbal means, in turn, were grouped on the basis of facial expression, gesture, body movement, body posture, gaze, distance, touch, as well as paralinguistic and prosodic components.

Sociopragmatic analysis was defined as one of the main methodological directions of the research. With the help of this method, the speech behaviors of the characters were studied in connection with social factors such as their age, gender, social position, occupation, cultural affiliation, communicative role and relationship with the interlocutor. In this process, the possibilities of verbal and nonverbal means in expressing communicative-pragmatic meanings such as respect, closeness, distance, dominance, submission, disapproval, approval, request, command, threat, irony, surprise, fear and anger were identified.

The comparative method was used to identify similar and different aspects between various forms of verbal and nonverbal communication. In particular, the mutual relation between the content expressed through a verbal unit and the nonverbal component accompanying it was studied. In this connection, cases were singled out where a nonverbal means confirms, strengthens, supplements the verbal content or creates a meaning opposite to it.

Results and discussion. According to the analytical approach of linguist D. Abduazizova, the prosodic and paraprozodic means determining the voice tempo of speech stand out as important constituent parts of the process of communication between people. Prosodic means possess phonological oppositions and discrete features and include elements such as the intonational structure of speech, variability of melody, voice loudness and speech tempo [2]. These means serve to clarify the semantic and pragmatic meanings of information through the speaker's speech intonation. Paraprozodic means, in turn, cover sound phenomena that have no linguistic structure but ensure the emotional and expressive aspects of speech, including vocal noises and qualitative changes of the voice. These means exert a noticeable influence on the listener's process of perceiving information, because they play an important role in reflecting the speaker's emotional state, intention and social position. In the drama context, prosodic and paraprozodic means enrich the speech behaviors of the characters and serve their social role, emotional state and pragmatic goals in communication [3]. For example, changes in the characters' melody or their use of pauses are employed to evoke certain emotions in the audience or to increase the dramatic force of the plot.

The pragmatic features of intercultural communication are of great importance in analyzing the mutual influence of characters in dramatic works. Effective communication between representatives of different nations is not limited to knowing the language; it requires knowledge of the national-cultural features of the communicants, socio-cultural norms, rules of etiquette and the politeness system of the communication participants. The ontological bases of intercultural communication are formed relying on its semiotic and pragmatic features, which is considered an important factor in ensuring the effectiveness of communication [4]. Not only cultural differences but also factors such as the participants' gender, occupation, age, social status, personal experience and psychological characteristics, for example, touchiness or patience, influence the communication process. In the speech of drama characters, these factors are often reflected in their lexical choices, intonational style and nonverbal behaviors. For example, a character's social position or gender may be clearly manifested in the melody of speech, word choice or gestures, which enriches the cultural and pragmatic context of the communication.

When intercultural communication is interpreted as a communicative act, it is defined as a process of mutual understanding between participants belonging to different cultures. This process depends not only on the linguistic structure of the language, but also on the correct use of prosodic and paraprozodic means, as well as on the full perception of the cultural context. In dramatic works, such communication stands out as an important means of revealing the social roles of the characters, their conflicts or mutual cooperation. As a result, prosodic and paraprozodic means, as well as the features of intercultural communication, manifest themselves in the speech of drama characters as important mechanisms serving pragmatic goals, which helps evoke a deep emotional and intellectual impact in the audience [5].

An aspect of intercultural communication that has attracted the particular interest of linguists is its nonverbal facets. Linguists have come to the conclusion that nonverbal communication, like language, is culture-dependent. The works of Edward Hall, the founder of the study of culture and communication, such as "The Silent Language" (1959) and "The Hidden Dimension" (1966), laid the foundation for the formation of this new direction [6]. Nonverbal (without language participation, speechless, wordless) communication is a form of communication that gives information and signals about the mutual influence of the communicating communicants and their emotional state. The linguist scholar M. Saidkhonov, emphasizing that the use of nonverbal means in the process of contact-interaction is a distinctive factor in the development of language, states the following: "in contact-interaction, a person involuntarily uses nonverbal means. Because the speech process, the dialogic situation and the psychological state of the interlocutors require the use of gestures, changes in sound and body movements in expressing an idea". With the help of these means, it is possible to express even feelings that cannot be expressed by means of language.

Language stands out as one of the most important forms of behavior reflecting the cultural distinctiveness of humankind, in which the specific lexical, syntactic, grammatical, phonological and pragmatic features of each culture are embodied. Each cultural environment employs its own approaches in developing the language and organizing the processes of communication, which leads to the different formation of the functional and sociopragmatic features of the language. The first studies on the influence of cultural diversity on speech behaviors were rooted in the works of David Efron devoted to the analysis of gestures among Sicilian and Lithuanian Jewish immigrants in New York City. According to Efron's conclusions, distinctive gestural behaviors exist in traditional Jewish and Italian communities, but as these communities integrated into the broader American culture, these traditional nonverbal means gradually disappeared. In particular, the rare use of gestures in English culture does not reflect its specific sociopragmatic features, but points to a cultural synthesis formed as a result of the influence of various ethnic strata. This process was analyzed even more deeply through the documentation by P. Ekman and his colleagues of cultural differences in symbolic gestures among Japanese, American and New Guinean communities.

The research of linguist D. Abduazizova emphasizes the important place of paralinguistic means in analyzing the sociopragmatic features of human speech. According to her, the social and national distinctiveness of speech behaviors is formed through a complex harmony of cultural, psychological and ethical factors. Paralinguistic means, for example, melody, speech tempo, voice loudness and intonational changes, stand out in the speech of drama characters as important mechanisms serving sociopragmatic goals. These means play an important role in expressing the characters' social position, emotional state and intentions in communication. D. Abduazizova cites R. Lado's idea that "the individual behaviors in which culture manifests itself are never identical; every action is distinctive and is not repeated", emphasizing the distinctive formation of nonverbal communication in every cultural context. In dramatic works, nonverbal means, for example, facial expressions, gestures or body movements, work in synergy with verbal speech, which is of great importance in revealing the characters' personalities, evoking certain emotions in the audience and enriching the sociopragmatic meanings of the plot.

From a sociopragmatic point of view, the harmony of verbal and nonverbal communication in the speech of drama characters reflects their social roles, cultural origin and psychological

characteristics. For example, a character's gestures or intonational style may emphasize their national or ethnic identifiers, which helps the audience to correctly perceive the cultural context of the communication. At the same time, the lexical and syntactic structure of the language, as well as paralinguistic means, serve as important means of revealing the characters' social class affiliation, gender or professional activity. As a result, the sociopragmatic analysis of verbal and nonverbal communication in the drama context makes it possible to deeply understand the speech behaviors of the characters and to analyze their intercultural interaction.

In mixed cultures, various nonverbal components may express contradictory content. Putting both hands on the sides of the head and pointing upwards with the index fingers means being angry in some cultures, while in others it denotes intimate relations. Studies conducted on humans and other beings have shown that gaze is related to dominance, power or aggressiveness, affiliation and upbringing. In the studies, scientists proposed that the affiliative aspects of gaze begin in infancy, because infants look at adults as a source of care and protection [7].

Conclusion and suggestions. In dramatic speech, it is important to single out, as characteristic features of the use of language units and their realization in speech, the predominance of monologues and dialogues. Moreover, writers may use dialectal words in their works only when the term of a concept in a dialect denotes a local feature of a situation that is significant for the reader — in order to draw a realistic depiction of life, to convey local color, to individualize the speech of the characters.

The lexical dialectisms used in a hero's speech serve to create local color and at the same time endow their speech with distinctiveness. The marks of "foreignness" and "novelty" in dialectisms compared with actively used common words ensure their imagery, and imagery brings about expressiveness, attractiveness and stylistic diversity.

Nonverbal means are connected with the speech act, but they participate in the communication process directly without being connected with the pragmatic program of the communicants' consciousness, and constitute an important component. In cultures and subcultures, nonverbal means may express contradictory content. Nonverbal components possess a cultural specification function and manifest the ethnic distinctiveness of the owner of that language.

In dramatic discourse, nonverbal means may be indicated by the author through stage directions (remarks) and may emerge through the behaviors of the characters. These means participate together with verbal components and help direct the thought straight. According to their use, nonverbal means differ in gender, psycho-physiological, culturological, psychophysiological and social aspects.

NOTES

[1] Хурсанов Н.И. Драматик дискурсда вербал ва новербал компонентлар муносабати. (ўзбек ва инглиз тилларидаги асарлар мисолида). Филол.фан.фал.д-ри. Дисс. авто-реф. – Андижон, 2022. 56 б.

[2] Абдуазизова Д.А. Сравнительно-типологический анализ паралингвистических средств (на материале английского, русского, узбекского языков). кан., фил., наук., дисс. – Ташкент, 1997. 58-бет.

[3] O'sha asar. D.A. Abduazizova. 1997. 58-bet.

[4] Поваляева М.А., Рутер О.А. Невербальные средство общения. – Ростон - на –Дону; Феникс 2004. – 352 с.

[5] Usmanova Sh., Rixsiyeva G. Madaniyatlararo muloqot. O'quv qo'llanma – T.: TDSHU, 2017.

[6] Edward T. Hall. "The silent language". Garden City, New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1959.; Edward T. Hall. (1966). The hidden dimension. New York: Doubleday.

[7] Exline, R. V., Ellyson, S. L., & Long, B. (1975). Visual behavior as an aspect of power role relationships. In P. Pliner, L. Krames, & T. Alloway (Eds.), Nonverbal communication of aggression (pp. 21-52). New York: Plenum. French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1959). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright (Ed.), Studies in social power (pp. 150-167). Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

REFERENCES

1. Abdusamatov H. Drama nazariyasi. – T.: G‘.G‘ulom nomidagi Adabiyot va san'at nashriyoti, 2000. – B. 221-222.
2. Boboyev T. Adabiyotshunoslik asoslari. – T.: O'zbekiston, 2002. – B. 175.
3. Sayfullayeva R., Mengliyev B., Boqiyeva G., Qurbonova M., Yunusova Z., Abuzalova M. Hozirgi o'zbek adabiy tili. – Toshkent: Fan va texnologiya, 2009.
4. Eshqurbonova A.B. O'zbek badiiy matnlarida dialogik nutqning pragmatik tadqiqi. Fil. fan. fal. dok. diss. avto-ref. – Termiz. 2025. 60 b.
5. Hakimov M. O'zbek tilida matnning pragmatik talqini: Filol. fan. dok. …diss. – Toshkent, 2011. – B. 94.
6. Ikramova M. Maqsud shayxzoda dramalarining lingvopoetik xususiyatlari. Filol.f.f. d-ri. avto-ref. – Namangan. 2025. 58 bet.
7. Ikromova G. S'harof Bos'hbekov dramalarining lisoniy tadqiqi: Filol.fan.bo'yicha fals. dokt. …diss. avtoref. – Jizzax, 2023.
8. Ishanbabaeva Sh. O‘zbek xalq eposi va kinodramaturgiya genezisi masalalari («Alpomish» va «Tohir va Zuhra» dostonlari misolida). Filol.f.f. diss. avto-ref. – Toshkent. 2023. 51 bet.
9. Islomov J. Hozirgi o'zbek dramaturgiyasida konflikt va xarakter yaratish mahorati (Usmon Azim va Erkin A'zam ijodi misolida). Filol.f.f. d-ri. avto-ref. – Samarqand. 2025. 47 bet.
10. Lutfullaeva D. Gapning semantik-sintaktik qurilis'h qolipi va propozitiv strukturasi o'rtasidagi munosabat (o'zbek tilidagi yo'qlik-mavjudlik belgilari asosida zidlanuvchi gaplar misolida): Filol.fan. dokt. …diss. – Toshkent, 2006. – B. 7.
11. Madaminova G. O'quvchilarning sotsiolingvistik kompetensiyalarini rivojlantirishda ta'limiy dramalarning o'rni (ingliz tili). Ped.f.f. d-ri. avto-ref. – Toshkent. 2023. 53 bet.
12. Qurbonova M. Bolalarga xos nutqiy akt turlarining pragmalingvistik tahlili // Xorijiy filologiya. – Samarqand, 2016. – № 4. – B. 96-97.
13. Saidxonov M. Noverbal vositalar va ularning o'zbek tilida ifodalanishi. Fil. fan. nom. diss. – Toshkent. 1993. 40-bet. 161-bet.
14. Xursanov N.I. Dramatik diskurs: kognitiv, pragmatik, lingvokulturologik tavsif (ingliz va o`zbek tillari chog`ishtiruvida). Filol.fan.d-ri. Diss. Avtoref. Farg'ona. 2024. 76 b.

15. Qo'ziboyeva L. Mustaqillik davri o‘zbek dramalarida inson va borliq muammosi talqini. Filol.f.f. d-ri. avto-ref. – Toshkent. 2025. 60 bet.