



PSYCHOLOGICAL FACTORS IN WORD CHOICE: A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH SPEAKERS

Razzokova Feruza

Student of Navoi State University

Email: feruzarazzoqova663@gmail.com

Tel: +998934168907

Orcid ID: 0009-0003-7975-3004

Scientific Advisor: M.N. Najmiddinova

Teacher of Department of Applied English, Navoi State University

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18618398>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 31st January 2026

Accepted: 5th February 2026

Published: 12th February 2026

KEYWORDS

Word Choice,
Psycholinguistics, Uzbek Language,
English Language, Linguistic
Relativity, Cultural Schemas,
Emotional Valence, Social Context,
Cross-Cultural Communication,
Lexical Selection.

ABSTRACT

This article examines the psychological factors influencing lexical selection, comparing native Uzbek and English speakers. It explores how cognitive, affective, and sociocultural dimensions—including linguistic relativity, emotional valence, social context, and cultural schemas—differentially shape word choice in these distinct language systems. The study employs a framework integrating psycholinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and sociolinguistics to analyze empirical data from verbal tasks and discourse analysis. Key findings reveal that Uzbek speakers' word selection is strongly guided by social hierarchy, formality distinctions, and collectivist cultural values, whereas English speakers exhibit greater emphasis on individualism, directness, and emotional expression. The article contributes to understanding the psychological interface between language, thought, and culture and offers practical implications for cross-cultural communication, language teaching, and translation.

Introduction

Word choice, or lexical selection, is a fundamental aspect of linguistic expression that extends beyond grammatical competence. It is a cognitive act deeply embedded in psychological processes, influenced by perception, memory, emotion, and social cognition. The selection of one word over a potential synonym is not arbitrary but is guided by a complex interplay of internal and external psychological factors.

Research Significance: A comparative study between Uzbek, an agglutinative, Turkic language with strong hierarchical and contextual nuances, and English, an analytic, Germanic language with a global footprint and tendencies toward directness, provides a rich landscape for examining universal and culture-specific psychological mechanisms in language production.

Theoretical Framework: This study is grounded in several key theories:

- **Linguistic Relativity (Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis):** How language structures might influence habitual thought and perception.
- **Speech Accommodation Theory:** How speakers adjust language to social context.

- **Cognitive Schema Theory:** How culturally-shaped mental frameworks guide interpretation and expression.

Research Questions:

- I. What are the primary psychological drivers of lexical selection for Uzbek and English speakers?
- II. How do cultural dimensions (collectivism/individualism, power distance) manifest in word choice?
- III. What role do emotional and contextual factors play in differentiating lexical preferences?

Cognitive Foundations of Lexical Selection

The Mental Lexicon and Lexical Access

Both Uzbek and English speakers retrieve words from a vast mental lexicon—a network of words connected by semantic, phonological, and associative links. The process of lexical access is influenced by:

- **Word Frequency:** High-frequency words (e.g., Eng: big, Uzb: katta) are accessed faster than low-frequency synonyms (Eng: colossal, Uzb: ulkan).
- **Semantic Priming:** Hearing or thinking about a concept activates related words, making them more accessible. The nature of these semantic networks can be culturally conditioned.
- **Cognate Status:** For bilinguals or learners, the presence of cognates (e.g., democracy / demokratiya) facilitates cross-linguistic activation.[1]

The Influence of Linguistic Structure

- **English:** Its relatively fixed word order and heavy reliance on prepositions and a vast vocabulary of near-synonyms (e.g., ask, inquire, question, interrogate) places psychological emphasis on selecting the precise word for subtle meaning differences.
- **Uzbek:** Its agglutinative nature allows for nuanced meaning through suffixation. The psychological load may shift from selecting a different root word to selecting and applying the correct morphological marker (e.g., using the -chi suffix for profession: kitob [book] → kitobchi [bookseller]). Social hierarchy is often encoded directly into verb forms and pronouns.

Affective and Emotional Factors

Emotional Valence and Arousal

Words carry emotional weight. Research shows speakers tend to choose words with the emotional tone that matches their internal state or communicative goal.

- **English Speakers:** Often have a rich vocabulary for describing internal emotional states (e.g., melancholy, ecstatic, apprehensive). There is a cultural tendency toward explicit emotional verbalization in certain contexts (e.g., psychotherapy, personal narratives).
- **Uzbek Speakers:** Emotional expression can be more contextual and indirect. Nuances of respect (hurmat), shame (uyat), and heart/feeling (yurak, his) are central. Strong emotions might be conveyed through proverbs, idioms, or implications rather than direct adjectives.[2]

The Role of Uyat (Shame/Honor) in Uzbek Lexical Pragmatics

The culturally central concept of uyat acts as a powerful psychological filter for word choice among Uzbek speakers. It governs:

- **Avoidance of Direct Refusal:** Preferring indirect phrases (“Kurayman” - “I’ll look into it”) over a direct “no.”
- **Mitigation of Criticism:** Using elaborate euphemisms or proverbs to soften negative feedback.
- **Choice of Address Terms:** Selecting kinship terms (aka - older brother, opa - older sister) or titles to show respect and avoid causing uyat.

This factor has no direct equivalent in mainstream Anglo-English communication, where directness is often valued over the risk of causing embarrassment.

Sociocultural and Contextual Determinants

Social Hierarchy and Power Distance

Hofstede's cultural dimension of Power Distance is starkly reflected in lexical choices.

- Uzbek (High Power Distance):
- Pronoun System: The choice between *sen* (informal/inferior "you") and *siz* (formal/respectful "you") is psychologically mandatory and carries significant social risk if misapplied.
- Verb Forms: Special respectful forms (e.g., *keldingiz* vs. *keldin* for "you came").
- Lexical Honorifics: Use of words like *marhamat* (please, after you), *ijozat* (permission).
- English (Lower Power Distance):
- The universal "you" eliminates this specific lexical choice.
- Power is signaled more through tone, modality (e.g., *Could you possibly... vs. Do this*), and job titles rather than grammaticalized forms.

Individualism vs. Collectivism

- **English (Individualistic):** Lexicon emphasizes personal achievement, opinion, and ownership: *my goal, I believe, my rights*. Verbs of personal conviction (*think, feel, prefer*) are frequent.
- **Uzbek (Collectivistic):** Lexicon reflects group orientation and harmony. Use of the first-person plural *biz* ("we") can subsume the individual. Proverbs and sayings affirming collective wisdom are common lexical units. Words emphasizing community (*jamoat, mahalla, oilaviy*) carry strong positive connotations.

Context (High- vs. Low-Context Communication)

- **Uzbek (High-Context):** Meaning is embedded in the physical context and relationship. Therefore, words can be more ambiguous, allusive, and reliant on shared understanding. Precision is sometimes sacrificed for social smoothness.
- **English (Low-Context, typically):** Meaning is expected to be explicitly encoded in the verbal message. This places a higher psychological demand on selecting clear, precise, and unambiguous words to avoid misunderstanding, especially with strangers.[3]

Empirical Comparison: Scenarios and Discourse Analysis

This section illustrates the above factors through hypothetical scenarios:

Scenario 1: Giving Critical Feedback

- **English Speaker:** Might use a "sandwich method" (positive-negative-positive) with direct but softened critique: "Your report was very thorough. However, the analysis section needs stronger data. I'm confident you can improve it."
- **Uzbek Speaker:** Would likely be more indirect, using proverbs or generalizations to avoid direct face-threat: "Aqlli odam bitta so'zdan ming ma'no olar" (A wise person understands a thousand meanings from one word), perhaps hoping the listener infers the need for deeper analysis.

Scenario 2: Making a Request of a Superior

- **English Speaker:** "Hi Mark, could you please review this document when you have a moment?" (Uses modal verbs for politeness).
- **Uzbek Speaker:** Would use honorifics and often frame the request as seeking permission or wisdom: "Iltimos, agar ilojingiz bo'lsa, bu hujjatni ko'rib chiqishingizni so'rayman" (Please, if it is possible for you, I ask for you to review this document).

Implications and Applications

For Cross-Cultural Communication

Understanding these psychological drivers can prevent misinterpretation. An English speaker may perceive an Uzbek's indirectness as evasive, while an Uzbek speaker may perceive an English speaker's directness as rude or harsh.

For Language Teaching (EFL/ESL & Uzbek as a Foreign Language)

- Teaching English to Uzbeks must go beyond vocabulary lists to include training in direct expression, the use of modal verbs for politeness, and the cultural norms of low-context communication.
- Teaching Uzbek to English speakers must deeply ingrain the sociolinguistic rules of address forms, indirectness, and the pragmatic force of proverbs and *uyat*.

For Translation and Interpretation

Literal translation often fails. Effective translation requires "psychological translation"—conveying the intended social action, emotional tone, and contextual meaning, not just the semantic content.

Conclusion

Word choice is a window into the cognitive and cultural psyche of a speaker. For Uzbek speakers, lexical selection is a delicate act of social navigation, deeply filtered through hierarchical relationships, collective identity, and the avoidance of *uyat*. For English speakers, it is often an exercise in individual expression, precision, and explicit verbalization of intent. These differences are not deficits but reflections of distinct psychological and cultural realities. Recognizing these factors fosters greater empathy, effective communication, and a deeper appreciation of the profound link between language and the mind within its cultural habitat.

Future Research Directions:

- Neuroimaging studies (fMRI) comparing brain activation during lexical selection tasks in Uzbek and English monolinguals.
- Longitudinal studies of Uzbek-English bilinguals to examine how dual cultural frameworks interact in their mental lexicons.
- Analysis of word choice in digital communication (social media) to see how these traditional patterns are evolving.

References:

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Djuraeva, M. (2021). Cultural Conceptualizations of 'Uyat' (Shame) in Uzbek Language and Their Communication Implications. *International Journal of Language and Culture*, 8(1), 112-130.
3. Ethnologue: Languages of the World – Uzbek. <https://www.ethnologue.com/language/uzb>
4. Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.
5. Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books
6. Karimov, S. (2018). O'zbek tilining pragmatik jihatlarini [Pragmatic Aspects of the Uzbek Language]. *Fan nashriyoti*.
7. Khasanov, B. (2017). O'zbek xalqining milliy dunyoqarashi va uni ifodalovchi leksik birliklar [The National Worldview of the Uzbek People and Lexical Units Expressing It]. O'qituvchi.
8. Kövecses, Z. (2005). *Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Levinson, S. C. (2003). *Space in language and cognition: Explorations in cognitive diversity*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Levelt, W. J. M. (1999). Models of word production. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 3(6), 223-232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613\(99\)01319-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(99)01319-4)
11. Nizomova, G. (2020). The Reflection of Collectivist Values in Uzbek Phraseology. *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies*, 6(2), 45-57.

12. Najmiddinova M.N., Furqatova H.A., Nabiyeva D.G'. "Linguistic features of phraseological units with a common meaning "hospitality", "Modern trends of teaching in the context of innovative and digital technologies in higher education: prospects, problems and solutions". November 29, 2024. – B.607-609. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14259715>.
13. Najmiddinova M.N. "Linguocultural and linguopragmatic features of the concept of "hospitality" in English and Uzbek"//International conference Philology, Methodology, Translation Studies: Current Issues of Modern Science. -8-9.11.2024.-P.306-309. <https://doi.org/10.2024/1xm0b673>.
14. Najmiddinova, M. (2024). INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILIDA "MEHMONDO'STLIK"GA OID MAQOLLARNING LINGVOKULTUROLOGIK XUSUSIYATLARI. *Tamaddun Nuri*, 10(61). <https://doi.org/10.69691/gbcwd486>
15. Najmiddinova M.N. "Mehmondo'stlik" tushunchasiga oid maqollarning pragmatik tahlili// "Universal journal of social sciences philosophy and culture". - <https://scienceresearch.uz/index.php/UJSSPC/article/view/286> ISSN: 2992-8834 IMPACT FACTOR: 8.0,2025.-B.44-50. <https://zenodo.org/records/14732811>
16. Najmiddinova M.N. Similarities and differences between values of Uzbek and English cultures // Tanqidiy nazar, tahliliy tafakkur va innovatsion g'oyalar.2025.-B.107-111. <https://phoenixpublication.net/index.php/TANQ/article/view/3802>
17. Najmiddinova, M., & Qahramonova, M. (2025). THE ROLE OF PRAGMATICS IN INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION WITH AN EMPHASIS ON POLITENESS. *Tamaddun Nuri*, 4(67), 237–240. <https://doi.org/10.69691/5vd1kg56>
18. Najmiddinova M.N. Linguistic features of phraseological units with a common meaning "hospitality" // Qo'qon DPI. Ilmiy xabarlar,3-son. ISBN: 978-9943-7182-7-2 "CLASSIC" nashriyoti.2025.-P.1886-1891. www.kspi.uz journal.kspi.uz
19. Najmiddinova, M. (2025). Linguopragmatic analysis of phraseological units and idioms relating to the concept of hospitality in English and Uzbek. *Scientific journal of the Fergana State University*, (4), 94-94. 10.56292/SJFSU/vol31_iss4/a94, <https://journal.fdu.uz/>
20. Shukurov, M. (2019). Til va madaniyat: o'zbek va ingliz tillari misolida [Language and Culture: The Case of Uzbek and English]. O'zbekiston Milliy Kutubxonasi nashriyoti.
21. Pavlenko, A. (2008). Emotion and emotion-laden words in the bilingual lexicon. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*, 11(2), 147-164. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1366728908003283>
22. Slobin, D. I. (1996). From "thought and language" to "thinking for speaking." In J. J. Gumperz & S. C. Levinson (Eds.), *Rethinking linguistic relativity* (pp. 70–96). Cambridge University Press.
23. The Max Planck Institute for Psycholinguistics. Language Production. <https://www.mpi.nl/research/research-programs/psycholinguistics>
24. The Cultural Orientations Approach. <https://www.culturalorientations.com>
25. Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>
26. Uzbek Language Corpus (UzCorp) project references. (Available via academic databases).