

The Role Of The Discussion Speech Type In Stylistic Variants Of Speech

I. Akhmadjonov

Senior Lecturer, Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

A. Dadadjonov

Lecturer, Fergana State University, Uzbekistan

Received: 12 April 2025; **Accepted:** 08 May 2025; **Published:** 17 June 2025

Abstract: Stylistics, a subfield of linguistics, explores how language elements function across different contexts and purposes. This study examines the “discussion” type of speech within two contrasting functional styles – scientific (academic) and colloquial (everyday) discourse – with a focus on the Uzbek language. Drawing on examples and a functional stylistic framework, we analyze how phonetic, lexical, and grammatical choices adapt to context and communicative goals in each style. In scientific discussion, argumentation is typically structured, objective, and terminology-rich, aiming for clarity and precision. In colloquial discussion, by contrast, expressiveness and interpersonal engagement are prominent, with informal phrasing and emotive language shaping the discourse. In particular, Uzbek academic discussions employ precise technical terms and carefully structured explanations, whereas everyday discussions use informal language, interactive dialogue, and context-dependent reasoning. The literature review synthesizes theories of functional styles and stylistic markers, while the methodology combines discourse analysis and comparative stylistics to systematically contrast the two styles. Findings highlight a distinct stylistic typology: scientific discussions prioritize logical argumentation, specialized terminology, and clarity, whereas colloquial discussions emphasize expressiveness, common vocabulary, and pragmatic flexibility. These insights contribute to functional stylistics and pragmatics, illustrating how communicative context drives stylistic adaptation in Uzbek and offering broader implications for comparative stylistic studies across languages.

Keywords: Stylistics; functional styles; scientific discourse; colloquial speech; discussion genre; argumentation; expressiveness; pragmatic adaptation; uzbek language; discourse analysis.

Introduction: Stylistics is broadly defined as the study of style in language, focusing on how linguistic choices vary with context and communicative purpose. It examines how different levels of language – from sounds and words to syntax and discourse structure – are employed to achieve specific effects and functions. A key concern in stylistics is understanding how context and purpose shape the use of phonetic, lexical, and grammatical units in speech. One important area of inquiry is functional stylistics, which classifies language into functional styles according to social context and communicative aim. A functional style is commonly defined as “a system of interrelated language means

serving a definite aim in communication”dinintohead.blogspot.com, reflecting a structured set of linguistic features tailored to a particular sphere of use. For example, scientific writing, casual conversation, legal documents, and journalistic articles each represent distinct functional styles with their own norms.

Within this framework, the present study gives special attention to the discussion type of speech across two markedly different functional styles: the scientific (academic) style and the colloquial (everyday spoken) style. By “discussion speech type,” we refer to discourse that involves exchange of arguments,

reasoning, or explanation – such as a debate, a scientific discussion section, or a conversational deliberation on a topic. This form of discourse is ubiquitous, but its stylistic realization can differ drastically depending on whether it occurs in a formal academic context or an informal everyday setting. In a scientific discussion (for instance, in a research article or scholarly debate), the language typically prioritizes logical argumentation, clarity, and precision. In a colloquial discussion (such as friends debating an issue or informal online forums), the language may prioritize interpersonal expressiveness, spontaneity, and clarity tailored to immediate context rather than strict logical structure.

Understanding these differences is important for both theoretical and practical reasons. Theoretically, it sheds light on how communicative purpose and audience influence stylistic choices, enriching our knowledge of linguistic variability. Practically, insights into stylistic adaptation inform fields like language education, cross-cultural communication, and translation – for example, knowing how an idea is expressed differently in academic prose versus casual speech can aid translators and language learners. Uzbek language provides a compelling case for this analysis, as it has well-established functional styles in its literary standard and offers clear contrasts between formal and informal usage. Although Uzbek linguists have documented the main functional styles of the language (scientific, official, journalistic, colloquial, literary), there remains a need for deeper comparative analysis of how specific discourse types (like discussions) operate across these styles. Previous research has noted the lack of detailed studies contrasting the lexical, morphological, and syntactic characteristics of each functional style in Uzbek and how they correspond to other languages' styles. This article aims to fill part of that gap by examining the stylistic markers and communicative characteristics of discussion discourse in scientific vs. colloquial contexts, using examples from Uzbek. We seek to characterize how argumentation, expressiveness, and clarity are realized in each style, and what this reveals about functional stylistic norms and pragmatic adaptation in language.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Linguistic style varies systematically with communicative function and context. Building on early stylistic theorists and modern pragmatic linguistics, functional stylistics posits that each major sphere of communication develops its own style, complete with characteristic features at all language levels. Classic classifications identify five primary functional styles: scientific (academic) style, official (bureaucratic) style, journalistic (publicistic) style, conversational

(colloquial) style, and literary (fictional or artistic) style. Each of these is recognized as an “independent whole” with internal unity of language means intohead.blogspot.com, yet also as part of a broader literary language system. Importantly, styles are not rigid compartments; they are shaped by historical development and social needs, and often blend or subdivide into sub-styles (e.g. technical vs. popular scientific sub-styles).

A functional style is characterized by a constellation of stylistic markers – recurring linguistic features that signal its identity. These markers span phonetics (e.g. intonation patterns, pronunciation), lexicon (choice of words, terminology, colloquialisms), morphology (word forms, use of contractions or formal suffixes), syntax (sentence length and complexity, preferred structures), and textual or discourse structure. For instance, the abundant use of specialized terminology and a formally logical tone are hallmarks of scientific [prosedinintohead.blogspot.com](http://intohead.blogspot.com). In contrast, frequent use of interjections, slang or idiomatic phrases, and elliptical sentence structures might mark colloquial conversational style. Functional styles also differ in what linguistic elements they permit or favor, as well as the frequency with which certain features appear. A technical term or complex sentence might occasionally surface in colloquial speech, but such elements occur far more frequently and systematically in scientific communication. Conversely, informal simplifications or expressive emphatics (e.g. repetitive words, hyperbolic slang) are pervasive in casual talk but rare in a scholarly article.

Scientific (academic) style has been extensively described in stylistics literature. Its communicative aim is to convey information and reasoning with maximum clarity, precision, and objectivity. As such, scientific discourse employs a neutral or impersonal tone, careful logical organization, and explicit argumentation structure. Common stylistic features include an abundance of technical terms, abstract vocabulary, and nominalizations, which help achieve precision in [referencedinintohead.blogspot.com](http://intohead.blogspot.com). Syntactically, scientific writing often favors complex sentences that carefully articulate cause and effect or conditional relations, though always with an emphasis on coherence and unambiguity. Scientific texts share core characteristics such as precision and objectivity (to ensure clarity), logical structure (ideas presented systematically), conciseness and coherence (to minimize ambiguity), and terminological consistency (use of agreed specialized terms). In other words, scientific style is optimized for transparent communication of complex ideas; emotional expression or rhetorical flourish is minimized, as these

could compromise clarity or objectivity. Even in spoken academic discussions or debates, participants tend to adhere to a formal register, carefully defined terms, and rational turn-taking, aligning with what is expected in the “scientific” functional style.

By contrast, conversational colloquial style serves everyday social interaction, where the goals often include personal expression, social bonding, or quick exchange of information in context. Colloquial discourse is typically spontaneous and dynamic, adapting in real-time to the immediate communicative environment. This style is characterized by a more relaxed observance of grammatical rules and a tolerance for ambiguity that can be resolved by shared context or background knowledge. Linguistic studies note that colloquial speech commonly exhibits strong emotional coloring and a loose syntactic organization of utterances. Speakers frequently use intonation, non-verbal cues, and interactive discourse markers (e.g. “well...”, “you know?”, fillers like “um”) to structure their speech, rather than the explicit cohesive devices seen in writing. Lexically, colloquial style favors everyday vocabulary including slang, contractions, and idiomatic expressions; specialized terms are rare, and if used, they may be simplified or explained for the layperson. Sentences in conversation tend to be shorter, often fragmentary or coordinated rather than subordinated, reflecting real-time processing and turn-taking. It is also rich in pragmatically driven ellipsis (omitting understood words) and repetition for emphasis or clarification. These features give colloquial discussions an expressive, engaging quality, but can also make them context-dependent – meaning is heavily reliant on the situation and shared knowledge.

From a pragmatic perspective, the differences between scientific and colloquial discussion styles represent the adaptation of language to different communicative contexts and purposes. Pragmatics scholars like Verschueren emphasize that language use involves continuous choice-making to suit context, with speakers selecting expressions that meet their communicative needs and “achieve the ideal effects” in a given situation academypublication.com. In an academic debate or a journal article discussion, the speaker/writer chooses precise words, formal tone, and logical structure because the context demands credibility, clarity, and persuasiveness in an intellectual sense. In an informal discussion among peers, the speaker opts for relatable language, emotional appeal, and interactive cues, because the goals include persuasion at a personal level, maintaining social harmony, or simply being engaging. The concept of pragmatic adaptation thus underlies functional stylistics: style is not just a set of abstract conventions

but a pragmatic response to the communicative environment. Uzbek linguistic tradition, influenced by both Russian and local scholarship, similarly views functional styles as pragmatic realizations of the language’s potential, shaped by audience and setting (for example, formal Uzbek vs. everyday Uzbek speech) dinintohead.blogspot.com.

Notably, prior studies in Uzbek stylistics have begun to catalog these stylistic distinctions. Shomaqsudov and colleagues’ work “Uzbek Language Stylistics” provides an overview of the functional styles in Uzbek and their general features. Other recent works have analyzed specific styles (e.g. official style or scientific style in Uzbek) in terms of vocabulary and grammar. However, detailed comparative studies of how a particular discourse genre (like discussion/argumentative speech) manifests across different styles remain limited. This literature review highlights that scientific and colloquial styles are almost polar opposites in many respects – one striving for explicit logical clarity, the other valuing expressiveness and implicit understanding – yet both are legitimate and effective in their domains. This dichotomy sets the stage for our analysis of the “discussion” speech type: by examining examples from each style, we can identify concretely which linguistic strategies are employed to fulfill the distinct communicative aims in scholarly versus everyday discussions.

METHODS AND METHODOLOGY

This research adopts a qualitative comparative methodology grounded in functional stylistic analysis and discourse analysis. Our approach involves several steps. First, we collected representative samples of “discussion” discourse in both scientific and colloquial contexts in the Uzbek language. For the scientific style, excerpts were drawn from academic texts (e.g. the discussion sections of Uzbek research articles, transcripts of scholarly debates, or scientific monologues) that demonstrate argumentation and explanation. For the colloquial style, we used transcriptions of informal conversations and discussions in Uzbek (such as dialogues from interviews, casual debates on everyday topics, or conversational exchanges in media and social settings). The selection of samples ensured that each contained elements of argumentative or explanatory speech – for example, a speaker presenting reasons or evidence, reacting to another’s point, or clarifying a concept – so that the core discourse function (discussion/argumentation) was present in both datasets.

Once the data were gathered, we applied a functional stylistic analysis: we examined the linguistic features of

each sample at multiple levels (phonological, lexical, grammatical, and discourse-structural) to identify stylistic markers. Following standard stylistic analysis procedures, we looked for patterns such as terminology density, sentence complexity, use of passive vs. active voice, presence of colloquial expressions, and any phonetic phenomena (like sound reductions or emphatic intonation in speech). For each feature, we noted whether it appeared in the scientific sample, the colloquial sample, or both, and in what frequency or form.

In parallel, a discourse analysis was conducted to understand how context and purpose influence the structure and content of the discussions. This involved examining the role of the participants (e.g. expert-to-expert vs. friends chatting), the degree of interactivity (monologic explanation vs. rapid turn-taking), and the implicit vs. explicit nature of the communication. We paid special attention to pragmatic features – for instance, how speakers managed clarity or ambiguity, how they signaled logical connections or contrasts (with words like “therefore,” “however” in academic Uzbek vs. more implicit cues in conversation), and how they used or avoided emotional appeals.

A comparative method was then used to directly juxtapose the findings from the two styles. We created a matrix of stylistic features and noted their realization in scientific vs. colloquial discussions. This allowed us to systematically contrast elements such as:

- **Argumentation structure:** Are points made through explicit logical reasoning (syllogisms, structured arguments) or through narratives and examples? How is disagreement or agreement signaled in each style?
- **Expressive elements:** What emotive or evaluative language appears (e.g. intensifiers, exclamations, humor), and is it deemed appropriate or is it toned down?
- **Clarity and explicitness:** Do speakers elaborate definitions and background (more likely in scientific discourse for precision) or rely on shared context and implied meaning (common in casual talk)?
- **Terminology and diction:** Does the discourse use field-specific terms or prefer general vocabulary and metaphors?
- **Syntax and cohesion:** Does it use formally cohesive devices (conjunctions, structured paragraphs) or informal cohesion (repetition, parallelism, intonation)?

Throughout the analysis, we referenced established stylistic theories (as reviewed above) to interpret how each observed feature contributes to the overall style.

For example, if an Uzbek academic discussion excerpt showed minimal use of first-person pronouns and a prevalence of impersonal constructions, we related this to the stylistic norm of objectivity in scientific style. If an informal conversation sample showed code-switching or Russian loanwords for effect, we considered the sociolinguistic context and the speaker’s pragmatic intent. The comparative analysis was thus both descriptive and interpretative, aiming not only to catalogue differences, but also to explain why those differences serve the communicative goals of each style.

Ensuring reliability in this qualitative analysis involved cross-checking observations with multiple examples and, where possible, consulting native speaker judgments. The methodology, anchored in functional stylistic theory and pragmatic discourse analysis, allows us to draw out a nuanced picture of discussion speech as it adapts to two divergent stylistic domains in Uzbek.

The main part

Stylistics is a branch of linguistics that examines the laws governing the use of linguistic phenomena in speech according to purpose, context, and communicative environment. It introduces how language elements are employed in a way that is appropriate to the communicative situation. Within stylistics, the use of language styles, the application of linguistic means in discourse, and the features of phonetic, lexical, phraseological, and grammatical units are systematically studied.

Stylistics (uslubshunoslik) is considered a relatively new area within Uzbek linguistics. It focuses on how language units function as means of communication across different fields and situational contexts. Stylistics explores the regularities of speech organization and investigates how all levels of language – phonetic, lexical, and grammatical – are used in speech to convey nuanced meanings. Stylistics has been defined as follows: “Stylistics is the discipline that determines how all existing means of language – lexical, grammatical, and phonetic – should be employed in speech. It recommends which type of form, word, or construction is most suitable and effective in a given communicative context. It establishes linguistic norms and identifies the means appropriate for various stylistic layers of discourse. Accordingly, stylistics is an independent science that studies the art of expression and the tools of linguistic representation”.

The correlation between oral and written forms of speech varies depending on the communicative context and the specific functional style being used. As is well known, the primary types of speech styles

include colloquial, publicistic, artistic, scientific, and official styles. Among these, the colloquial style is mainly realized in spoken form, which distinguishes it from other styles. Both the literary colloquial and non-literary colloquial subtypes of this style typically manifest in oral communication. The literary colloquial style dominates everyday interpersonal interaction. Even when colloquial speech is transferred into written form, its core features are generally preserved.

In colloquial style, discussion (or argumentative discourse) is expressed in a distinctive manner, as people frequently engage in active debate in daily life. The non-literary colloquial style, in particular, is rich in such dialogic exchanges. As a functional style, colloquial speech is largely free from the strict norms of the standard literary language and is characterized by flexibility and spontaneity.

However, the discussion speech type under investigation in this study differs from casual colloquial debate in its structure and function. While still drawing from colloquial elements, discussion in this context assumes a more monologic form, where the speaker reflects on ideas through an internal dialogue. Therefore, the discussion speech type develops in a unique stylistic form, distinct from everyday argumentation and more structured in intent and delivery.

In colloquial speech, discussions often remain incomplete or open-ended. While the discussion type of speech typically includes elements such as opinion, comparison, and evaluation, it frequently lacks an explicit judgment. In many cases, the judgment is implied rather than directly stated, or it is left to the listener's interpretation.

Each speech type develops specific features depending on the functional style in which it is realized. In colloquial style, features such as elliptical constructions, lack of lexical precision, and brevity significantly influence the formation of discussion-based speech. In this style, conclusions and judgments are rarely verbalized explicitly within the discourse but are instead inferred from the context.

By contrast, the scientific style represents a functional style primarily associated with academic, technical, and research-based communication. In this register, every concept, object, or phenomenon is clearly defined and explained. Scientific style is distinguished by its specialized communicative function and relies heavily on precise terminology. While technical terms form the core of scientific lexicon, scientific discourse also employs a wide range of abstract vocabulary and polysemous words from the general language.

Additionally, the scientific style often incorporates

symbols, formulas, and numerical data, especially in disciplines related to mathematics, physics, engineering, and other empirical sciences. The precision, clarity, and objectivity of expression are the hallmarks of this style, setting it apart from colloquial and expressive forms of communication.

In scientific style, the method of expressing thought differs significantly from that of literary or colloquial discourse. When compared with these other speech styles, the distinctions become even more evident. Scientific texts reflect objective truth through logical reasoning and coherent argumentation. For this reason, scientific literature is characterized, from beginning to end, by a process of discussion and evidence-based justification. These features are reflected not only at the stylistic level but also in the formation of speech structure itself.

The characteristics of scientific style shape the overall development of speech and define the typological attributes of the text. In turn, this distinguishes the discussion type of speech as it appears in scientific discourse from its manifestations in other functional styles. Among all the functional styles, the scientific style is considered one of the most actively engaged in using the discussion type of speech.

Scientific style is based on reasoned conclusions supported by factual data, relies on the discipline-specific terminology of each academic field, and presents ideas in a clear, precise, and logically consistent manner. Thus, the incorporation of discussion into this style occurs in a distinct and specialized form.

This is evident in the inclusion of core discussion elements such as: strict adherence to the topic of discussion, concise and straightforward expression of ideas, avoidance of unnecessary lyrical or emotional digressions, the provision of relevant evidence and arguments presented clearly and succinctly.

These features naturally create ample space for the discussion speech type within the scientific style. The following examples will illustrate how such elements are integrated into academic discourse.

Sometimes the word “mirshikor” is used as “mirishkor”. However, the correct form of this is “mirshikor”, which is formed from the words “mir” and “shikor”. “Shikor” means hunting, and “mir” is the “mir” in the words “mirob” and “mirshab” and means “a gap like an amir”. In fact, “mir” is a shortened form of the word “amir”. The lexical meaning of “amir” is “commander”. “Mirshab” refers to the head of the night watchmen, “mirob” to the watermen, and “mirshikor” to the hunters. It is not correct to use the word “mirshikor” as “mirishkor dehqon” in relation to farmers. The reason

for the appearance of the expression “mirishkor dehqon” in the speech of some people is a misunderstanding of the second part of the word “mirshikor”.

(From the book “A Word About Words” by A. Rustamov)

This example belongs to the discussion text and is typical of the scientific style in terms of style. If we pay attention to the words used in the text, it discusses in detail the lexical meaning of the word “mirshikor”, which is often used from the words specific to linguistics. In this example, the elements specific to discussion, namely scientific foundations, how to use them, evidence are presented, compared, contrasted, and a clear conclusion is given at the end of the text. Unlike the conversational style, a complete discussion is formed in this style. The signs of the object being discussed are clearly indicated. The facts and evidence that are the basis for the discussion are listed, and the conclusion is fully expressed. In the above passage, the words “mirshikor” and “mirishkor” are compared to each other for the basis for making a judgment. To substantiate his opinion, the author cites words such as “mir”, “shikar”, “amir”, “Mirshab”, “mirab” and the forms that form the basis for the formation of words.

The official style is a style of speech that is characteristic of the written official form of the literary language, has a certain speech pattern, and has firmly established forms. This style is used in diplomatic relations between statesmen, in official business processes of offices, enterprises, and institutions, and in business papers of individuals, such as applications, receipts, and letters of credence .

Since the formal style is based on a lot of clarity and brevity, it is difficult to find examples from working papers that are specific to the discussion text.

A style of speech that figuratively expresses a certain reality through artistic means and thus has an aesthetic effect on the listener is considered an artistic style. Figurativeness and aesthetic effect are important features of an artistic style .

The style of the mass media is considered to be a journalistic style. An important feature of this style is the provision of information and influence, simplicity, clarity, expressiveness, strict adherence to the norms of the literary language. There are also oral and written forms of the journalistic style. The radio and television style is characteristic of the oral form of the journalistic style, and the newspaper and magazine style is characteristic of the written form .

The levels of the scientific style include such features as accuracy, objectivity, logical consistency, neutrality,

brevity and completeness, which are often visible in the linguistic structure of a scientific text. These features of the scientific style also affect the formation of speech. In themselves, they also determine the generalization of the typological features of speech. This, in turn, distinguishes discussion speech and its manifestation in the scientific style from its manifestation in other styles. The scientific style is one of the most actively used speech styles. Because in this style, the elements of discussion are considered: not to deviate from the topic of discussion, to express the idea concisely, simply, not to indulge in excessive lyrical digressions, to clearly and concisely express arguments and proofs that are consistent with the idea. In conclusion, the discussion type of speech in speech styles is quite complex and manifests itself in various forms. In scientific and artistic styles, discussion speech is most actively used. In other styles, the use of discussion speech is limited.

CONCLUSION

Our comparative stylistic analysis of discussion-type discourse in scientific versus colloquial styles has revealed a clear typology of communicative strategies corresponding to each functional style. In the scientific style discussions, whether in written articles or formal debates, the language is characterized by structured argumentation, explicit reasoning, and a neutral tone aimed at clarity and precision. Uzbek scientific discourse, much like its English counterpart, employs specialized terminology and carefully delineated logical links to ensure that each point is unambiguous and evidence-based. The speaker or writer often suppresses personal emotive expression in favor of objective presentation, using impersonal constructions and formal vocabulary. The result is a discussion that is informative and persuasive on a rational level, with stylistic markers such as frequent technical terms, long complex sentences with subordinate clauses, and standardized rhetorical moves (e.g. stating a hypothesis, providing data, drawing a conclusion). These features align with the functional goal of scientific communication: to argue or explain in a manner that is transparent and verifiable. Even when debates occur orally in academic settings, participants adhere to a polite, measured register; interruptions or exclamations are minimized, and turns are signaled in a controlled way, reflecting the influence of written scholarly norms on spoken scientific Uzbek.

In contrast, colloquial style discussions in Uzbek display a distinctly different set of communicative characteristics. Here, expressiveness and interpersonal engagement come to the forefront. Discussions among friends, family, or peers – whether face-to-face or in casual online forums – often feature animated

intonation, interjections, and a fluid, sometimes fragmentary syntax. Arguments in this context may not be laid out as systematically; instead, they are interwoven with anecdotes, humor, or emotive appeals that resonate with the listeners' personal experiences. We observed that colloquial discussions tolerate and even expect a degree of redundancy and implicit meaning. For example, a speaker might repeat a key phrase for emphasis or rely on a shared understanding to skip over formal definitions. The language is replete with everyday words, and when specialized terms or foreign borrowings are used, they are frequently adapted or accompanied by explanation in simpler words. Such conversations show pragmatic flexibility – speakers easily shift styles or registers (code-switching between formal and informal phrases) to adjust to the tone of the moment. Misunderstandings are often resolved interactively through clarifications (“You mean...?”) rather than prevented by preemptive explicitness. These traits correspond to the social function of colloquial discussions: to persuade or inform in a relatable way, to strengthen social bonds, and to navigate real-time feedback from interlocutors.

Overall, the study underscores that “discussion” as a speech genre is not monolithic; its stylistic realization is deeply context-dependent. The scientific and colloquial styles in Uzbek form two ends of a spectrum: one end being maximally explicit, formal, and information-centric, and the other being implicit, informal, and interaction-centric. This typology confirms general stylistic theory while providing specific insights into the Uzbek context. It highlights how the same underlying communicative function – exchanging ideas and arguments – is achieved through different balances of linguistic resources. In scientific discussions, success is measured by clarity and cogency of argument, whereas in colloquial discussions, it is measured by rapport, persuasiveness, and clarity as negotiated within the interaction.

From a broader perspective, our findings illustrate the principle of functional adequacy in language: effective communication requires that style be tuned to context and purpose. The Uzbek examples demonstrate pragmatic adaptation in action: speakers modulate not only vocabulary and grammar but also discourse strategies to fit the communicative setting. This has practical implications. For language educators, teaching students the differences between these styles can improve their ability to shift registers appropriately – for instance, to avoid an overly casual tone in academic writing or to make a formal presentation more engaging by borrowing some communicative techniques (minus informality) from colloquial style. For translators and cross-cultural communicators,

awareness of these stylistic nuances is crucial; translating a discussion text requires not just linguistic equivalence but also stylistic equivalence, preserving the level of formality and manner of argumentation suitable to the genre.

In conclusion, stylistics as a discipline provides valuable tools to dissect how a language like Uzbek operates across different functional realms. By focusing on the discussion speech type across scientific and colloquial styles, this study contributes to both the theory of functional stylistic typology and the practical understanding of discourse in context. It reaffirms that linguistic units – sounds, words, syntax – do not carry inherent style, but acquire stylistic weight through usage in particular communicative environments. The clarity of a scientific argument and the expressiveness of a friendly debate are both achievements of appropriate stylistic choices. Future research may extend this comparative approach to other speech genres (such as narrative or instructional speech) and other languages, further illuminating the interplay between style, function, and communication.

REFERENCES

- Салтанова Ю.Н. Специфика рассуждения в художественном тексте. Дисс. канд. фил. наук. – Москва: 2008. – С. 72
- Kasimova M. Artistic speech Linguistic features of individuality.- Andijan , NDA.
- Dadajonov, A., & Xojaliyev, I. (2024). MUHOKAMA NUTQ TIPINING TIL TIZIMIDA TUTGAN O ‘RNI. Farg'ona davlat universiteti, (6), 158-158.
- Dadajonov, A. (2025). MUHOKAMA NUTQ TIPINING ILMIY USLUBDAGI O ‘RNI. " Issues of Turkish Philology", 1(1).
- Semino, E. & Culpeper, J. (2011). Stylistics. In J.-O. Östman & J. Verschueren (eds.), *Pragmatics in Practice*. John Benjamins. – “Stylistics is the study of style in language... Its focus is the way in which language varies under the influence of factors such as context, purpose, author and period” researchgate.net.
- Galperin, I.R. (1977). *Stylistics*. Moscow. – “Functional Style is a system of interrelated language means serving a definite aim in communication. It is the coordination of the language means and stylistic devices which shapes the distinctive features of each style” dinintohead.blogspot.com.
- Mukammal U. Kosimova (2022). “The characteristics of scientific style.” *Academica* 12(05): 931-933. – Functional styles are “subsystems of language, each subsystem having its own peculiar features in vocabulary, syntax, and even phonetics,” differing by the frequency of certain elements; e.g., a technical

term may appear in colloquial speech, but far less often than in scientific text academia.edu.

Eshonkulova, D. (2020). Uzbek Language Stylistics (transl. of Shomaqsudov et al.). – Identifies Uzbek functional styles analogous to English (scientific, official, publicistic, colloquial, literary)zienjournals.com and notes a lack of detailed comparative studies of these styles' linguistic features academia.edu.

Rakhmanberdieva, M. (2019). "Colloquial Style in Modern Uzbek." Journal of Linguistics 5(2): 115-127. – Colloquial Uzbek is marked by emotional expressiveness and syntactic looseness, with strong intonation and frequent ellipsis in spontaneous conversations studfile.net.

Sobirova, N. (2023). "Pragmatic Adaptation in Uzbek-English Translation." Translational Pragmatics 14(1): 50-58.