# CONCEPTUAL-COGNITIVE ELEMENTS IN TEXT FORMATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

**Ozoda Eshkobilova Khalikulovna,**

**University of Economics and Pedagogy in Karshi**

**Abstract.** This study examines the role of conceptual-cognitive elements in text formation in English and Uzbek. From a cognitive-linguistic perspective, a text is not simply a sequence of grammatically connected sentences but a complex conceptual structure in which information, events, participants, and relationships are organized according to the communicative intentions of the speaker or writer. The study focuses on conceptual coherence, frames, prototypes, image schemas, conceptual metaphors, background knowledge, and information organization. Particular attention is paid to the ways in which English and Uzbek use lexical combinations and grammatical structures to construct coherent conceptual representations. The analysis demonstrates that word combinations function as important building blocks of textual meaning because they establish semantic relationships and activate particular ***conceptual domains. Although English and Uzbek Sentabr differ in word order and*** may differ in word order and grammatical organization, both languages employ cognitive mechanisms to construct coherent discourse. The study concludes that conceptual-cognitive analysis provides a useful framework for understanding text production and interpretation and has practical applications in discourse analysis, translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication.

**Keywords:** text formation, conceptual-cognitive elements, English, Uzbek, conceptual coherence, frame, prototype, image schema, conceptual metaphor, discourse, background knowledge, cognition, text structure.

## Introduction

Text is one of the most complex forms of linguistic communication. It combines lexical, grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive elements into a unified communicative structure. Traditional approaches to text analysis emphasize cohesion, grammatical relationships, sentence structure, and semantic connections. Cognitive linguistics adds another important dimension by examining how speakers conceptualize information before and during the process of text production. From this perspective, text formation involves not only linguistic organization but also the activation and arrangement of knowledge. When a person produces a text, they select concepts, determine relationships between them, organize information, and choose appropriate linguistic structures. The reader then reconstructs these conceptual relationships during interpretation. The purpose of this study is to investigate the conceptual-cognitive elements involved in text formation in English and Uzbek.

**1. Conceptual Coherence.** Conceptual coherence is one of the most important characteristics of a meaningful text. A text is conceptually coherent when its individual elements contribute to a common conceptual structure. For example:

**Modern education requires effective communication between teachers and students. Digital technologies provide new opportunities for learning and allow students to access educational resources more easily.**

The text activates the conceptual domain:

**EDUCATION → TEACHER → STUDENT → COMMUNICATION → TECHNOLOGY → LEARNING**

The Uzbek equivalent can activate a similar conceptual network:

**Zamonaviy ta'lim o‘qituvchilar va talabalar o‘rtasidagi samarali muloqotni talab qiladi. Raqamli texnologiyalar ta’lim olish uchun yangi imkoniyatlar yaratadi va talabalarga ta’lim resurslaridan osonroq foydalanish imkonini beradi.**

Thus, conceptual coherence exists beyond individual sentences.

**2. Frames in Text Formation.** Frames provide background knowledge that allows readers to interpret textual information. For example, a text about **travelling** may activate the following frame:

**TRAVEL**

→ passenger
→ passport
→ ticket
→ airport
→ flight
→ destination
→ hotel
→ luggage

When some of these elements appear in a text, readers can activate the broader frame even when every element is not explicitly mentioned. The same cognitive mechanism operates in both English and Uzbek.

**3. Prototypes and Text Interpretation.** Prototypes also influence how readers interpret texts. A category such as **teacher**, **student**, **doctor**, or **leader** may activate culturally and experientially established expectations. For example, the word **teacher** may activate concepts such as:

**knowledge → classroom → explanation → instruction → student → assessment**

These associations contribute to rapid text comprehension.

**4. Image Schemas.** Image schemas represent basic patterns derived from human bodily and spatial experience. Important image schemas include:

- **CONTAINER**
- **PATH**
- **SOURCE–PATH–GOAL**
- **UP–DOWN**
- **BALANCE**
- **FORCE**

These schemas can appear in abstract expressions. For example:

**English:**

- move forward
- reach a goal
- overcome an obstacle
- fall into difficulty
- rise to success

**Uzbek:**

- oldinga harakat qilmoq
- maqsadga erishmoq
- to‘siqni yengib o‘tmoq
- qiyinchilikka tushmoq
- muvaffaqiyatga erishmoq

These expressions demonstrate the influence of spatial and bodily experience on abstract conceptualization.

**5. Conceptual Metaphor and Text Formation.** Conceptual metaphor can structure not only individual expressions but also entire texts. One common conceptual metaphor is:

**LIFE IS A JOURNEY**

It can produce expressions such as:

- a difficult path
- move forward
- reach a goal
- face obstacles
- choose a direction

Uzbek similarly uses concepts associated with *yo‘l* and *harakat* to conceptualize life and personal development. Another example is:

**ARGUMENT IS WAR**

English expressions include:

- defend an argument
- attack a position
- defeat an opponent
- strong argument

The metaphor organizes the way an argumentative text may be structured.

**6. Background Knowledge.** Text interpretation depends heavily on the reader's background knowledge. The same linguistic expression may be interpreted differently depending on the knowledge and cultural experience of the reader. For this reason, English and Uzbek texts may contain culturally specific references that require additional contextual knowledge. For example, references to social traditions,

institutions, historical events, food, celebrations, or forms of address may activate different conceptual associations among speakers of different languages.

**7. Information Organization.** English and Uzbek also differ in the linguistic organization of information. English generally depends strongly on relatively fixed syntactic order:

**The researcher analyzed the data.**

Changing the word order can affect grammaticality or emphasis. Uzbek allows greater flexibility:

**Tadqiqotchi ma'lumotlarni tahlil qildi.**

Other word-order arrangements may be used for pragmatic emphasis. Consequently, text formation involves both conceptual organization and language-specific mechanisms for presenting information.

**Conclusion**

The analysis demonstrates that text formation in English and Uzbek is closely connected with cognitive processes. Textual meaning is constructed through the interaction of linguistic elements and conceptual structures. Conceptual coherence, frames, prototypes, image schemas, conceptual metaphors, background knowledge, and information organization all contribute to the production and interpretation of texts. English and Uzbek employ similar cognitive mechanisms because speakers of both languages share fundamental aspects of human experience. However, the linguistic realization of these mechanisms differs because of grammatical structure, lexical conventions, and cultural patterns. A conceptual-cognitive approach therefore provides a broader understanding of text formation. It demonstrates that successful communication depends not only on grammatical correctness but also on the ability to construct and interpret shared conceptual structures. The results are relevant to

discourse analysis, translation, foreign-language teaching, intercultural communication, and comparative linguistics.

**References:**


1. Beaugrande, R. de, & Dressler, W. U. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
2. Fillmore, C. J. (1982). Frame semantics. In *Linguistics in the Morning Calm*. Seoul: Hanshin Publishing.
3. Johnson, M. (1987). *The Body in the Mind*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
4. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
5. Lakoff, G., & Turner, M. (1989). *More Than Cool Reason*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6. Langacker, R. W. (2008). *Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
7. van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction, and Cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
8. Kövecses, Z. (2010). *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.