

**MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL****MENTAL ENLIGHTENMENT SCIENTIFIC –
METHODOLOGICAL JOURNAL**<http://mentaljournal-jspu.uz/index.php/mesmj/index>**INTERRELATIONSHIP OF STRUCTURE, CONTENT, AND COMMUNICATIVE
STRATEGY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK BUSINESS NEGOTIATIONS****Ugilkhon Kakilova***Independent Researcher**Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages**Andijan, Uzbekistan*

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: business negotiation, structural organization, semantic content, communicative strategy, integrative analysis, English, Uzbek.

Received: 20.09.26

Accepted: 21.09.26

Published: 22.09.26

Abstract: This thesis examines the interrelationship between structural organization, semantic content, and communicative strategy in English and Uzbek business negotiation discourse. Rather than treating these dimensions as independent levels of analysis, the study considers how a negotiating action acquires its functional significance through their interaction. Particular attention is given to the relationship between the stage of negotiation, the commercial content under discussion, and the strategy employed to manage that content. It is argued that an integrative perspective provides a more comprehensive basis for cross-linguistic comparison by showing not only what is negotiated and how interaction develops, but also how participants strategically direct this development toward coordination.

Introduction. Business negotiation is a complex communicative process whose development is determined not only by the sequence of speech acts or the commercial issues under discussion. At every significant point in a negotiation, at least three aspects intersect: a communicative act occurs in a particular structural position within the negotiation, brings a specific content into focus, and performs a strategic function consistent with the participant's

goal. For this reason, describing business negotiations solely from a structural, solely from a semantic, or solely from a pragmatic perspective may fail to fully reveal their internal dynamics.

The linguistic study of business negotiations has taken shape at the intersection of several theoretical approaches. Gardani (2017) notes the existence of prescriptive, theoretical, ethnographic, experimental, and discourse-based approaches in negotiation research and summarizes the aspects of business negotiations connected with pragmatics, specialized vocabulary, vague language, and other linguistic phenomena. This indicates the necessity of viewing business negotiation not as a single-level phenomenon but as a complex discourse in which various linguistic and communicative factors interact.

Methodology. Focusing on the nature of negotiation as a process, Fells (2012) distinguishes between the issue itself and the process of agreeing on it. In his approach, information exchange, determining the parties' flexibility, and making concessions appear as interrelated elements of the process of reaching agreement. This perspective is also important for linguistic analysis: a particular commercial content does not develop spontaneously in negotiation but acquires a new status through the communicative actions that participants perform in relation to it.

Proceeding from this, the central question of the present thesis is formulated as follows: how are the structural position of the negotiation, the commercial content under discussion, and the participant's communicative strategy interrelated? The aim of the research is to illuminate the interrelationship of these three aspects on the basis of the principle of integrative analysis in order to compare English and Uzbek business negotiations.

RESULTS and DISCUSSION. In order to understand the interrelationship of structure, content, and strategy in business negotiation, it is first necessary to determine the function each of them performs in the analysis. The structural aspect indicates the place of a communicative act in the development of the negotiation: is an issue being introduced, is an offer being formulated, is an existing condition being discussed, or are the parties approaching the stage of confirming agreement? The semantic aspect identifies exactly what is being negotiated: price, quantity, payment, delivery deadline, quality requirement, or another commercial term. The communicative-strategic aspect shows what the participant is seeking to do with this content: to advance it, clarify it, justify it, express its unacceptability, soften it, modify it, or bring it into an acceptable state.

Although these three components exist separately, in the real negotiation process they do not operate independently of one another. For example, the mere mention of price by a participant does not in itself constitute a strategic act. Price is a semantic component. Its

functional significance in the negotiation is determined by the structural situation in which the price is introduced and the communicative purpose for which the participant employs it. An initially offered price may, in one situation, establish an opening position; the same price, if later mentioned in response to an objection, may become a component of a strategy of justification or retention.

Thus, the same semantic component may perform different strategic functions at different structural points of the negotiation. The reverse is also observed: a single strategic goal may be applied to different content components. For instance, a strategy directed at modifying a condition may be realized by lowering the price, extending the delivery deadline, or redefining the payment terms.

This relationship can be provisionally expressed as follows:

STRUCTURAL POSITION → SEMANTIC CONTENT → STRATEGIC FUNCTION →
SUBSEQUENT COMMUNICATIVE ACT

However, it is not correct to understand this relationship as a one-directional linear process. A strategic act may influence the subsequent structural development of the negotiation. For example, after an objection has been raised, the parties may return to a previously discussed commercial term, assign it a new value, or introduce an alternative option. Thus, structure creates the context for the realization of strategy, while the strategic act in turn alters the subsequent development of the structure.

It is precisely this dynamic character of the negotiation process that demonstrates the necessity of an integrative approach. Fells shows the connection of actions such as information exchange, testing flexibility, and making concessions with agreement in the negotiation process. From a linguistic point of view, particular importance attaches to how a given content is expressed in such processes and for what communicative purpose the participant employs it.

Consider, for example, a situation in which the buyer regards the delivery deadline as unacceptable. The delivery deadline is a semantic component. The expression of its unacceptability occurs in a particular structural response position. Yet within that position the participant may choose different strategic paths: directly rejecting the condition, explaining the reason, asking a clarifying question, or proposing a different deadline. Thus, even under identical structural and semantic conditions, communicative-strategic realization may vary.

This situation also clarifies the role of linguistic means. A modal unit, a conditional construction, a mitigating expression, or a direct declarative form is not in itself equivalent to a particular strategy. Its strategic value is determined by the content it expresses, the structural

situation in which it appears, and the direction it gives to the subsequent communicative act. Gardani notes the importance, alongside pragmatics, of vague language and other linguistic resources in linguistic research on business negotiations. Zhao and Nie (2015), studying vague expressions in business negotiations from a pragmatic perspective, show that precision is not always the sole effective method of negotiation communication.

In this regard, the linguistic realization of a strategy must not be equated with its function. For example, a mitigated expression may serve to maintain relations, yet in certain situations it may also serve the participant's temporary avoidance of clear commitment or the preservation of an opportunity for further negotiation. Therefore, the strategic function of a linguistic form must be determined solely on the basis of the context and the specific point of development of the negotiation.

Recent research on international business negotiations also demonstrates this. Gelūnaitė-Malinauskienė (2022), analyzing English-language business negotiations between German and Lithuanian participants, shows how power and solidarity dynamics are realized through various politeness strategies. This finding confirms that it is insufficient to link strategic choice solely to an individual linguistic unit; its connection with the relationship between participants and the communicative situation must also be taken into account.

An integrative approach is especially important when comparing English and Uzbek business negotiations. If analysis begins only from linguistic forms, the fact that a strategic act expressed by a modal verb in one language may be performed in another language through context, grammatical form, or a combination of several units may escape attention. Conversely, if the communicative task is first identified and then its structural position, semantic object, and linguistic realization are compared, it becomes possible to identify functionally corresponding phenomena despite formal differences.

On this basis, integrative comparative analysis can be organized through three questions:

1. At which structural point of the negotiation is the communicative act occurring?
2. Toward which semantic content or commercial condition is this act directed?
3. What strategic goal is the participant realizing by managing this content?

For example, describing an objection concerning price solely as a price semantic component is insufficient. If it occurs in a response position, the participant may justify the unacceptability of the price in mitigated form and direct it toward reconsideration. In this case the response/objection structural position + price semantic component + justification and orientation toward reconsideration strategy appear as a single functional unit.

The same principle can be applied to delivery deadlines, payment terms, quantity, or other commercial contents. However, an important methodological limitation exists here: every formal difference identified in the English and Uzbek materials cannot be directly interpreted as a feature of the language or of national communicative characteristics. Spoken and written form, the institutional roles of the participants, existing business relations, and the issue under discussion also influence strategic choice.

Therefore, the task of the integrative model is not to combine the three levels of analysis mechanically. Its primary task is to determine how a particular commercial content is being strategically managed at a given structural point of the negotiation. It is precisely this linkage that reveals the dynamic nature of business negotiation and the real functional value of linguistic units in the negotiation process.

Conclusion. Integrative analysis of English and Uzbek business negotiations requires that structural organization, semantic content, and communicative strategy be viewed as interrelated phenomena. The structural position of the negotiation creates the conditions for the communicative act, the semantic component determines its content object, and strategy shows how the participant is directing this content. At the same time, the strategic act exerts a reciprocal influence on the subsequent structural and semantic development of the negotiation. For this reason, when comparing English and Uzbek materials, comprehensively taking into account the relationship structural position → semantic content → strategic function → linguistic realization can more clearly reveal both the general functional mechanisms of business negotiations and the language-specific features of their expression.

References:

- [1]. Fells, R. (2012). Managing a business negotiation. In *Effective Negotiation: From Research to Results* (pp. 202–209). Cambridge University Press. DOI: 10.1017/CBO9780511841491.018.
- [2]. Gardani, F. (2017). Business negotiations. In G. Mautner & F. Rainer (Eds.), *Handbook of Business Communication*. De Gruyter Mouton. DOI: 10.1515/9781614514862-005.
- [3]. Gelūnaitė-Malinauskienė, G. (2022). Interactional-sociolinguistic analysis of the dynamics of power and solidarity in German–Lithuanian business negotiations. *Sustainable Multilingualism*, 21(1), 249–275. DOI: 10.2478/sm-2022-0020.
- [4]. Zhao, D., & Nie, J. (2015). Vague language in business negotiation—From a pragmatics perspective. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 5(6), 1257. DOI: 10.17507/tpls.0506.19.