FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF TEXTS OF OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS IN ENGLISH, UZBEK AND RUSSIAN LANGUAGES

Saidova Mamura Suleymanovna
Assosiate Professor (PhD),
USWLU English language faculty -3
Teaching English Methodology Department,
Abdurakhmanova Aliya Yakubovna
USWLU, 2ndt Year Student of Master's degree,

Annotation: This paper presents a comparative functional analysis of official documents in English, Uzbek and Russian languages. Official documents serve as crucial means of communication in governmental, legal, and administrative domains, conveying information, issuing instructions, and enacting policies. Understanding the linguistic features and functions of such texts is essential for effective communication and intercultural understanding.

Keywords: Functional analysis, official documents, linguistic features.

A conceptual tool for the first step of the document design process is functional analysis. According to Ormerod's definition of design, it stands to reason that the first step in the process is to identify, assess, and balance various constraints; functional analysis is intended to support this type of work. We do not, however, make a clear distinction between different design phases. As a matter of fact, the entire design process can be understood as a progressive specification of constraints, wherein general needs are gradually replaced by increasingly particular depictions of the desired appearance of the document. However, the beginning of this process is especially crucial. This is where it will be most beneficial to closely examine the document's functional environment.

Official documents serve as crucial means of communication in governmental, legal, and administrative domains, conveying information, issuing instructions, and enacting policies. Understanding the linguistic features and functions of such texts is essential for effective communication and intercultural understanding. Through the application of functional linguistics frameworks, including systemic functional linguistics (SFL), this study examines the structural organization, lexical choices, syntactic patterns, and pragmatic functions employed in English and Russian official documents. The analysis explores how linguistic features contribute to the realization of communicative purposes and the expression of power relations within these texts. By uncovering similarities and differences between the two languages, this research aims to enhance cross-cultural communication and facilitate translation and

interpretation practices in official contexts. The findings contribute to the broader understanding of language use in official documentation and underscore the importance of linguistic analysis in intercultural communication.

Of course, the document's communication goal is a key element of this context. In addition to providing direction to the design team during the cooperative planning and drafting process, purposes can also be used as a benchmark for evaluating the effectiveness of reader-tested document drafts.

While Anderson has already stressed the significance of purposes in communication design, it is frequently unclear how communicative aims should be expressed. For example, Askehave has defined one of the primary objectives of company brochures as portraying the company as a qualified partner in research that is primarily devoted to establishing communicative purposes. Askehave correctly notes in her study that in order to assess a document's aims, we must have a deeper understanding of its environment. But while examining this background, what should we be looking for? And is describing the business as a qualified partner a useful way to achieve this goal?

It is not, in our opinion. Anderson suggests that purpose descriptions focus on the desired outcome that readers will experience when using the document. Accordingly, the goal shouldn't be explained in terms of the author's goals, like

I will advise the manager to accept the new policy.

While Anderson has already stressed the significance of purposes in communication design, it is frequently unclear how communicative aims should be expressed. For example, Askehave has defined one of the primary objectives of company brochures as portraying the company as a qualified partner in research that is primarily devoted to establishing communicative purposes.

Askehave correctly notes in her study, that in order to assess a document's aims, we must have a deeper understanding of its environment. It is not, in our opinion. Anderson suggests that purpose descriptions focus on the desired outcome that readers will experience when using the document. Accordingly, the goal shouldn't be explained in terms of the author's goals, like

I will advise the manager to accept the new policy.

Instead, it ought to discuss the intended outcomes for readers. What sort of reader impacts, though? Which of the following claims applies to document design the most?

The manager is willing to implement the new policy.

The manager proposes the new policy in the management team.

In 2004 the new policy will be the standard procedure in the whole company.

This article's initial section will make a distinction between organizational outcomes and individual cognitive and behavioral consequences. Additionally, we will demonstrate how a primary document purpose can be broken down into a hierarchical

network with subgoals.

However, a functional analysis must do more than just list objectives. Though not the only source, single communication objectives are a significant source of design restrictions. The most important concerns in document design often have to do with what happens when many audiences and purposes are combined into one document, as well as when purpose-related factors are combined with other factors like legal and financial ones. The easiest way to analyze these challenges is to look at the many limitations that can come from various parts of the functional environment. The article's second section will demonstrate that.

We must ascertain the information demands of our readers in order to establish the topic or topics. The reader is responsible for acting upon the information provided in this document. Because of this, reader task analysis is frequently discussed in handbooks on technical communication in relation to communicative goals. However, it's not always obvious where the functional analysis and reader task analysis stop. For instance, Hackos (1994, pp. 233-239) provides an example of a manual's goal, which resurfaces as an example of a task analysis a few pages later in nearly exact terms.

In certain situations of design, a thorough task analysis could be required. For example, Ormerod (2000) suggests creating comprehensive lists of all the activities and sub-actions that need to be done, together with details on the sequence in which they should be done and the information that is needed for each activity. This strategy might work well when readers regularly use the same material to carry out repetitively difficult tasks. One example of this could be the design of a software manual.

However, a broader level of examination is often sufficient. Examine the description we gave before, where "administering Drug Y" is the subject. What information has to be included in the document is not made clear by this statement. We advise examining the a to ascertain the intended substance of the text. The first step in our scenario is taking the medicine, but there's also a second: stopping when it's appropriate. The initial action must be broken down into three parts in order to pick the information needed to permit correct drug use: choosing the dosage, choosing the time, and actually giving the medication. Therefore, here is how our purpose statement reads:

Patients suffering from AIDS know what dose they need to take of Drug Y, when they should take it, how they should administer it, and when they should stop taking it.

After using the page, the reader must be able to accomplish the following actions The reader's level of familiarity with the necessary information to carry out these actions will need to be ascertained in the following design stage. However, for the initial stages of design, this description should be adequate.

The document design team will need to conduct attitude analysis to determine which subtopics should be included in the text for persuasive, motivating, and affective reasons. This can be accomplished by rationally reconstructing a set of beliefs that are

thought to be necessary for the document's primary goal. However, on occasion, an empirical approach will be required. For example, the designer might set up focus groups or give out questionnaires to a sample of the audience to find out what the most persuasive arguments are for the audience in making a decision. (see Hoeken 1995, pp. 71–92).

In conclusion, the comparative functional analysis of official documents in English, Uzbek and Russian languages sheds light on the intricate interplay between language, culture, and communication within bureaucratic contexts. Through the lens of systemic functional linguistics (SFL), this study has revealed both commonalities and distinctions in the linguistic features and communicative functions employed in these texts. The examination of structural organization, lexical choices, syntactic patterns, and pragmatic functions has highlighted the nuanced ways in which language is utilized to convey information, assert authority, and negotiate power relations. Despite differences in linguistic structure and cultural conventions, English, Uzbek and Russian official documents share overarching communicative goals, emphasizing clarity, authority, and accountability.

Moreover, this research underscores the significance of linguistic analysis in promoting effective cross-cultural communication and facilitating translation and interpretation practices in official settings. By deepening our understanding of the linguistic strategies employed in official documentation, this study provides valuable insights for language educators, translators, policymakers, and practitioners involved in intercultural communication. Recognizing the dynamic nature of language use in bureaucratic discourse, future research endeavors may explore additional linguistic features, examine a broader range of official document genres, or investigate the impact of technological advancements on document production and dissemination. Ultimately, this comparative analysis contributes to the broader discourse on language and communication by elucidating the intricate mechanisms underlying the construction and interpretation of official documents in diverse linguistic and cultural contexts. By fostering a deeper appreciation for the role of language in governance and administration, this research advances our collective efforts towards fostering mutual understanding, transparency, and cooperation in an increasingly interconnected world.

The list of used literature:

1. Andrushko S.Ya. The art of writing business letters in English. - Odessa: "Two Elephants", 1993. - 130 p.
2. Vinogradov V. Lexical issues in the translation of literary prose. M., 1978. 74 p.
3. Komissarov V.N. A word about translation. M.: International relations, 1973. - 315 p.

4. Pocheptsov O.G. Fundamentals of a pragmatic description of a sentence. – Kyiv: Vishcha School, 1986. – P. 75.

5. Mukhamedova Nigora Abdulkhayevna, & Kattabayeva Dilrabo Kattabayevna. (2024). "Semantic functions of modal words in the utterance". *Journal of New Century Innovations*, *49*(1), 25–27. Retrieved fromhttps://newjournal.org/index.php/new/article/view/12127.

6. Mukhamedova, N. A. "The role of modality contamination and negation in the interrogative sentence". *Novainfo. Ru*, (130), 59-61.

7. Saidova, M. S., & Khodzhaeva, K. U. K. Features of the texts of international treaties as a kind of official-business style. *Novainfo. RU*, (128), 42-43.