

The Role of Psycholinguistics in Palliative Care: A Comparative Cross-Cultural Analysis of Speech Practices in English and Uzbek Linguistic Cultures

ISROILOVA DILBAR IKRAMOVNA
Andijan State Medical Institute, Andijan, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

Communication in palliative care takes place in conditions of exceptional emotional, cognitive, and ethical sensitivity. Patients and their relatives are often required to understand complex medical information while simultaneously coping with fear, uncertainty, pain, anticipatory grief, and thoughts about mortality. For this reason, the effectiveness of palliative communication cannot be evaluated solely in terms of the factual accuracy of medical information. The linguistic form in which information is presented, the emotional associations activated by particular words, the degree of directness, the use of metaphor and euphemism, pauses, repetition, forms of address, and the involvement of family members may considerably influence how a message is perceived and processed. The present study examines the role of psycholinguistic mechanisms in palliative communication through a comparative analysis of English and Uzbek linguistic cultures. The research employs a qualitative comparative approach based on the analysis of studies in palliative communication, psycholinguistics, pragmatics, politeness theory, intercultural communication, and recent English-Uzbek research on medical euphemism and speech practices. The analysis demonstrates that contemporary English-language palliative discourse generally favors explicit information, patient autonomy, calibrated directness, and verbal confirmation of understanding. Uzbek communicative practice, in contrast, may place greater importance on

relational harmony, respectful forms of address, indirectness, family participation, culturally meaningful euphemisms, and gradual disclosure of emotionally threatening information. These differences should not be treated as rigid cultural rules. Rather, they represent communicative tendencies that interact with age, education, family structure, personal preferences, illness experience, and individual coping strategies. The study concludes that culturally responsive palliative care requires not only translation between languages but also psycholinguistic adaptation of meaning, emotional intensity, pragmatic intention, and interpersonal positioning.

Keywords: Psycholinguistics, palliative care, medical communication, English linguistic culture, Uzbek linguistic culture, euphemism, end-of-life communication, pragmatics, cross-cultural communication.

INTRODUCTION

Palliative care is concerned not only with the management of physical symptoms but also with psychological, social, communicative, and spiritual dimensions of serious illness. Among these dimensions, communication occupies a central position because many essential decisions in palliative medicine depend on the ability of patients, relatives, and healthcare professionals to construct a shared understanding of illness, prognosis, treatment possibilities, symptoms, uncertainty, and personal priorities.

Communication near the end of life is fundamentally different from routine information exchange. Words such as “cancer,” “incurable,” “progression,” “dying,” “comfort care,” and “no further curative treatment” carry not only dictionary meanings but also powerful emotional associations. They may trigger fear, denial, grief, anger, hope, or memories of previous illness experiences. Therefore, the way patients interpret medical information depends on cognitive and emotional processes as much as on linguistic competence.

This is where psycholinguistics becomes particularly relevant. Psycholinguistics studies how language is produced, perceived,

understood, stored, and emotionally processed in the human mind. In palliative care, its relevance can be observed in lexical choice, cognitive framing, metaphor, speech tempo, repetition, silence, pragmatic inference, emotional priming, comprehension under stress, and the interpretation of indirect messages.

Research based on directly observed end-of-life conversations demonstrates that experienced clinicians use a range of communicative strategies, including hypothetical questions, references to patients' earlier statements, pauses, indirect approaches to sensitive subjects, and gradual movement toward difficult prognostic information [5]. Communication is therefore not simply the transmission of medical facts but a carefully negotiated interpersonal process.

The cultural context of that process is equally significant. A phrase perceived as compassionate in one linguistic culture may appear evasive, excessively direct, pessimistic, or disrespectful in another. Studies of culturally diverse palliative populations emphasize that linguistic concordance, cultural expectations, family roles, and attitudes toward information disclosure may affect the quality of care [4]. Language barriers may further reduce understanding of diagnosis, prognosis, symptom control, and goals of care, particularly when professional interpreters are unavailable or underused [7].

The comparison between English and Uzbek is especially relevant because the two linguistic cultures differ in grammatical organization, traditions of politeness, social relations, medical discourse, and culturally conventional ways of speaking about illness and death. Recent comparative research indicates that English and Uzbek speakers employ euphemism and politeness differently in sensitive communicative domains. In Uzbek discourse, relational respect, contextual interpretation, honorific forms, and culturally established euphemistic expressions can play an especially visible role, whereas contemporary professional English medical communication tends to combine politeness with comparatively explicit information delivery [8; 10].

However, cultural tendencies should never be converted into stereotypes. Not every English-speaking patient wants complete and immediate disclosure, and not every Uzbek-speaking patient

prefers indirect communication or family mediation. Contemporary palliative communication requires individualized assessment of the patient's informational preferences.

The aim of this study is therefore to identify the main psycholinguistic characteristics of palliative communication and compare their manifestation in English and Uzbek linguistic cultures. The study addresses the following research questions:

1. Which psycholinguistic mechanisms are particularly important in palliative-care communication?
2. How do English and Uzbek linguistic cultures differ in the verbal management of prognosis, death, suffering, hope, and emotional distress?
3. What role do euphemism, directness, politeness, metaphor, family participation, and silence play in each linguistic environment?
4. How can knowledge of these differences improve culturally responsive palliative communication?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The study employed a qualitative comparative research design combining principles of psycholinguistic interpretation, pragmatic analysis, discourse analysis, and cross-cultural comparison.

Rather than generating artificial clinical data, the analysis was based on published scholarship concerning palliative communication, clinician-patient interaction, cross-cultural end-of-life care, interpreter-mediated communication, English–Uzbek pragmatics, politeness, and medical euphemism.

Particular attention was given to communication practices that influence cognitive and emotional processing: lexical directness, euphemistic substitution, hedging, metaphorical framing, repetition, pronoun choice, forms of address, silence, family-mediated communication, expressions of hope, and discussions of death.

The material was interpreted through four interconnected levels:

1. The lexical-semantic level examined the choice of words used to refer to disease progression, incurability, dying, death, pain, and prognosis.
2. The pragmatic level focused on the communicative intention behind utterances, including direct and indirect speech, hedging, politeness, implication, mitigation, and face-saving strategies. Brown and Levinson's [3] theory of politeness was used as a conceptual reference for understanding how speakers reduce interpersonal threat in emotionally difficult conversations.
3. The psycholinguistic level examined the possible influence of emotional arousal, cognitive load, lexical associations, framing, repetition, and semantic accessibility on message comprehension.
4. Finally, the cross-cultural level compared the communicative tendencies reported for contemporary English-language medical settings with patterns identified in Uzbek linguistic and cultural research.

Six major domains were selected for comparative analysis:

- disclosure of diagnosis and prognosis;
- reference to dying and death;
- expression and maintenance of hope;
- linguistic mitigation and euphemism;
- patient versus family participation;
- silence, emotional response, and relational language.

Because the present research is a literature-based comparative analysis and does not involve direct experimentation with human participants, no patient-level clinical data were collected.

RESULTS

The analysis indicates that several psycholinguistic mechanisms are particularly important in palliative care.

1. First, emotional stress can increase cognitive load. Patients who have just received threatening information may hear the

clinician's words without processing their full meaning. Complex sentences, unfamiliar terminology, or excessive information can therefore result in partial comprehension. In such circumstances, repetition and semantic simplification are not signs of poor medical communication; they are necessary strategies for supporting information processing. A clinician may, for instance, initially say: "The scans show that the disease has progressed." After allowing time for emotional processing, the same central information may be reformulated: "This means that the cancer has continued to grow despite the treatment." The second formulation reduces lexical ambiguity and makes the clinical implication more accessible.

2. Second, lexical items associated with death or incurability have strong affective value. The words chosen by clinicians can therefore influence both the cognitive interpretation of a medical situation and the patient's immediate emotional response.
3. Third, patients frequently infer meaning from what clinicians do not say. Hesitation, avoidance, changes in tone, prolonged pauses, or repeated references to "comfort" may become indirect indicators of prognosis. Palliative communication is thus partly explicit and partly inferential.

Conversation-based studies of end-of-life care demonstrate that clinicians regularly use patient cues, hypothetical formulations, pauses, and gradual progression toward difficult topics rather than relying on isolated declarations [5]. Similar findings have been reported in earlier discourse-analytic research, where indirect reference, hypothetical questions, and linking new information to something already expressed by the patient were identified as recurring communication strategies.

A major difference emerging from the comparison concerns the preferred degree of communicative explicitness. In contemporary English-language clinical ethics, patient autonomy has strongly influenced norms concerning diagnosis and prognosis. Physicians are generally expected to provide understandable and truthful information while adjusting detail to the patient's preferences. Typical expressions may include:

- I am concerned that the treatment is no longer controlling the cancer.
- I wish the situation were different, but I am worried that time may be short.
- Would it be all right if we talked about what you might expect over the next few months?

These formulations are direct in informational content but mitigated in interpersonal tone. The clinician does not conceal the underlying medical reality, yet emotionally forceful statements are softened by expressions such as “I am concerned,” “I am worried,” “would it be all right,” and “I wish.”

The psycholinguistic function of such phrases is important. They prepare the listener for threatening information while simultaneously signalling empathy.

Uzbek communication may organize the same pragmatic task somewhat differently. Sensitive information can be preceded by relational or preparatory language:

Sizbilandavolashningkeyingibosqichihaqidaehtiyotkorlikbilangapla shibolishimizkerak.

“We need to discuss the next stage of your treatment carefully.”

A clinician may initially avoid the strongest lexical expression and gradually explain that treatment possibilities have become limited:

Kasallikdavolashgaavvalgidekjavobbermayapti.

“The disease is no longer responding to treatment as it did before.”

This may later be followed by a clearer explanation:

Hozirasosiymaqsdakasalliknibutunlayyo‘qotishdanko‘ra, og‘riqvaboshqabelgilarnikamaytirib, hayotsifatiniimkonqadaryaxshisaqlashdir.

“At this point, rather than eliminating the disease completely, the main goal is to reduce pain and other symptoms and preserve quality of life as much as possible.”

The distinction is not between “truthful English” and “indirect Uzbek.” Rather, it concerns the sequencing and interpersonal

framing of difficult information. Uzbek medical discourse may provide greater space for relational preparation and contextual interpretation before the most threatening implication is made explicit.

Euphemism emerged as one of the most important cross-cultural categories. Both English and Uzbek use euphemistic language to reduce the emotional harshness of death. English expressions include “passed away,” “no longer with us,” “at the end of life,” and “comfort-focused care.” Uzbek includes expressions such as *vafotetdi* [passed away/died], *olamdano'tdi* [departed from this world], and other indirect formulations connected with culturally respectful discourse.

Recent English-Uzbek studies confirm the importance of euphemistic substitution in discussions of illness and death and suggest that Uzbek discourse may employ culturally and socially embedded mitigation more extensively in some sensitive domains [8; 10].

Psycholinguistically, euphemism can serve several functions. It may reduce immediate emotional arousal, preserve dignity, allow gradual acceptance, and prevent a difficult conversation from becoming psychologically overwhelming. However, euphemism also carries risk. If a clinician says only “Things are becoming more difficult,” the patient may interpret the statement as meaning that treatment remains potentially successful.

Similarly, expressions equivalent to “the condition is serious” may not adequately communicate that a patient is actively dying. Therefore, palliative communication requires a balance between emotional protection and semantic clarity. The most effective approach may involve a softening phrase followed by an unambiguous explanation:

I am very sorry to say this. His condition has deteriorated significantly. We believe he may now be approaching the final days of life.

In Uzbek:

Buni aytish men uchun ham oson emas. Ahvoli ancha og'irlashdi. Hozirgi belgilar uning hayotining so'nggi kunlariga yaqinlashayotganini ko'rsatmoqda.

Here empathy precedes explicit information rather than replacing it.

Politeness has a particularly important role in Uzbek interpersonal communication. Uzbek distinguishes between informal and respectful second-person forms, and the choice of *sen* versus *siz* carries strong interpersonal meaning. In professional medical communication, *siz* is normally appropriate for adult patients and contributes to maintenance of dignity and respectful social distance. English does not possess a comparable productive T/V pronoun distinction in contemporary usage. Respect must consequently be conveyed more extensively through lexical, syntactic, prosodic, and pragmatic strategies. Examples include:

- "Would you like me to explain what the scan shows?"
- "Can I ask what is most important to you if your condition becomes worse?"
- "Would it be helpful if we included your family in this discussion?"

Modal verbs and interrogative structures reduce the directive force of medical speech and preserve the patient's sense of agency.

Uzbek politeness may combine respectful pronouns, titles, kinship-like address terms, verbal morphology, and indirect formulations. Recent comparative studies of English and Uzbek pragmatics highlight the significance of social hierarchy, respect, and contextual politeness in Uzbek communication.

In a palliative context, such features are not merely grammatical conventions. They contribute to the patient's perception of whether the clinician is emotionally distant, compassionate, authoritative, respectful, or dismissive. One of the most clinically significant areas of cross-cultural difference concerns the role of family members.

Patient autonomy is strongly emphasized in many English-speaking medical systems. The default assumption is commonly that a competent adult patient should determine how much information they want and who else should participate in decision-making. This orientation is visible in expressions such as: "How

much would you like to know about what we expect?" and "Who would you like to be involved when we discuss your care?"

In Uzbek settings, close relatives may occupy a more active communicative position. Family members may ask clinicians to speak to them before discussing prognosis with the patient, particularly when the diagnosis is severe.

Such requests often arise from a protective intention: relatives may fear that direct disclosure will destroy hope or cause emotional harm.

From a psycholinguistic perspective, the family can therefore function as a communicative filter between professional medical discourse and the patient.

However, automatic acceptance of family-mediated disclosure creates ethical difficulties. Family involvement should not result in the systematic exclusion of a patient who wishes to receive information.

A culturally sensitive strategy is therefore to establish the patient's preferences early:

Some people want to know every detail about their illness. Others prefer that we discuss some information first with their family. How would you like us to communicate with you?

An equivalent Uzbek formulation may be:

*Ba'zibemorlarkasalligihqidabarchama'lumotnio'zlaribatafsilbilish
nixohlashadi, boshqalariesaayrimmasalalarniavvaloila'zolari
bilangaplashishimizni afzalko'rishadi. Sizga qaysi usulma'qul?*

Such questions respect both individual autonomy and culturally meaningful family involvement.

Hope remains central to palliative communication, but the object of hope may change over time. When cure becomes medically unrealistic, continuing to speak as though cure remains likely may produce false expectations. Abrupt removal of all hopeful language, however, may intensify psychological distress. Psycholinguistically effective communication reframes rather than simply eliminates hope. For example:

Although we cannot cure the cancer, there is still a great deal we can do to control pain and help you spend meaningful time with your family.

This sentence changes the semantic target of hope from “cure” to “comfort, relationships, and meaningful time.”

In Uzbek, such reframing can be especially important because patients often interpret “nothing more can be done” as abandonment.

Kasalliknibutunlaydavo lashimkoniyatijudacheklanganbo'lsa ham, og'riqnika maytirish, o'zingizniimkonqadaryaxshi his qilishingizvayaqinlaringiz bilanvaqto'tkazishingizuchunko'pyordam beraolamiz.

The expression should therefore generally be avoided. Palliative care does not mean that medical care has ended; it means that its priorities have changed.

Silence is another psycholinguistically significant component of palliative dialogue. After serious information, clinicians may instinctively attempt to reduce discomfort by continuing to talk. Yet patients often require silence to process what they have heard. A pause following a statement such as, “The treatment is no longer working” may function as part of the message itself. It provides cognitive processing time and gives the patient an opportunity to respond emotionally.

Studies based on recorded palliative conversations have shown that pauses and other non-verbal interactional practices may encourage patients to continue speaking about sensitive concerns [5].

In Uzbek culture, silence may additionally carry meanings associated with respect, emotional restraint, shock, or acceptance. Its interpretation therefore requires sensitivity to the broader interaction. A silent patient should not automatically be interpreted as a patient who understands or agrees.

Clinicians may need to check comprehension gently:

Men sizga juda ko'p ma'lumot berdim. Shu gaplardan siz nimani tushundingiz?

"I have given you a lot of information. Could you tell me what you understood from what we discussed?"

This approach is more informative than simply asking:

Tushundingizmi?

"Did you understand?"

A yes/no question can easily generate a socially polite *yes* even when comprehension is incomplete.

Table 1. *Comparative summary of English and Uzbek speech practices*

Communicative dimension	English linguistic culture	Uzbek linguistic culture	Psycholinguistic significance
Prognostic disclosure	Relatively explicit, often combined with hedging	Frequently gradual and relationally framed	Regulates emotional intensity and comprehension
Patient autonomy	Strongly verbalized	May coexist with stronger family participation	Influences control and information preferences
Euphemism	Common but balanced with explicit explanation	Often culturally embedded and socially meaningful	Reduces affective threat but may create ambiguity
Politeness	Modal verbs, questions, hedging, collaborative language	Respect pronouns, honorifics, contextual politeness, relational expressions	Protects dignity and interpersonal "face"
Death-related language	Direct terminology acceptable when sensitively framed	Respectful and indirect expressions may be preferred initially	Alters emotional activation
Family role	Usually dependent on explicit patient permission	Often naturally integrated into communication	Changes information flow and decision-making
Silence	Used as processing space	Can indicate processing, respect, restraint, or distress	Requires contextual interpretation
Hope	Frequently reframed toward achievable goals	May be reinforced through family, relational, and culturally meaningful language	Supports coping and emotional adjustment

These distinctions describe broad tendencies rather than fixed cultural categories.

DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that psycholinguistics provides a valuable framework for understanding why technically accurate communication may still fail in palliative care.

The meaning received by a patient is not always identical to the meaning intended by a clinician. Between intention and interpretation lie lexical associations, cultural expectations, emotional arousal, previous experiences, cognitive load, pragmatic inference, and family influence. This is particularly important in cross-cultural settings. A clinician who relies exclusively on literal translation may successfully transfer words while failing to transfer pragmatic meaning.

For example, the English expression “comfort-focused treatment” cannot always be translated mechanically. The patient must understand that the shift toward comfort does not mean that clinicians have abandoned treatment. It refers to a different therapeutic priority. This illustrates an important distinction between linguistic equivalence and communicative equivalence.

Professional interpreters can play a critical role in achieving the latter. Silva et al. [7] found that interpreter availability and quality influence palliative-care communication among patients with limited English proficiency. When untrained family members act as interpreters, medically important information may be simplified, changed, omitted, or emotionally filtered.

The role of interpreters in palliative care must therefore go beyond lexical substitution. They must be capable of transmitting the emotional force and pragmatic purpose of statements while preserving accuracy.

Cross-cultural palliative care research similarly indicates that healthcare professionals frequently encounter challenges associated with language, cultural expectations, family involvement, and differing interpretations of illness [4].

For English-Uzbek communication, this is particularly relevant because apparently equivalent expressions may produce

different emotional effects. The direct statement: “You are dying” may be ethically justified in some contexts but could be experienced as excessively abrupt if delivered without preparation. At the opposite extreme, repeatedly saying: “Your condition is a little difficult” may leave the patient unable to understand the seriousness of the situation.

Neither maximum directness nor maximum indirectness should therefore be treated as universally ideal. A more appropriate model is calibrated explicitness: the clinician gradually adjusts linguistic directness according to the patient's desire for information, emotional state, comprehension, and cultural preferences.

This concept also challenges simplified distinctions between so-called individualistic English culture and collectivistic Uzbek culture. Cultural frameworks may be useful starting points, but individual variation remains substantial. A young, medically educated Uzbek patient may prefer explicit, autonomous decision-making, whereas an English-speaking elderly patient may prefer to delegate decisions to relatives.

The central clinical question should consequently not be: “What does this culture prefer?” but: “How does this particular patient prefer information, decisions, and family involvement to be managed?”

Psycholinguistic competence can help clinicians answer that question. Such competence includes the ability to recognize emotionally loaded vocabulary, control information density, reformulate important content, detect ambiguous responses, use pauses productively, interpret metaphor and euphemism, and verify understanding without humiliating the patient.

One particularly useful strategy is the ask-tell-ask pattern:

1. First, the clinician asks what the patient already understands.
2. Second, information is provided in manageable segments.
3. Third, the clinician asks the patient to describe what they have understood or what questions the information raises.

This sequence reduces cognitive overload and provides immediate feedback concerning semantic misunderstanding.

Another important principle is to distinguish hope from unrealistic reassurance. Phrases such as “*everything will be fine*” may temporarily reduce anxiety but can damage trust when the patient's condition continues to decline.

More responsible language maintains emotional support without contradicting medical reality:

We will continue to care for you and manage your symptoms, whatever happens.

This form of reassurance is especially compatible with palliative philosophy because it promises continued care rather than an uncertain medical outcome.

Recent English-Uzbek research on euphemism supports the idea that sensitive medical terms acquire meanings through broader cultural systems rather than through lexical semantics alone [8; 10]. The selection of vocabulary in palliative settings must therefore account for emotional, social, and cultural associations.

The findings have implications for medical education in Uzbekistan as well. Communication training should not consist solely of translating English-language protocols into Uzbek. International models are valuable, but their speech examples and communicative assumptions should be adapted to Uzbek linguistic realities. Training should include practice in:

- explaining prognosis without unnecessary cruelty or ambiguity;
- asking patients how much information they wish to receive;
- negotiating family participation;
- moving appropriately between euphemistic and explicit terminology;
- responding to silence and emotional distress;
- checking understanding through reformulation;
- discussing palliative goals without communicating abandonment;
- working effectively with professional interpreters.

The development of such skills can strengthen both patient safety and the therapeutic relationship.

Several limitations should be acknowledged.

1. First, substantially more empirical research is available on English-language palliative communication than on Uzbek clinical discourse. Consequently, some aspects of the English–Uzbek comparison rely on broader pragmatic and linguocultural research rather than large observational studies of recorded Uzbek palliative consultations.
2. Second, neither English-speaking nor Uzbek-speaking populations are culturally homogeneous. Regional background, age, education, religiosity, urban or rural residence, clinical experience, and family structure can all modify communicative preferences.
3. Third, the present study is a qualitative comparative analysis and does not claim statistical generalizability.

Future studies should therefore collect naturally occurring or experimentally controlled data from Uzbek palliative settings. Recorded clinician-patient consultations, followed by conversation analysis and patient interviews, could provide particularly valuable evidence.

CONCLUSION

Psycholinguistics offers an essential perspective for understanding palliative-care communication because end-of-life conversations are simultaneously linguistic, cognitive, emotional, interpersonal, and cultural events.

The comparative analysis suggests that English palliative discourse generally places strong emphasis on explicit information, patient autonomy, verbal clarification, and carefully mitigated directness. Uzbek communicative practice may more strongly foreground relational respect, gradual disclosure, family participation, culturally familiar euphemisms, respectful forms of address, and contextual meaning.

These tendencies should not be interpreted as fixed rules. The most effective palliative communication is neither completely culture-blind nor mechanically culture-bound. It is individualized.

Healthcare professionals should determine how each patient wishes to receive information, how directly sensitive subjects should be discussed, which family members should participate, and what linguistic forms make medical information both understandable and psychologically bearable.

The practical contribution of psycholinguistics to palliative medicine therefore lies in helping clinicians understand not merely what to say, but how particular words are likely to be heard, emotionally processed, interpreted, remembered, and acted upon.

For English-Uzbek clinical communication, culturally sensitive practice requires more than accurate translation. It requires the adaptation of semantic content, emotional intensity, pragmatic intention, social positioning, and culturally embedded meaning. Such an approach can reduce misunderstanding, preserve dignity, maintain realistic hope, and contribute to genuinely person-centred palliative care.

REFERENCES

1. Anderson, R. J., Bloch, S., Armstrong, M., Stone, P. C., Low, J. T. S. 2019. Communication between healthcare professionals and relatives of patients approaching the end-of-life: A systematic review of qualitative evidence. *Palliative Medicine*, 33/8, 926-941. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0269216319852007>.
2. Baile, W. F., Buckman, R., Lenzi, R., Glober, G., Beale, E. A. & Kudelka, A. P. 2000. SPIKES – A six-step protocol for delivering bad news: Application to the patient with cancer. *The Oncologist*, 5/4, 302-311. <https://doi.org/10.1634/theoncologist.5-4-302>.
3. Brown, P. & Levinson, S. C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Burke, C., Doody, O. & Lloyd, B. 2023. Healthcare practitioners' perspectives of providing palliative care to patients from culturally diverse backgrounds: A qualitative systematic review. *BMC Palliative Care*, 22, 182. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12904-023-01285-3>.

5. Ekberg, S., Parry, R., Land, V., Ekberg, K., Pino, M., Antaki, C., Jenkins, L. & Whittaker, B. 2021. Communicating with patients and families about illness progression and end of life: A review of studies using direct observation of clinical practice. *BMC Palliative Care*, 20, 186. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12904-021-00876-2>.
6. Parry, R., Land, V. & Seymour, J. 2014. How to communicate with patients about future illness progression and end of life: A systematic review. *BMJ Supportive & Palliative Care*, 4/4, 331-341. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmjspcare-2014-000649>.
7. Silva, M. D., Genoff, M., Zaballa, A., Jewell, S., Stabler, S., Gany, F. M. & Diamond, L. C. 2016. Interpreting at the end of life: A systematic review of the impact of interpreters on the delivery of palliative care services to cancer patients with limited English proficiency. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management*, 51/3, 569-580. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpainsymman.2015.10.011>.
8. Sodikova, S. B. 2026. Cultural interpretations of euphemisms in doctor-patient communication: A comparative study of English and Uzbek languages. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 262-265.
9. Toshpulatova, F. & Nishonova, S. 2025. Politeness strategies in English and Uzbek: A pragmatic and typological comparison. *Conference Proceedings in Linguistics and Language Studies*.
10. Xoliqova, M. A. 2026. Corpus-based study of illness and disease euphemisms in English and Uzbek. *Research and Publications*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20393526>.

ISROILOVA DILBAR IKRAMOVNA
ANDIJAN STATE MEDICAL INSTITUTE,
ANDIJAN, UZBEKISTAN.
E-MAIL: <ISROILOVADILBAROY@GMAIL.COM>