SOCIOLINGUISTIC MARKING OF DIALECTAL WORDS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Kamola Jalolova Malikovna
Assistant at Karshi State Technical University.
Karshi, Uzbekistan
kamola210188@gamil.com

Abstract: *This thesis analyzes the sociolinguistic functions of dialectal words in English and Uzbek. Dialectal words are interpreted not only as lexical units belonging to a particular region, but also as important linguistic markers that reveal the speaker's regional identity, social status, age, profession, cultural background, and communicative intention in a specific speech situation. The English dialectal units wee, bairn, lass, lad, nowt, owt, aye, bonny, canny, geet, pet, ain't and the Uzbek dialectal units jo'q, jo'l, jigit, jigirma, shoy, osh, qo'ra, qirqim, bo'g'oz, yantoq, ena, momo, bachcha, opoqi, boruvdim, keluvdim are analyzed as examples of identification, expressive-emotional, linguocultural, communicative and stylistic functions. The theoretical views of J. Fishman, W. Labov, R. Hudson, P. Trudgill, J. Chambers, E. Polivanov, V. Reshetov, N. Baskakov, S. Ashirboyev, T. Enazarov, N. Mahmudov and M. Daniyeva are also compared within the framework of this topic.*

Keywords: *dialect, dialectal word, sociolinguistics, sociolinguistic marker, regional variety, social dialect, lexical-semantic model, speech situation, communicative adaptation, linguoculture.*

Introduction

In modern linguistics, language is studied not only as a grammatical or lexical system, but also as a social phenomenon closely connected with social life, interpersonal relations, cultural values and communicative needs. Dialectal words are especially important because they reflect the historical memory, regional lifestyle, social experience, occupation, traditions and speech culture of a nation.

Dialectal words should not be regarded as a marginal or secondary layer of language. On the contrary, they constitute a living, natural and popular layer of the national language. Through such units, it is possible to identify the speaker's regional origin, social environment, relationship with the interlocutor, and the formal or informal character of the speech situation. Therefore, the study of dialectal vocabulary is of great importance not only for dialectology, but also for sociolinguistics, linguoculturology, stylistics, translation studies and pragmalinguistics.

In the research entitled "Sociolinguistic Peculiarities of Dialectal Words in English and Uzbek", dialectal words are studied not merely as regional speech elements, but as linguistic units carrying social and cultural information. The main aim of the research is to reveal the sociolinguistic features, place in the language system and functional possibilities of dialectal words in English and Uzbek. The abstract states that linguistic description and classification, modeling, contextual, lexical-semantic, etymological and comparative analysis methods were used in the study [15].

Sociolinguistics studies the existence, development and use of language in society in connection with social factors. J. Fishman interprets language as a phenomenon related to the social structure of society [1]. W. Labov analyzes

linguistic variation in relation to social class, age, gender and speech situation [2]. R. Hudson considers the main task of sociolinguistics to be the study of interaction between language and society [3]. P. Trudgill emphasizes the relationship between dialect and social group speech and shows that dialectal units serve as markers of regional and social identity [4].

In Uzbek linguistics, the studies of E. Polivanov, V. Reshetov, A. Borovkov, N. Baskakov, K. Yudakhin, S. Ashirboyev, T. Enazarov, N. Murodova, A. Allaberdiyev, D. Elova, G. Safarova and M. Daniyeva form the theoretical basis for the study of dialect, regional varieties and sociolinguistic analysis [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [12]. Based on this scientific tradition, the comparative study of English and Uzbek dialectal words makes it possible to understand the regional, social and cultural features of both languages more deeply.

Main Part

Dialectal words are lexical units used in the everyday oral speech of representatives of a certain region or social group. They differ from the literary language in phonetic, lexical, semantic or stylistic features. However, dialectal words do not perform only the function of naming objects, phenomena or actions. They also indicate the speaker's personal, social and regional characteristics. For this reason, such units can be regarded as sociolinguistic markers.

In Uzbek, dialectal words clearly demonstrate regional differences. For example, in the speech of some southern regions, especially in Kashkadarya and Surkhandarya, the forms *jo'q* instead of *yo'q*, *jo'l* instead of *yo'l*, *jigit* instead of *yigit*, and *jigirma* instead of *yigirma* are used. These forms function as phonetic markers of regional identity. In the Khorezm dialect, the use of *shoy*

instead of *choy* and *osh* instead of *palov* reflects historical pronunciation traditions and local speech features. In Kashkadarya and Surkhandarya, such words as *qo'ra, qirqim, bo'g'oz,* and *yantoq* are actively used and are connected with cattle breeding, agriculture and local lifestyle.

In addition, Uzbek dialects contain many words related to family and everyday relations, such as *ena, momo, bachcha, opoqi, aka, uka,* and *kelinoyi*. These units are not only kinship terms; they also express respect, closeness, age difference, family status and popular speech etiquette. For example, in some regions, the word *ena* means "mother", while in other regions it may also be used as a respectful form of address for an elderly woman.

In English, dialectal words also function as markers of regional and social identity. In Scottish English, such words as *wee* "small", *bairn* "child", *aye* "yes", and *bonny* "beautiful" are widely used. In Yorkshire dialect, the words *nowt* "nothing", *owt* "anything", *lass* "girl", and *lad* "boy" are common. In the Geordie dialect, the words *canny* "good, nice", *geet* "very", and *pet* "dear" express local speech identity and emotional closeness. In Cockney speech, *ain't, mate, bloke*, as well as forms of *rhyming slang*, are associated with the speech of the London working class.

The formation of dialectal words in English is influenced by social stratification, education and standardization, colonial expansion, language contact, historical-cultural experience and the mass media [15]. In Uzbek, regional, historical, social and cultural-everyday factors, as well as internal linguistic processes such as semantic expansion, metaphorical and metonymic transfer, and synonymic substitution play an important role in the formation of dialectal units [15].

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of Scholars' Views and the Direction of the Present Research

Scholar or scientific source	Main scientific view	Relation to the present topic	Distinctive feature
J. Fishman	Language is studied in relation to the social system of society [1].	Dialectal words are interpreted in relation to social relations and communicative needs.	Fishman focuses on the general relationship between language and society, while this research focuses on dialectal vocabulary.
W. Labov	Linguistic variation is connected with social class, age, gender and speech situation [2].	Dialectal words are analyzed in relation to age, region, profession, education and social status.	Labov mainly studied urban speech and American English; this research compares English and Uzbek.
R. Hudson	Sociolinguistics studies the interaction between language and society [3].	Dialectal units are explained as elements of the social-communicative system.	Hudson provides a theoretical basis; this research demonstrates the theory through

			specific dialectal words.
P. Trudgill	Dialects express regional and social identity [4].	Regional and social dialects in English and Uzbek are classified and compared.	Trudgill mainly focuses on English dialects; this research includes Uzbek dialects as well.
J. Chambers and P. Trudgill	Dialectology studies regional varieties of language [5].	The regional distribution and social marking of dialectal words are analyzed.	Their works concern general dialectology; this research emphasizes sociolinguistic marking.
E. Polivanov	Uzbek dialectology and the relation between dialect and literary language are studied [6].	The relation between Uzbek dialects and the literary language is explained.	Polivanov worked in historical dialectology; this research uses a functional-sociolinguistic approach.
V. Reshetov	Phonetic and grammatical features of Uzbek	Forms such as *jo'q, jo'l, jigit,* and *jigirma* are interpreted as	Reshetov emphasized descriptive dialectology; this

	dialects were investigated [7].	sociolinguistic markers.	research also highlights communicative and social functions.
N. Baskakov	Turkic languages and their dialectal features were studied [8].	The place of Uzbek dialects in the Turkic language system is understood.	Baskakov focused on Turkic languages generally; this research compares Uzbek with English.
S. Ashirboyev	The theoretical foundations of Uzbek dialectology were described [9].	The classification of Uzbek dialects and the role of dialectal units in the language system are supported.	Ashirboyev worked within Uzbek dialectology; this research applies a comparative approach.
T. Enazarov	The collection of dialect materials and development of dialectological methodology were emphasized [10].	The need to study dialectal words in literary texts, proverbs and real speech situations is supported.	Enazarov focuses on methodology and material collection; this research strengthens sociolinguistic interpretation.

N. Mahmudov	Language reflects national thinking and culture [11].	Dialectal words are connected with mentality, cultural experience and historical memory.	Mahmudov highlights the cultural role of language; this research demonstrates it through dialectal vocabulary.
M. Daniyeva	Sociolinguistics studies language use in real communication [12].	Dialectal units are analyzed in connection with speech situation, communicative adaptation and the interlocutor factor.	Daniyeva presents a general sociolinguistic approach; this research develops it through English-Uzbek dialectal material.

The table shows that the present thesis is based on previous theoretical views, but differs from them by analyzing dialectal words in two different language systems, English and Uzbek, from a comparative-sociolinguistic point of view. Previous studies often focused on phonetic, grammatical or regional characteristics of dialects separately. In this research, however, the social marking, communicative adaptation and linguocultural information-carrying functions of dialectal units are analyzed together.

Table 2. Comparative Analysis of Dialectal Words in English and Uzbek

Language	Dialectal word or expression	Meaning in the literary language	Region or social group	Sociolinguistic function
English	*wee*	small, little	Scottish English	Regional identity, national coloring
English	*bairn*	child	Scottish / Northern English	Family sphere, ethnocultural memory
English	*lass*	girl	Yorkshire / Northern English	Regional identification
English	*lad*	boy, young man	Northern English	Age and gender marker
English	*nowt*	nothing	Yorkshire	Local speech marker
English	*owt*	anything	Yorkshire	Informality, popular speech
English	*aye*	yes	Scottish / Northern English	Communicative and regional marker
English	*bonny*	beautiful	Scottish / Northern English	Emotional evaluation, folk expression

English	*canny*	good, nice	Geordie	Positive evaluation, closeness
English	*geet*	very	Geordie	Intensification, expressiveness
English	*pet*	dear, darling	Geordie	Friendly address, social closeness
English	*ain't*	am not / is not / are not	Cockney and informal speech	Social group and informality marker
English	*mate*	friend	British informal speech	Friendly relation, communicative closeness
English	*bloke*	man	British informal speech	Popular style, social environment
Uzbek	*jo'q*	yo'q	Kashkadarya / Surkhandarya	Regional pronunciation marker
Uzbek	*jo'l*	yo'l	Southern regions	Phonetic marker
Uzbek	*jigit*	yigit	Kashkadarya / Surkhandarya	Regional identification
Uzbek	*jigirma*	yigirma	Southern dialects	Phonetic variation

Uzbek	*shoy*	choy	Khorezm	Historical pronunciation tradition
Uzbek	*osh*	palov	Khorezm and some regions	Everyday-cultural unit
Uzbek	*qo‘ra*	place for keeping livestock	Kashkadarya / Surkhandarya	Cattle-breeding culture
Uzbek	*qirqim*	sheep-shearing process	Cattle-breeding regions	Occupation and economic activity
Uzbek	*bo‘g‘oz*	pregnant animal	Agricultural speech	Professional and everyday marker
Uzbek	*yantoq*	desert plant	Southern and desert regions	Natural environment and regional experience
Uzbek	*ena*	mother / elderly woman	Various Uzbek dialects	Respect, kinship and closeness
Uzbek	*momo*	grandmother	Uzbek dialects	Age and respect markers
Uzbek	*bachcha*	child	Oral speech and some dialects	Popular form of address

Uzbek	*opoqi*	elder sister / respected woman	Some regional speech	Respect and social distance
Uzbek	*boruvdim*	I had gone	Oral dialectal speech	Informality, popular style
Uzbek	*keluvdim*	I had come	Oral dialectal speech	Naturalness of speech, regional coloring

This table demonstrates both similar and different features of dialectal words in English and Uzbek. In English, dialectal words are often connected with historical regions, social stratification, urban culture, migration processes and mass culture. For example, Cockney speech is associated with the London working class, Geordie with Newcastle and Northern England, and Scottish English with the Scottish cultural environment. In Uzbek, dialectal words are more closely related to regional lifestyle, agriculture, cattle breeding, family and everyday relations, kinship systems and popular speech etiquette.

One of the most important functions of dialectal words is the identification function. Through this function, the regional identity of the speaker is revealed. In Uzbek speech, forms such as *jo'q, jo'l, jigit,* and *jigirma* are perceived as phonetic indicators of southern regions. In English, words such as *wee, bairn,* and *aye* signal Scottish or Northern English speech identity.

The second important function is the expressive-emotional function. Dialectal words give speech sincerity, naturalness and emotional coloring. For instance, the Geordie word *pet* is not simply a form of address; it expresses warmth, closeness and friendly attitude. Similarly, Uzbek dialectal words such

as *ena, momo, bachcha,* and *opoqi* strengthen family intimacy, respect and popular sincerity.

The third function is the linguocultural function. Dialectal units preserve the historical lifestyle, occupation and cultural experience of a people. Uzbek words such as *qo‘ra, qirqim, bo‘g‘oz,* and *yantoq* reflect cattle breeding, agriculture and the natural environment. English words such as *bairn, lass, bonny,* and *canny* represent the cultural speech environment of Northern England and Scotland.

The fourth function is communicative adaptation. A speaker uses dialectal words according to the speech situation. In formal situations, literary language forms are usually dominant. However, in family conversations, neighborhood communication, market speech, friendly dialogue, literary texts and folklore, dialectal units are used actively. In such cases, dialectal words create an atmosphere of closeness, sincerity and informal communication.

The fifth function is stylistic-pragmatic. In literary works, dialectal words individualize the speech of characters, specify the region where events take place, give the text national coloring and increase the realism of the image. For example, in Uzbek literary texts, such units as *boruvdim, keluvdim, opkel, obor, shundoq,* and *qandoq* show the local speech environment of a character. In English literary texts, units such as *ain’t, gonna, lad, lass, wee, nay,* and *aye* reveal the regional or social features of the character.

The abstract emphasizes that dialectal words in literary texts and proverbs perform identification, expressive-emotional, affiliation-expressing, informality-creating and communicative adaptation functions [15]. This proves that dialectal units are significant not only in oral speech, but also in written literary texts, paremiological units and translation processes [15].

From the point of view of translation studies, dialectal words represent an important problem. When such units are translated literally into another language, their regional, social and emotional coloring may be lost. For example, translating the English word *bairn* simply as "child" does not fully convey its Scottish or Northern English character. Similarly, translating the Uzbek dialectal words *jo'q, jo'l, ena, opoqi,* or *boruvdim* into ordinary literary forms may reduce their regional and stylistic value. Therefore, such units should be rendered by explanatory translation, stylistic compensation or an appropriate sociolinguistic equivalent.

Conclusion

Dialectal words in English and Uzbek are important linguistic units that reflect the regional, social, cultural and communicative characteristics of society. They show the speaker's regional origin, social background, adaptation to a particular speech situation and relationship with the interlocutor.

The comparative analysis shows that in English, the formation of dialectal words is strongly influenced by historical regions, social stratification, urban culture, standardization, colonial contacts and mass media. In Uzbek, such units are more closely connected with regional lifestyle, cattle breeding, agriculture, family and everyday relations, kinship systems and popular speech culture.

The sociolinguistic and dialectological views of J. Fishman, W. Labov, R. Hudson, P. Trudgill and J. Chambers serve as a theoretical basis for understanding the social nature of dialectal units [1], [2], [3], [4], [5]. The works of E. Polivanov, V. Reshetov, N. Baskakov, S. Ashirboyev, T. Enazarov, N. Mahmudov and M. Daniyeva clarify the national scientific foundations of

Uzbek dialectology and sociolinguistic analysis [6], [7], [8], [9], [10], [11], [12].

Thus, studying dialectal words as sociolinguistic markers makes it possible to understand the regional and social layers of English and Uzbek more deeply, to interpret national-cultural meaning in literary texts and proverbs correctly, to preserve the functional value of dialectal units in translation, and to evaluate the living development of language on a scientific basis.

REFERENCES

1. Fishman J. The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society. Newbury House Publishers, 1972. – 250 p.
2. Labov W. Sociolinguistic Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1973. – 372 p.
3. Hudson R.A. Sociolinguistics. Cambridge; New York, 1980. – 270 p.
4. Trudgill P. Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society. London; New York: Penguin, 2000. – 244 p.
5. Chambers J.K., Trudgill P. Dialectology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
6. Polivanov E.D. Uzbekskaya dialektologiya i uzbekskiy literaturniy yazik. Tashkent, 1933. – 44 p.
7. Reshetov V.V. O namanganskom govore uzbekskogo yazika. Moscow, 1953. – 216 p.
8. Baskakov N.A. Karakalpakskiy yazik. Moscow: Izd-vo AN, 1956. – 423 p.
9. Ashirboyev S. O‘zbek dialektologiyasi. Tashkent, 2011. – 80 p.

10. Enazarov T. Dialektologiya metodologiyasi. Tashkent: Innovatsiya-Ziyo, 2020.

11. Mahmudov N. Til tilsimi tadqiqi. Tashkent: Mumtoz so‘z, 2017. – 174 p.

12. Daniyeva M.Dj. Sociolinguistics is the study of languages in conversations. Innovatsionnaya nauka. Ufa, 2024. № 11-2-1. – P. 55–56.

13. Aliqulov Z., Boymirzayeva S. Sotsiolingvistika. Samarkand, 2009.

14. Turdibekov M. O‘zbek dialektologiyasi. Tashkent, 2021.

15. Sociolinguistic Peculiarities of Dialectal Words in English and Uzbek. Abstract of the dissertation for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philological Sciences. Karshi, 2026.