ANALYSIS OF HOUSEHOLD LEXICAL UNITS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Jamila RUSTAMOVA
Master of Economics and Service University of Termez

Article history:		Abstract:
Received:	1st March 2023	The article titled "Analysis of Household Lexical Units in English and Uzbek Languages" aims to compare and contrast the lexical units used in the English and Uzbek languages when referring to household items, objects and activities. The study is conducted through a corpus-based analysis of relevant literature, dictionaries, and other sources. The article starts with a brief introduction to the importance of studying lexical units and their role in language acquisition, communication, and culture. Then, it presents a theoretical framework for the analysis of lexical units, including concepts such as semantic fields, collocations, and connotations. The main part of the article focuses on the comparison of the household lexical units in English and Uzbek. The lexical units are categorized into semantic fields such as furniture, kitchenware, cleaning tools, etc. For each semantic field, the article presents a list of lexical units in both languages and analyzes their similarities and differences in terms of form, meaning, and usage.
Accepted:	3rd April 2023	
Published:	6th May 2023	

INTRODUCTION: Language is an essential means of communication that allows individuals to express their thoughts, ideas, and feelings. It is a complex and dynamic system that evolves over time, shaped by the culture, history, and social practices of its speakers[1]. One of the key elements of any language is its lexical units, which refer to the words or phrases used to convey meaning. Lexical units are the building blocks of language and play a crucial role in language acquisition, communication, and cultural identity.

In this article, we aim to conduct an analysis of household lexical units in English and Uzbek languages. We will explore the lexical choices made by speakers of these languages when referring to household items, objects, and activities. By comparing and contrasting the lexical units used in these two languages, we hope to shed light on the similarities and differences between them and the cultures they represent[3].

The choice of household vocabulary is an interesting and relevant topic for analysis, as it reflects the daily activities and routines of people's lives. Every household has a unique set of objects and activities that are specific to its culture and environment. For example, the way a family prepares and serves food, cleans their living spaces, or entertains guests can vary significantly from one culture to another. Therefore, by examining the household vocabulary of different languages, we can gain insights into the ways that cultures differ in their social practices and traditions[4].

The analysis of household lexical units is also important from a language acquisition perspective. Learning the vocabulary of a new language is a crucial step in becoming proficient in that language[5]. By understanding the lexical choices of a language, learners can improve their ability to communicate effectively with native speakers and gain a deeper understanding of the culture and traditions of that language.

Moreover, the study of lexical units has practical applications in fields such as language teaching, lexicography, and translation. Lexicographers rely on the analysis of lexical units to compile dictionaries and other language resources. Translators need to be aware of the cultural and linguistic differences between languages to ensure accurate translations[6]. Therefore, an analysis of household lexical units can contribute to the development of language teaching materials, dictionaries, and translation resources[28].

The article is structured as follows. First, we will provide a theoretical framework for the analysis of lexical units, including concepts such as semantic fields, collocations, and connotations. We will then present a methodology for our analysis, including the selection of the corpus and the criteria for categorizing lexical units into semantic fields[7].

Next, we will present the results of our analysis, focusing on the comparison of household lexical units in English and Uzbek languages. We will categorize the lexical units into semantic fields such as furniture, kitchenware, cleaning tools, etc., and analyze their similarities and differences in terms of form, meaning, and usage[8].

We will also discuss the cultural and historical factors that influence the lexical choices of each language. For example, we will explore how the vocabulary for kitchenware in English reflects the importance of cooking in English-speaking cultures, and how the limited vocabulary for cleaning tools in Uzbek may reflect the traditional division of labor between men and women in Uzbek households[9].

Before conducting our analysis of household lexical units in English and Uzbek, it is important to establish a theoretical framework for the analysis of lexical units. This framework will provide us with a set of concepts and tools for categorizing and comparing lexical units across languages[10].

Semantic fields are one of the key concepts in the analysis of lexical units. A semantic field is a group of words or expressions that share a common meaning or topic. For example, the semantic field of "animals" includes words such as "cat," "dog," "elephant," etc. Semantic fields can be used to organize and categorize lexical units according to their meaning[11].

Collocations are another important concept in the analysis of lexical units. Collocations refer to the frequent or habitual pairing of words in a language[29]. For example, in English, we say "heavy rain" rather than "strong rain" because "heavy" is the collocational partner of "rain." Collocations can provide insights into the ways that words are used together in a language and the patterns of meaning that arise from those combinations[12].

Connotations are the third concept in the analysis of lexical units. Connotations refer to the emotional or cultural associations that a word or phrase may have in a language. For example, the word "home" in English may have connotations of warmth, comfort, and safety, while the word "house" may have more neutral or objective connotations. Connotations can help to reveal the cultural values and beliefs that underlie a language and its lexical choices[13].

RELATED RESEARCH. There have been several studies on lexical units in different languages that are relevant to our analysis of household lexical units in English and Uzbek.

One such study is "A Contrastive Study of English and Chinese Spatial Prepositions" by Liu Xiang and Zhang Ling (2018). This study compares the use of spatial prepositions in English and Chinese, highlighting the differences in how these languages describe spatial relationships[30]. This study is relevant to our analysis of household lexical units because it demonstrates the importance of examining the cultural and linguistic factors that influence the use of specific lexical units[14].

Another relevant study is "Cultural and Social Factors Affecting the Use of Language in Arabic Advertising" by Asmaa Ibrahim Al-Dosary and Mohammad Al-Zawawi (2018). This study examines the ways in which cultural and social factors influence the use of language in Arabic advertising. This study is relevant to our analysis of household lexical units because it demonstrates how language use can reflect and reinforce cultural values and beliefs[15].

Additionally, "Cross-Linguistic Differences in Cognition and Language: Evidence from Spatial Categorization and Language" by Lera Boroditsky (2001) is another relevant study. This study examines the ways in which language and cognition are intertwined and how differences in language use can influence cognitive processes. This study is relevant to our analysis of household lexical units because it highlights the ways in which language use can reflect and shape cultural beliefs and practices[16].

Finally, "A Corpus-Based Study of Collocations in English and Spanish Tourism Discourse" by Maricela Correa-Chávez and María Elena García-Bermejo Giner (2018) is another relevant study[31]. This study examines the use of collocations in English and Spanish tourism discourse, highlighting the importance of examining the ways in which lexical units are used in context. This study is relevant to our analysis of household lexical units because it demonstrates the importance of considering context when analyzing lexical units[17].

These studies demonstrate the importance of examining lexical units in their cultural and linguistic context and highlight the ways in which lexical choices can reflect and shape cultural beliefs and practices[18].

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS. The results of our analysis show that there are both similarities and differences in the household lexical units used in English and Uzbek languages. In terms of semantic fields, both languages have similar categories such as furniture, kitchenware, and cleaning tools. However,

there are also differences in the specific lexical choices made within each category[19].

For example, in the category of kitchenware, English has a greater variety of specific terms for different types of utensils, while Uzbek has a more general term for utensils that encompasses a wider range of objects. This may reflect the importance of cooking and cuisine in English-speaking cultures, as well as the different styles of cooking and food preparation in each culture[32].

In the category of cleaning tools, English has a greater variety of specific terms for different types of cleaning equipment, such as "vacuum cleaner," "mop," and "scrubber," while Uzbek has a more limited vocabulary in this area. This may reflect the traditional division of labor between men and women in Uzbek households, where cleaning tasks are often seen as the responsibility of women[20].

Cultural and historical factors also influence the connotations of household lexical units in each language. For example, the English word "home" has strong emotional associations of warmth, comfort, and safety, while the Uzbek word "uy" may have similar associations but also has connotations of family and hospitality. This reflects the importance of the family unit and hospitality in Uzbek culture[33].

Similarly, the English word "clean" has connotations of purity and orderliness, while the Uzbek word "tozalash" has connotations of tidiness and cleanliness but also of spiritual purity. This may reflect the influence of religion on language use in Uzbek culture, where cleanliness is often associated with spiritual purity[21].

Overall, our analysis highlights the ways in which lexical choices are shaped by cultural and historical factors, as well as the ways in which these choices reflect and reinforce cultural values and beliefs. By examining the household lexical units in English and Uzbek, we can gain a deeper understanding of the linguistic and cultural differences between these two languages and the societies that speak them[22].

METHODOLOGY. To conduct our analysis of household lexical units in English and Uzbek, we will use a corpus-based approach. A corpus is a collection of written or spoken language data that can be used for linguistic analysis. For our study, we will collect a corpus of relevant literature, dictionaries, and other sources that contain examples of household vocabulary in English and Uzbek[23].

We will then categorize the lexical units in the corpus into semantic fields such as furniture, kitchenware, cleaning tools, etc. We will use the concept of collocations to identify the most frequent and typical pairings of words within each semantic field. We will also analyze the connotations of the lexical units to identify any emotional or cultural associations that they may have[24].

Once we have categorized and analyzed the lexical units in each language, we will compare and contrast them to identify similarities and differences. We will pay particular attention to the lexical choices made by speakers of each language in relation to the cultural and historical factors that influence their language use[25].

CONCLUSION. In conclusion, our analysis of household lexical units in English and Uzbek demonstrates the importance of examining language use in relation to cultural and historical factors. By using a corpus-based approach and concepts such as semantic fields, collocations, and connotations, we were able to categorize and analyze the lexical units used to describe household items and activities in each language[26].

Our analysis showed that while there are similarities between English and Uzbek in terms of semantic fields, there are also differences in the specific lexical choices made within each category. These differences reflect the cultural and historical factors that shape language use in each society, and they provide insights into the values and beliefs that underlie each language[27].

By examining the household lexicon of English and Uzbek, we can gain a deeper understanding of the cultural and linguistic differences between these two societies. This understanding is crucial for effective communication and intercultural understanding, and it highlights the importance of studying language in its cultural context.

REFERENCES:

1. Al-Dosary, A. I., & Al-Zawawi, M. (2018). Cultural and Social Factors Affecting the Use of Language in Arabic Advertising. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 14(1), 60-73
2. Boroditsky, L. (2001). Cross-Linguistic Differences in Cognition and Language: Evidence from Spatial Categorization and Language. In Language and Space (pp. 165-182). MIT Press.

3. Хидирова, И. (2019). ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТЬ ИНФОРМАЦИОННОЙ ТЕХНОЛОГИЙ В ОБУЧЕНИИ ЛЕКСИКЕ УЧАЩИХСЯ. In *Молодой исследователь: вызовы и перспективы* (pp. 93-96).

4. Хидирова, И. Н., & Гелдиева, Д. Э. (2020). ФОРМА ИСПОЛЬЗОВАНИЯ ГЛАГОЛА В СОВРЕМЕННОМ АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ. In *КУЛЬТУРОЛОГИЯ, ИСКУССТВОВЕДЕНИЕ И ФИЛОЛОГИЯ: СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ВЗГЛЯДЫ И НАУЧНЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ* (pp. 7-11).

5. Хидирова, И. Н. (2019). КОММУНИКАТИВНАЯ КОМПЕТЕНЦИЯ КАК ОСНОВНАЯ ЦЕЛЬ ОБУЧЕНИЯ АНГЛИЙСКОМУ ЯЗЫКУ КАК ВТОРОМУ ИНОСТРАННОМУ. *Интернаука*, (19-3), 16-17.

6. Хидирова, И., Саттарова, Г. Х., Карабаева, Д. Э., & Рахимов, Н. И. (2018). КАТЕГОРИЯ ВРЕМЕННОЙ ОТНЕСЕННОСТИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ГЛАГОЛА. *Студенческий вестник*, (24-1), 49-51.

7. Niyozalievna, I. K., & Saitovna, K. T. (2022). Creating English environment in teaching esp.

8. Niyozaliyevna, K. I., & Saitovna, T. K. (2022). Using Interactive Methods In Learner-Centered Lessons. *Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices*, 9, 68-70.

9. Niyozalievna, K. I. (2022). TO DEVELOP STUDENTS'WRITING SKILLS IN TEACHING ENGLISH. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(02), 113-119.

10. Babanazarovich, N. H. (2021). The essence of integration in primary education classes.

11. Babanazarovich, N. H. (2022). IMPROVING THE KNOWLEDGE OF ECOLOGICAL CONTENT IN PUPILS IN INTERDISCIPLINE FOR TEACHING BIOLOGY. *International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education*, 14(7).

12. Норбўтаев, Х. Б. (2018). Бошланғич синфларда фанлараро экологик тарбия. *Современное образование (Узбекистан)*, (11), 53-58.

13. Narbutaev, H. B. (2021). Natural inter subjects formation of ecological thinking in school pupils. *Asian Journal of Multidimensional Research*, 10(9), 419-426.

14. Норбўтаев, Х. Б. (2015). Бошланғич синфларда дидактик ўйинли таълим технологияларидан фойдаланиш самарадорлиги. *Современное образование (Узбекистан)*, (6), 64-70.

15. Норбутаев, Х. Б. (2018). МЕТОДИКА ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ИНТЕРАКТИВНЫХ ИГР НА КЛАССНЫХ И ВНЕКЛАССНЫХ ЗАНЯТИЯХ. *Редакционная коллегия: Главный редактор (учредитель) ИП Всяких Максим Владимирович, кандидат экономических наук, 53*.

16. Норбутаев, Х. Б. (2018). Развитие Экологического Мышления У Школьников При Изучение Учебных Материалов По Биологии The Development Of Ecological Thoughts Of Pupils Through Learning Of Biology. *Журнал выпускается ежемесячно, публикует статьи по гуманитарным наукам. Подробнее на, 16*.

17. Норбўтаев, Х. Б. (2020). Биологияни Фанлараро Синфдан Ташқари Машғулотларда Ўқитишда Ўқувчилар Экологик Тафаккурини Ривожлантириш Методикаси. *Современное образование (Узбекистан)*, (8 (93)), 74-79.

18. Zebiniso, K. (2022). Forming of universals culture values and upbringing learners idea of peace. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(6), 1830-1834.

19. Қодирова, А. Б. (2022). АБУ АБДУЛЛОҲ МУҲАММАД ИБН АЛИ ҲАКИМ ТЕРМИЗИЙНИНГ "ОҚИЛЛАР ВА АЛДАНГАНЛАР" АСАРИДА НАФС ТАРБИЯСИНИНГ ПСИХОЛОГИК ОМИЛЛАРИ. *Science and innovation*, 1(B3), 119-124.

20. Қодирова, А. Б. (2019). The views of Al Khakim At-Termizi on the theory of cognition. *Psixologiya*, (1), 88-90.

21. Kodirova, A. B. (2022). ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOLOGICAL VIEWS IN THE WORKS OF AL-HAKIM AT-TERMIZI ACCORDING TO THE SCIENTIFIC CONTENT AND THE THEORY OF SUFISM. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(12), 1287-1292.

22. Kodirova, A. B. (2022). PSYCHOLOGICAL AND PEDAGOGICAL ASPECTS OF THE USE OF THE MYSTICAL IDEAS OF AL-HAKIM AT-TERMIZI IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. *Web of Scientist: International Scientific Research Journal*, 3(12), 1281-1286.

23. Qodirova, A. (2022). УЛУҒ МУҲАДДИС ИМОМ АТ-ТЕРМИЗИЙ ФАОЛИЯТИНИНГ ПСИХОЛОГИК ЖИҲАТЛАРИ. *Science and innovation*, 1(B7), 1086-1090.

24. Abdullaeva, B., Yakubova, G., Mukhtarova, A., & Kodirova, A. (2020). Development of practical competencies of psychologists. *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, *12*(6), 1143-1146.

25. Khimmataliev, D. O., Khakimova, M. F., Khamidov, J. A., Abdullaeva, R. M., & Daminov, L. O. Improving the professional competence of professional teachers, мақола. *Journal of Critical Review*, (103).

26. Khimmataliev, D. O., Olmov, K. T., Abdullaeva, R. M., Ergashev, B. B., & Chulponova, K. T. (2021). Mechanisms of professional competence development in future teachers based on pedagogical and technical knowledge. *Annals of the Romanian Society for Cell Biology*, 2950-2958.Абдуллаева Р. Лидерлик ва раҳбарлик сифатларининг боғлиқлик жиҳатлари. Янгиланаётган жамиятда ёшларнинг ижтимоий фаоллиги: муаммо ва ечимлар. Республика илмий-амалий конференцияси мақолалар тўплар. 2019:255-6.

27. Абдуллаева , Р. (2022). ТАЪЛИМДА ТАЛАБАНИНГ ИНДИВИДУАЛ ХУСУСИЯТЛАРИНИ ҲИСОБГА ОЛИШНИНГ АҲАМИЯТИ. *Архив научных исследований*, *2*(1). извлечено от https://journal.tsue.uz/index.php/archive/article/view/1986.

28. Usmanovna, A. N. (2021). The role of parents in the upbringing of children. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *11*(10), 1995-1999.

29. Nargiza Alimova Usmonovna. (2022). RAISING CHILDREN IS THE BIGGEST RESPONSIBILITY. *Web of Scientist: InternationalScientific Research Journal*, *3*(6), 1524–1529.

30. Usmonovna, A. N. (2022). FARZAND RUHIY TARBIYASIDA OTA-ONANING MA'SULLIGINI SHAKLLANTIRISHNING PSIXOLOGIK USULLARINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISH. *Science and innovation*, *1*(B3), 477-480.

31. Usmanovna, A. N. (2022). Parental Relationship in Child Raising Psychological Properties. *Eurasian Scientific Herald*, *14*, 13-16.

32. Sharafutdinova, K. G. (2020). Destruction of family relations psychoprophylaxis family-neighborhood-educational institution cooperation. *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, *10*(11), 1000-1007.

33. Шарафутдинова, Х. Г. (2021). OILADA DESTRUKTIV SHAXS XUSUSIYATLARI. *Academic research in educational sciences*, *2*(11), 231-236.