



N. T. Kuchimova,
 Doctorate Samarkand State Foreign Languages University Uzbekistan

Abstract

This article analyzes the fact that sociolinguistics is a direction of linguistics that is inextricably linked with society, this area is not just the grammatical and phonetic structure of language, but how it is used in society, what social tasks it performs, and how it changes under the influence of social variables. It is also justified that sociolinguistics sees language as an active element of social life rather than as an abstract, ideal system.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, microsociolinguistics, macrosociolinguistics language, linguistics, society, thought, social factor.

Introduction

The fact that language, like art, is an institution related to the past, separate from Man and society, at the same time creating them, makes it possible to express feelings and thoughts through the coexistence of the individuals that make up society, through the use of a number of common sound and meaning elements.[1] According to Vardar, the units or indicators of meaning in a language take many of their fundamental characteristics from their sociality and perform their functions within a society. Indeed, each language is formed within a particular society, around a different derivative and civilization, and fulfills its function in such a framework. So it can be said that each language reflects a certain society.[2] The fact that language is a branch of the ever-changing social system and that the elements that make up the social system are expressed in language makes language a branch of continuous change and development; as a result of this change and progress, new applications in language, words, structures, etc. echoes. This process also supports the view that "the vocabulary of a language is the window of a society that uses that language".[3]

Although we do not have any knowledge of the life, culture and historical events of society, as Aksan points out, we can obtain valuable information on these issues only by checking the language and vocabulary of that society; in the same way, by checking the language text of a certain period on foreign elements, we can determine which foreign-speaking society is under Famous statesman and linguist of the XVIII – XIX centuries U. von Humboldt explains the relationship between language and society, the development of language in society with changes in the field of culture and thinking.[4] Humboldt's view that language is not a free product of a free person, but always belongs to a nation suggests that language is formed by society, that there is nothing unique in language, that language is abundant in all respects.[5] the creator of the language is this society.

A society that conducts selection and order in the use of language ceases to be a mechanical phenomenon that only has its own internal structure and, thanks to this, controls its apparatus. It



also demonstrates the social and cultural dimensions of language by causing language to shrink, expand, and even become censored when deemed necessary.[6] As can be understood from all this, people cannot understand without language, live together and form a community. This interdependence between language and society allows the emergence of the use of social language. This use is formed within the framework of social variables such as age, gender, social class, ethnic group and constitutes the subject of the study of sociolinguistics.

Since the second half of the 20th century, with the acceleration of interdisciplinary research in the social sciences, language-related issues have begun to be examined through the joint studies of various fields such as psychology, anthropology, sociology, ethnology, history, geography, and philosophy. Research in the field of sociolinguistics, which emerged as a product of these collaborative studies, has rapidly developed from various perspectives in many countries. Vardar describes the emergence of sociolinguistics. He examines the relationship between language and society in its simplest form and notes that Saussure's statement—more precisely, that of those who compiled and published his lecture notes—that “the sole and true object of linguistics is language itself and nothing else” was interpreted by some too rigidly, resulting in the neglect of any elements outside the system. Consequently, research on social factors entered a period of stagnation.

Once systematic studies reached a certain density, the relationships between linguistic phenomena and social facts, their interactions, and their emergence as variables affecting each other—in other words, the covariance and interrelations between them—began to be methodically analyzed. A new type of study was born: sociolinguistics (social linguistics). Thus, many people recall that Saussure spoke not only of “external” linguistics but also of “internal” linguistics. It should also be emphasized that sociality is actually among the internal properties of language. [7]

Due to the changing characteristics of society and its different structures, sociolinguistic studies focus on different areas in each society, so the study of sociolinguistics is interpreted by linguists from different point of view. In the dictionary of interpretive linguistic terms, sociolinguistics refers to “the relationship between linguistic phenomena and social phenomena, their influence on each other, their emergence as variables of each other, in other words, it is defined as” a mixed field studying covariance between two types of phenomena”. [8] Spolsky defines sociolinguistics as a field of study that studies the relationship between language and society and between the use of language and the social structures inhabited by those who use that language, and human societies consist of many models and behaviors, some of which are linguistic, assumes that. [9] While Gumperz called sociolinguistics an attempt to find correlations between social and linguistic structures and to observe the changes taking place, Chambers defines it directly as a study of the social application of language. [10] In addition to the term social linguistics (sociolinguistics), the terms sociology of language (sociology of language), macro-sociolinguistics (macro-sociolinguistics) and micro-sociolinguistics (micro-sociolinguistics) are also used. Although the terms from my name are similar in nature, each of them in practice seeks different purposes. While social linguistics deals with the relationship between language and society in order to better understand the structure of language and the function of language in interaction, the sociology of language attempts to better understand the social structure by examining language. It is therefore concerned with what functions specific linguistic features perform to describe specific social structures. Microsociolinguistics studies how social structure affects people's speech and how language types and applications are related to social characteristics such as class, gender, and age.



Macro-social linguistics, on the other hand, deals with what societies do with language, in other words, studies the functional distribution of speech types, language displacement (language shift), language retention (language maintenance), language change (language change), delimitation and interaction of language communities.[11]

Language gives its users the opportunity to say any linguistic message in different ways. The social context, the person to whom the linguistic message is conveyed, and factors such as the person to convey the message, age, gender, social status, level of information, and where the message is delivered determine what the message should be. Whichever language we do not study carefully, we are faced with a unique variety and we see that its speakers always use languages suitable for their purpose among the different possibilities that the language offers them. No one always speaks the same. However, Khomsky and many of the linguists who followed him define language as a homogeneous (organized) system and speak of the existence of an ideal receiver / transmitter (speaking / listening). It is assumed that the ideal receiver/transmitter lives in an unstable society and speaks perfectly in the language of that society. In this sense, it does not matter to whom, under what circumstances, where it is spoken. According to this opinion, the task of a linguist is to write a grammar of that language to help us understand the language: what is language, how to learn it and what does it tell us about the human mind? Linguistics in this discipline, called theoretical linguistics, is hardly concerned with the use of language.[12] in contrast to this antisocial linguistics, many sociologists argue that "as we study the relationship between language and society, why we speak differently in different social contexts" and seek to describe the social functions of language and ways of conveying social meaning.[13]

Also, the speaker and listener know the grammatical system of the language; the ability to compose grammatically correct sentences and distinguish grammatically incorrect sentences, which Khomsky advanced as an indicator of asocial point of view.[14] Language proficiency is also knowledge of how to use this language. It is not enough to know the laws of language and be able to make sentences based on these rules, it is also necessary to know the correct application of these sentences. Khomsky, interested in contextual discourse as a social linguist while talking about an ideal speaker and listener, Heims talks about the concept of communicative competence: "when evaluated from the point of view of an Ideal speaker, the uniqueness of a child who makes statements using language rules perfectly does not hold. Knowing how to use these sentences correctly in a social and linguistic context leads to the child being portrayed as a social predator. "Therefore, Khomsky argues that in order to properly use language in a given social and cultural environment, what the speaker should know and what the child should learn is communicative competence.[15] The word sociolinguistics was first coined in 1939 by Thomas S. Hodson's paper, "The man in India", appeared in "Social linguistics in India".

In the world of linguistics, the word sociolinguistics first appeared in the second edition of Eugene Nida's "Morphology", but many researchers claim that the term belongs to Javier Kerry as well as that Kerry introduced the term sociolinguistics.[16] When it began to manifest itself as a separate science, many linguists introduced the relationship between society and language into their studies. For example, much of today's more modern studies of social dialects, gender and age divisions, are based on Blumfield's early observations. Similarly, in his work "some early Studies of Language in its Social Context", Antoine Meillet argues that language is a social phenomenon, and linguistics is a social science, that language change is a result of social change. Linguistic



diversity follows from this. Meillet, a 19th-century linguist, was much more modern for his time, and neither he nor his colleagues focused on the idea of the interrelationships of social and linguistic phenomena. The most important reason for this is undoubtedly the 19th-century research focused on etymology, language change, and the origin of languages. Although Meillet is correct in his ideas, the technological and social context is not yet favorable for the development of these ideas. As Labov noted, not much was done until the development of sound recorders, spectrograms, sampling procedures and, of course, computers to process more data.[17] The most important reason for this is the collection of data with survey methods or non-systematic observations. The biggest disadvantage of using these methods is the limitation of human memory. As a result, with the development of technology, it is much easier and more reliable to collect large volumes of speech samples on various topics, from phonology to speech and speech structure, and analyze the collected data at all linguistic levels than before.[18]

While linguistics in North America in the early 1900s was driven by the existence of an ideal speaker/listener who emerged from an unstable society, sociolinguists concluded that the structure of society in North America was highly variable and focused on their language learning. In different sections of society, especially in cities, they focused on studying how language is used by different groups and the differences between these applications. In 1948, McDavid examined social differences in his study of the use of postvocalic in South Carolina. The Washington, D.C. study of urban communities, including Petit, Putnam, and O'hern, on Black speech, De Camp's San Francisco work, and the Levin and Crockett studies of North Carolina began.[19] By the mid-1960s, sociolinguistics began to gain popularity with Labov's work. With her master's thesis on the effects of social motivation on sound change on the Martha's Vineyard (Massachusetts) Peninsula and her PhD on social linguistic stratification in New York City, Labov not only meticulously reveals variables and layers in complex urban life, but also the method and sampling techniques she brought to the field reach a respectable place.[20] Labov in contrast to traditional research methods with his work, developed a quantitative approach to systematically calculate the social relationships of language diversity and change. While traditional approaches tend to focus on specific and categorical differences in seeking to identify specific forms of language that apply to completely different variants, the main advantage of the quantitative method is that it allows populations that use the same linguistic variants to be compared to different languages.[21] Social linguists can sometimes assess the level of education, economic status, political attitude, or belief systems of the language community based on differences in pronunciation or the use of grammatical structures. Sometimes sociolinguists check the connection between social identity and language preferences and study why some language options are more effective and dominant, while others are more recessive, and also consider how language changes according to a changing social structure, such issues as language types of different social strata and groups, regional and social language uses. Social linguists are interested in a variety of linguistic diversity that explains and reflects social factors.

The concept of language diversity was first used by Labov. Labov is the first to systematically suggest that the frequency of using a particular variant may be related to regional, social, or situational factors.[22] Language diversity can occur both at the verbal level and at morphological, syntactic and phonological levels. At each level we are talking about, the speaker is presented with a set of options that he can use in different social contexts. Among these options, the speaker uses



options that best fit the social context in which he is.[23] Each of these choices presented to the speaker is called an option. A variant, a sociolinguistic term associated with the use of contextual language, is defined as the sum of linguistic forms applied in specific social contexts with a specific social distribution. The term, which has a wide range of uses, includes different accents, different linguistic styles, different dialects and even different languages that contradict each other for different social reasons.

Example 1: In a mountainous village in southeastern Italy called Sauris, sociolinguist said in 1971 that all adults in the village speak three languages. According to this report, the villagers who were part of the Austrian Empire until 1866 spoke a German dialect. Until the late 1960s, villagers used the dialect at home and in neighboring villages, while also using the Friulian language to communicate with people outside the village. Friulian was also a language used by people to communicate in bars, symbolizing friendship and harmony. However, young people who had to travel to nearby Ampezzo for secondary education now had to know Italian. When the villagers leave the village, the language they use for education is Italian. Their village was now used as the Italian language of church and school, becoming part of Italy.

Source: Holmes, 2008: 7-8[24]

When the above case is considered, it can be seen that in Example 1, the different variants used in Sauris are created by completely different languages. While the fact that the village was formerly under the Austrian Empire allowed the population to use a predominantly German dialect, in social relations it also required the use of the Friulian language, typical of the area where the village is located. and with other villages of the region. However, the fact that the village later became part of Italy requires the use of Italian in official Affairs and relations with other regions that are part of Italy. The villagers decide which options to use, thinking where, with whom and for what purpose the conversation will be held.

In other cases, we can see that different people address a particular person in different ways, depending on their status and proximity, and in doing so they use suitable options that the language offers. Examples show that people have different ways of applying language variants. Meerhoff lists the main reasons for these differences as follows: The desire to show that other people are suitable or different from them: people want to see themselves as part of a social group or to exclude themselves from this group.

Therefore, there are differences in the language options they use. The desire to do what is valued in society (to associate oneself with what is valued): among the reasons for applying language diversity, the fact that society values this diversity in an informed or conscious way encourages speakers to use such options. The desire to do things that society does not hate: just as speakers want the options that society values to be used by speakers, the options that society hates are not used by speakers, and speakers prefer options. In particular, options that are outdated, have a negative connotation, or are used by another social group are not used by speakers.[25]

Holmes, on the other hand, considers the reasons for applying different variants in two dimensions: those who use language and those who use language. Who is spoken to (the couple talking to each other, the client talking to the employees of the seller or employer), the place of conversation or social context (conversation at home, at work or at school), the purpose and topic of the



conversation give rise to different categories.[26] Under language variants, there are concepts such as standard languages, pits in and creoles, lingua franca or trade languages, communication languages, on which research has been conducted. The process of emergence of sociolinguistics, a research area that studies the relationship between language and society and evaluates the use of different languages in society in the context of different social variables such as age, gender, social class, identity, social network, tries to explain to what extent and how often these applications change, coverage and areas of study. Unlike structural linguistics, which defines language as a homogeneous system and talks about the existence of an ideal speaker/listener, sociolinguistics gives us the opportunity to learn language, trying to identify the social functions of language and the ways in which it forms a social meaning.

The language that offers its speakers the opportunity to express any linguistic message in different ways is formed by factors such as social context, the person who conveys the linguistic message, and the person who delivers the message, age, gender, etc. As a result, due to the indistinguishable nature of language from society, the science of sociolinguistics has continued to increase its popularity since the mid-1960s, when it began to be systematically conducted.

References:

1. Aksan, D., Her Yönüyle Dil Ana Çizgileriyle Dilbilim (Cilt 1). Ankara: TDK Yayınları. 2003.
2. Vardar, B., Dilbilimin Temel Kavram ve İlkeleri. İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Yayınları, 2001a.
3. Vardar, B., Dilbilimin Temel Kavram ve İlkeleri. İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Yayınları, 2001a.
4. İmer, K., Dil ve Toplum. Ankara: Gündoğan Yayınları, 1990.
5. Kula, O. B., Dil Felsefesi Edebiyat Kuramı - I. İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları, 2012.
6. Demirci, K., Türkoloji İçin Dilbilim Konular Kavramlar Teoriler. Ankara: Anı Yayıncılık, 2014.
7. Vardar, B., Dilbilimin Temel Kavram ve İlkeleri. İstanbul: Multilingual Yabancı Dil Yayınları, 2001a
8. Güz, N., Huber, E., Senemoğlu, O., & Öztokat, E. Açıklamalı Dilbilim Terimleri Sözlüğü (2 b.). (B. Vardar, Dü.) İstanbul: Multilingual, 2007.
9. Spolsky, B., Sociolinguistics. (H. Widdowson, Dü.) Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003.
10. Wardhaugh, R., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (5 b.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
11. Wardhaugh, R., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (5 b.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
12. Wardhaugh, R., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (5 b.). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
13. Holmes, J., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (3 b.). London: Pearson / Longman, 2008.
14. Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T., & Mesthrie, R., A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd., 2004.
15. Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T., & Mesthrie, R., A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd., 2004.



16. Mesthrie, R., "Sociolinguistics: History and Overview", R. Mesthrie, & R. Asher içinde, Concise Encyclopedia of Sociolinguistics (s. 1 - 4). Oxford: Elsevier Science Ltd., 2001.
17. Tucker (Dü) içinde, Sociolinguistics: The Essential Readings (s. 1 - 3). Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd., 2003.
18. Shuy, R. W., "A Brief History of American Sociolinguistics", C. B. Paulsten, & G. R.
19. Milroy, J., & Milroy, L., "Language in Society: Sociolinguistics", N. E. Collinge (Dü.) içinde, An Encyclopedia of Languages (s. 267 -284). London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2005.
20. Ball, M. J., "Introduction" M. J. Ball (Dü.) içinde, The Routledge Handbook of Sociolinguistics Around The World (s. 1-2). London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group. 2010.
21. Swann, J., Deumert, A., Lillis, T., & Mesthrie, R., A Dictionary of Sociolinguistics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press Ltd., 2004
22. Milroy, J., & Milroy, L., "Language in Society: Sociolinguistics", N. E. Collinge (Dü.) içinde, An Encyclopedia of Languages (s. 267 -284). London & New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2005.
23. Durrell, M., "Linguistic Variable - Linguistic Variant / Sprachvariable - Sprachvari-ante", U. Ammon, N. Dittmar, K. J. Mattheier, & P. Trudgill (Dü) içinde, Sociolinguistics An International Handbook of The Science of Language and Society (2 b., Cilt 1, s. 195 -200). Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2004a.
24. Holmes, J., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (3 b.). London: Pearson / Longman, 2008.
25. Holmes, J., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (3 b.). London: Pearson / Longman, 2008.
26. Meyerhoff, M., Introducing Sociolinguistics. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2006.
27. Holmes, J., An Introduction to Sociolinguistics (3 b.). London: Pearson / Longman, 2008.