ETHNOCULTURAL STEREOTYPES IN WOMEN'S SPEECH AND THEIR LEXICAL-SEMANTIC REPRESENTATION

B. M. Polvonova[1], I. K. Mamajonov[1], G. E. Zaylobiddinova[2]
1 Academic Lyceum No. 2 of Fergana State Technical University, Uzbekistan;
2 Master's student at the Banking and Finance, Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
bakhtiyorp@mail.ru; alfstu2@gmail.com

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu maqolada ayollar nutqida etnomadaniy stereotiplarning baholovchi leksika, qarindoshlik atamalari, murojaat shakllari, xushmuomalalik strategiyalari, metaforalar va frazeologik birliklar orqali qanday ifodalanishi hamda muloqot jarayonida qayta talqin qilinishi o'rganiladi. So'zlovchining niyati, ijtimoiy munosabatlar va madaniy tafovutlarga urg'u beruvchi kontekstual leksik-semantik tahlil yondashuvi taklif etiladi.*

Kalit so'zlar: *ayollar nutqi, etnomadaniy stereotiplar, leksik semantika, sotsiolingvistika, pragmatika, baholovchi leksika, gender va til*

Аннотация. *В статье рассматривается, как этнокультурные стереотипы выражаются и переосмысляются в женской речи посредством оценочной лексики, терминов родства, форм обращения, стратегий вежливости, метафор и фразеологических единиц. Предлагается контекстуальный лексико-семантический подход, уделяющий особое внимание намерению говорящего, социальным отношениям и культурным различиям.*

Ключевые слова: *женская речь, этнокультурные стереотипы, лексическая семантика, социолингвистика, прагматика, оценочная лексика, гендер и язык*

Abstract. *This article examines how ethnocultural stereotypes are expressed and negotiated in women's speech through evaluative vocabulary, kinship terms, forms of address, politeness strategies, metaphors, and phraseological units. It proposes a contextual lexical-semantic framework emphasizing speaker intention, social relationships, and cultural variation.*

Keywords: *women's speech, ethnocultural stereotypes, lexical semantics, sociolinguistics, pragmatics, evaluative vocabulary, gender and language*

Introduction

Language is both a means of communication and a resource through which communities express, transmit, and reinterpret cultural knowledge. Everyday lexical

choices can encode assumptions about social roles, appropriate behaviour, age, family relations, emotional expression, and interpersonal obligations. Some of these assumptions become stereotypes: simplified and socially shared expectations associated with particular groups or identities. When gender is involved, stereotypes may shape how women's speech is described, evaluated, and interpreted, as well as how speakers themselves use language to align with or resist prevailing expectations.

The phrase "women's speech" should not be understood as referring to a single, uniform linguistic system. Women differ by age, region, social class, education, occupation, ethnicity, language repertoire, and individual communicative style. Research on language and gender has therefore moved beyond the assumption that women and men necessarily speak in fundamentally separate ways. Instead, it examines how gendered meanings emerge through social interaction and how linguistic practices are shaped by power, identity, community norms, and context [1; 2].

Ethnocultural stereotypes are especially visible in lexical-semantic choices. Words of praise or criticism, kinship terms, forms of address, diminutives, metaphors, proverbs, and conventional expressions may evoke culturally familiar images of femininity, motherhood, modesty, hospitality, emotionality, or responsibility for family relationships. Yet the same expression can function differently across settings: it may communicate affection in one interaction, reinforce an expectation in another, or be used ironically to question the expectation itself. The purpose of this article is to describe the principal lexical-semantic mechanisms through which ethnocultural stereotypes may appear in women's speech and to offer a contextual framework for analysing them. The article addresses three questions: (1) which lexical-semantic groups are particularly relevant to the analysis of gendered ethnocultural stereotypes; (2) how can their meanings shift according to pragmatic and social context; and (3) how can researchers avoid reproducing stereotypes while studying them?

Theoretical Background

A stereotype can be understood as a socially circulated representation that simplifies the characteristics or expected behaviour of a group. Stereotypes are not merely individual opinions; they are also reproduced through repeated descriptions, narratives, jokes, proverbial expressions, institutional practices, and everyday evaluations. Their linguistic form may be explicit, as in a direct statement about what women "should" do, or implicit, as when a particular adjective or metaphor repeatedly associates women with a limited set of qualities.

The relationship between language and gender is not adequately explained by listing supposedly feminine or masculine words. A sociolinguistic approach considers who uses a form, to whom it is addressed, in what circumstances, and with what interactional consequences. A form that appears deferential may be strategic rather than submissive; emotional vocabulary may signal empathy, urgency, humour, or criticism; and a conventional expression may be repeated to conform to a norm or quoted to distance the speaker from it. Ethnocultural meaning is similarly contextual. A term associated with family, hospitality, respect, or social propriety may carry positive associations within one community and different implications in another. Even within the same community, meanings vary across generations, regions, institutions, and personal experiences. Consequently, an analysis should distinguish between a cultural convention, a stereotype attached to that convention, and an individual speaker's use of language in a specific interaction. Lexical semantics provides tools for examining denotation, connotation, semantic fields, metaphor, evaluative meaning, and relations among words. Pragmatics adds attention to implication, politeness, irony, presupposition, and the relationship between utterance and context. Combining these perspectives makes it possible to describe not only what a word conventionally means, but also what social assumptions it may activate in a particular exchange [2–4].

Methodology

The article uses a qualitative, interpretive approach based on conceptual analysis of relevant lexical-semantic categories. The analytical framework groups potentially stereotype-bearing language into evaluative vocabulary, kinship and family terminology, forms of address, politeness and mitigation, metaphorical expressions, and phraseological units. These categories are treated as analytical entry points rather than as an exhaustive inventory of women's language.

The examples discussed in the article are illustrative and are designed to show how a form may acquire different meanings in different contexts. They are not presented as direct quotations from a recorded corpus, nor do they represent measured frequencies, survey results, or claims about all Uzbek-speaking women. A full empirical study would require a clearly defined sample, informed consent where human participants are involved, transparent transcription procedures, contextual metadata, and a reproducible coding scheme. For each example, the proposed analysis considers four dimensions: (1) the lexical or phraseological form; (2) its possible conventional or dictionary meaning; (3) the cultural assumption it may evoke; and (4) its pragmatic function in the particular context. The framework also allows for counter-readings, including irony, resistance, affectionate use, and

neutral usage. This helps prevent the analyst from automatically interpreting every gender-marked expression as evidence of a stable stereotype.

Results and Analysis

The conceptual analysis identifies several interrelated lexical-semantic fields through which ethnocultural stereotypes may be expressed. Their relevance lies not in the assumption that women use them more often than others, but in the fact that they can become resources for negotiating gendered expectations in everyday interaction.

Table 1. Lexical-semantic fields relevant to the analysis of ethnocultural stereotypes

Lexical-semantic field	Potential cultural association	Contextual questions
Evaluative adjectives and nouns	Modesty, beauty, competence, respectability, emotionality	Who evaluates whom, and by what standard?
Kinship and family terms	Care, obligation, belonging, intergenerational respect	Does the term express affection, status, duty, or control?
Forms of address	Respect, distance, intimacy, hierarchy	How do age, setting, and relationship affect interpretation?
Politeness and mitigation	Tact, deference, cooperation, conflict avoidance	Is the form expected, strategic, ironic, or situational?
Metaphors and comparisons	Domesticity, beauty, delicacy, strength, social roles	Does the metaphor affirm or challenge a conventional image?
Proverbs and phraseological units	Collective wisdom, social norms, gendered expectations	Is the expression endorsed, quoted, questioned, or mocked?

Adjectives and nouns that evaluate a person's conduct, appearance, competence, or character may encode culturally familiar expectations. For example, terms equivalent to "modest," "well-mannered," "strong," "self-sacrificing," or "ambitious" can be positive in one context but restrictive in another. When modesty is praised as a personal choice, it may express respect; when it is treated as a compulsory condition for women's social acceptance, it may reinforce a gendered norm. Likewise, describing a woman as "strong" can acknowledge agency, while using the same label to imply that she must silently carry every responsibility may normalize unequal expectations [3–5].

Terms referring to mothers, daughters, sisters, wives, and other relatives can communicate intimacy and belonging. They can also activate assumptions about who should care for children, maintain family harmony, preserve traditions, or

perform domestic work. Their meaning depends on the interaction: a kinship term may be affectionate, respectful, humorous, admonitory, or strategically used to claim authority. Researchers should therefore analyse the relationship between the term, the speaker's intention, and the response it receives rather than assigning a single fixed meaning.

Address forms and indirect requests may help speakers manage social distance, respect, and potential disagreement. However, politeness should not automatically be equated with female submissiveness. Speakers of any gender may use indirectness to preserve cooperation, avoid embarrassment, or adapt to institutional expectations. A gender-focused analysis should ask whether a particular form is expected more strongly of women in the relevant setting and what happens when that expectation is followed, ignored, or challenged. Metaphors can make cultural assumptions memorable by linking women with familiar images, objects, natural phenomena, or social roles. Such comparisons may celebrate care, resilience, or beauty, but they may also narrow the range of identities considered acceptable. A metaphor should be interpreted in its discourse environment: speakers may use it sincerely, creatively, playfully, critically, or ironically. The analyst should also consider who introduces the metaphor and whether the person being described accepts or resists it.

Proverbs and phraseological units are especially important because they can present historically situated values as if they were universal truths. When repeated without comment, a proverb may lend authority to a social expectation. When quoted with irony or followed by a counterexample, it may instead expose the limitations of that expectation. The presence of a traditional expression alone does not prove that the speaker endorses its worldview; quotation, parody, and disagreement are also meaningful communicative practices.

Discussion

The analysis suggests that the lexical-semantic study of ethnocultural stereotypes requires attention to both conventional meaning and situated use. A lexical item does not carry an identical ideological message in every interaction. Its interpretation is shaped by prosody, co-text, participants' relationship, the activity being performed, and the wider cultural narratives available to them. This is why lists of supposedly feminine words are insufficient for explaining how stereotypes work.

A comparative reading can distinguish a traditional or prescriptive interpretation from a contextual interpretation. For instance, a phrase praising a woman's patience may be understood traditionally as confirming an ideal of endurance. A contextual analysis asks whether patience is freely chosen, whether

the burden is shared, whether the phrase is affectionate or coercive, and whether the speaker is questioning unequal expectations. The two perspectives are not competing measurements; they are different analytical lenses. The comparative framework also highlights a methodological risk: researchers can unintentionally reproduce the stereotypes they aim to describe. This may occur when examples are selected only because they confirm a familiar assumption, when one speaker is treated as representative of an entire group, or when a culturally specific practice is judged without its social context. A careful analysis should record counterexamples, acknowledge variation, and separate participants' own explanations from the researcher's interpretation.

For Uzbek-language research in particular, ethnocultural meanings should be investigated with attention to regional and generational diversity, multilingual practices, changing family structures, education, work, and digital communication. Expressions circulating in a family conversation may not function in the same way in a classroom, workplace, public speech, or online discussion. Future empirical work could compare naturally occurring interactions, interviews, media texts, and online discourse while documenting the context in which each item appears.

This article offers a conceptual framework rather than a quantitative or corpus-based account. It does not estimate how often particular expressions occur, establish causal relationships, or claim that all women share the same communicative patterns. The examples are illustrative, and the categories are intended to guide future analysis rather than to function as a final classification.

Further research could build a balanced corpus containing different genres and speaker groups; define transparent inclusion criteria; code expressions for semantic field, pragmatic function, and stance; and test coding consistency between researchers. Interviews or participant commentary could help clarify how speakers understand expressions that an analyst initially interprets as stereotypical. Such a design would make it possible to distinguish recurrent patterns from isolated examples and to examine change over time.

Conclusion

Ethnocultural stereotypes in women's speech are best approached as context-sensitive meanings that emerge through the interaction of lexical choice, cultural knowledge, social relationships, and communicative purpose. Evaluative vocabulary, kinship terminology, address forms, politeness strategies, metaphors, proverbs, and conventional expressions can all make gendered expectations linguistically visible. Nevertheless, no expression should be classified as stereotypical solely because it refers to women or appears in a traditional setting. A robust lexical-semantic analysis combines attention to denotation and connotation

with pragmatic interpretation and awareness of social variation. It asks not only which cultural assumption an expression may evoke, but also who uses it, in what circumstances, with what effect, and whether the expression is endorsed, negotiated, or challenged. This approach provides a more nuanced basis for studying language, gender, and ethnocultural identity without treating women as a homogeneous group.

References

1. Cameron D. Language, gender, and sexuality: current issues and new directions // Applied Linguistics. – 2005. – Vol. 26, no. 4. – P. 482–502. – DOI: 10.1093/applin/ami027.

2. Eckert P., McConnell-Ginet S. Language and gender. – 2nd ed. – Cambridge University Press, 2013.

3. Holmes J., Meyerhoff M. (eds.). The handbook of language and gender. – Blackwell Publishing, 2003.

4. Polvonova B. The Poetic Representation of Female Characters in the Khamsa Epics: A Gender Studies Analysis // FerSU Scientific Reports. – 2026. – Vol. 7, no. 4. – P. 111–116. – URL: https://journal.fdu.uz/main/pages/current-issue.html?issue=186

5. Mills S. Language and sexism. – Cambridge University Press, 2008.