



# IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



**VOL.3 № 5**

**2026**

## **INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK LEKSIK TIZIMLARIDA GENDER REPREZENTATSIYASI**

**Normurodov Kamol Ikromovich**

Jizzax davlat pedagogika universiteti , katta o‘qituvchi

### **Annotatsiya**

Mazkur maqolada ingliz va o‘zbek tillarining leksik tizimlarida gender reprezentatsiyasi qiyosiy-lingvistik nuqtai nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot genderning leksik birliklar, so‘z yasash modellari, kasb nomlari, qarindoshlik terminlari, murojaat shakllari hamda madaniy jihatdan belgilangan ifodalar orqali qanday kodlanishi, aks ettirilishi, neytrallashuvi yoki ijtimoiy talqin qilinishiga qaratilgan. Ingliz va o‘zbek tillari tipologik jihatdan farqlanadi: ingliz tili grammatik gender tizimini deyarli yo‘qotgan bo‘lsa, o‘zbek tili turkiy til sifatida ot turkumida grammatik gender kategoriyasiga ega emas. Shunga qaramay, har ikkala tilda ham gender leksik ma‘no, ijtimoiy nomlash amaliyoti, metaforik assotsiatsiyalar va diskursiv qo‘llanish orqali ifodalanadi. Maqolada gender reprezentatsiyasi faqat grammatik hodisa emasligi, balki madaniy qadriyatlar, tarixiy taraqqiyot va kommunikativ me‘yorlar bilan ham shakllanishi asoslab beriladi. Ingliz tilida gender-neytral leksikaga intilish kasb nomlari va ommaviy diskursga sezilarli ta‘sir ko‘rsatgan bo‘lsa, o‘zbek tilida gender qarindoshlik terminlari, ijtimoiy rollar va madaniy jihatdan xos murojaat shakllari orqali namoyon bo‘ladi. Tahlil natijalari har ikkala tilda ham an‘anaviy gender stereotiplarining izlari mavjudligini, shu bilan birga, inklyuziv va neytral leksik birliklarga o‘tish tendensiyalari kuchayib borayotganini ko‘rsatadi. Tadqiqot natijalari qiyosiy tilshunoslik, tarjimashunoslik, leksikologiya, sotsiolingvistika hamda o‘zbek akademik muhitida ingliz tilini o‘qitish jarayonlari uchun foydali bo‘lishi mumkin.

**Kalit so‘zlar:** gender reprezentatsiyasi, leksik tizim, ingliz tili, o‘zbek tili, gender-neytral til, leksikologiya, sotsiolingvistika, qiyosiy tilshunoslik.

## **ГЕНДЕРНАЯ РЕПРЕЗЕНТАЦИЯ В АНГЛИЙСКОЙ И УЗБЕКСКОЙ ЛЕКСИЧЕСКИХ СИСТЕМАХ**

**Нормуродов Камол Икромович**

Джизакский государственный педагогический университет , старший преподаватель

### **Аннотация**

В данной статье рассматривается гендерная репрезентация в лексических системах английского и узбекского языков с позиций сравнительного языкознания. Исследование сосредоточено на том, каким образом гендер кодируется, отражается, нейтрализуется или социально интерпретируется через лексические единицы, словообразовательные модели, профессиональные наименования, термины родства, формы обращения и культурно маркированные выражения. Английский и узбекский языки различаются типологически: английский язык в значительной степени утратил грамматический род, тогда как узбекский язык как тюркский не обладает категорией грамматического рода существительных. Тем не менее, в обоих языках гендер выражается через лексическое значение, социальные практики наименования, метафорические ассоциации и дискурсивное употребление. В статье утверждается, что гендерная репрезентация ограничивается не только грамматикой, но также формируется культурными ценностями, историческим развитием и коммуникативными нормами. В английском языке стремление к гендерно-нейтральной лексике оказало влияние на профессиональные титулы и общественный дискурс, тогда как в узбекском языке гендер проявляется через термины родства, социальные роли и культурно специфические формы обращения. Анализ показывает, что оба языка сохраняют следы традиционных гендерных ожиданий, однако одновременно демонстрируют тенденции к более инклюзивным и нейтральным лексическим средствам. Полученные результаты могут быть полезны для сравнительного языкознания, переводоведения, лексикологии, социолингвистики и преподавания английского языка в узбекском академическом контексте.

**Ключевые слова:** гендерная репрезентация, лексическая система, английский язык, узбекский язык, гендерно-нейтральный язык, лексикология, социолингвистика, сопоставительное языкознание.

## **GENDER REPRESENTATION IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LEXICAL SYSTEMS**

**Normurodov Kamol Ikromovich**

Jizzakh State Pedagogical University , Senior Lecturer

### Abstract

This article examines gender representation in the lexical systems of English and Uzbek from a comparative linguistic perspective. The study focuses on how gender is encoded, reflected, neutralized, or socially interpreted through lexical items, word-formation patterns, occupational terms, kinship vocabulary, address forms, and culturally marked expressions. English and Uzbek differ typologically: English has largely lost grammatical gender, while Uzbek, as a Turkic language, does not possess grammatical gender as a noun-class category. However, both languages represent gender through lexical meaning, social naming practices, metaphorical associations, and discourse-based usage. The article argues that gender representation is not limited to grammar; it is also shaped by cultural values, historical development, and communicative norms. In English, the movement toward gender-neutral vocabulary has influenced professional titles and public discourse, while Uzbek demonstrates gender through kinship terms, social roles, and culturally specific forms of address. The analysis shows that both languages contain traces of traditional gender expectations, yet they also reveal ongoing tendencies toward more inclusive and neutral lexical choices. The findings may be useful for comparative linguistics, translation studies, lexicology, sociolinguistics, and English language teaching in Uzbek academic contexts.

**Keywords:** gender representation, lexical system, English, Uzbek, gender-neutral language, lexicology, sociolinguistics, contrastive linguistics.

The study of gender in language has become one of the most significant directions in modern linguistics because it connects lexical structure with social meaning. Language does not merely name reality; it also preserves cultural experience, social hierarchy, communicative habits, and patterns of evaluation. For this reason, gender representation in vocabulary deserves special attention in comparative linguistics. English and Uzbek provide an interesting field for such comparison because the two languages belong to different language families, have different grammatical structures, and reflect different socio-cultural histories.

In traditional grammar, gender is often discussed as a grammatical category. However, contemporary linguistic research shows that gender is also realized at the lexical, semantic, pragmatic, and discourse levels (Hellinger & Bußmann, 2001, pp. 6–7). Even when a language does not have grammatical gender, it may still encode gender through personal nouns, kinship terminology, address forms, metaphorical expressions, occupational names, and culturally fixed collocations (Hellinger & Bußmann, 2001, pp. 7–8). Therefore, the lexical system of a language becomes an important source for understanding how society conceptualizes male and female roles.

English is usually described as a language with natural gender rather than grammatical gender. Most English nouns are not marked as masculine or feminine, but certain words such as *man*, *woman*, *father*, *mother*, *actor*, *actress*, *waiter*, *waitress*, *king*, *queen*, *bachelor*, and *spinster* express gender lexically (Curzan, 2003, pp. 11–30; Hellinger, 2001, pp. 107–108). In addition, contemporary English has experienced important changes connected with gender-neutral usage. Words such as *chairperson*, *spokesperson*, *firefighter*, *police officer*, and *flight attendant* demonstrate a tendency to avoid unnecessary gender marking in professional and public communication (Holmes, 2001, pp. 125–126; European Parliament, 2018, p. 8).

Uzbek, by contrast, does not have grammatical gender. Pronouns such as *u* may refer to both *he* and *she* depending on context. Nevertheless, Uzbek vocabulary contains numerous lexical units that indicate gender, especially in kinship terms, family roles, social titles, and cultural forms of address: *ota*, *ona*, *aka*, *opa*, *uka*, *singil*, *xotin*, *er*, *kelin*, *kuyov*, *qiz*, *o'g'il*, *ayol*, *erkak*, *yigit*, *qiz bola*. These words do not represent grammatical gender, but they carry strong semantic and cultural associations.

The relevance of this topic is connected with the growing importance of gender-sensitive communication, intercultural competence, and accurate translation between English and Uzbek. In translation, gender-neutral English forms may create difficulties when rendered into Uzbek, while Uzbek context-dependent gender expressions may require additional clarification in English. Thus, the comparative study of gender representation in the English and Uzbek lexical systems is not only theoretically significant but also practically valuable for translation, language teaching, and intercultural communication.

### Methodology

This article applies a qualitative comparative method. The analysis is based on lexical-semantic observation of English and Uzbek words that express or imply gender. The selected examples include kinship terms, occupational names, personal nouns, address forms, culturally marked expressions, and gender-neutral alternatives. The research uses descriptive, comparative, and sociolinguistic approaches. The descriptive approach identifies the lexical means by which gender is represented in each language. The comparative approach reveals similarities and differences between English and Uzbek. The sociolinguistic approach explains how lexical meanings are connected with cultural norms, social roles, and changes in public discourse.

The article does not aim to provide a statistical corpus analysis; instead, it offers a theoretical and interpretive discussion of typical lexical patterns. Such an approach is suitable for identifying general tendencies in gender representation and for demonstrating how linguistic forms reflect broader cultural attitudes.

### **Theoretical Background: Gender as a Lexical and Social Category**

In linguistics, gender may be understood in several ways. Grammatical gender refers to the classification of nouns into categories such as masculine, feminine, and neuter (Corbett, 1991, pp. 1–6; Curzan, 2003, p. 11). Natural gender refers to the biological or social sex of the referent; in Modern English, this type of gender is mainly connected with the real-world sex of persons or animals rather than with noun classes (Curzan, 2003, pp. 11–12). Lexical gender refers to words whose meaning directly includes gender information, for example, nouns such as *father*, *mother*, *king*, *queen*, *man*, and *woman* (Hellinger & Bußmann, 2001, pp. 7–8). Social gender, meanwhile, refers to culturally constructed expectations associated with masculinity and femininity, which are reflected in language use, address forms, occupational terms, and discourse practices (Hellinger & Bußmann, 2001, pp. 6–9; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003, pp. 9–13).

English has moved from an earlier system with grammatical gender in Old English toward a modern system based mainly on natural and lexical gender. This means that most English nouns do not belong to masculine or feminine classes, but the language still contains many words that carry gender meaning. For example, *father* and *mother* differ not grammatically but lexically. Similarly, *husband* and *wife*, *son* and *daughter*, *uncle* and *aunt*, *nephew* and *niece* encode gender as part of their lexical meaning.

Uzbek does not use grammatical gender in nouns, adjectives, or third-person pronouns. This absence often makes Uzbek appear more gender-neutral at the grammatical level. However, gender is still deeply present in the lexical system. Words such as *ayol*, *erkak*, *qiz*, *yigit*, *ona*, *ota*, *opa*, *aka*, *kelin*, *kuyov*, *beva*, *er*, and *xotin* express gendered social roles. Therefore, gender representation in Uzbek must be studied not through grammar but through lexical semantics and cultural pragmatics.

The important point is that the absence of grammatical gender does not mean the absence of gender representation. Both English and Uzbek show that vocabulary may preserve traditional roles, family relations, occupational expectations, and social evaluations. Gender is not only a linguistic marker; it is also a cultural sign.

### **Gender Representation in the English Lexical System**

The English lexical system represents gender through several groups of words. The first group consists of kinship terms: *father*, *mother*, *son*, *daughter*, *brother*, *sister*, *uncle*, *aunt*, *husband*, *wife*, *nephew*, and *niece*. These words are semantically gender-marked and remain stable in everyday communication. They are necessary because they refer to biological or family relations where gender distinction is traditionally relevant.

The second group includes occupational and social titles. Historically, English used many masculine forms as generic terms: *chairman*, *businessman*, *policeman*, *fireman*, and *mankind*. Such words reflected a period when public and professional roles were often associated with men; in fact, the generic use of masculine nouns and pronouns in English was standard practice until the 1970s, when feminist linguistic criticism challenged this usage (UN Women, 2019, p. 1). Feminine equivalents also existed, such as *actress*, *waitress*, *hostess*, and *stewardess*. However, modern English increasingly avoids gender-specific professional titles when gender is irrelevant. The terms *chairperson* or *chair*, *businessperson*, *police officer*, *firefighter*, *humankind*, *actor*, *server*, *host*, and *flight attendant* are now widely accepted in formal and inclusive communication (UN Women, 2019, pp. 2–3; UNESCO, 1999, pp. 9–10; European Parliament, 2018, pp. 10–11).

The third group consists of asymmetrical lexical pairs. In English, some male and female terms have developed different connotations. For instance, *bachelor* and *spinster* both historically refer to

unmarried people, but *spinster* has often carried a more negative social meaning. Similarly, *master* and *mistress* are not equal in modern usage: *master* may suggest authority or skill, while *mistress* has acquired meanings connected with private relationships. Such asymmetries show that vocabulary may reflect unequal social attitudes even when words appear structurally parallel.

The fourth group includes generic masculine forms, especially *man* and *he*. In older formal English, *man* could mean humanity and *he* could refer to a person of unspecified gender. Contemporary academic and professional writing tends to avoid such usage because it may exclude or invisibilize women. Instead of *Every student must submit his paper*, many style guides recommend *Every student must submit their paper* or *Students must submit their papers*. This shift shows that lexical and pronominal choices are influenced by social awareness and changing communicative ethics. Thus, English gender representation demonstrates a movement from male-centered lexical traditions toward more neutral and inclusive patterns. This change is especially visible in educational, legal, media, and workplace discourse.

### **Gender Representation in the Uzbek Lexical System**

Uzbek gender representation is mainly lexical and cultural rather than grammatical. One of the richest areas of gender marking is kinship terminology. Uzbek has a detailed kinship system in which gender, age, and family hierarchy are closely connected. Words such as *ota*, *ona*, *aka*, *opa*, *uka*, *singil*, *amaki*, *xola*, *tog'a*, *amma*, *kelin*, *kuyov*, *qaynona*, *qaynota*, *qaynsingil*, and *qaynaka* express not only gender but also family position and social relationship.

Unlike English, Uzbek often gives special attention to age and respect in family-related vocabulary. For example, *aka* and *uka* both correspond to *brother* in English, but *aka* means elder brother and *uka* means younger brother. Similarly, *opa* and *singil* correspond to *sister*, but they differ according to age hierarchy. These distinctions show that Uzbek gender representation is closely connected with respect, seniority, and family structure.

Another important group includes words naming social roles: *ayol*, *erkak*, *qiz*, *yigit*, *xotin*, *er*, *ona*, *ota*, *kelin*, and *kuyov*. These words are not merely biological labels; they often carry cultural expectations. For example, *ona* is associated with care, respect, family unity, and moral authority. *Ota* is associated with responsibility, protection, leadership, and family honor. *Kelin* and *kuyov* express marital roles but also include expectations related to family behavior and social adaptation.

Uzbek address forms also reveal gendered and cultural meaning. Words such as *opa*, *aka*, *singlim*, *ukam*, *xola*, and *amaki* may be used not only for actual relatives but also as respectful forms of address for non-relatives. This pragmatic use shows that gendered kinship terms extend beyond the family and function as tools of politeness and social closeness. For instance, addressing an unknown woman as *opa* or *xola* may express respect depending on age and context.

At the same time, Uzbek has a grammatically neutral third-person pronoun *u*, which may mean *he* or *she*. This creates a certain level of grammatical neutrality. However, in translation into English, context is often required to choose *he* or *she*. Conversely, when English gender-neutral *they* is translated into Uzbek, the pronoun *u* may naturally preserve neutrality.

Overall, Uzbek lexical gender representation is less connected with professional title marking and more connected with kinship, respect, family structure, and culturally established social roles.

### **Comparative Analysis of English and Uzbek Gendered Vocabulary**

A comparison of English and Uzbek shows both similarities and differences. The main similarity is that both languages express gender through lexical meaning. Kinship terms in both languages are strongly gender-marked: *father/ota*, *mother/ona*, *brother/aka* or *uka*, *sister/opa* or *singil*, *husband/er*, *wife/xotin*. These words are fundamental because they name family relations and social roles.

The first major difference lies in grammatical structure. English has gendered third-person singular pronouns *he* and *she*, while Uzbek uses the neutral pronoun *u*. This difference is important in translation because the Uzbek pronoun *u* can refer to “he,” “she,” or “it,” and the exact gender is usually understood from context (Erkinovna, 2025, p. 7). An Uzbek sentence such as *U keldi* does not identify gender without context. In English, the translator must usually choose *He came*, *She came*, or *They came* depending on the communicative situation.

The second difference concerns age hierarchy. Uzbek kinship vocabulary includes age distinctions that English often does not lexicalize. English uses *brother* and *sister*, while Uzbek distinguishes *aka/uka* and *opa/singil*. Therefore, Uzbek gendered vocabulary often combines gender with age, respect, and hierarchy. This makes Uzbek kinship terms semantically denser than their English equivalents, because Uzbek kinship terms clearly reflect family hierarchy, age distinction, and culturally

defined social roles (Baratova, 2024, pp. 127–128).

The third difference is connected with professional vocabulary. English has undergone visible reform in occupational terms because many older words contained masculine elements such as *-man*. Uzbek professional terms are often not gender-marked in the same way: *o'qituvchi*, *shifokor*, *tarjimon*, *yozuvchi*, *talaba*, *tadqiqotchi*, and *olim* may refer to both men and women. In this sense, Uzbek professional vocabulary may appear more neutral. However, social interpretation may still be gendered depending on cultural stereotypes about professions.

The fourth difference concerns asymmetrical connotation. English has several historically unequal pairs, such as *bachelor/spinster* and *master/mistress*. Uzbek also has words whose social evaluation may differ depending on whether they refer to men or women. For example, certain expressions connected with family honor, modesty, or marital status may carry stronger expectations for women than for men. This indicates that lexical meaning is shaped not only by dictionary definitions but also by social attitudes.

Therefore, the comparison shows that English gender representation is strongly visible in pronouns, occupational reform, and gender-neutral language movements, while Uzbek gender representation is especially visible in kinship terms, respect forms, and culturally marked family roles.

### **Gender-Neutral Tendencies and Modern Usage**

Modern English demonstrates a strong tendency toward gender-neutral and inclusive vocabulary. This tendency is particularly visible in academic writing, journalism, legal documents, workplace communication, and education. Instead of using *mankind*, many writers prefer *humanity* or *humankind*. Instead of *chairman*, they use *chair* or *chairperson*. Instead of *policeman*, they use *police officer*. These changes are not simply lexical replacements; they reflect a broader effort to make language more inclusive and socially accurate.

In Uzbek, gender neutrality functions differently. Since the language lacks grammatical gender and has a neutral third-person pronoun, some aspects of Uzbek are naturally non-gendered. Uzbek, like many Turkic languages, does not have grammatical gender, and Uzbek nouns do not carry masculine or feminine distinctions; moreover, the third-person singular pronoun *u* is used for both “he” and “she” (Agzamova & To'ychiyeva, 2024, p. 48). Words such as *talaba*, *o'qituvchi*, *shifokor*, *tarjimon*, *yozuvchi*, *tadqiqotchi*, *rahbar*, *xodim*, and *mutaxassis* can refer to any gender. This is also seen in occupational titles, since Uzbek tends to use gender-neutral professional terms, for example, *o'qituvchi*, which is not gender-specific (Agzamova & To'ychiyeva, 2024, p. 48).

However, Uzbek still contains gendered social vocabulary, especially in family and cultural contexts. As a result, gender neutrality in Uzbek is less about changing grammatical forms and more about avoiding unnecessary stereotypes in discourse. In Uzbek society, gender-related differences are often visible in lexical choice, politeness strategies, communicative style, and public discourse, which shows that gender is shaped by cultural norms and social expectations rather than by grammar alone (Sadikova, 2026, pp. 7–8). For example, when discussing professions, it is more neutral to say *ayol shifokor* only when the gender of the doctor is relevant. Otherwise, *shifokor* is sufficient. Similarly, in English, *female scientist* may be unnecessary if gender is not central to the message. Both languages therefore face a similar communicative question: when is gender relevant, and when does mentioning gender create bias?

The movement toward gender-sensitive language does not mean eliminating gendered words entirely. Kinship terms and biologically relevant expressions remain necessary. The main issue is to avoid unequal evaluation, unnecessary gender marking, and language that presents one gender as the norm while the other appears exceptional.

Gender representation in English and Uzbek lexical systems shows that gender is not only a grammatical category but also a lexical, semantic, cultural, and pragmatic phenomenon. English has largely lost grammatical gender, yet it continues to express gender through pronouns, kinship terms, occupational titles, and social vocabulary. Modern English also demonstrates a strong movement toward gender-neutral and inclusive lexical choices, especially in public and academic discourse.

Uzbek does not have grammatical gender and uses the neutral pronoun *u*, but its lexical system contains rich gender representation through kinship terms, address forms, marital roles, and culturally significant social labels. Uzbek vocabulary often connects gender with age, respect, family hierarchy, and social expectations.

The comparison reveals that English and Uzbek both encode gender lexically, but they do so through different linguistic and cultural mechanisms. English gender representation is especially noticeable

in pronoun choice and professional terminology, while Uzbek representation is more visible in family-related vocabulary and culturally marked address forms. In my view, the study of gendered vocabulary is important because it helps us understand how language reflects social life and how social change influences linguistic choice. For translation, it prevents inaccurate or biased interpretation. For language teaching, it develops students' awareness of both form and cultural meaning. For linguistics, it confirms that vocabulary is not a neutral list of words; it is a living system where culture, history, and identity interact.

#### REFERENCES

1. Agzamova D., To'ychiyeva M.A. qizi. Gender Aspects of English and Uzbek Language // *Western European Journal of Modern Experiments and Scientific Methods*. – 2024. – Vol. 2(1). – P. 46–49.
2. Baratova K.G. Lexical-Semantic Features of Kinship Terms in English and Uzbek Languages // *Biruni Journal*. – 2024. – P. 127–128.
3. Byram M. *Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence*. – Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. – P. 71.
4. Cameron D. *Feminism and Linguistic Theory*. – Palgrave Macmillan, 1992.
5. Coates J. *Women, Men and Language: A Sociolinguistic Account of Gender Differences in Language*. 3rd ed. – Routledge, 2013.
6. Corbett G.G. *Gender*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991. – P. 1–6.
7. Crystal D. *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language*. 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
8. Curzan A. *Gender Shifts in the History of English*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – P. 11–12.
9. Eckert P., McConnell-Ginet S. *Language and Gender*. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – P. 9–13.
10. Erkinovna K.S. Differences between English and Uzbek in Language Learning // *International Journal of Universal Science and Technology*. – 2025. – P. 7.
11. *Gender-Neutral Language in the European Parliament*. – Brussels: European Parliament, 2018. – P. 10–11.
12. UNESCO. *Guidelines on Gender-Neutral Language*. – Paris: UNESCO, 1999. – P. 9–10.
13. Hellinger M., Bußmann H. *Gender Across Languages: The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men* // In: Hellinger M., Bußmann H. (eds.) *Gender Across Languages: The Linguistic Representation of Women and Men*. Vol. 1. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 2001. – P. 1–25.
14. López-Rocha S. *Intercultural Communicative Competence: Creating Awareness and Promoting Skills in the Language Classroom* // *Innovative Language Teaching and Learning at University*. – 2016. – P. 105–111.
15. Madiyurova V.Q., Djumabayeva J.Sh., Bekmuradova F.N. Translation and Gender Through the Lens of Native and Foreign Translators: Case Study on the English Translations of Uzbek Feministic Representations // *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*. – 2024. – Vol. 14(8). – P. 2306–2315.
16. Sadikova L.A. Gender and Language Use in Uzbek Society: A Sociolinguistic Perspective // *Eurasian Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*. – 2026. – Vol. 51. – P. 6–8.
17. Simon S. *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity and the Politics of Transmission*. – London; New York: Routledge, 1996. – P. 1–13.
18. UN Women. *Gender-Inclusive Language Guidelines: English*. – New York: UN Women, 2019. – P. 1–3.