

e-ISSN 3060-5059

DOI: 10.67227



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNAL

Scientific and Innovative Research in
Social and Humanitarian Studies

Vol. 3 • Issue 9

2026



Founded in 2024



publishscience.uz



publish_science_journal@mail.ru



PEER REVIEWED • OPEN ACCESS

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK PAREMIOLOGIK BIRLIKLARIDA SHAXSNING IJTIMOY IDENTIKLIGI

Turayeva Shahnoza

Tadqiqotchi. e-mail: Ushakhnoza2317@gmail.com ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5336-2942>

Annotatsiya.

Ushbu maqolada ingliz va o'zbek paremiologik birliklarida shaxsning ijtimoiy identikligi qiyosiy-lingvomadaniy jihatdan tadqiq etiladi. Tadqiqot materiali 640 ta paremiologik birlikdan, jumladan, 320 ta ingliz va 320 ta o'zbek maqol hamda matallardan tashkil topgan. Korpus shaxs ijtimoiy identikligining sakkiz asosiy kategoriyasi: oila va qarindoshlik, yosh va avlod, gender va ijtimoiy rol, mehnat va kasbiy faoliyat, ijtimoiy-iqtisodiy mavqe, axloqiy-reputatsion identiklik, shaxslararo munosabatlar hamda shaxs-jamiyat munosabatlari asosida tasniflandi. Tahlilda paremiologik birliklarning ijobiy, salbiy va ambivalent baholanishi, individual, relyatsion va kollektiv yo'nalishi, semantik mexanizmlari hamda ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi ekvivalentlik darajalari hisobga olindi. Natijalar har ikki paremiologik tizimda mehnatsevarlik, halollik, donolik, sadoqat, mas'uliyat va oilaviy qadriyatlarining ijobiy baholanishini ko'rsatadi. Shu bilan birga, ingliz paremiyalarida individual mas'uliyat va shaxsiy tashabbusni, o'zbek paremiyalarida esa qarindoshlik, o'zaro ko'mak, ijtimoiy birdamlik va jamoaviy mas'uliyatni ifodalovchi modellar nisbatan faolroq namoyon bo'ladi. Tadqiqot paremiologik birliklarning shaxs ijtimoiy identikligini shakllantiruvchi lingvomadaniy vosita sifatidagi ahamiyatini ochib beradi.

Kalit so'zlar: paremiologik birlik, ijtimoiy identiklik, ingliz tili, o'zbek tili, maqol, lingvomadaniyat, aksiologik baholash, individual identiklik, kollektiv identiklik, ekvivalentlik, qiyosiy tahlil.

СОЦИАЛЬНАЯ ИДЕНТИЧНОСТЬ ЛИЧНОСТИ В АНГЛИЙСКИХ И УЗБЕКСКИХ ПАРЕМИОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ ЕДИНИЦАХ

Тураева Шахноза

Исследователь.

Аннотация.

В статье в сравнительно-лингвокультурологическом аспекте исследуется социальная идентичность личности в английских и узбекских паремиологических единицах. Материал исследования включает 640 паремиологических единиц, в том числе 320 английских и 320 узбекских пословиц и поговорок. Корпус классифицирован по восьми основным категориям социальной идентичности личности: семья и родственные отношения, возраст и поколение, гендер и социальная роль, труд и профессиональная деятельность, социально-экономический статус, морально-репутационная идентичность, межличностные отношения и отношения «личность–общество». При анализе учитывались положительная, отрицательная и амбивалентная оценочность паремиологических единиц, их индивидуальная, реляционная и коллективная направленность, семантические механизмы, а также уровни эквивалентности в английском и узбекском языках. Результаты показывают, что в обеих паремиологических системах положительно оцениваются трудолюбие, честность, мудрость, верность, ответственность и семейные ценности. Вместе с тем в английских паремиях относительно более активно представлены модели, выражающие индивидуальную ответственность и личную инициативу, тогда как в узбекских паремиях — родственные связи, взаимопомощь, социальную солидарность и коллективную ответственность. Исследование раскрывает значение паремиологических единиц как лингвокультурного средства формирования социальной идентичности личности.

Ключевые слова: паремиологическая единица, социальная идентичность, английский язык, узбекский язык, пословица, лингвокультура, аксиологическая оценка, индивидуальная идентичность, коллективная идентичность, эквивалентность, сравнительный анализ.

SOCIAL IDENTITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK PAREMIOLOGICAL UNITS

Turayeva Shahnoza

Researcher.

Abstract.

This article examines the social identity of the individual in English and Uzbek paremiological units from a comparative linguocultural perspective. The research material comprises 640 paremiological units, including 320 English and 320 Uzbek proverbs and sayings. The corpus was classified according to eight major categories of social identity: family and kinship, age and generation, gender and social role, labor and professional activity, socio-economic status, moral and reputational identity, interpersonal relationships, and individual–society relations. The analysis considers the positive, negative, and ambivalent evaluation of paremiological units, their individual, relational, and collective orientations, their semantic mechanisms, and the levels of equivalence between English and Uzbek. The results demonstrate that both paremiological systems positively evaluate diligence, honesty, wisdom, loyalty, responsibility, and family values. At the same time, English paremiology more actively represents patterns associated with individual responsibility and personal initiative, whereas Uzbek paremiology shows a relatively stronger representation of kinship, mutual assistance, social solidarity, and collective responsibility. The study reveals the significance of paremiological units as linguocultural means of shaping an individual's social identity.

Keywords: paremiological unit, social identity, English language, Uzbek language, proverb, linguoculture, axiological evaluation, individual identity, collective identity, equivalence, comparative analysis.

Introduction. Language functions not only as a means of communication but also as a symbolic system through which individuals interpret social reality, define their relationships with others, and position themselves within a particular cultural community. The linguistic representation of a person is therefore closely connected with such categories as family membership, social status, age, gender, occupation, moral reputation, interpersonal relations, and belonging to a wider community. These dimensions constitute an important part of social identity, understood as the aspect of an individual's self-concept that emerges through participation in social groups and through the values, norms, and behavioural expectations associated with those groups [1]. From this perspective, language becomes one of the principal mechanisms through which socially recognized models of identity are constructed, reproduced, evaluated, and transmitted from one generation to another.

Among the linguistic units that preserve socially significant knowledge, paremiological units occupy a particularly important position. Proverbs and proverbial sayings represent condensed forms of collective experience accumulated over long periods of social and cultural development. Mieder argues that proverbs constitute an essential part of traditional knowledge and continue to function in everyday communication, literature, public discourse, and other spheres of social interaction [2]. Their semantic compactness, figurative character, evaluative potential, and relative structural stability enable them to encode socially accepted ideas about desirable and undesirable behaviour, interpersonal responsibilities, social hierarchy, work, family, friendship, wealth, wisdom, honour, solidarity, and individual agency.

The concept of social identity provides a productive theoretical framework for examining these verbal models. Social identity theory emphasizes that individuals partly define themselves through association with social groups and through comparison between social categories [1]. Within paremiological discourse, such categorization is frequently manifested through oppositions and relational models such as parent–child, old–young, rich–poor, friend–enemy, wise–foolish, hard-working–lazy, and individual–community. Proverbs do not merely name these social categories; they attribute values, expectations, rights, obligations, and behavioural characteristics to them.

The comparative study of English and Uzbek paremiological systems is especially significant because the two languages developed within historically and culturally different communicative environments. At the same time, both traditions possess extensive proverbial repertoires dealing with universal aspects of human life, including family, labour, friendship, responsibility, material well-being, education, wisdom, reputation, and social relationships. Recent comparative studies have identified both shared moral concepts and culturally specific patterns in figurative imagery and axiological orientation [7–11]. These tendencies should not be interpreted as absolute cultural oppositions; rather, they represent differences in the salience and linguistic framing of particular social values.

Despite growing scholarly interest in the linguocultural, semantic, cognitive, and comparative characteristics of English and Uzbek proverbs, the representation of the social identity of the individual as an integrated paremiological category requires more systematic investigation. Existing research has largely concentrated on national mentality, conceptual metaphors, moral values, equivalence, cultural symbols, and general similarities and differences between English and Uzbek proverbial traditions. Comparatively less attention has been paid to the ways in which paremiological units construct the individual as a member of family, age, gender, occupational, economic, moral, and communal categories and to how these categories interact within the broader cultural model of the person.

Accordingly, the aim of the present study is to identify and compare the linguistic and cultural mechanisms through which the social identity of the individual is represented in English and Uzbek paremiological units. The study focuses on the semantic, axiological, metaphorical, and pragmatic features of proverbs representing family and kinship, age and generation, gender roles, work and professional behaviour, socio-economic status, moral reputation,

interpersonal relations, and individual-community relations. The research seeks to determine the principal social-identity patterns represented in the two corpora, reveal universal and culture-specific models, examine evaluative oppositions, and establish similarities and differences in the conceptualization of individual agency, social belonging, responsibility, status, and interpersonal obligations.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The study of social identity in paremiological units requires an interdisciplinary approach integrating social psychology, paremiology, linguoculturology, semantics, and comparative linguistics. Tajfel and Turner conceptualize social identity as the part of the self-concept derived from group membership and the values attached to such membership [1]. This theoretical principle is especially relevant to proverbs because paremiological units frequently encode binary social categorizations and culturally sanctioned evaluations of behaviour.

Within international paremiology, Wolfgang Mieder's research provides an important theoretical foundation for understanding proverbs as culturally transmitted forms of collective experience. Mieder treats proverbs as established expressions that circulate in communication and transmit observations, beliefs, ethical judgements, and practical wisdom accumulated by a speech community [2]. From this perspective, a proverb that praises diligence, loyalty, wisdom, family responsibility, or social solidarity simultaneously presents a culturally legitimate model of individual behaviour.

A semantic and pragmatic perspective was developed systematically by Norrick, who demonstrated that proverb meaning cannot be reduced to the literal meanings of individual lexical components [3]. Literal, figurative, metaphorical, metonymic, hyperbolic, and other mechanisms participate in proverbial interpretation. This approach is significant for social-identity analysis because references to a person's hand, tongue, house, bread, clothes, neighbour, or other concrete entities may function metaphorically and metonymically to characterize work ethic, reputation, family position, material status, or community membership.

The cognitive dimension of paremiological meaning was further explored by Honeck, who approaches the proverb as a complex verbal and cognitive phenomenon [4]. Understanding a proverb requires speakers to activate culturally established schemas in order to derive generalized meaning from a concrete image. Applied to social identity, this view suggests that references to family members, wealth, occupation, age, friendship, or social conduct are interpreted against culturally shared knowledge concerning the expected characteristics of social roles.

Uzbek paremiological scholarship provides an equally important basis for such analysis. The collection *O'zbek xalq maqollari*, compiled by T. Mirzayev, A. Musoqulov, and B. Sarimsoqov, presents Uzbek folk proverbs as semantically rich manifestations of language, philosophy, artistic thought, and centuries-long social experience [5]. The collection contains extensive material concerning the individual, family, society, labour, morality, education, friendship, homeland, material life, and interpersonal relations. These units provide a substantial empirical basis for examining how Uzbek culture verbalizes social belonging, responsibility, hierarchy, solidarity, and moral identity.

Another fundamental source for the semantic interpretation of Uzbek paremias is Sh. Shomaqsudov and Sh. Shorahmedov's *Hikmatnoma: O'zbek maqollarining izohli lug'ati* [6]. The explanatory character of this work is methodologically significant because the social identity encoded by a proverb cannot always be established through its surface wording. Cultural commentary helps reveal implicit ideas concerning honour, shame, social reputation, kinship, reciprocity, hospitality, generational hierarchy, and acceptable behaviour.

More recent comparative research has increasingly approached English and Uzbek proverbs within a linguocultural framework. Qobilova and Atoeva analyze the manifestation of national culture in English and Uzbek folk proverbs and focus on proverbs representing human qualities [7]. Their work supports the view that paremias preserve culturally meaningful perceptions of character and social behaviour. Sharobidinovna, Kabilovna, and Usmanova examine English and Uzbek proverbs concerning parents and demonstrate the analytical importance of kinship terminology and parental relations in comparative paremiology [8].

Rajapova compares English and Uzbek paremiological units from linguistic, structural, cultural, thematic, and pragmatic perspectives and distinguishes full equivalents, partial semantic equivalents, functional equivalents, and culture-specific units [9]. Qurbonbayeva similarly examines Uzbek and English proverbs as linguoculturemes and reports differences in the relative prominence of collectivist, hospitality-oriented, pragmatic, and individual-centred values [10]. Babaeva's comparative study likewise emphasizes shared moral concerns together with culturally specific differences in metaphorical structure, social harmony, respect, and individual orientation [11].

These findings are useful as hypotheses rather than as absolute descriptions of either culture. English proverbial culture also contains numerous units emphasizing cooperation, family responsibility, and social solidarity, while Uzbek paremiology includes units foregrounding individual ability, initiative, personal honour, and achievement. Therefore, broad oppositions such as "individualistic English" versus "collectivistic Uzbek" require corpus-based testing within clearly defined social domains.

The reviewed scholarship reveals three interrelated research gaps. First, classic paremiological studies primarily explain definition, semantics, cognition, and communicative functioning [2–4], whereas social identity theory explains categorization and group identification without focusing specifically on proverbial discourse [1]. Second, Uzbek paremiological scholarship provides rich material concerning national worldview and social values [5; 6] but requires further integration with social-identity theory. Third, comparative English–Uzbek research has identified important linguocultural differences [7–11], yet a systematic category-based comparison of the individual as a social subject remains insufficiently developed. The present study addresses this gap through an eight-category model of social identity combined with axiological, relational, semantic, and equivalence-based coding.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Design

The present study employed a comparative linguocultural mixed-method design combining qualitative semantic interpretation with quantitative corpus-based analysis. The research material consisted of 640 paremiological units, including 320 English proverbs and proverbial expressions and 320 Uzbek paremiological units. The corpus was constructed specifically to investigate the linguistic representation of the individual's social identity in the two linguistic cultures.

For analytical balance, the material was organized according to eight major dimensions of social identity. Each category contained 40 English and 40 Uzbek paremiological units, producing 80 units per category and 640 units in total. The balanced structure was selected deliberately to provide comparable amounts of linguistic evidence for each identity dimension. Therefore, the distribution of 40 units per category was treated as an analytical sampling framework rather than as evidence of the natural frequency of these categories in the entire English or Uzbek paremiological system.

Table 1. Distribution of the paremiological corpus

Social-identity category	English	Uzbek	Total
1. Family and kinship identity	40	40	80
2. Age and generational identity	40	40	80
3. Gender and social-role identity	40	40	80
4. Occupational and labour identity	40	40	80
5. Socio-economic and status identity	40	40	80
6. Moral and reputational identity	40	40	80
7. Interpersonal and relational identity	40	40	80
8. Individual–community identity	40	40	80
Total	320	320	640

Sources of the Paremiological Material

The English-language corpus was primarily compiled from established proverb dictionaries and paremiological sources, especially *The Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*, edited by Jennifer Speake [12], with semantic interpretation informed by Mieder [2] and Norrick [3]. The Uzbek corpus was selected primarily from *O'zbek xalq maqollari*, compiled by T. Mirzayev, A. Musoqulov, and B. Sarimsoqov [5]. Where a proverb contained culturally specific vocabulary, archaic components, or potentially ambiguous figurative meaning, its interpretation was checked against *Hikmatnoma: O'zbek maqollarining izohli lug'ati* [6].

The use of lexicographically and academically recognized collections was intended to reduce the inclusion of artificially created, recently translated, or insufficiently established proverbial expressions.

SELECTION CRITERIA

A unit was included in the corpus if it:

1. was documented in an established English or Uzbek paremiological source;
2. represented a relatively stable proverbial or aphoristic construction;
3. contained an explicit or implicit reference to an individual as a social subject;
4. expressed a socially meaningful value, norm, expectation, status, role, relationship, or behavioural judgement;
5. could be assigned to at least one of the eight social-identity categories;
6. possessed sufficient semantic and cultural information for comparative interpretation.

A unit was excluded if it:

1. represented an ordinary idiom without generalized social or moral meaning;
2. was an identifiable literary quotation associated with a specific author rather than traditional paremiology;
3. referred exclusively to natural phenomena, weather, agriculture, or physical objects without a relevant social-identity component;
4. duplicated another proverb with only minor orthographic or grammatical variation;
5. lacked sufficient contextual or lexicographic evidence for reliable semantic interpretation.

When several variants of one proverb occurred in the source materials, the most widely documented or lexicographically normalized form was retained.

SOCIAL-IDENTITY CODING FRAMEWORK

Each proverb was assigned a primary social-identity code according to its dominant semantic focus. A proverb could additionally receive secondary semantic tags when more than one identity dimension was involved, but only the primary code was used to maintain the balanced 40-item structure of each category.

Table 2. Operational coding criteria for the eight social-identity categories

Code	Category	Operational coding criteria
SI-1	Family and kinship identity	Family membership, kinship obligations, parental or filial responsibility, relations between spouses, parents and children, siblings and relatives, household solidarity, inheritance of behaviour, and the individual's position within the family.

SI-2	Age and generational identity	Age, life stage, experience, relations between generations, seniority, youth, old age, respect for elders, learning from experience, and generational hierarchy.
SI-3	Gender and social-role identity	Socially attributed male or female roles, expectations concerning men or women, marital roles, motherhood, fatherhood, masculinity, femininity, and culturally conventional gendered behaviour.
SI-4	Occupational and labour identity	Work, profession, craftsmanship, diligence, laziness, skill, productivity, mastery, learning through practice, and responsibility toward labour.
SI-5	Socio-economic and status identity	Wealth, poverty, social position, material resources, power, dependence, prestige, social mobility, ownership, economic success, and the relation between material status and human worth.
SI-6	Moral and reputational identity	Honesty, dishonesty, honour, shame, wisdom, foolishness, courage, cowardice, generosity, greed, modesty, pride, trustworthiness, and social respect.
SI-7	Interpersonal and relational identity	Friendship, hostility, trust, betrayal, cooperation, reciprocity, neighbour relations, communication, conflict, mutual assistance, and loyalty.
SI-8	Individual-community identity	Community belonging, collective responsibility, solidarity, conformity, social integration, mutual dependence, independence, individual agency, social duty, homeland, neighbourhood, and responsibility toward society.

Primary and Secondary Coding

Because proverbial meaning is frequently multidimensional, a hierarchical coding rule was employed. The primary code represented the social-identity dimension without which the central proverbial meaning would substantially change. A secondary code represented an additional identity component that contributed to the meaning but was not dominant.

For example, a proverb concerning a parent's responsibility to teach a child could involve both family identity and age/generational identity. It was assigned to SI-1 if the primary focus was kinship obligation, while SI-2 could be recorded as a secondary tag. Similarly, a proverb associating poverty with social reputation could be coded primarily as SI-5 if economic status constituted the central contrast, while SI-6 could be recorded as a secondary moral-reputational component.

Secondary Analytical Variables

Axiological orientation was coded as positive, negative, or ambivalent/context-dependent. Identity orientation was coded as individual-oriented, relational-oriented, or collective-oriented. Semantic mechanism was coded according to the dominant means through which social identity was represented: literal, metaphorical, metonymic, contrastive/antithetical, analogical, cause-and-effect, or evaluative-generalizing. The social evaluation target was coded as personal quality, social behaviour, social role, interpersonal obligation, group membership, or social status.

These additional variables enabled the research to compare not only the thematic content of English and Uzbek proverbs but also the mechanisms through which social identity is evaluated and culturally organized.

Comparative Linguocultural Analysis Procedure

1. Corpus formation: English and Uzbek paremiological units containing socially relevant meanings were extracted from the selected sources.
2. Normalization: orthographic variants and duplicate forms were identified, and one normalized version was retained.
3. Contextual interpretation: the literal and figurative meanings of each unit were determined with reference to proverb dictionaries and explanatory sources.
4. Social-identity coding: each proverb was assigned to one of the eight primary categories according to the operational criteria.
5. Secondary coding: axiological orientation, identity orientation, semantic mechanism, and evaluation target were recorded.
6. Intra-linguistic analysis: English and Uzbek corpora were first examined independently to establish recurrent semantic patterns.
7. Cross-linguistic comparison: corresponding units were compared according to social meaning, evaluative orientation, imagery, cultural reference, and pragmatic function.
8. Equivalence assessment: proverb pairs were classified as full functional-semantic equivalence, partial equivalence, functional-cultural analogy, or culture-specific/zero equivalence.

Quantitative Analysis

Quantitative analysis was used to support the qualitative linguocultural interpretation. Frequencies and percentages were calculated for positive, negative, and ambivalent evaluations; individual-, relational-, and collective-oriented identity patterns; semantic mechanisms; evaluation targets; and types of English-Uzbek equivalence.

Because the number of units in each of the eight primary categories was fixed at 40 per language by research

design, differences in the size of the eight categories were not interpreted as indicators of their natural prevalence in English or Uzbek paremiology. Instead, quantitative comparison focused on the internal structure of each category. Where inferential comparison was appropriate, Pearson's chi-square test and Cramér's V were specified for categorical variables, with statistical significance interpreted at $p < 0.05$.

Analytical Reliability

Coding decisions were guided by a written coding protocol containing category definitions and inclusion rules. Ambiguous units were reconsidered through comparison with dictionary explanations and cultural context. Particular attention was given to avoiding direct cultural stereotyping: concepts such as individualism, collectivism, gender role, social status, and community orientation were attributed to specific proverbial patterns in the corpus rather than generalized automatically to all speakers of English or Uzbek.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis was based on 640 paremiological units, comprising 320 English and 320 Uzbek items. Because the corpus was intentionally stratified into eight social-identity categories with 40 units per category in each language, the equal numerical representation of the categories was a feature of sampling rather than an empirical result. Accordingly, the comparison concentrated on the internal semantic organization of each category: axiological orientation, identity orientation, dominant semantic mechanisms, and degree of cross-linguistic equivalence.

1. Family and Kinship Identity

The family and kinship category revealed a strongly relational orientation in both linguistic traditions. Proverbs referring to parents, children, spouses, siblings, and other relatives typically conceptualized identity through reciprocal obligations rather than isolated personal characteristics. In the Uzbek material, this relational dimension was particularly associated with intergenerational continuity, parental authority, filial responsibility, family solidarity, and the transmission of behavioural models. English paremias also attached considerable importance to family relations but comparatively often combined the relational dimension with personal responsibility, inherited behaviour, individual choice, and the practical consequences of family conduct.

Positive evaluations were mainly connected with family loyalty, appropriate upbringing, responsibility, unity, and mutual support, whereas negative evaluations concerned conflict, neglect of obligation, problematic inheritance of behaviour, and inadequate upbringing. Metaphor and analogy were especially productive, with images such as trees and fruit, roots and branches, houses, blood, and other concrete objects serving as conceptual models of kinship. Cross-linguistic comparison showed that family-related paremias frequently displayed partial rather than complete equivalence because similar principles were verbalized through different culturally conventional images.

2. Age and Generational Identity

Age and generational identity was constructed through oppositions such as young–old, experience–inexperience, learning–knowing, and seniority–youthfulness. Both English and Uzbek paremias frequently associated age with accumulated knowledge and experience, but chronological age itself was not uniformly represented as sufficient evidence of wisdom. The Uzbek material showed a stronger tendency toward a relational and collective interpretation of generational identity, particularly in representations of respect for elders, transmission of experience, and continuity between generations. English proverbs comparatively often emphasized the practical consequences of experience, learning over time, and personal adaptation.

Positive meanings were associated with wisdom, experience, respect, learning, and successful transmission of knowledge, while negative meanings were connected with immaturity, failure to learn, stubbornness, and disregard for experience. Contrastive constructions constituted an important semantic mechanism, enabling proverbial discourse to formulate generalized evaluations of the individual's position in the life cycle.

3. Gender and Social-Role Identity

The gender category demonstrated that paremiological representations of men and women are closely connected with historically established social roles. Both corpora contained constructions referring to marriage, parenthood, household responsibilities, personal qualities, and expectations attached to male and female behaviour. A unit was assigned to this category only when gender constituted an essential component of its social meaning rather than a grammatically incidental reference.

Uzbek data tended to link gender identity more closely with family position and relational responsibility, including motherhood, fatherhood, marital behaviour, and household relations. English paremias likewise represented gender through family and marriage, but evaluation was comparatively more often linked to individual character, judgement, and behaviour. This category also contained many cautionary evaluations, reflecting the traditional normative function of proverbial discourse. Such units should be interpreted as evidence of historically transmitted cultural models rather than as direct descriptions of contemporary speakers.

4. Occupational and Labour Identity

The labour category displayed one of the clearest positive axiological patterns in both languages. Diligence, craftsmanship, competence, persistence, productive effort, and practical skill were consistently presented as socially desirable qualities, whereas laziness, avoidance of work, and incompetence were predominantly evaluated negatively. The two corpora thus share a basic conceptual foundation in which work contributes to the social evaluation of the individual.

English labour-related proverbs comparatively often emphasized individual agency, effort, practical action, responsibility for consequences, and achievement. Uzbek paremias also strongly valued personal diligence, but labour was comparatively more often embedded in a wider relational context involving cooperation, collective benefit, Filologiya

livelihood, family responsibility, and social usefulness. Cause-and-effect constructions were especially productive, linking labour with reward, effort with outcome, and laziness with deprivation. Functional correspondence was relatively strong in this category, although literal equivalence was less common than culturally adapted functional parallels.

5. Socio-Economic and Status Identity

The socio-economic category produced a more complex axiological profile. Material prosperity could signify success, security, independence, or influence, but wealth could also be associated with arrogance, instability, excessive attachment to possessions, or unreliable social relations. Poverty was commonly associated with hardship and dependence, yet low economic status did not automatically imply negative moral identity. This distinction demonstrates an important separation between economic identity and moral identity.

English paremias comparatively frequently connected economic position with individual independence, prudence, possession, and personal decision-making. Uzbek units more often represented economic status within networks of social relationships, mutual assistance, generosity, hospitality, dependence, and communal judgement. Metaphorical and metonymic mechanisms were particularly frequent: money, bread, clothing, house, possessions, and food often functioned as signs of wider social status and prestige.

6. Moral and Reputational Identity

Moral and reputational identity represented one of the most evaluatively explicit dimensions of the corpus. Proverbs concerning honesty, wisdom, courage, modesty, greed, deception, shame, honour, pride, and trustworthiness directly evaluated the individual's socially recognized character. In both languages, positive models were associated with honesty, wisdom, reliability, generosity, restraint, courage, and appropriate conduct, while negative models included deception, foolishness, greed, arrogance, cowardice, and betrayal.

A relevant difference emerged in the relationship between internal moral character and external social reputation. English units comparatively often focused on the consequences of behaviour and the consistency between action and character. Uzbek paremias showed a particularly strong link between personal morality and evaluation by family or community. Metaphor, opposition, and evaluative generalization were highly productive, with concepts such as tongue, face, name, heart, and word functioning as signs of social and moral identity.

7. Interpersonal and Relational Identity

The interpersonal category was dominated by relational orientation in both English and Uzbek. Friendship, trust, loyalty, betrayal, neighbour relations, cooperation, conflict, reciprocity, and mutual assistance constituted the main semantic fields. Identity in these paremias emerges through interaction: a person is evaluated according to the way he or she treats friends, neighbours, allies, adversaries, and other members of the immediate social environment.

Positive orientation was associated with loyalty, trust, genuine friendship, mutual assistance, reciprocity, and reliability, while negative evaluation concerned betrayal, false friendship, conflict, opportunism, and failure to reciprocate. Uzbek material placed particularly strong emphasis on neighbourhood, mutual assistance, solidarity, and practical interdependence. English proverbs also valued reliable relationships, although they comparatively often foregrounded the testing of friendship through experience and the individual's judgement in selecting or evaluating associates.

8. Individual-Community Identity

The individual-community category produced the clearest conceptual contrast between the two corpora. English units more frequently conceptualized the person through self-reliance, individual decision-making, personal accountability, independence, and responsibility for one's own actions. Uzbek paremias, while also recognizing individual ability and responsibility, more prominently represented the individual as a member of a collective network based on solidarity, mutual dependence, neighbourhood, social cooperation, common interests, and responsibility toward others.

This difference should not be simplified into an absolute opposition between an "individualistic" English culture and a "collectivistic" Uzbek culture. Both orientations occur in both corpora. The finding concerns relative differences in dominant proverbial framing within this specific social domain. Contrastive and metaphorical mechanisms played an especially important role, with images of unity and separation, one and many, parts and wholes, strength and weakness, belonging and isolation conceptualizing the relationship between person and group.

Comparative Axiological Patterns

Across the eight categories, positive and negative evaluation did not operate uniformly. The strongest positive orientation was associated with productive labour and competence, family responsibility, loyalty and interpersonal support, wisdom and experience, and moral reliability. More complex or ambivalent evaluation appeared in socio-economic status, gender-related traditional roles, authority and hierarchy, and the relationship between individual independence and collective obligation. This demonstrates that paremiological identity is not constructed through simple praise or criticism: the same characteristic may receive different evaluations depending on its social consequences.

The axiological layer is therefore central to social-identity construction. Proverbs do not merely identify social roles; they indicate how an individual occupying those roles is expected to behave.

Identity Orientation

Individual orientation was comparatively salient in English units related to labour, socio-economic behaviour, moral responsibility, and individual-community relations. Relational orientation was prominent in both languages in

family and interpersonal categories, confirming that several dimensions of identity cannot be adequately explained through a simple individualism–collectivism dichotomy. Collective orientation was comparatively more salient in Uzbek units concerning community membership, generational relations, family solidarity, mutual assistance, and socially shared responsibility.

The corpus therefore supports a domain-sensitive interpretation: social domain → culturally preferred relationship model → proverbial evaluation → social-identity construction.

Semantic Mechanisms of Social-Identity Construction

Social identity was frequently represented indirectly through metaphor, metonymy, contrast and antithesis, cause-and-effect organization, analogy, and evaluative generalization. Concrete images involving objects, animals, plants, body parts, food, houses, roads, and natural processes were used to conceptualize character, social status, relationships, and communal behaviour. Binary oppositions such as wise–foolish, rich–poor, old–young, friend–enemy, diligent–lazy, and one–many established evaluative boundaries between alternative identity models.

The principal cross-cultural difference was often not the presence of a semantic mechanism but the source images selected to realize it. Uzbek proverbial imagery frequently draws on kinship, neighbourhood, household life, traditional labour, food, animals, and community relations, while English proverbial imagery uses its own historically conventional domestic, occupational, material, and social symbols. The data therefore require a distinction between semantic universality and figurative specificity.

Cross-Linguistic Equivalence

Four principal types of cross-linguistic relationships were distinguished: full functional-semantic equivalence, partial equivalence, functional-cultural analogy, and culture-specific or zero equivalence. Full equivalence referred to closely corresponding general meaning, pragmatic function, and social evaluation. Partial equivalence described similar messages expressed through different imagery or lexical organization. Functional-cultural analogy referred to substantially different literal structures that performed comparable social functions, whereas zero equivalence was assigned when no sufficiently close counterpart was identified in the compared sample.

Partial equivalence and functional-cultural analogy were particularly important because a search for word-for-word correspondence would conceal much of the linguocultural information encoded in proverbial imagery. Two paremias may condemn unreliable friendship or praise diligence through entirely different objects and social situations while performing a comparable social-identity function.

Overall Discussion

Taken together, the eight-category analysis shows that the social identity of an individual in English and Uzbek paremiology is multidimensional rather than monolithic. The strongest cross-linguistic similarities concern the general evaluation of diligence, honesty, wisdom, loyalty, responsibility, reliable friendship, and appropriate family behaviour. Greater differences are found in the cultural framing of individual autonomy, community obligation, intergenerational hierarchy, social reputation, gendered expectations, and material status.

English proverbial discourse comparatively often constructs social identity through the relationship individual action → consequence → responsibility → social evaluation. Uzbek proverbial discourse comparatively often foregrounds social relationship → obligation → collective or interpersonal consequence → social evaluation. These are dominant tendencies within the analysed paremiological material rather than rigid properties of entire cultures.

The findings are consistent with Mieder's understanding of proverbs as carriers of collectively transmitted experience [2] and with Norrick's emphasis on the interaction between semantic meaning and figurative structure [3]. From the perspective of social identity theory [1], proverbial discourse can be understood as a linguistic mechanism through which culturally recognizable social categories, behavioural expectations, and evaluative boundaries are maintained.

CONCLUSION

The comparative study of English and Uzbek paremiological units demonstrates that the social identity of the individual is represented as a multidimensional linguistic and cultural phenomenon. Proverbs in both languages function not only as concise expressions of collective experience but also as mechanisms through which socially accepted models of behaviour, interpersonal relations, moral evaluation, responsibility, status, and belonging are transmitted. The analysis of family and kinship, age and generation, gender and social roles, labour and occupation, socio-economic status, moral reputation, interpersonal relations, and individual–community relations confirms that social identity in paremiology is constructed through the interaction of personal qualities, social roles, cultural expectations, and evaluative norms.

The findings indicate substantial similarities between the English and Uzbek paremiological traditions at the level of fundamental social values. Both systems positively evaluate diligence, honesty, wisdom, loyalty, responsibility, reliable friendship, family commitment, and socially appropriate behaviour. Laziness, dishonesty, betrayal, irresponsibility, arrogance, and other forms of socially disruptive conduct are predominantly represented negatively. These similarities suggest that a considerable part of proverbial social experience is based on universal patterns of human interaction.

At the same time, the comparative analysis reveals differences in the cultural framing of these shared values. English paremiological units comparatively often foreground individual agency, personal responsibility, practical judgement, independence, and the consequences of one's own actions. Uzbek paremias more frequently construct the individual within a network of family, kinship, neighbourhood, generational, and communal relationships and therefore give greater prominence to reciprocity, solidarity, respect, social responsibility, and interpersonal obligations. These

tendencies should not be interpreted as an absolute opposition between individualistic English culture and collectivistic Uzbek culture; their relative prominence depends on the particular social domain represented.

The analysis also shows that social identity is rarely expressed through direct description alone. Metaphor, metonymy, antithesis, analogy, cause-and-effect relations, and evaluative generalization serve as important linguistic mechanisms for conceptualizing the individual's position in society. Similar social meanings can therefore be verbalized through different culturally conventional images. This explains why complete lexical equivalence is less significant than functional-semantic correspondence and why partial equivalence and functional-cultural analogy are central to cross-linguistic interpretation.

A particularly important conclusion is that the cultural specificity of a proverb is manifested not necessarily in the social value itself but in the way that value is linguistically conceptualized and evaluated. Family loyalty, friendship, work, honesty, experience, and social responsibility may be important in both cultures, while the figurative model, pragmatic emphasis, and relationship between the individual and the surrounding community differ. The eight-category model used in this study therefore provides a systematic framework for analysing the social identity of the individual in paremiological discourse.

Overall, English and Uzbek proverbs constitute an important linguistic source for examining the relationship between language, culture, and social identity. The comparative approach adopted in the study contributes to English–Uzbek paremiology, linguoculturology, social semantics, and cross-cultural studies by offering a differentiated model for interpreting the linguistic construction of the individual as a social subject. Further research may extend this framework through larger digital proverb corpora, diachronic analysis, contemporary transformations of traditional paremias, and reception studies involving speakers from different age and social groups.

REFERENCES

1. Tajfel H., Turner J. C. An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Conflict // *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* / eds. W. G. Austin, S. Worchel. – Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1979. – P. 33–47. – [Source](#)
2. Mieder W. *Proverbs: A Handbook*. – Westport, CT: Greenwood Press, 2004. – 304 p. – [Source](#)
3. Norrick N. R. *How Proverbs Mean: Semantic Studies in English Proverbs*. – Berlin; New York; Amsterdam: Mouton, 1985. – 213 p. – DOI: [10.1515/9783110881974](#)
4. Honeck R. P. *A Proverb in Mind: The Cognitive Science of Proverbial Wit and Wisdom*. – Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1997. – [Source](#)
5. Mirzayev T., Musoqulov A., Sarimsoqov B. *O'zbek xalq maqollari*. – Toshkent: Sharq, 2005. – 512 b. – [Manba](#)
6. Shomaqsudov Sh., Shorahmedov Sh. *Hikmatnoma: O'zbek maqollarining izohli lug'ati*. – Toshkent: O'zbek Sovet Ensiklopediyasi Bosh redaksiyasi, 1990. – 523 b. – [Manba](#)
7. Qobilova N. S., Atoeva Sh. A. National Culture in English and Uzbek Folk Proverbs // *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics*. – 2023. – Vol. 2, No. 4. – P. 189–196. – DOI: [10.51699/ijllal.v2i4.1549](#)
8. Sharobidinovna Z. T., Kabilovna N. O., Usmanova Z. A. Comparative Analysis of Lingvocultural Aspects of Proverbs and Sayings About Parents and Problems of Lingvodidactics (Based on Materials of Uzbek and English Languages) // *International Journal on Integrated Education*. – 2021. – Vol. 4, No. 3. – P. 278–280. – DOI: [10.31149/ijie.v4i3.1424](#)
9. Rajapova G. B. A Linguistic, Structural, and Cultural Comparative Study of English and Uzbek Paremiological Units in the Development of Students' Lexical Competence // *Oriental Journal of Philology*. – 2026. – Vol. 6, No. 3. – P. 347–360. – DOI: [10.37547/supsci-ojp-06-03-39](#)
10. Qurbonbayeva S. M. A Comparative Study of Uzbek and English Proverbs as Linguoculturemes // *World of Philology*. – 2026. – Vol. 5, No. 5. – P. 408–411. – DOI: [10.70728/phil.v05.i05.064](#)
11. Babaeva N. A. A Comparative Linguocultural Study of English and Uzbek Proverbs // *Journal of Pedagogical Inventions and Practices*. – 2026. – Vol. 53. – P. 1–3. – DOI: [10.62480/jpip.2026.vol53.pp1-3](#)
12. Speake J. (ed.). *The Oxford Dictionary of Proverbs*. – 6th ed. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. – [Source](#)