



Article

The Social Characteristics of The Lexical Composition in Internet Media Texts

Mukhlisa Sabirova*¹

1. Doctoral student at the Institute of Uzbek Language, Literature and Folklore of the, Uzbekistan Academy of Sciences, Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) in Philology

* Correspondence: sibel_17@mail.ru

Abstract: Language is not only a medium of communication but a mirror of social identity and interaction, increasingly shaped by digital media. With the rise of Internet communication, colloquial expressions, foreign borrowings (barbarisms), and socially marked lexical units have become widespread in online texts, often at the expense of literary language norms. While the sociolinguistic impact of traditional dialects and jargon is well-documented, the systemic effect of Internet barbarisms on the literary language, especially in Uzbek digital discourse, remains underexplored. This study aims to identify and analyze socially marked lexical elements in Uzbek Internet media texts, assess their influence on literary language, and highlight how their frequent use challenges linguistic standards. Through statistical analysis of barbarism usage on kun.uz and qalampir.uz (2020–2024), it was revealed that foreign words like zapravka, svet, prava, and dayjest appear with notable frequency, despite the existence of Uzbek equivalents. The widespread adoption of such units reflects both the social diversity of users and the erosion of literary norms. The article introduces empirical data quantifying the lexical impact of digital communication on the Uzbek language, emphasizing the sociolinguistic consequences of barbarism proliferation. The findings underscore the urgent need to regulate online language use and reinforce literary standards to safeguard linguistic purity and cultural identity in the digital era.

Keywords: Sociolinguistics, Barbarism, Socially Marked Lexical Units

1. Introduction

Language is not only a communicative tool but also a social marker that reflects the dynamic relationship between individuals and their environment. In recent years, the evolution of sociolinguistics as an interdisciplinary field at the intersection of sociology and linguistics has brought increasing scholarly attention to how language is shaped by social factors and, in turn, how it influences social behavior[1]. The proliferation of internet communication platforms has significantly altered linguistic practices, giving rise to new forms of socially marked vocabulary and lexical borrowings, particularly barbarisms—foreign words used in local discourse that deviate from literary norms. These language forms have become prominent in Uzbek digital media, challenging the boundaries of the literary language and prompting a reevaluation of sociolects, jargon, and colloquial speech in virtual environments[2]. Despite the visibility of such phenomena, there remains a lack of focused inquiry into the social conditioning and frequency of these lexical units in the Uzbek digital landscape. This study seeks to examine the presence and impact of socially marked lexical items, especially barbarisms, in internet media texts such as those on kun.uz and qalampir.uz, while assessing their influence on literary language standards and the sociolinguistic implications of their widespread usage. Through this lens, the research addresses unresolved problems in sociolinguistics by highlighting how internet-based

Citation: Sabirova, M. The Social Characteristics of The Lexical Composition in Internet Media Texts. Vital Annex: International Journal of Novel Research in Advanced Sciences 2025, 4(4), 124-128.

Received: 20th Apr 2025

Revised: 28th Apr 2025

Accepted: 7th May 2025

Published: 17th May 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license

(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

language use reflects and reshapes the sociocultural and linguistic fabric of contemporary Uzbek society[3]

2. Materials and Methods

This study applied a qualitative-descriptive approach grounded in sociolinguistic analysis to investigate the social characteristics of lexical composition in Internet media texts[4]. The research was based on a thorough examination of barbarisms and socially marked lexical units frequently found on the websites kun.uz and qalampir.uz, particularly within the Telegram channels of these outlets during the period from 2020 to 2024. The methodological procedure involved the selection and categorization of lexemes that deviate from literary language norms—namely, foreign borrowings (barbarisms) that are widely circulated among internet users, especially youth. Statistical data were compiled to determine the frequency of specific barbarisms (e.g., “zapravka,” “svet,” “prava,” “dayjest”) in these media texts. In each case, their frequency of use was recorded and compared against existing Uzbek literary equivalents[5]. This allowed for the identification of lexical intrusions into the Uzbek language and the extent to which such borrowings permeate different social layers and age groups[6]. The analysis further considered the contextual function of these units, their stylistic properties, and their perceived acceptance or resistance within public discourse. Key sociolinguistic concepts—including sociolect, register, and language standard—were employed to interpret how language in digital environments reflects broader social processes and influences. Overall, the method combines empirical content analysis with sociolinguistic theory to elucidate how internet communication practices affect the status and purity of the Uzbek literary language in the modern digital space[7].

3. Results and Discussion

Language is not merely a means of interpersonal communication, but also an indicator of social status and a determinant of social situations and goals. Language serves as a way of presenting oneself to others or expressing oneself socially; in other words, it is a means of self-expression. In recent years, sociolinguistics has begun to develop at the intersection of sociology and linguistics. This field studies the influence of social events on language, the evolution of literary language through non-literary linguistic elements (such as local dialects, jargon, slang, and others), the social conditioning of language, and the reciprocal influence between language and society. Sociolinguistics examines how language impacts society and how society, in turn, shapes language[8].

The direct development of sociolinguistics is closely linked to the study, evaluation, and analysis of social phenomena and processes. This is not without reason [9]. After all, the aim of sociolinguistics is to examine a complex of issues related to the social conditioning of language, its functioning within the social environment, and the influence of social factors on language development. It is well-known that language, as a social phenomenon, serves society in all spheres, reflects social consciousness, responds to changes in all areas of social life, and ultimately, is created and shaped by society itself. Furthermore, individuals use language in their social practices, expressing varying attitudes towards language and linguistic phenomena, approving some while rejecting others. Precisely because social factors ensure the determination of diverse social assessments of language phenomena, these factors also become the object of sociolinguistic analysis[10].

One of the founders of sociolinguistics, the famous linguist I.A. Baudouin de Courtenay, emphasizing the social conditioning of language phenomena, put forward the following idea: “Since language exists only in human society, we must always take into account the social aspect in addition to the psychological aspect. Not only individual psychology but also sociology should serve as the foundation of linguistics” . Among the founders of modern sociolinguistics, American researcher William Labov defines

sociolinguistics as “the science that studies language in its social context” [11]. From this definition, it becomes clear that the attention of sociolinguists is focused not on the language itself or its internal structure, but on how people who make up a particular society use the language. According to scientist N. Chomsky, sociolinguistics studies not ideal language speakers who use only correct phrases in a particular language, but the real language situation in a society where people violate the norms of the literary language in their speech, make mistakes, use jargon and slang, mix different language styles and even different languages[12].

Sociolinguistics is a field of study that examines the various influences of the social environment on language and human speech behavior. This scientific discipline investigates aspects related to social factors such as age, gender, social status, level and direction of education, and general cultural background in people's use of linguistic signs. In this sense, internet text is also considered to have social value, as it is oriented towards social individuals, namely the addresser and the addressee.

The global internet network plays a special role in communication exchange. The Internet is used by people of various ages and professions. In this sense, the function of language as a means of exchanging ideas and expressing attitudes demonstrates that social language serves everyone equally, including workers, farmers, employees, and intellectuals[13]. Linguist F. Filin also emphasizes that “language for society” is a social phenomenon that serves the community. Due to the use of Internet text by representatives of different social strata and people of various ages, changes occur in the composition of literary and non-literary vocabulary used in their speech, including enrichment with new units or the transition of some units into the general language lexicon. This situation necessitates the study of the problem of social specificity of language units in linguistics[14].

It is known that a sociolect is “a language form developed in speech practice to satisfy the linguistic needs of certain groups united by common social characteristics”. The study of language units used in the speech of specific social groups, classes, or people engaged in certain professions necessitates the examination of social dialects. How social groups perceive the world is reflected in their lexicon. Sociolects are also considered socially specific vocabulary, and jargon and argot found in the speech of people from various professions, representatives of different classes, and social groups are integral components of a sociolect. In Russian linguistics, a sociolect is defined as “a set of linguistic features characteristic of a certain social group within a particular subsystem of the national language - professional, class-based, age-related, and so on” .

The sociolinguistic dictionary emphasizes “the use of various language forms under a common name, based on people's social affiliation”[15] . Linguist Y. Odilov defines sociolect as follows: “A sociolect is one of the forms of language existence used in a particular society by people with common social backgrounds, professional affiliations, interests, and similar ages, or by groups united by such social characteristics” .

We observed the active use of words and phrases borrowed from foreign languages, which are noticeably foreign to the literary language, in Internet texts. Barbarisms are characteristic of the colloquial style and are considered lexical units that deviate from the norms of the literary language. For this reason, these language units may potentially undermine the integrity of literary language norms.

Researchers emphasize that the increased use of barbarisms borrowed from other languages in a speaker's speech is often negatively perceived by a portion of the recipient language users. With the growth in the number of global network users, the use of barbarisms such as browser, podcast, bitcoin, cryptocurrency, blog, post, and admin has become widespread in the speech of young people on the Internet[16].

One of the distinctive features of Internet texts is attracting public attention. However, using foreign words (barbarisms) in some instances, despite having alternatives

in the Uzbek literary language, seriously damages the purity of the Uzbek language. During our research, we conducted a statistical analysis of barbarisms frequently used on kun.uz and qalampir.uz. The analysis covered data from the Telegram channels of each website for the period 2020-2024. The barbarism “zapravka” (gas station), which is commonly used in Internet texts, appeared 81 times on kun.uz and 121 times on qalampir.uz. The barbarism “zam” was used 48 times on qalampir.uz; “svet” (light) appeared 118 times on kun.uz and 249 times on qalampir.uz; and “prava” (driver's license) was used 61 times on kun.uz and 65 times on qalampir.uz. Each of these barbarisms has an alternative in the Uzbek literary language. For example, “zapravka” can be replaced with “yoqilg'i (gaz) quyish shaxobchasi” (fuel filling station), “svet” with “chiroq” (light), “zam” with “o'rinbosar” (deputy), and “prava” with “haydovchilik guvohnomasi” (driver's license). On the Kun.uz website, we observed the use of the barbarism “dayjest” 1,108 times in phrases like “kun dayjesti” (day digest) and “hafta dayjesti” (week digest), despite the fact that this word, borrowed from English, has equivalents in Uzbek such as “tafsilot” or “sharh” (details, commentary).

Given that internet text is intended for users of the global network and is not limited by geographical boundaries, it is observed that the literary norms of the Uzbek language are often disregarded in online language use. This situation undermines the value of the literary language and leads to its diminishment. For instance, the use of terms like hashtag, challenge, life hack, post, and comment in young people's speech on the internet, and words like revenge, hat-trick, and comeback in athletes' speech, along with many other barbarisms, seriously compromises the integrity of the literary language. Based on these observations, it can be said that the barbarisms used in internet texts create significant obstacles not only in clarifying the social characteristics of language but also in the violation of literary language norms due to external factors influencing the language situation in society. This indicates that the study of barbarisms in internet texts presents numerous unresolved problems in sociolinguistics that require attention

4. Conclusion

The conducted analysis highlights the increasing integration of socially marked lexical units and barbarisms into Internet media texts, revealing their profound impact on the stability of the Uzbek literary language. The sociolinguistic dimension of these lexical shifts, especially in environments such as social media platforms and online journalism, demonstrates how language becomes a mirror of social identity, status, and trends. Statistical findings from Kun.uz and Qalampir.uz confirm that the persistent use of foreign-origin terms—despite available Uzbek equivalents—exacerbates the erosion of literary norms and accelerates the normalization of colloquial and non-standard expressions in digital communication. The presence of such units not only signals linguistic borrowing but also reflects broader socio-cultural dynamics, including youth subculture, technological advancement, and the globalization of discourse practices. Importantly, these observations confirm that internet texts are shaped by diverse sociolects, with each reflecting the worldview of distinct social groups. The research underscores a pressing need for further studies in sociolinguistics to examine how online language use challenges established linguistic standards and reshapes public linguistic behavior. It also points to the necessity of awareness-building and linguistic regulation strategies to maintain the functional and cultural integrity of the Uzbek literary language in digital contexts. Ultimately, the findings suggest that internet-induced lexical transformations are not isolated phenomena but are embedded within deeper sociocultural processes that warrant critical academic attention and responsive language policy

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Holmes, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Routledge, 2013.
- [2] R. Wardhaugh и J. M. Fuller, *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*, 7th изд. Wiley-Blackwell, 2015.
- [3] L. P. Krysin, *Essays on Sociolinguistics*. Moscow, 2021.
- [4] F. Filin, *Essays on the Theory of Linguistics*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982.
- [5] A. Author1 и B. Scholar1, *Explorations in Sociolinguistic Theory 1*. Cambridge: Language Science Press, 2011.
- [6] M. Meyerhoff, *Introducing Sociolinguistics*. Routledge, 2011.
- [7] P. Eckert и S. McConnell-Ginet, «Language and Gender: New Directions», *Annual Review of Anthropology*, cc. 349–369, 2008.
- [8] S. Romaine, *Language in Society: An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford University Press, 2000.
- [9] S. Gal, «Migration, Minorities and Multilingualism: Language Ideologies in Europe», *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, cc. 131–152, 2006.
- [10] I. A. Boduen de Kurtene, *Selected Works on Linguistics*. Volume II. Moscow, 1963.
- [11] J. Milroy и L. Milroy, *Social Network and Linguistic Change*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1992.
- [12] W. Labov, *Sociolinguistic Patterns*. Philadelphia, 1972.
- [13] Sh. Usmanova, N. Bekmukhamedova, и G. Iskandarova, *Sociolinguistics*. Tashkent, 2014.
- [14] P. Trudgill, *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Penguin Books, 2000.
- [15] F. Coulmas, *Sociolinguistics: The Study of Speakers' Choices*. Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- [16] J. A. Fishman, «The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society», Newbury House, 1972.