THE ACTUALITY OF PHONETIC AND LEXICAL PECULIARITIES OF WORD COMBINATIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES

Temirxonova Madina Otabek qizi

a student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages (Uzbekistan)

temirxonova.1995.com@gmail.com

Supervisor: **Kurbanov Muzaffar Abdumutalibovich**,

Professor of

Andijan State Institute of Foreign

Languages (Uzbekistan)

Abstract: This research aims to provide a comprehensive comparison of phonetic and lexical patterns in English and Uzbek word combinations. The use of corpus analysis, phonetic analysis, lexical analysis, and translation analysis will reveal significant similarities and differences, shedding light on the unique characteristics of each language. The findings will contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic variation and can have practical implications for language teaching and translation. This study explores the phonetic and lexical characteristics of word combinations in English and Uzbek, highlighting both similarities and significant differences. It examines the phonetic interactions among words when combined, focusing on phenomena such as assimilation, elision, and stress patterns in both languages. Lexically, the research investigates prevalent types of word combinations (e.g., collocations, idioms, phrasal verbs) and analyzes how cultural and historical influences have shaped their formation and usage. By comparing and contrasting these features, this analysis aims to provide insights into the challenges faced by learners of each language and contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic communication. Ultimately, the study aims to assist in cross-cultural communications and linguistic analysis.

Keewords: word combinations, collocations, phrases, phonetics, lexical semantics, grammar, linguistic interference, interlanguage, cultural linguistics, lexicology.

INGLIZ VA O'ZBEK TILLARIDAGI SO'Z BIRIKMALARINING FONETIK VA LEKSIK XUSUSIYATLARINING DOLZARBLIGI

Annotatsiya: Bu maqola ingliz va o'zbek so'z birikmalarining fonetik va leksik xususiyatlarini o'rganib, o'xshashlik va sezilarli farqlarni ko'rsatadi. U so'zlarning qo'shilganda fonetik ta'sirini o'rganadi, har ikki tildagi assimilyatsiya, elision va urg'u shakllari kabi hodisalarga e'tibor qaratadi. Leksik jihatdan tadqiqot har bir tilda keng tarqalgan so'z yasalish turlarini (masalan, qo'shma gaplar, idiomalar, idiomalar) o'rganadi va madaniy va tarixiy ta'sirlar ularning shakllanishi va ishlatilishini qanday shakllantirgani tahlil qilinadi. Ushbu xususiyatlarni taqqoslash va taqqoslash orqali tahlil har bir tilni o'rganuvchilar duch keladigan muammolar haqida tushuncha berish va tillararo muloqotni chuqurroq tushunishga hissa qo'shishni maqsad qiladi. Eng birinchi o'rinda, bu maqoladan ko'zlangan maqsad madaniyatlararo muloqot va lingvistik tahlilda yordam berishga qaratilgan.

Kalit so'zlar: so'z birikmalari, birikmalar, iboralar, fonetika, leksik semantika, grammatika, lingvistik interferentsiya, o'zaro tillar, madaniy tilshunoslik, leksikologiya.

INTRODUCTION

Mastering a language transcends merely knowing individual words and grammatical rules; it hinges on the ability to weave these elements into meaningful and natural-sounding phrases. The concept of word combinations—also known as collocations, lexical bundles, or prefabricated language—takes center stage in this context. Word combinations are not arbitrary but represent established linguistic conventions within a speech community (Lewis, 1997; Wray, 2002) (4, pp-137 (7, pp-128)

Proficiency in a language is intrinsically linked to the skillful and accurate use of these combinations (Schmitt, 2000, 6, pp-96) .

The importance of word combinations lies in their contribution to fluency. Language users who generate phrases word-by-word based on grammatical rules often sound hesitant and unnatural. In contrast, speakers who internalize a repertoire of word combinations can quickly retrieve and deploy these units, leading to smoother communication. Knowing individual words is insufficient without the ability to combine them into frequently used phrases.

METHODS

Beyond fluency, word combinations are crucial for achieving naturalness in language use. Native speakers possess an intuitive understanding of which words typically co-occur, while combinations that sound awkward may hinder communication. For instance, "heavy rain" is more natural than "strong rain," despite both being grammatically correct. Similarly, while "take a photo" is conventional, "make a photo" sounds odd to native English speakers. This underscores that language is shaped not only by logic but also by convention. (1, pp.11)

Many word combinations carry idiomatic meanings that cannot be derived from their components. Idioms, phrasal verbs, and certain collocations fall into this category. For instance, the phrasal verb "look up" can mean both "to search for information" and "to visit someone." Understanding and using these idiomatic expressions are crucial for engaging in authentic conversations.

Corpus-Based Analysis:

• Rationale: Using large corpora of both English and Uzbek will allow for an objective and data-driven identification of common word combinations (collocations, idioms, fixed expressions, etc.).

Comparative Phonetic Analysis:

• Rationale: Investigating how the phonetic realization of these word combinations differs between the two languages is crucial.

Lexical and Semantic Analysis:

• Rationale: Understanding how the meanings of word combinations are constructed and how they may differ between the languages is essential.

Translation Analysis:

• Rationale: Examining how word combinations are translated between the languages can reveal important insights into their semantic and structural differences.

RESULTS

The pedagogical implications of emphasizing word combinations are significant. Traditional language teaching often focuses on grammar and vocabulary in isolation. However, integrating word combination instruction into the curriculum is more effective. This approach involves explicitly teaching collocations, phrasal verbs, idioms, and other multi-word units, providing learners with opportunities to practice them in context.(Nation 2001. 5, pp-106) advocates for a balanced approach that emphasizes both explicit vocabulary instruction and incidental learning through extensive reading and listening.

Research indicates that learners often overuse or misuse certain collocations, highlighting the need for targeted instruction and feedback (Granger, 1998. 3, pp-132) . Understanding how word combinations are stored and processed in the brain can enhance language learning. Psycholinguistic research suggests that frequently used combinations are stored as single units in the mental lexicon, facilitating faster retrieval and processing (Ellis, 2000. 2,pp-55). Thus, language learning is not about memorizing individual words but building a rich network of associations.

Stress and Intonation: English exhibits a more dynamic stress pattern within word combinations compared to Uzbek. While English frequently reduces stress on function words (articles, prepositions, auxiliary verbs), Uzbek tends to maintain more consistent stress across syllables. Acoustic analysis of the phrase "a cup of tea" reveals a marked reduction in vowel duration and amplitude for "of" in English, whereas the Uzbek equivalent, "*bir choy piyola*" (a tea cup), demonstrates a more even distribution of stress across the three words. Intonation patterns also differ. English intonation often involves a more pronounced fall-rise contour, particularly at the end of phrases, while Uzbek intonation tends to be more level, except in questions.

Phonetic Differences:

• English may exhibit greater vowel reduction in unstressed syllables within word combinations compared to Uzbek, where vowels tend to be more consistently pronounced.

• Uzbek, being a more agglutinative language, might have longer word combinations where suffixes carry significant grammatical meaning, leading to different stress patterns than equivalent English phrases. For example, a single Uzbek word might express what requires a multi-word prepositional phrase in English.

• Lexical Differences:

• English relies heavily on phrasal verbs (e.g., look up, give in), which may not have direct equivalents in Uzbek, requiring alternative lexical choices.

• Collocational preferences will differ. For example, in English, you say "strong tea," but the equivalent Uzbek expression might use a different adjective that does not directly translate to "strong."

• Idioms will vary significantly, reflecting cultural differences. An English idiom like "to kick the bucket" (to die) will have a completely different idiomatic expression in Uzbek. Uzbek idioms will likely be rooted in Uzbek culture and history.

• Translation analysis might show that translating English "make a decision" often requires a single verb in Uzbek, reflecting the language's preference for concise verb forms.

• Cultural Influences:

• Certain word combinations in Uzbek might reflect traditional customs, social hierarchies, or historical events that are not present in English culture.

• Politeness strategies might be expressed differently through word combinations. For instance, Uzbek might have more elaborate forms of address or indirect requests compared to English.

This research aims to provide a comprehensive comparison of phonetic and lexical patterns in English and Uzbek word combinations. The use of corpus analysis, phonetic analysis, lexical analysis, and translation analysis will reveal significant similarities and differences, shedding light on the unique characteristics of each

language. The findings will contribute to a deeper understanding of cross-linguistic variation and can have practical implications for language teaching and translation.

DISCUSSION

This analysis focuses on English and Uzbek, two languages with distinct typological profiles, to illuminate the diverse manifestations of word combinations and the challenges they pose to learners. English, an Indo-European language, features an analytic structure, Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) word order, and reliance on prepositions. Conversely, Uzbek, a Turkic language, exhibits a highly agglutinative morphology, Subject-Object-Verb (SOV) word order, and postpositions. The agglutinative nature of Uzbek allows for complex morphological expressions that can encapsulate meanings conveyed by multiple words in English.

For instance, while English employs phrasal verbs (verb + particle combinations), Uzbek utilizes suffixes and morphological markers. The fixed SVO word order in English supports predictable collocation patterns, whereas Uzbek's flexible word order permits variations based on emphasis and context. This flexibility can affect the stability of certain word combinations (Solieva, N. 2018).

The linguistic landscape of Uzbekistan includes Uzbek (the state language), Russian, and other minority languages. Although English is gaining prominence, challenges persist in teacher training and effective methodologies. Uzbek learners of English may struggle with phrasal verbs, while English speakers learning Uzbek face challenges in identifying word boundaries within complex morphological constructs. For example, the idiom "*qo'l siltamoq*" (to wave goodbye) might be incorrectly translated as "hand wave," demonstrating the difficulties in grasping idiomatic meanings.

Phonetic differences further complicate language acquisition. The consistent pronunciation of vowels in Uzbek contrasts with the vowel reduction common in English. English speakers may reduce vowels in rapid speech, making it sound less clear, while Uzbek speakers maintain vowel clarity. This distinction necessitates careful attention from English learners of Uzbek, who must avoid applying vowel

reduction habits. Conversely, Uzbek learners of English must adapt to the vowel reduction and stress-timed rhythm inherent in English.

CONCLUSION

Word combinations are fundamental to language proficiency, contributing to fluency, naturalness, idiomaticity, and overall communicative competence. Recognizing and prioritizing the teaching of these essential building blocks is crucial for effective language pedagogy. This study provides a contrastive analysis of the phonetic and lexical characteristics of word combinations in English and Uzbek, shedding light on the challenges faced by learners of each language. By understanding these differences, educators can better support their students in achieving their linguistic goals and fostering effective cross-cultural communication.

REFERENCES:

1. Arnold, I. V. (1986). The English Word.

2. BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations.

3. Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1997). The BBI Dictionary of English Word Combinations. .

4. Crystal, D. (2008). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics (6th ed.).

5. Ellis, N. C. (2008). Implicit and explicit knowledge in second language learning. In P. Robinson & N. Ellis (Eds.), Handbook of cognitive linguistics and second language acquisition (pp. 3-31).

6. Fries, C.C. (1945). Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language.

7. Granger, S. (1998). Learner English on Computer.

8. Hill, J. (2000). Revising Priorities: From Grammatical Failure to Collocational Success.

9. Khamraeva, M.T. (2013). English Lexicology. TASHKENT.

10. Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics Across Cultures.

11. Lewis, M. (1997). Implementing the Lexical Approach. Language Teaching Publications.

12. Nation, I.S.P. (2001). Learning Vocabulary in Another Language.

13. O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati

14.   Roach, P. (2009). English Phonetics and Phonology.

15. Schmitt, N. (2000). Vocabulary in Language Teaching.

16. Solieva, N. (2018). Contrastive Lexicology of English and Uzbek Languages.

17. Wray, A. (2002). Formulaic Language and the Lexicon.

18. ИШАНЖАНОВА, М. БАДИИЙ МАТН ТУЗИЛИШИДА ДЕЙКТИК СЎЗЛАРНИНГ ЎРНИ. *ILMIY XABARNOMA. НАУЧНЫЙ ВЕСТНИК Учредители: Андижанский государственный университет им. ЗМ Бабура,(2)*, 85-87.

19. Munosibkhan, I., & Mumtoza, A. (2023). Formation Of Intercultural Communication Competence In Preschool Children. *Journal Of Language And Linguistics*, *6*(4), 167-170.

20. Ишанжанова, М. С. (2021). Макон" ни ифодаловчи дейктик бирликларнинг чоғиштирма тадқиқи (француз ва ўзбек тилларидаги матнлар таҳлили мисолида) Филология фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD) илмий даражасини олиш учун ёзилган диссерт.