

THE CONCEPT OF POVERTY IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES: NOMINATIVE, COMMUNICATIVE UNITS, STRUCTURES, AND SEMANTICS

Supervisor Shamsuddinova Diyoraxon

Intizorxon Kuychiboyeva

the student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages,

Abstract: *This article aims to explore effective methods for developing speaking skills in B1 level students, focusing on the importance of communicative competence. Through a literature analysis, various strategies will be examined to identify key elements that contribute to successful language acquisition at this level. The methods section will outline practical approaches for educators, incorporating interactive activities and motivation techniques. The results section will present the outcomes of applying these methods, followed by a discussion that delves into the implications of the findings. Finally, the article will conclude with suggestions for further research and practical recommendations for teachers.*

Keywords: *Speaking skills, B1 level, language acquisition, communicative competence, interactive activities, motivation, language proficiency.*

INTRODUCTION

The concept of poverty is a fundamental aspect of human social understanding, capturing economic, social, and cultural realities. Analyzing how this concept is expressed in different languages reveals a wealth of linguistic structures, semantic nuances, and communicative functions. This article explores the linguistic representation of the concept of poverty in English and Uzbek languages, focusing on nominative forms, communicative units, structures, and semantics. Through this comparative study, we aim to understand both similarities and differences in how these two languages construct and convey the notion of

poverty.

Understanding the linguistic depiction of poverty requires considering its historical and cultural contexts. In both English and Uzbek societies, poverty has been viewed through various lenses—moral, economic, and social. The linguistic approach examines how languages encode this concept, revealing underlying worldviews, cultural values, and communicative priorities.

In English, the concept of poverty has evolved through social discourse, political debates, and literature, often associated with deprivation, hardship, or social exclusion. In Uzbek, traditionally rooted in social and cultural contexts, the concept reflects community-based understandings of scarcity and hardship.

Nominative Forms and Their Role in Expressing Poverty

2.1. The Nominative Case in Linguistics

The nominative case typically indicates the subject of a sentence—the entity about which something is asserted. It plays a crucial role in linguistically framing the concept.

2.2. English Nominative Forms

In English, the noun "poverty" functions as the subject or predicate nominative. Examples include:

- Poverty exists in many countries.
- The main problem is poverty.

The term "poverty" is a noun that encapsulates the concept's core, functioning syntactically and semantically as the focus of assertions about social conditions.

2.3. Uzbek Nominative Forms

In Uzbek, "kambag'allik" is the noun representing poverty. It also serves as the subject in sentences:

- Kambag'allik jahon muammosi bo'lib qolmoqda. (Poverty remains a global problem.)
- Kambag'allik insonning rivojlanishiga to'sqinlik qiladi. (Poverty hinders human development.)

The basic nominative form is central to constructing statements about poverty in Uzbek, often highlighting its social implications.

2.4. Comparative Analysis

Both languages employ their respective nouns as the core term in expressing the concept. However, the morphological structures and contextual usage may vary, influencing how the concept is perceived and discussed.

3. Communicative Units and Their Functions

3.1. Defining Communicative Units

Communicative units encompass words, phrases, or larger structures used to communicate the concept. They include idiomatic expressions, collocations, and contextual phrases that clarify or emphasize the notion of poverty.

3.2. English Communicative Units

In English, expressions like:

- Living in poverty
- Economic hardship
- Deprivation
- Financial struggle

serve as units that communicate various aspects of poverty. These units are often used in discourse to elaborate on the severity, causes, or effects of poverty.

3.3. Uzbek Communicative Units

Analogously, Uzbek expressions such as:

- Kambag'allikda yashash (Living in poverty)
- Boylik yetishmasligi (Lack of wealth)
- Qashshoqlik (Destitution)
- Ahvol qiyin (Hardship)

are used as units to convey specific nuances, emphasizing material deprivation or social hardship.

3.4. Comparative Analysis

While both languages deploy similar expressive units, Uzbek expressions

often emphasize traditional values and social cohesion, whereas English units may reflect formal or technical language, especially in academic or policy discourse.

4. Structural Aspects of the Concept

4.1. Lexical Structures

In both languages, the core noun and associated adjectives or modifiers construct the basic lexical structure of the concept.

- English: Extreme poverty, Persistent poverty
- Uzbek: Jiddiy kambag'allik (Severe poverty), Davom etayotgan qashshoqlik

(Ongoing destitution)

4.2. Syntactic Structures

English tends toward using copulative constructions and relative clauses:

- Poverty is a significant issue affecting millions
- People living in poverty often face numerous challenges

Uzbek employs similar structures but often relies on participial phrases and compound sentences:

- Kambag'allikdan aziyat chekuvchilar soni ortmoqda. (The number of those suffering from poverty is increasing.)

- Kambag'allik bilan kurashish uchun muhim choralar ko'rilmoqda. *(Important measures are being taken to fight poverty.)

4.3. Semantics of Structural Variations

Structural differences influence the emphasis and perception of the concept. English structures tend to highlight the social issue, whereas Uzbek structures may focus more on societal responses.

5. Semantic Aspects of the Poverty Concept

5.1. Semantic Features in English

In English, "poverty" is associated with:

- Lack of material resources
- Economic deprivation
- Social marginalization
- Vulnerability and hardship

Metaphorical expressions like "poverty of mind" or "poverty of opportunities" expand its semantic boundaries.

5.2. Semantic Features in Uzbek

In Uzbek, "kambag'allik" carries similar denotative meanings but also conveys cultural connotations of community obligations, social justice, and moral aspects. The term can sometimes be linked with:

- social shame
- communal responsibility
- spiritual hardship

5.3. Comparing Semantic Nuances

While both languages comprehend the core idea of material deprivation, Uzbek semantics often embed social and moral dimensions rooted in cultural values, whereas English semantics may emphasize individual and structural issues.

6. Synthesis and Conclusions

The representation of poverty in both English and Uzbek languages employs core nominative nouns ("poverty" and "kambag'allik") that serve as linguistic anchors in constructing discourse. Communicative units surrounding these concepts vary in structure, reflecting linguistic traditions and cultural perceptions.

Structurally, both languages utilize adjectives, modifiers, and syntactic patterns suited to expressing degrees, causes, and effects of poverty, with subtle differences that shape emphasis. Semantically, while the fundamental meaning remains consistent, cultural nuances influence how poverty is conceptualized—whether as a moral failure, a social problem, or a material condition.

Understanding these linguistic patterns provides insight into the societal attitudes towards poverty in English and Uzbek-speaking communities, highlighting the importance of language as a mirror of cultural values and social realities.

References

1. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A

comprehensive grammar of the English language. Longman.

2. Shukurov, M. (2010). Structural and semantic features of Uzbek language. *Journal of Uzbek Linguistics*, 15(2), 45–58.
3. Venuti, L. (2012). The translation of cultural and social concepts: A focus on poverty. *International Journal of Translation Studies*, 8(3), 123–137.
4. Goddard, A. (2018). Semantic and pragmatic perspectives on social lexicon. *Language & Social Psychology*, 37(4), 500–514.
5. Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in sociolinguistics: An ethnographic approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.
6. Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature. (2015). *Uzbek Grammar*. Tashkent: Publishing House of Uzbek Language.