

UDC 81-26

https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/65/67

SCIENTIFIC APPROACHES TO THE STUDY OF YOUTH SOCIOLECT IN LINGUISTICS

©Akramova N., ORCID: 0000-0001-5972-524X, Fergana State University,
Fergana, Uzbekistan, naz1224@yandex.ru

НАУЧНЫЕ ПОДХОДЫ К ИЗУЧЕНИЮ МОЛОДЕЖНОГО СОЦИОЛЕКТА В ЛИНГВИСТИКЕ

©Акрамова Н. М., ORCID: 0000-0001-5972-524X, Ферганский
государственный университет, г. Фергана, Узбекистан, naz1224@yandex.ru

Abstract. Modern linguistics has close connections with interlingual and intercultural communication. In this regard, one of the main components of scientific research is youth sociolect. It is the study of youth language that helps to predict the future development of modern spoken language. Currently, there are relatively few scientific linguistic works and studies devoted to the issue of the use of modern youth slang. This fact is explained by the entrenched view of the vocabulary of youth sociolect as something minor and not worthy of a scientific description. The relevance of this article is due to the need for a fuller identification and comprehensive study of youth sociolect as a special subsystem of the language, which is characterized by a certain range of speakers and its own vocabulary.

Аннотация. Современное языкознание имеет тесные связи с межъязыковой и межкультурной коммуникацией. В этом плане одним из главных компонентов научных исследований является молодежный социолект. Именно изучение молодежного языка помогает прогнозировать будущее развитие современного разговорного языка. В настоящее время существует относительно немного научных лингвистических работ и исследований, посвященных вопросу употребления современного молодежного сленга. Объясняется этот факт укоренившимся взглядом на лексику молодежного социолекта как на нечто второстепенное и не заслуживающее научного описания. Актуальность данной статьи обусловлена необходимостью более полного выявления и всестороннего изучения молодежного социолекта как особой подсистемы языка, которая характеризуется определенным кругом носителей и собственным словарным составом.

Keywords: sociolinguistics research, youth slang, interjargon, speech activity, linguistic, social groups, concepts, expressive and nominative base.

Ключевые слова: социолингвистические исследования, молодежный сленг, интержаргон, речевая деятельность, социальные группы, концепции, экспрессивная и номинативная база.

Discussion

The anthropological and cognitive paradigms of scientific knowledge established in the second half of the 20th century have led to a new approach to the study of language. The shift of researchers' interest from studying language as a system to the language of speaking subjects

contributes to the fact that “uncodified spheres of ethnic languages are increasingly becoming the subject of research, focusing the attention of linguists on language phenomena not represented in prescriptive grammars and normative dictionaries” [1].

At the present time, the subject of sociolinguistics research is studying the process of language development both in its literary form and in separate functional and speech variants, such as colloquial speech, media language, professional terminology, territorial and social dialects.

The personality of a native speaker, his or her thinking, outlook, spiritual culture, and profession play a special role in the study of various forms of sociolect. In this regard, the study of youth language as an object of linguocultural research and analysis is the most promising.

In modern linguistics, youth sociolect is treated by various authors as “youth slang”, “interjargon”, although in situational aspect these concepts can be interpreted as different.

Modern linguists pay much attention to the problems of studying various forms of language existence, which have different degrees of stability and codification. Researchers study such forms of sociolect as computer jargon [2–4]; soldier jargon [5–6]; drug jargon [7–8]; jargon of advertising specialists [1]; thieves’ argot [9]; devalued language vocabulary [5]; historical forms of jargon [9].

Modern authors come to the conclusion that “sociolect, whatever you call it, jargon, slang or argot, is not a harmful parasitic outgrowth on the body of language, but ... At the same time, sociolect is “a kind of ‘raw material’ expressive and nominative base, from which the common language borrows lexemes” [1].

The peculiarity of the social status of young people lies in the fact that this age group is no longer children, but also not yet adults, which is expressed in their speech activity: a child’s speech evolves from touchingly meaningless babbling to meaningful communication — therefore errors and deviations from the norm in children’s speech are quite acceptable. Society is tolerant of “word creation” and innovations in the speech of the older generation — writers, political and public figures, whose new words and expressions gradually enter the norm of everyday speech.

At the same time, it should be noted that youth socio-linguistic is varied enough — this includes school jargon [10], student jargon [5], jargon of youth subcultures [1].

Modern authors conclude that the ability of the younger generation to create its own linguistic standard is not inferior to other age and social groups, since the variety of neologisms of the literary standard also occurs at the expense of the lexicon of youth sociolect [11].

Due to the rapid change and inconstancy of the lexical composition, there is a continuous renewal and replenishment of synonymic rows, which creates problems with the synchronous description of the youth sociolect [12]. “Peculiarities and uniqueness are known to be best revealed through comparison” writes Eva Neuland. — “The method of comparison seems to be the very means ... which allows us to move a little further” [3]. In our opinion, comparative analysis in the study of language allows us to discover specific and veiled features in it, as well as the dynamics of hidden language transformations. Consequently, the comparative method is the most effective in developing the problems of youth’s socio-linguistic language.

In this article we focus on a comprehensive study of youth vocabulary, because youth sociolect is gradually becoming more and more prestigious and fashionable phenomenon in modern life. The frequency of using its variations and elements is constantly increasing, both in everyday communication of different age groups of population, and at official, national level. V. M. Mokienko considers youth sociolect as a special subsystem of the national language, functioning in the process of communication of a certain age category of native speakers (youth), characterized by the predominance of reduced emotional and evaluative vocabulary and based on a common to all styles system of phonetic, grammatical, lexical means. This author believes that the sociolect of

youth serves as a kind of unifying link between non-normative linguistic phenomena and the literary form of language [13].

The main parameters of youth speech are age (schoolchildren, students, etc.), social affiliation (profession), territorial feature (city, village), gender criterion, as well as the degree of education of native speakers. Besides the specified parameters, social qualities (degree of socialization of a person, familiarization with material and spiritual life of society), psychological features (need for friends, aspiration for self-assertion), culturological features (creation of own sociocultural space, opposition of own culture to culture of adults) are not less important [10].

Youth sociolect is characterized by relaxedness, informality of communication and joking tone on the background of a high degree of emotionality; at the same time, young people strive for non-standard self-expression, which is inherent to modern youth [4, 8]. Constant striving of youth to demonstrate their belonging to definite subculture, desire to stand out and separate from other subcultures develops some set of identifying signs, expressed in everyday life (in clothes, accessories, hairstyle, tattoos, terminology and other signs of image). So, E. M. Beregovskaya [10] calls this way of expression “linguistic passport”. In his opinion the main thing in youth sociolect is not so much aspiration to secrete language, but rather a pragmatic and ideological idea to demonstrate their own morals, ideals, way of thinking and behavior in opposition to the way of life of adults. What distinguishes youth sociolect from adult sociolect is the expressive function that dominates the speech of the young.

Youth sociolect is a peculiar channel through which lexical and phraseological linguistic innovations are introduced into ordinary language. New non-standard words, introduced into the language turnover, replenish the vocabulary of the language, give new meaning to both words and expressions, characterize the dynamics of today’s life and the real state of the modern language, which is absolutely impossible to ignore [14].

Young people use lexical units from literary sources without destroying the form, reinterpreting metaphorically and metonymically their meanings, as a result of which all lexical units have a highly expressive and emotional coloring.

Conclusion

Youth sociolect itself is a primary phenomenon, which widely covers all social groups of young people, while slang, jargon and argo are secondary lexical subsystems of sociolect. In particular, slang can be seen as a secondary lexical subsystem of the Russian, Uzbek and English languages. At the same time, slang and argo operate within the confines of closed youth groups of the population. The main factors in the development of slang of social groups of young people are the commonality of interests, habits, occupation and other parameters of the social status of the specified group of the population.

Words and terms function as non-standard synonyms in addition to the generally accepted literary norms, so many slang expressions gradually pass to the level of literary use. Slang is a special category of glossary, which is built on the principle of literary language norms. At the same time, the mentioned slang units have a touch of exclusivity, informality, expressiveness, wit, language play.

Unlike the conservatism of the literary language, youth slang is characterized by constant renewal and rapid change of lexical means, as well as temporary renewal of lexical units, i. e. as a result of frequent use of the word there is a need to change the image, image. Therefore, slang is always ready to perceive the new and unusual.

References:

1. Grachev, M. A. (1997). Russkoe argo. N. Novgorod.
2. Mokienko, V. M. (1991). Iz istorii zhargonnoi leksiki i frazeologii. *Russistik*, (1), 30-41.
3. Sheigal, E. I. (1996). Komp'yuternyi zhargon kak lingvokul'turnyi fenomen. *Yazykovaya lichnost': kul'turnye kontsepty*. Volgograd, 204-210.
4. Masalov, A. V. (1992). Kolleksiya komp'yuternogo zhargona. *Softpanorama*, (4 (28)).
5. Möller, K. P. (2000). Der wahre E: ein Wörterbuch der DDR-Soldatensprache. Lukas Verlag.
6. Grachev, M. A. (1996). Argotizmy v molodezhnom zhargone. *Russkii yazyk v shkole*, (1), 78-85.
7. Becker, C. A. (1980). Semantic context effects in visual word recognition: An analysis of semantic strategies. *Memory & cognition*, 8(6), 493-512. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03213769>
8. Likholtov, P. V. (1997). Komp'yuternyi zhargon. *Russkaya rech'*, (3), 43- 49.
9. Grachev, M. A. (1989). Sposoby slovoпроизводства v sovremennom molodezhnom zhargone. Gorkii.
10. Beregovskaya, E. M. (1996). Molodezhnyi sleng: formirovanie i funktsionirovanie. *Voprosy yazykoznaniya*, (3), 32-41.
11. Puig, M. S. (1991). Opisanie sposobov priema narkoticheskikh sredstv v leksike russkoyazychnykh narkomanov. *Russistik*, (1), 42-47.
12. Neuland, E. (1994). Jugendsprache und Standardsprache. Zum Wechselverhältnis von Stilwandel und Sprachwandel. *Zeitschrift für Germanistik*, 78-98.
13. Mokienko, V. (1999). Research into Russian Jargon through Monographs and Lexicography. *Russian Linguistics*, 23(1), 67-85.
14. Akramova, N. M., & Burkhonova, G. Y. (2020). The study and description of a youth sociolect. *European research: innovation in science, education and technology*, 69-71.

Список литературы:

1. Грачев М. А. Русское аргю. Н. Новгород, 1997.
2. Мокиенко В. М. Из истории жаргонной лексики и фразеологии // *Russistik*, 1991. №1. С. 30-41.
3. Шейгал Е. И. Компьютерный жаргон как лингвокультурный феномен// *Языковая личность: культурные концепты*. Волгоград, 1996. С. 204-210.
4. Масалов А. В. Коллекция компьютерного жаргона // *Софтпанорама*. 1992. №4 (28).
5. Möller К. P. Der wahre E: ein Wörterbuch der DDR-Soldatensprache. Lukas Verlag, 2000.
6. Грачев М. А. Арготизмы в молодежном жаргоне // *Русский язык в школе*. 1996. №1. С. 78-85.
7. Becker С. А. Semantic context effects in visual word recognition: An analysis of semantic strategies // *Memory & cognition*. 1980. V. 8. №6. P. 493-512. <https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03213769>
8. Лихолитов П. В. Компьютерный жаргон // *Русская речь*. 1997. №3. С. 43- 49.
9. Грачев М. А. Способы словопроизводства в современном молодежном жаргоне Горький, 1989.
10. Береговская Э. М. Молодежный сленг: формирование и функционирование // *Вопросы языкознания*. 1996. №3. С. 32-41.
11. Пуиг М. С. Описание способов приема наркотических средств в лексике русскоязычных наркоманов // *Russistik*, 1991. №1. С. 42-47.

12. Neuland E. Jugendsprache und Standardsprache. Zum Wechselverhältnis von Stilwandel und Sprachwandel // Zeitschrift für Germanistik. 1994. P. 78-98.

13. Мокиенко В. М. Монографическое и лексикографическое исследование русского жаргона // Russian Linguistics. 1999. Т. 23. №1. 67-85.

14. Akramova N. M., Burkhonova G. The study and description of a youth sociolect // European research: innovation in science, education and technology. 2020. С. 69-71.

*Работа поступила
в редакцию 29.03.2021 г.*

*Принята к публикации
04.03.2021 г.*

Ссылка для цитирования:

Akramova N. Scientific Approaches to the Study of Youth Sociolect in Linguistics // Бюллетень науки и практики. 2021. Т. 7. №4. С. 541-545. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/65/67>

Cite as (APA):

Akramova, N. (2021). Scientific Approaches to the Study of Youth Sociolect in Linguistics. *Bulletin of Science and Practice*, 7(4), 541-545. <https://doi.org/10.33619/2414-2948/65/67>