

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
ПИИИ (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2021 Issue: 08 Volume: 100

Published: 27.08.2021 <http://T-Science.org>

QR – Issue



QR – Article



Vazira Talatovna Suleymanova

Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages
teacher at the chair of "Teaching methodology of English"


DISTINCTIVE SIGNS OF VARIANTS OF THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE THAT IS NOT NATIVE TO ITS USERS

Abstract: The concept of a language variant as a non-native language is considered in the work. With regard to the English language as a language of global distribution, such a variant appears as an exonymic idiom of the Expanding circle, according to B. Kachru's theory of three concentric circles. The variant is based on its linguoculturological substantiation and traces of native language transference, the degree of manifestation of which depends on the type of the lectal level of the bilingual continuum (basilect, mesolect and acrolect). The typification and consistency of linguistic deviations revealed in the mesolect and acrolect speech of the society are the signs of the variant that distinguish it from the interlanguage of the individual.

Key words: Language variant, English as an international language, English as a lingua franca, contact variantology theory, three circles of the English language, lectal levels, distinctive linguistic features, transference, linguocultural basis.

Language: English

Citation: Suleymanova, V. T. (2021). Distinctive signs of variants of the English language that is not native to its users. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 08 (100), 360-363.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-100-66> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2021.08.100.66>
Scopus ASCC: 1200.

Introduction

Modern bilingualism, which is increasingly turning into mass [7] and characteristic of almost all countries of the world, is the parallel functioning and interaction of the global language, which is English, and the local, contributing to the assertion of glocality - a phenomenon similar to the eastern yin and yang, connecting opposites, passing into each other. English affects local languages and local languages affect English. Consideration of the problems of such interaction has become the task of a new conceptual paradigm - World Englishes, the mouthpiece of which is the international association IAWE, whose members discuss relevant problems at annual conferences and in a number of international print media.

In the foreword to the publication of the materials of one of the first IAWE conferences, published under the editorship of Larry Smith, the founder of this paradigm Braj Kachru and the famous British linguist Randolph Quirk emphasized the reality of the existence of different variants of the English language, both native and non-native, in the

modern world. These are variants spoken by Bangladeshis, Singaporeans, Malaysians, Thais, peoples of India and the Philippines, Germans, etc.: "There were almost as many varieties of English - native and non-native, Western and non-Western - as there were participants, including voices from Bangladesh, Singapore, Malaysia, Thailand, India, the Philippines, New Zealand, Britain, Germany, and the USA. Numerous cultural, linguistic, ideological and other differences could be found among the participants, but they all had this one thing in common: all of them used the English language to debate, discuss, and argue questions which concern both native and nonnative users of English, as well as global uses of English in various sociolinguistic contexts in different parts of the world" [14]. The global use of English occurs in different sociolinguistic and linguistic-cultural contexts - this extremely important idea has been confirmed in numerous further works of researchers from all over the world.

The basis of the paradigm was the recognition of the change in the bicentricity of the English, which

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

was previously represented by only two variants - British and American - by pluricentricity, which means the coexistence of several standard variants in written and oral forms in the territories where they are in contact with other (local) languages and are separated from their own. prototype options. The founders of variantology emphasize that all variants are equal, that no one variant has advantages over other variants in terms of cultural dominance. Each option reflects a different culture.

Currently, there are several pluricentric languages [2] - among them German, Spanish, French, Portuguese, etc., the question already arises about the variance of the Uzbek [10] - but their description is not yet as complete as English, which is obviously related with the global distribution of the latter.

The variety of options is reflected in a number of schematizations, and one of the most common models is the theory of three concentric circles Kachru, which shows that, relatively speaking, all versions of the English can be divided into three groups:

1. Variants that are native to most country users and function in all sorts of functions are variants of the Inner Circle.

2. Variants that act as the second official languages in their states, where they were once transferred during the era of colonialism - this is the so-called Outer Circle.

3. Variants of the Expanding Circle, functioning mainly in the field of intercultural communication. Uzbek, of course, belongs to the countries of the Expanding Circle.

Since absolutely all variants can function in intercultural communication, and speakers and non-native speakers of the English must be prepared for such communication, English as a lingua franca, or a language-mediator in communication, is a common function of all variants, as presented in Luke Prodromow's model.

According to the theory of three concentric circles, variants differ in the status of their norm in each of the circles. Kachru called the variants of the Inner Circle norm-providing, because they serve as educational models for students and mastering the English. Variants of the Outer Circle - normative - this is where the rapid formation of new norms takes place, which are gradually codified and become the language standard. The Expansion Circle variants are norm-dependent on the models represented by the Inner Circle variants. The peculiarity of the expanding circle options is that they are characterized by a much wider variety of norms, since they can be guided by the models of the British, American, Australian, New Zealand, Canadian, Irish, South African and other options, depending on the needs of users of the English language. It should be emphasized that all World Englishes are called variants, both native and non-native to their users.

Accordingly, the norm-providing variants have their own standards, or endonorms; norm-dependent variants are characterized by exonorms, i.e. orientation towards the norms of other variants, and in norm-developing variants there is the formation of endonorms competing with exonorms. For example, in Indian, Filipino and a number of other Asian variants, the use of the plural is becoming the norm for nouns that are considered uncountable in the British and American variants, and are perceived as discrete in Asian variants: equipments, furnitures.

The codification of more and more variants of the English language, at least in their oral form (the so-called Standard Spoken English), has already affected a lot of variants of the Inner and Outer circles, which is reflected in the new book of the Cambridge Publishing House edited by Raymond Hickey "Standards of English" describing the formation of new norms in Australian, New Zealand, Canadian, Scottish, Irish, Maltese, South African, West African, East African, South Asian, Caribbean and other varieties of English.

Definition of a variant. So, what can be considered a variant of the language, what parameters must be taken into account in order to recognize the variant as such? There is an opinion that only an idiom that has its own norms and language standards can be considered a variant [11], [13]. In this case, in the Expanding Circle, we cannot talk about options. And if these are not options, then what are they?

There are three main erroneous, as it seems to us, ideas about the idioms of the Expanding Circle.

1. Many people identify variant with a teaching model: for example, many Uzbeks think they speak British or American.

2. Others believe that in the Expanding Circle we should talk about the lingua franca and nothing more, that is. about the intermediary language, not about the variant.

3. Still others associate the variant with learner's English.

As for the first representation, it is a delusion, because the model is the ideal that we strive for when studying the language, and the sociolinguistic English language reality is such that in reality the result of speech production does not always and often does not coincide with the educational ideal. What the student receives at the input (input) is not at all equal to what he produces at the output (output), and this is manifested in the accent, sometimes in grammar, especially in syntax, in the selection of vocabulary, in the discursive features of speech.

English as a lingua franca (ELF) is just one of the functions of a language used in intercultural communication, and, as we said, ELF is inherent in both non-native speakers and native speakers who are forced to adapt to their bilingual foreign intercultural interlocutor. Although the lingua franca is the mediating function of English, it is the primary

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

language for the Expanding Circle variants, it is not the only English language. Today it can already be firmly asserted that Uzbeks use English in various fields - including as a means of teaching (albeit on a limited scale), as a creative means (there is already a fictional English language, literature into English, created by the English language by Uzbek authors), not to speak of media and other uses. That is why the second understanding of the status of the Uzbek version of the English language is limited and insufficient.

The third view is due to the closeness of the concepts "variant" and "interlanguage", but despite the apparent similarity, they are fundamentally different from each other. In contrast to the variant, the interlanguage does not have a social nature [12]. This is an individual, psycholinguistic phenomenon showing a static frozen (for a certain moment) level of language proficiency for students.

Unlike the interlanguage (the concept of which was developed in the methodology of teaching English as a second / foreign language by the American linguist Larry Selinker), the variant is a social phenomenon, it is a multidimensional dynamic functional continuum used by bilinguals with different levels of language proficiency and in different functions. The multidimensionality of the social variant lies in the fact that it represents a set of different lectal zones:

-acrolect - a standard subvariant that is used in formal situations by well-educated users;

-mesolect - a subvariant focused on the standard of the spoken language used by educated users in an informal communication situation or in a situation when, for some reason, they lose complete control over their speech (fatigue, agitation and other reasons can cause the imprint of the transfer of linguistic features of their native language);

-basilect - typical for poorly educated users with initial bilingualism; subvariant, which is characterized by an extremely high English language degree of linguistic mixing / hybridization, that is why it is called a hybrid term: Chinglish, Ruslish, Japlish, Hinglish, etc.

All these three lectures taken together represent a variant used by a certain linguocultural society, therefore, one cannot associate a variant with only one lecture; so the English language association is only relevant in the case of an interlanguage.

Considering the English language variants of the Outer Circle, Platt, Weber and Ho identified four parameters necessary for the recognition of a variant:

1. Use in the educational system. (If we add the Uzbek version of the English language to these parameters, we see the expansion of this function in connection with the new requirements for our universities, which are forced to offer English-language courses in connection with the need to meet the requirements of academic mobility and

compliance with the principle of internationalization of education).

2. Expansion of the usus among non-native users (which, of course, applies to our version).

3. Expansion of the functions of the English language (This also takes place in Russia - new functions appear in advertising, in the language game [8], fictional English literature appears, written in English by Russians into English - O. Grushina, L. Vapnyar, A. Ulinich and others).

In the syntax, deviations are revealed in the construction of attributive chains (Uzbeks prefer not the prepositive use of definitions, but the prepositional postpositive: the form of the 19th century < the 19th century form; word order (in the definitive group: the problem "generation gap" < the generation gap problem; B sentence - topicalization of the add-on: Mornings we usually spent at the beach), lack of union in a group of three or more homogeneous members (.. way to safety, constancy, tranquillity < ... safety, constancy, and tranquillity) etc.

At the discursive level, Uzbek English turns out to be a masculine-oriented language that does not suffer from excessive political correctness: The lexical units involved in our study concern man as social being, his activities... Sometimes, for Uzbek English, verbalization is characteristic: the process of globalization; it becomes the result of an elaborate fraud. Often, the English-speaking language of the Uzbek language seems to foreigners too categorical due to the excess of imperative structures, the absence of lithotes and displacements of negation: I think I cannot do that < I don't think I can do that. His dream came true only in 1900. < His dream did not come true until 1900.

All these signs are manifested in the speech of linguistically educated users and allow them to be identified as Uzbek bilinguals who successfully use English for their communication purposes. Some of the distinctive features inherent in their speech, as well as the speech of other Uzbek users, are gradually fixed in the oral and written forms of discourse in various fields of activity, turning the English language into innovation; The other part of the English language is still rather considered as typical mistakes - these are common deviations that sometimes manifest themselves in the variants of the Inner and Outer circles and indicate certain trends in changing the norms of English as an international language (EIL). This question is very acute and requires special research.

Conclusion.

Thus, the linguistic English language, the revolutionary character of the variantological paradigm consists in the following features: the recognition of the pluricentricity of one language, causing a variety of variants equal from the linguocultural side, the recognition of the dominant

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 0.126
ESJI (KZ) = 9.035
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

principle of functionality (the paradigm grew out of M. Halliday's functional linguistics), variability and greater inclusiveness (inclusion the number of

options; inclusion in the object of consideration of more and more areas of activity, etc.).

References:

1. Antonova, A.M. (2002). *Leksika russkogo pravoslavija v anglojazychnom tekste i slovare*: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. SPb..
2. (1981). *Varianty polinacional'nyh literaturnyh jazykov* / pod red. Jy.A. Zhluktenko, K..
3. Dudchenko, L.Jy. (2010). *Pravoslavnyj komponent v anglojazychnyh naimenovanijah russkih ikon*: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk / L.Jy. Dudchenko, SPb..
4. Egorova, K.A. (2013). *Lingvisticheskie osobennosti bytovoj leksiki turizma na materiale autentichnyh anglojazychnyh putevoditelej po Rossii*: avtoref. dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. SPb..
5. Kabakchi, V.V. (1998). *Osnovy anglojazychnoj mezhkul'turnoj kommunikacii*. SPb..
6. Kachru, B. (2012). Mirovye varianty anglijskogo jazyka: agonija i jekstaz. *Lichnost'. Kul'tura. Obshhestvo*, T. XIV, Vyp. 4, № 75 - 76, pp. 145 - 165.
7. Rivlina, A.A. (2013). O nekotoryh osobennostjah i lingvisticheskikh problemah processa formirovanija massovogo rusko-anglijskogo bilingvizma. *Social'nye i gumanitarnye nauki na Dal'nem Vostoke*, T. 37, № 1, pp. 61 - 66.
8. Rivlina, A.A. (2011). Ob osnovnyh priemah sovremennoj anglo-russkoj jazykovej igry. *Homo Loquens: aktual'nye voprosy lingvistiki i metodiki prepodavanija inostrannyh jazykov / pod obshh. red. I.Jy. Shhemeleva*, Vyp. 3, SPb., pp. 86 - 96.
9. (2006). *Slovar` sociolingvisticheskikh terminov* / pod red. V. Mihal'chenko, Moscow.
10. Sulejmenova, Je.D. (2010). *K osmysleniu verojatnosti varianta russkogo jazyka v Kazahstane*. *Slavica Helsingiensia* 40. Instrumentarium of Linguistics. Sociolinguistic Approaches to Non- Standard Russian / A. Mustajoki, E. Protassova, N. Vakhtin (eds.). (pp. 252 - 265). Helsinki.
11. Bruthiaux, P. (2003). Squaring the circles: Issues in modeling English worldwide. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, V. 13, № 2, pp. 159 - 178.
12. Davies, A. (1989). Is International English an interlanguage? *TESOL Quarterly*, V. 23, № 3, pp. 447 - 467.
13. Dröschel, Y. (2011). *Lingua franca English: The role of simplification and transfer*. Bern a.o..
14. (1981). *English for Cross-Cultural Communication* / L. Smith (ed.), N.Y..