"SOCIOLINGUISTIC FACTORS IN LEARNING FOREIGN LANGUAGES"

Feruza Ashurova Maxamadyusupovna

English Teacher of the Department of Foreign Languages Academic lyceum Ferghana State University

Annotation: *This article explores the sociolinguistic dimensions influencing foreign language acquisition, focusing on how social context, cultural norms, and interpersonal interactions shape the learning process. It delves into critical factors such as identity, motivation, social status, and the learner's perception of the target language community. The study highlights the role of sociolinguistic competence—understanding language variation, pragmatics, and social nuances—in achieving fluency and effective communication. Additionally, it examines challenges learners face due to linguistic prejudice, stereotyping, and unequal access to resources. The article underscores the importance of integrating sociocultural awareness into language teaching methodologies to foster inclusivity and promote deeper engagement with the target language.*

Key words: *Acquisition, ethnicity, social factors, dialect, socio-economic factors, identity, social status, ...*

Methods. Group of learners. In my English language class, there are 24 students with the age of 16-18 in one group. These students are from urban areas, 13 of them are girls and the rest are boys.

They study at Keeping Human Health Institutions, in the first bachelor's grade. According to ethnicities they belong to different ethnicities like Uzbek, Tajik, Russian, Pakistani, and Indian, as the opportunity of Institution here a lot of foreign countries students can continue their studies for taking a career. Students come from different countries such as Uzbekistan, Russia, and India with different regional dialects of their origin country such as Bukhara dialects, Belarusians, Indian English, and Pakistan dialects.

Subgroup 1. From a group of learners, I selected two subgroups to use in my updated linguistic profile according to their social factors. 10 of them belong to different Uzbek backgrounds with dialect geography of Fergana, Namangan, Bukhara, and Tashkent. As Mesthrie et al. (2009) note "speech can serve to differentiate in the region, gender, and social standing" There are 3 boys and 7 girls in the first group (p. 74).

Their L1 is Uzbek and Tajik as their home-using language, however, Uzbek is the dominant language in the academic sphere. In terms of English proficiency level, they all have B2 certificates in CEFR with visible Standard English with some accent varieties (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2014).

According to language background, learners possess standard usage of the Uzbek language so they easily differentiate Uzbek varieties influencing pronunciation, grammar, and vocabulary in their dialects like the Taskent dialect or Bukhara dialect. Considering socio-economic factors, my first learners come from upper-working-class and upper-middle-class families (Labov, 1972) and have good attitudes using language norms. They are all Muslims about the religion.

Subgroup 2. The other 14 of the selected group of learners belong to various ethnicities, 6 of them are students of India, mainly girls, 4 of them are Russian boys, and 4 boys are from Pakistan cities. Students from India and Pakistan have solidarity as they have come from similar dialect boundaries (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2014). They pose different proficiency levels in English, from B1 to C1 in different frameworks such as IELTS and TOEFL as English is a second language in all educational institutions. Using prestigious values of language (Mather, 2012) is common among Russian boys, Pakistanis, and Indians who opt for speaking non-standard English and Indian accent (Mather, 2012). In terms of social-financial factors students are from diverse economic backgrounds; Russian students are from high-income families whereas Indians and Pakistani learners are low–class family members.

In terms of language background, the L1 of these learners is different for all of them according to their various ethnicities, even though it is a bit complicated that they are not connected to dialect geography (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2014). Russian is similar to English in grammar and word formation so Russian boys acquire language in a good way in the second language. But it can not be considered for Indians and Parkish learners since their L1 is different from L2 or from a second language.

Practice. Learning the context of these groups

The Target group of learners is studying at the Keeping Human Health State Institution in Ferghana City, where Uzbek and Russian are dominant, multilingual societies. During giving instructions Uzbek and Russian are used and English is used in social subjects such as Art, ESP, Social history, etc. twice a week duration of 80 min. Their institutions are equipped with special ESL classrooms, and specialized English language teachers. The classroom is fully equipped with technology devices, visuals, and multilingual resources. Considering the learning environment it is a formal classroom setting with adaptation materials for supporting student needs. It is required to get B2 certificates to be enrolled to a Master's degree and continue academic success. The lessons are conducted considering learners' specific needs and interests, such as developing speaking fluency, improving writing skills, or focusing on vocabulary related to their field of preparation for getting certificates.

Gender. Here gender is given to indicate its role in language use and social interactions. According to Schilling (2011), the interrelation of gender and language is mostly based on male and female language differences. As I mentioned above 13 of my group of learners are girls who may be indicated "weaknesses in both biological and linguistical" (Schilling, 2011, p. 220). It can also be detected powerlessness of women according to religion and history. All my women learners come from Muslim backgrounds where dominance was given to men. Thus, they use weaker linguistic patterns such as tag questions, exclamations, and silent ways of speaking contrasting male learners, who use non-standard varieties, omitting diphthongs in the pronunciation of English, grammar defects, and irrelevant word formations. Even though female learners are shy, they follow the formality of language and standard English in speaking.

Ethnicity. Ethnicity has a clear and "significant relationship to the language rather than other social factors" (Fought, 2011, p. 238). In terms of ethnic identity, my group of

learners may be identified according to the usage of some sociolinguistic features, for example, 3 of my Uzbek learners speak the Ferghana variety as a dominant language compared to Bukhara or Namangan dialects or Russian and Indian male learners use code-switching (Fought, 2011) a combination of L1 to L2 or foreign language, like " I like sup, Namaste, would you like laddu". These examples show the ethnic background of some target learners. It allows them to appreciate the diversity within the group and better understand cultural nuances in language use and social interactions. Ethnicity can influence language use patterns, including vocabulary, pronunciation, and discourse styles.

Sexuality is not allowed to be discussed in my instructional context, I omitted it here. Race is also avoided because I chose ethnicity to describe the social factors of my target learners.

Pedagogical implications. Acquiring language can be different according to identity, culture, age, society, religion, and other social factors in speakers and their groups which are considered determiners "of how speakers use language" (Wardhaugh & Fuller, 2014, p. 7). Having direct details of some social factors of learners will evaluate relevant learning contexts.

Teachers as facilitators create supportive learning environments using different L1 languages, it may incorporate students' home language, social dialectology, and cultures into the curriculum; and may provide bilingual instructions to support them.

Students have some allowance to use code-switching during communicative activities, as they are anxious about making mistakes and having the right words when needed.

To make language meaningful I would create tasks according to students' interests, social backgrounds, and religious choices; like not overusing high-class topics or selecting texts, stories, literature, and examples that reflect diverse language backgrounds and social factors that can align equally attitudes among students in communicative tasks.

Adapting reading materials, vocabulary lists, or writing tasks to match learners' language and literacy levels and gender can facilitate comprehension, vocabulary acquisition, and writing skills development.

As they are auditory and visual learners video watching can expand their knowledge in listening and vocabulary.

According to their ethnicity, different varieties of English can be implemented instead of frequent standardization in everyday activities in reading and speaking.

Coming to writing nondiscrimination or overestimating topics in writing, essays and letters should be encountered during lessons.

Conclusion. Sociolinguistic factors significantly influence the process of foreign language acquisition, shaping learners' proficiency, attitudes, and communication styles. Ethnicity, gender, social status, and cultural identity play a pivotal role in determining how language is learned and used.

Effective language instruction requires teachers to create inclusive and adaptive learning environments that respect linguistic and cultural diversity.

By incorporating learners' sociocultural contexts and allowing for practices such as code-switching and dialectal variation, educators can enhance engagement and foster meaningful language acquisition.

Ultimately, understanding these sociolinguistic dimensions enables a more comprehensive and equitable approach to teaching foreign languages.

REFERENCES:

Fought, C. (2011). Language and ethnicity. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of sociolinguistics (pp. 238–257). Cambridge University Press.

Labov, W. (1963). The social motivation of a sound change. WORD, 19(3), 273-309.

Labov, W. (1972). Sociolinguistic Patterns. Chapter 3. Social Stratification of (r) in New York City Department Stores. pp. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mather, P. (2012). The Social Stratification of /r/ in New York City: Labov's Department Store Study Revisited. Journal of English Linguistics 40(4).

Mesthrie, R., Swann, J., Deumert, A., & Leap. W. L. (2009). Introducing sociolinguistics. Edinburgh University Press.

Schilling, N. (2011). Language, gender, and sexuality. In R. Mesthrie (Ed.), The Cambridge Handbook of sociolinguistics (pp. 218–237). Cambridge University Press

Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2014). An introduction to sociolinguistics. John Wiley & Sons.