

## Ethnic Stereotypes in the Phraseologisms of the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak Languages

Gulom Ismailov Mirzaevich

*Eastern Philology Department, Philology Faculty of Alfraganus University, Tashkent 100190, Uzbekistan*

(Corresponding author's e-mail: [gulom1208@gmail.com](mailto:gulom1208@gmail.com); [g.ismailov@afu.uz](mailto:g.ismailov@afu.uz))

*Received: 20 June 2025, Revised: 1 October 2025, Accepted: 3 October 2025, Published: 8 October 2025*

### Abstract

In this article, the concept of stereotype and linguistic stereotype, as well as the types of ethnic stereotypes in Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak phraseologisms and the mechanisms of their formation in the mind of a linguistic person are studied. In addition, in linguoculturalology, the term stereotype is understood as a mental stereotype related to the meaningful aspect of the units resulting from the interaction of language and culture, language and ethnicity. Ethnic stereotypes in Turkic languages' phraseologisms are divided into gender stereotypes, age stereotypes, occupational stereotypes, religious stereotypes and subject stereotypes, and they are scientifically analyzed in this paper. Implicit and explicit forms of stereotypes have also been studied. Besides it, it is paid attention to linguistic features, cultural associations, and their influence on intercultural communication. We are confident that our research will contribute to the understanding of intercommunication, and cultural exchange through the study of ethnic stereotypes in those languages.

**Keywords:** Turkic languages, Linguistic picture of the world, Linguoculturology, Factor, Phenomenon

### Introduction

As the vocabulary of each language is enriched as a result of the influence of non-linguistic factors due to scientific and technological development, this process, in turn, becomes the basis for the formation of new concepts in the language. Through knowledge, a person understands the form and content- essence of the surrounding reality that has arisen under the influence of certain non-linguistic factors, names it and imprints it in his memory through objects and events that are already known to him. As a result of these cognitive linguistic processes that occur in the mind of a linguistic person, a unique form of the linguistic picture of the world appears in the mind of each representative of the language. Of course, linguistic units that have received nominations as a result of the above mental processes are of great importance in the formation of the linguistic picture of the world, and information about objects and events existing in a particular linguistic culture is formed as a certain image due to various psychological processes and is reflected in the language in the form of stereotypes.

The phenomenon of stereotype has been variously interpreted and defined as an object of research in various fields of science, such as psychology, sociology, ethnography, and cultural studies. This term was first used by Lippmann (1922) in sociology as a "social stereotype". According to him, "a stereotype is a picture of the world in the human mind, organized and systematized by culture, and plays an important role in the simplified perception of complex social reality-objects" (Lipmann, 1922). From the definition given to the stereotype, it becomes clear that objective existence is very large and rich in very complex objects-events, and its perception requires a great deal of intelligence from a person. This indicates that both cultural (culture of a certain group) and psychological (simplified perception of an object in existence) processes are involved in the stereotype. According to scientists who have conducted research in various fields, stereotype thinking is primarily a certain idea of the world and its elements from the point of view of simple forms of consciousness (Guslyakova, 1977; Apresyan, 1995;

Kon, 1968; Semendyaeva, 1986; Silinskiy, 1991; Tolstaya, 1995). In the work “Psychology of Culture” (Geyne, 2011), a stereotype is defined as “an idea about an object that is formed within the framework of a certain collective experience and determines what it represents as an object, how it looks, how it behaves, and how it is perceived by humanity”. At the same time, this idea, embodied in language, is known to us through language and belongs to collective knowledge about the world (Bartminsky, 2005). In world linguistics, attention has been paid to the linguistic and cultural aspects of this phenomenon, and a number of studies have been conducted (Belova, 2006; Krasnyh, 2002; Lenotev, 1993; Maslova, 2001; Prokhorov, 2008; Potapova, 2005; Sorokin, 1978; Ismailov, 2017), but it is known from sources that there has been insufficient monographic research and no consensus has been reached on a precise definition of the phenomenon of stereotype.

### **Theoretical framework**

A stereotype is formed as a result of cognition in the mind of a linguistic person based on the information obtained from the observation of objects and events in existence, and is associated with the processes of conceptualization and categorization of knowledge. Because by categorizing the events that a person observes and perceives, he simplifies the content and essence of this event and understands its inner aspect. Conceptualization, on the other hand, divides existence into separate, that is, different parts through the human mind, determines its distinctive features, and leads to the formation of a certain phenomenon, that is, a concept. It can be seen from this that the process of stereotyping in the human mind ensures that the phenomenon enters a certain system through its specific features. The systematization of the stereotype serves the economy of language means, in turn, the speaker names the object that gives rise to the stereotype using the language means available in the vocabulary, and the addressee perceives it, encountering all the aspects and essence of the object or event hidden behind this name. The mechanism of stereotype formation as a result of the perception of reality organizes the most important parts of the information and presents a certain image in the mind. Based on the above considerations, it can be said that the concept of a stereotype can be said to be a small

picture of an object or event that has the characteristics of describing and evaluating objects and events in existence by representatives of the language of a certain region, as well as a unique idea of the object or reality that arises as a result of interpreting reality within the framework of social cognitive models.

### **The concept of stereotype and its linguistic essence**

Prokhorov (2008) writes that stereotypes are special forms of perception of a reality that is unfamiliar to a person and the processing and simplification of the information that arises as a result of it (Prokhorov, 2006). Thus, a person initially has an automated process of movement in his mind about a reality that is familiar to him, and he practically acts without controlling his consciousness, because the observed phenomenon is known to him in advance and therefore in most cases it is not objective. When a person encounters new unfamiliar phenomena, he consciously overcomes certain indications of consciousness, apperception of the comprehensive properties of the object. In general, the basis of the perception of the world and the essence of the elements in it by each representative of the language is, of course, objective meaning, stereotyped thinking and specific cognitive models. The phenomenon of stereotypes, which is considered the object of semantic theory in linguistics, is associated with the name of the American philosopher Hillary Putnam. This phenomenon ensures the realization in speech of common ideas accepted by various social groups in a given linguistic culture. A stereotype is an idea of a certain linguistic culture group about what an object or reality should look like, how it behaves, and how it should manifest itself (Danilova, 2009).

As a result of human observations, the complex of figurative and standard ideas about objects and phenomena forms a certain stable linguistic picture of objective existence, the center of which is an unchanging, stable figurative “stereotypical idea”. “Phraseologisms in their totality are capable of representing a vast fragment of the linguistic picture of the world of each ethnic group” (Ismailov, 2017). Based on these ideas, it should be said that the linguistic picture of the world is composed of ethnic stereotypes, which are the result of the ethnic consciousness of the national thinking of a particular nation. Golubovskaya (2004)

understands the national picture of the world as the content of the ideas of a certain ethnos about the external world, imprinted in the form of words and saturated with ideas about this ethnos, and the assessment given to it. According to the scientist, two factors shape the ethnic image: first, material culture and environment, which are elements of the objective world, and the second factor is a factor that determines the specific characteristics of the perception of the world by a particular ethnic group, which Golubovskaya (2004) calls national thinking and national mentality (Golubovskaya, 2004).

Krasnykh (2002) explains the stereotype as a component of the linguistic picture of the world as follows: “it is a stable component of the linguistic picture of the world that exists in the public consciousness. It is a figurative representation of an ethnos about a particular object and phenomenon, saturated with national and cultural baggage, a stable mental picture of its own” (Krasnykh, 2002). Thus, if the linguistic picture of the world is a conclusion about an object and its signs and properties that is imprinted in the consciousness of a speaker of a certain language, which is contained in the content of a word or text or is implicitly expressed through this content, then linguistic stereotypes allow a person to compactly perceive the world and a small part of reality in it, and see it in a holistic form. This is clearly manifested in phraseological units.

In linguoculturology, the term stereotype is related to the content of units that arise as a result of the interaction of language and culture, language and ethnicity, and is understood as a mental stereotype. A stereotype, like a concept, is a mental concept that forms a perceived linguistic unit in a language as a speech unit, that is, in the form of lexical units (lexema, phraseology, proverb, saying), and is formed as a set of conditional ideas associated with lexical units of a certain society or nation. In particular, a comparative study of phraseology in different languages makes it possible to clearly express linguistic imagery and identify typical associations in each language, as well as similarities and national-cultural differences. From this it can be seen that phraseology is manifested in the unique aspects of such elements as the historical development of humanity, culture, everyday life, and the peculiarities of the associative-figurative thinking of language

representatives. For example, the etalon *qo'y* (sheep) in the languages of different nationalities is figuratively expressed in the form of a stereotype of the various character traits inherent in a person, his intellectual abilities, behavior, etc., in the Russian language as a “fool, idiot” (*как баран на новые ворота* Eng.: *like a ram at the new gates*), and in the Turkic languages, including the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak linguistic culture, as a stereotype image of a “stupid person” (phraseologism: *qo'y og'zidan cho'p olmagan* – Uzbek., *қой мінез, қойдай жуас* – Kazakh, and *қойдай жуас* – Karakalpak) (Eng.: who did not take a bite from a sheep's mouth – Uzbek, sheep-like character, sheep-like character – Kazakh, sheep-like character – Karakalpak), embodying the category of positive and negative evaluation. Scientists have noted that “the ancient Greeks also used the *qo'y* (sheep) as a “fool” standard” (Birikh, 1998). As a result of the use of the above linguistic stereotypes by the speaker of the language, it not only facilitates and simplifies the process of communication, but also gives it an ethnocultural coloring and forms ethnic stereotypes that are an integral part of the linguistic picture of the world in the language.

From the above considerations, it is clear that a stereotype is a product of human perception of objects and phenomena in the world, formed in language, with a stable, mental, cultural determination, and it is a phenomenon that has a cognitive, social, and emotional function as a certain component of the linguistic picture of the world. Therefore, it is imprinted and manifested in language as a mental phenomenon. As Bartminsky (2005) writes, a stereotype can be studied and described not as random associations (semantic or formal elements) imprinted in collective memory at a level of specificity corresponding to lexemes, but as a stable, recurring phenomenon (Basic stereotypes, 2009). Stereotypes are expressed through various elements of language and are reproduced through various representations of an object or phenomenon (zonym – the repetition of the same feature in the language when expressing the human character of the fox's cunning), as well as the imprinting of this feature in the language, can be considered one of the important indicators of “stereotyping of reality”. The linguistic approach to interpreting a stereotype concerns both the formal (phraseological and other combinations) and semantic (meaning of a linguistic unit) levels of language, and its

aspects of stereotype and linguistic sign, stereotype and phraseological meaning (cognitive semantics), and the cognitive structure of the stereotype are revealed.

In general, the concept of “linguistic stereotype” in anthropocentric linguistics was studied in detail and precisely by the linguist Bartminsky (2002). According to his theory, a stereotype is one of the central concepts of ethnolinguistics, defined as a small picture of the world determined by the subject of an object, which contains descriptive and evaluative features, as well as the result of interpreting reality within the framework of social cognitive models (Bartminsky, 2002). Thus, a stereotype is an image formed within the collective experience of a certain linguistic culture and refers to collective knowledge about the existence and the objects and events in it that are manifested in the language as a phenomenon that determines what the object represents in itself, how it looks, acts, and how it is perceived by the linguistic person. Thus, the concept of a stereotype is a person’s conclusions about the object and reality in the existence that exist in the meanings of the text and word structure, which is considered the basic phenomenon of the theory of linguistic stereotypes.

From a psycholinguistic point of view, Krasnih (2002) distinguishes two types of stereotypes in the perception of existence and reality, namely, a stereotype of behavior (stereotype of behavior) and a stereotype of representation (stereotype of representation). Stereotypes of human behavior are values, ideals, moral norms and simplified behavioral signs of people, standard representations of actions. Stereotype behavior is stored in the linguistic consciousness in the form of stamps and determines the communicative behavior of a particular situation. Stereotype representation is stored in the linguistic consciousness in the form of a cliché and is realized as a standard. They not only express behavioral and associative sequences, but also determine the linguistic forms that express them. Stereotype representation, in turn, is based on certain ideas about an object or situation and is divided into a stereotype image (in the form of a cliché) and a stereotype situation (in the form of a cliché and a stamp). For example, stereotypical image: *пчела – труженица, баран – упрямый, лимон – кислый, жёлтый*; stereotype situation: *билет – компостер, аист – капустя* (Krasnyh, 2002).

The structure of stereotype formation includes certain cognitive processes, as well as a causal attribute, that is, a person’s interpretation of information about the linguistic culture in which he lives and about other cultures that are alien to him.

This, in turn, can be divided into two types of stereotypes, firstly, a cognitively systematized and simplified stereotype about a certain linguistic person, and secondly, it means the existence of stereotypes formed in the consciousness of a certain group of people, about a linguistic and cultural community. Stereotypes of the first type are more likely to arise due to the skill of the creator, that is, using the method of expanding his existing universal phraseology, creating occasional phraseology. In this case, the creator, through an individual conceptualization of reality in existence, expresses his own worldview in his own language and forms a stereotype. For example, the word concert in our language means “the performance of musical works, songs, dances, and similar numbers in front of the public, according to a certain program” (EDUL, 2022). The writer uses the word denoting this concept as an occasional phraseologism, the free combination “not ending the concert”. – *Karimjon bolam... Qaynag’ang otpuskaga kelganmi? – Yo’ q, ertaga ketadi. . . . Xurrakning ham kiftini keltirar ekan, - yoyilib kuldi Muboraxxon aya. – Bir haftadan beri konserti tugamaydi- ya. (Oy nurlari so’ nmaydi. B. Xudoyberganov)*. In this text, it can be seen that the author uses the phraseologism of *hurraq otmoq* as an individual, that is, author-specific phraseologism. The use of the phraseology “*yong’oqni talqon qilmoq*” (“to crush a nut”) (Oy nurlari sonmaydi. B. Khudoiberganov) instead of the phraseology *tog’ni talqon qilmoq* (“to crush a mountain”) is also proof of this. We have also observed this situation in the Kazakh language. For example, the phraseology *көзі отмай жанды* (“to be happy”) has been formed as an occasional phraseology in the form of *көзі шырадай жайнады*, which means to be happy. The examples show that the author has an individual approach to the nomination of the event, which has led to the imprinting of a unique linguistic stereotype in the memory. The second type of stereotypes, on the other hand, reflects the folk customs, behavior and actions of a certain group and is considered a sealed form of culture determined in the collective consciousness, and these include

phraseology such as *og'zi qulog'ida, gapni gapni gapga qo'shmoq, boshini ikkita qilmoq* (Eng.: “to put your mouth in your mouth”, “to add your mouth to your mouth”, and “to make your head two”).

“A stereotype is understood as a subjectively determined image reflecting the objective and evaluative characteristics of an object or event, determined as a result of interpreting reality within the framework of socially significant cognitive models, while socio-cultural stereotypes determine the nature of linguistic semantic connotations, creating an ethnosemantic aura of a linguistic sign that is difficult to understand by other linguistic and cultural communities” (Aliferenko, 2010).

Each national culture serves as the basis for the formation of “cultural stereotypes”, that is, behavioral stereotypes, communication stereotypes, and worldview stereotypes. The observation of the world and objects or events in it, as well as their specific features, by the speaker of the language and their comparison with other objects or events, leads to the stereotyping of this compared object in the language based on metaphor. In this regard, it should be noted that the emergence of a metaphor leads to the elimination of the boundary separating objects into classes and serves as a “semantic bridge” between objects belonging to different classes.

## Methodology

### Participants

This article is a comparative descriptive analysis. In order to achieve the result, representatives of three languages were interviewed. The participants of the research (interviewees) were 80 individuals (30 males and 50 females) with the age range of 25-60 (Uzbek, Kazakh, Karakalpak). They were from different educational backgrounds and levels. It became clear that in their language, phenomena in existence are stereotyped in different ways.

### Types of ethnic stereotypes

The diversity of languages is not determined solely by the sounds and signs that exist in that language, but is characterized by the diversity and differentiation of the worldview of the speaker of the language. Regarding to opinion of Khussainova (2024) the each language reflects a particular prism through which the world is seen, shaped by historical, geographical, and social factors that have influenced its development.

Each language reflects a distinct prism through which the world is seen, shaped by the historical, geographical, and societal factors that have influenced its development (Khussainova et. al., 2024). The ethnic specificity of the concepts created by the speaker of the language is determined by the reflections on objects and phenomena that appear as images behind the various units formed in his language. In this regard, it can be said that the ethnocultural aspects of linguistic stereotypes are most clearly expressed in the system of intercultural communication, and stereotyped thinking covers all layers of human social life. This means that people from each linguistic culture see the world differently and in their own way than speakers of another linguistic culture, and its perception creates the basis for the formation of various stereotypes, in particular, ethnic stereotypes, gender stereotypes, social stereotypes, etc. stereotypes. In this regard, stereotypes in the language can be divided into verbal (phraseology, proverbs, etc.) and nonverbal (facial expressions, smiles, movements, etc.) stereotypes.

It should be noted that the primary role of language in the knowledge of the world of each speaker, its impact on real existence and consciousness, is the main source of all human cognitive activity, and the national character and behavior of the speaker of that language can be understood by looking at his language. Ultimately, this situation indicates the existence of linguistic stereotypes that are prone to specific behavior in each nation. As Prokhorov (2006) and Sternin (2006) note, speech etiquette differs in different ways in each nation. Differences in greetings, greetings and farewells, and other etiquette are of great importance, for example, it is customary for Belgians to talk in an elevator, while this is unusual for Russians (Prokhorov, 2006). One of the important features of ethnic stereotypes is their variety, and in this respect they are formed in various modifications in all aspects of social life.

As a result of research conducted on ethnic stereotypes in world linguistics, scientists study them as a product of processes such as the manifestation in the mind of various objects and phenomena in real life and their concepts about them, and their imprinting in the mind of the linguistic individual, and divide ethnic stereotypes into different types based on various criteria (Belova, 2006; Nelson, 2003; Ivanova, 2000; Prokhorov, 2008; Manukovsky, 2005; Löschmann,

2001; Castano et. al. , 2002; Dąbrowska, 1999; Pavlovskaya, 1998; Metelkina, 2002). For example, they classified stereotypes by subject and studied individual and collective, that is, social stereotypes, cultural stereotypes, gender, heterostereotype, autostereotype, etc., but the aspects of these stereotypes'

relation to phraseologisms were not studied in a monographic plan. As a result of our analysis and research of Turkic languages' phraseologisms, we observed that the following types of stereotypes appear in them.

Anthropostereotype	Social stereotypes	Gender stereotype
		Age stereotype
		Occupational stereotype
		Mythological stereotype
		Religious stereotype
		Subject stereotype

**Figure 1** Types of ethnic stereotypes.

### Gender stereotypes

In the phraseology of Turkic languages, there are also phraseology that express the concept of gender and the degree of its differentiation, which are explicitly and implicitly reflected in the semantic structure of the phraseology. The structure of phraseology of Turkic languages also contains gender components, which reflect the ideas about men and women and their actions formed in a particular culture. For example, in the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages, examples of gender stereotypes can be seen in the following phraseology, which express the physical and spiritual maturity of a boy. For example, in the phraseologisms, which is mean to reach puberty is *bo'yi yetmoq* in Uzbek, *эжетке (қажетке) жарау* (Kenesbaev, 2007) in Kazakh, *бойжетіу* (or *бойжеткен*), *ес енуі* (EDKL, 1988) in Karakalpak. The phenomenon of gender stereotypes has influenced the formation of attitudes towards both sexes in the minds of speakers of the three linguocultural languages as a result of various situations occurring in their lives, and has shaped the expression of gender stereotypes in the minds of the linguistic individual.

Also, in the knowledge of the content of the gender tereotype in the phraseologisms *bo'yi yetmoq*, *эжетке (қажетке) жарау*, *бойжетіу* (or *бойжеткен*) are mean in the Uzbek linguistic culture there are different signs that differ from each other, such as “a girl who has reached adulthood”, in the Kazakh linguistic culture

“having reached adulthood” and in the Karakalpak linguistic culture “adult girl and boy”. From the examples given, it can be seen that the gender stereotype is a sign that arose as a result of the linguistic person's action or experience, including the consideration of the characteristic gestures, actions of a woman and a man, physiological, psychological and other signs themselves in the linguistic consciousness of the language. Kirilina (1999) restored the gender stereotype as information about the attributes and norms of behavior of both sexes and information about the necessary things for the total consumer goods and the necessary ideas and presuppositions of social life (Kirilina, 1999).

As a result of studying phraseologisms of Turkic languages, the essence of the stereotype content contained in them can be divided into physical (appearance, age), psychological (character, feelings, emotions, speech, intellect, behavior) and social (family, work, possible ideal role), etc. When it comes to gender stereotypes, we will dwell in detail in the next chapter.

### Age stereotypes

Since the process of stereotyping existing reality or objects by a linguistic person is connected with systematic cognitive processes simplified by human perception, at the heart of any stereotype there are also features that allow grouping reality, objects or people into a certain type. In these phraseological units of grouping into different categories, age stereotypes

belonging to social stereotypes arise on the basis of different realities of age categories by speakers of different linguistic cultures. For example, in the Uzbek language, the phraseologism *sochiga oq oralamoq* (to have white hair) , in the Kazakh language the phraseologisms: *бесік табы кетпеген, ата сақал аузына битпеген, қызылик болды / қылауы туспеген – young / сары тіс болу / сары кідір болу / самайына ақ кірді* (Kenesbaev, 2007), and also in the Karakalpak language the phraseologisms: *бели бугилиў, сақалына ақ ениў* or *уўыздай дене* (EDKL, 1988) reflects age stereotypes of the human and uses a reality that exists in the language as a metaphor for another reality.

### Occupational stereotypes

As is known, language has a cumulative function. This function of language is to “preserve socially significant information about language and culture, transmit it from generation to generation, create and develop intercultural dialogue. In this case, language is both a product of culture and the main condition for its existence, performing the function of a phenomenon that determines the image of culture and ensures its inheritance” (Khudoiberganova, 2022). This state of affairs in the human mind is realized by ethnic stereotypes. Because ethnic stereotypes are an important means of transmitting the social and moral experiences of humanity, as well as customs and traditions from generation to generation. As is known, the Turkic people have also been engaged in their own national crafts and various professions since ancient times. These realities are also reflected in the phraseology of the Turkic languages, forming professions stereotypes in their imagination. For example, in the Uzbek language, phraseological units such as “*bozchining mokisiday*” (non-stop) , in the Kazakh language *тілі мiрдiң оғындай* or *қасапшының пышағындай жалаңдай* are express a person’s character and behavior. The content of these phraseological units contains ethnic or universal signs that are manifested as a result of the perception of world realities, and this can be expressed in the difference in the description of the same reality in existence by the speaker of the language, in the difference in the perception of the world, and in the stereotypes formed in the linguistic consciousness of this speaker.

### Mythological stereotypes

It should be emphasized that in linguoculturology, phraseology is studied as a form of culturally significant realities recorded in the language, embodying the specific mentality of the nation in the language. Therefore, ethnic stereotypes also form a mythical microcosm in the consciousness of the linguistic individual, which ensures the unique perception of human behavior by representatives of a certain language. Initially, a person begins to form different views on the surrounding reality and, with the help of perception, forms it as a certain concept. When a person encounters a new reality, this reality acquires a nomination through the initial knowledge previously formed in his consciousness, in particular, mythical images. “Thus, the speaker of the language is engaged in myth-making, and he believes in his myth in the stereotypical scheme of verbal actions” (Kashkin, 2002), because the understanding of this truth has a regularity, it is not limited to a certain time, it is a truth accepted by people who have lived before us (Dyakonov, 1990). For example, according to the scientific theory of Anscombe (2001), distinguishing its features in the type of stereotypical phrase, he emphasizes that the stereotype is implicitly manifested in the structure of phraseology (Anscombe, 2001). It is difficult to agree with Anscombe (2001), because the expressive plan of phraseology is precisely the expression of reality formed in the human mind, which serves to express human behavior by describing some reality. In particular, in Turkic languages, there are stereotypes that have formed a unique mythical micro world. For example, in the Uzbek language the phraseologism *anqoning urug’i* (EDUL, 2022), in the Kazakh language *қайда барса да Қорқыттың көри шығу* (FS, 395) , and in the Karakalpak language, *айдарханың қанын шашыў* (EDKL, 1988) can be seen as embodying a mythical microcosm in the minds of representatives of the three languages and aimed at naming human activities, character, and actions.

### Religious stereotypes

Ethnic stereotypes are an integral element of any culture, and by their very nature they influence the mentality and actions of humanity, motivating the formation of a certain reality in their perception and

consciousness. In the process of socialization, stereotypes are assimilated by humanity in various ways, and they arise as a result of people's encounter with a certain reality. Religious stereotypes are associated with the doctrine of each people's belief in their religion and have the character of a mandatory truth. In other words, this is a concept of theology at the level of immutable law. Thus, a religious stereotype is a stable microcosm formed on the basis of information about something or a person that exists in the mind of a representative of a certain language, including information that changes to a certain extent based on religious beliefs. The essence of religious stereotypes cannot be changed and can only be supplemented, they can be explained in accordance with the conditions of that time, essentially unchanged. This stereotype has been formed in the minds of representatives of the Turkic peoples as a small picture of the world, and it is also directed to the nomination of human actions, as can be seen from the following examples. For example, the phraseology of the Uzbek language *go'riga g'isht qalamoq* (to build a brick in the grave) (EDUL, 2022), the Kazakh language *қойынға шайтан кіру* (to enter the devil) (Kenesbaev, 2007), and the Karakalpak language *әулийеге кесек атыў* (to throw a piece of stone to the augur) (EDKL, 1988) are phraseology that have been formed in the minds of representatives of the three languages as a religious stereotype, and they are formed in three linguistic cultures as an expression of a certain reality using different ethno-stereotypes of the same concept.

Thus, religious stereotypes do not change or complement each other; they can be interpreted based on the demands of the present era, without changing their essence. They are also sources of social stereotypes, since they are manifested by the demands of the era and are formed as social stereotypes (Shmelev, 2012).

### Subject stereotypes

In the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages, stereotypes about objects are quite productive and are used in phraseologisms to express various realities, taking into account the properties and characteristics of various objects. As a result of the stereotyping of objects in the human mind, it can be observed that phraseologism is formed as a result of the stereotyping

of images, encompassing various objects, that is, objects, phenomena, etc., and comparing their functions, characteristics and properties with human behavior and activities. Speaking about the mechanisms of linguistic expression of stereotype concepts about a certain society, phraseologism is embodied as a result of apperception of realities that are unfamiliar to a person. In general, a person encounters various unfamiliar situations throughout his life and tries to express them through concepts that are already known to him. For example, phraseologisms with the concept of "closeness of distance" are expressed in Uzbek as *bir qadam yer* (one step away), in Kazakh as *бәрік тастам жер* (a stone is thrown away) (MS, 106, Guldarkhan), and in Karakalpak as *tayaq taslam jer* (EDKL, 1988). Also, to express the concept of "someone's lifestyle not improving", the phraseologisms *kosasi oqarmadi* (Rahmatullayev, 1992), *ақсаулағы қараймай* (EDKL, 1988), and *шыр бимнеди* (Kenesbaev, 2007) are used. Another example is the phraseology "to praise someone excessively for one's own benefit" in Uzbek, *пахта қо'уго* (to put cotton to somebd.) in Kazakh *қонуик қойды* (Kenesbaev, 2007), and in Karakalpak *шаибаўын котериў* (EDKL, 1988). In expressing these concepts, all three cultures applied the specific properties of objects in existence to human actions and activities, creating the basis for the emergence of a new concept.

### Functions of ethnic stereotypes in Phraseology

Phraseologism is a stable combination that encompasses the history and life experience of a nation passed down from generation to generation, the peculiar way of thinking of the national mentality, as well as the paradoxical aspects of the worldview. Phraseologism forms the national phraseological model of the world, that is, an integral part of the national linguistic picture of the world, and is a source of knowledge about the manifestation of national stereotypes recorded in the human mind through imagery. Ethnic stereotypes embody the perceptions and ideas of a linguistic individual inherent in the common consciousness of his society and other peoples, they not only generalize information about the object and its associative concepts, but also express the category of assessment in

relation to it. Stereotypes are formed by humanity, comparing the reality it observes with the reality already known to it, reshaping it and filling it with various contents. For example, in the Uzbek language, which means “young, immature, not physically and mentally mature enough to do something” the phraseologism is used “*ona suti og‘zidan ketmagan*”, “*og‘zidan sarig‘i ketmagan*” (mother’s milk has not been drained, the yolk has not been drained), and in the Kazakh language, “*қарын шашы алынбаған*” (the belly hair has not been removed), and in the Karakalpak language, *аўзының сарысы кетпеген* (the yolk of the mouth has not been drained). These examples show that three different stereotypes regarding “human age” have been formed in the minds of speakers of three languages, that is, a small part of the linguistic landscape of three different worlds.

Stereotypes in the semantic structure of phraseological units have a number of specific features. These features that are part of the structure of stereotypes have not been sufficiently studied by linguists. In general, it is very difficult for humanity to perceive the world as a whole, and a processed model of objects and events in the world appears in the human mind. Ethnic stereotypes are characterized by stability, emotional- evaluative and regular repetition (Berezovich, 2009; Lipmann, 1922), which are sometimes expressed explicitly, sometimes implicitly. U. Lipmann noted that “the system of stereotypes is not neutral... it is saturated with sensations and feelings that form associations through them” (Lipmann, 2004). Thus, the associations gathered around the expressive plan of the construction that makes up the phraseological unit are also connected with the associations formed around the meaning that the phraseological unit conveys, and ethnic stereotypes are formed through these associations. For example, the phraseology with the meaning “to get married, to get married, to have a family” is used in the Uzbek language as *yelkasiga ola xo‘rjin osmoq* (to carry a basket on one’s shoulder), in the Karakalpak language as *шанарақ көтериў* (to carry a basket on one’s shoulder) or as *аягына тусаў салыў* (to put a basket on one’s foot) (EDKL, 1988), in the Kazakh language as *басына ноқта киді* (to put a dot on one’s head) as *басына отау тікті* (to put a dot on one’s head) / as *мойнына құрық түсті* (to put a dot on one’s neck) (Kenesbaev, 2007). A person has formed an ethnic stereotype by attributing

the reality of “getting married, getting married” to a reality already known to him (*yelkasiga ola xurjun osmoq* – Eng.: to carry a basket on one’s shoulder), and in the peripheries of this ethnic stereotype (*xurjun* – basket) such semantics as family, household goods, and food products are also included in the peripheries of “getting married, getting married”. The phraseologism *yelkasiga ola xurjun osmoq* (carrying a bag over one’s shoulder) is a sign of the stability of the ethnic stereotype, a small mental picture of the world that has been processed through the human ability to perceive the concept of “marrying, getting married”. This phenomenon can also be observed in the above Kazakh and Karakalpak phraseologisms.

It should be noted that in the formation of phraseological units and ethnic stereotypes in their composition, real life realities are of great importance. Because they arise as a secondary representation as a cognitive activity in human life on the basis of primary representations, and also give rise to the emergence of various attitudes of the subject towards this reality. This attitude is an evaluative category that contains information about the value of an object-event contained in the denotative content of the phraseological unit. Regardless of whether it is specific or not, it is present in the essence of ethnic stereotypes. The primary content of stereotypes imprinted in the human mind on the basis of phraseological units, as well as the image (gestalt) formed on its basis, initially activate the emotional, as well as evaluative perception of a person at certain stages of the cognitive process, creating the basis for the nomination of a new reality. For example, in the Uzbek language, phraseologism *pioyalada choy soviguncha* (until the tea cools in the cup), in the Kazakh language *шай қанатым уақыт* (it is time for boiling tea) (Kenesbaev, 2007), in the Karakalpak language *ем пусирим ўақыт* (it is time for cooking meal) (EDKL, 1988) phraseologisms express the time of completion of an action in a short time. In representatives of the three linguistic cultures, this concept of “time” is imprinted with various realities as an ethnic stereotype of various objects, that is, in the mind of the speaker of the Uzbek language as the stereotype “the process and time of tea cooling”, in the Kazakh language as the stereotype “the process and time of tea boiling”, and in the Karakalpak language as the stereotype “the process and time of meat cooking”, and the attitude towards it is formed by

emotional, as well as positive assessments. The assessment present in ethnic stereotypes has a complex structure. In this regard, scholars initially emphasize such components of the evaluation category as “the ‘starting point of evaluation’, which includes an explicit or implicit evaluation subject representing the person or society being evaluated, the evaluation object (person, object, or event), the evaluation element itself, as well as the evaluation scale and evaluation stereotypes” (Babaeva, 1997).

In addition to the above components, in ethnic stereotypes, its signs, in particular, the aspects of evaluation through the criteria of evaluation of reality and various intensifiers, are also of great importance. Usually, the subjective attitude (assessment) to object-events is based on certain stereotyped ideas about the object. In the structure of ethnic stereotypes, there are also intensifiers related to evaluation, which ensure the occurrence of a certain reality “quickly, in a very short time”, which has a hyperbolic character in phraseology. For example, the phraseologism in the Uzbek language *ko‘z ochib yumguncha* (in the blink of an eye), in the Kazakh language *қабак (қас) қаққанша* (in the blink of an eye) (Kenesbaev, 2007), and in the Karakalpak language *көзди ашып-жумганиша* (in the blink of an eye) (EDKL, 1988) are a clear proof of this. Thus, the ethnic stereotype serves as a bridge connecting the semantic aspect of the phraseologisms formed in the language and its stabilized image, which has a verbal expression.

The ambivalent function of some phraseologisms, which are ethnic stereotypes that are an expression of human behavior in the process of linguistic cognition, can be seen in the following examples. For example, in the Kazakh language, the somatic component of the bosh (head) is involved in the word *бас сұқты* (Kenesbaev, 2007), and also the phraseologism *boshiga ko‘tarmoq* used in the meaning to honor and make a noise in Uzbek language, as well as in the in the Karakalpak language, the phraseologism *бастан кешириу* means to experience difficulties and joy in life. In the process of formation of these ethnic stereotypes as a result of human perception, the components of the value structure are expressed both explicitly and implicitly. In such phraseologisms, one can see the simultaneous expression of the subject’s two-sided attitude to reality in the language of each speaker, and

this phraseologism ceases to have the function of ambivalence only when it is fully realized in speech. This typological feature of ethnic stereotypes manifests itself in various modifications as a result of the activity of the stereotyping mechanism of objects and phenomena, which are a small mental component of the phraseological picture of the world, in the subject’s thinking, and indicates the repetition of one reality for the second time, that is, the function of the ethnic stereotype as a repetition.

## Result

### Implications for intercultural communication

Intercultural relations are often influenced by the semantic field of word meaning, which in turn have differences in the interpretation of stereotype, influenced by historical factors and the heritage of a Turkic languages. In this paper, we presented a broader study of the semantic field of ethnic stereotypes in the Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages. Besides it, it is paid attention to linguistic features, cultural associations, and their influence on intercultural communication. We are confident that our research will contribute to the understanding of intercommunication, and cultural exchange through the study of ethnic stereotypes in those languages.

The linguistic image of the world has a general (abstract) and specific (concrete) character (Akhunov et al. 2024). In this way, the stereotypes also in phraseological units of Turkic languages are general and specific to a representative of one language. Stereotypes, acting in different cultural codes and environments, create a unique polymotivational effect and reflect the motivational impulses that interact with each other. Ethnic stereotypes are ready-made in the language, imprinted in the mind of the speaker, they are ready-made stamps ( clichés) that contribute to the organization of information about objects and events in the world, their adequate perception, and affect human thinking, memory and actions. This concept, which is considered the result of the thinking of the speaker of the language, is inherent in the consciousness and speech of each representative of the nation and belongs to the linguistic-mental component, reflects the national thinking of the speakers of the language, their unique way of seeing the world, and they form an integral part of the linguistic picture of the world, inseparable from

the language. In general, the way each speaker sees and perceives the world and the basis of the worldview are their own system of subject-related meanings, social stereotypes and cognitive schemes.

## References

- Alefirenko N. (2010). *Language stereotypes of the Russian ethnocultural space. East European Review. №1. – Poland. – P. 422-423.* Olsztyn, Poland: Publisher.
- Anscombe, J. C. (2001). Dénomination, sens et référence dans une théorie des stéréotypes nominaux. *Cahiers de praxématique*, 36, 43-72.
- Apresyan Yu.D. (1995). The image of a person according to language: an attempt at a systematic description. *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*, 1(P), 37-67.
- Babaeva E. V. (1997). Cultural and linguistic characteristics of attitudes towards property (based on the German and Russian languages). (Doctoral dissertations). Volgograd, Russia: Volgograd State Pedagogical University.
- Bartminsky E. (2005). *The linguistic image of the world: Essays on ethnolinguistics* (Translated from Polish). Moscow, Russia: Indrik.
- Basic stereotypes and their profiling (2009). *Stereotypes in language, communication, culture: collection of articles.* Moscow, Russia: RSUH.
- Belova O. V. (2005). Ethnic stereotypes according to the language and folk culture of the Slavs. Moscow, Russia: Indrik press.
- Berezovich E. L. (2009). *Ethnic stereotypes in different cultures codes / Stereotypes in language, communication, culture: collection of articles.* Moscow, Russia: RSUH.
- Birikh A. K., Mokienko V. M., & Stepanova L. I. (1998). *Dictionary of Russian phraseology* (Historical and Etymological Handbook). Saint Petersburg, Russia: Folio-press.
- Castano E., Paladino M. P., & Coull A. (2002). Protecting the ingroup stereotype: Ingroup identification and the management of deviant ingroup members. *The British journal of social psychology*, 41(3), 365-386.
- Dąbrowska J. (1999). *Stereotype und ihr sprachlicher Ausdruck im Polenbild der deutschen Presse: eine textlinguistische Untersuchung.* Tübingen: Narr, (Studien der deutschen Sprache. Bd. 17). Zielona-Gora, Poland: Gunter Narr Verlag Tübingen.
- Danilova, A. A. (2009). *Manipulation of Words in the Mass Media. Moscow: Dobrosvet, "KDU Publishing House"*. Retrieved from <https://textarchive.ru/c-2758309-p8.html>
- Dauletbaev, K. D., Esemuratova, R. E., & Beketov, B. B. (1988). *Explanatory Dictionary of Karakalpak Language.* Uzbekistan, Nukus: Karakalpakstan.
- Golubovskaya, I. A. (2004). *Ethnic Features of Language Pictures of the World.* Kyiv, Ukraine: Logos.
- Guslyakova, L. G. (1977). *Stereotypes of Everyday Consciousness.* Leningrad, Russia: LGPI press.
- Heine S. J. (2011). *Psychology of culture.* New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Ismailov, G. M. (2017). Linguocultural study of gender stereotypes in Turkic phraseologisms (on the material of Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages). *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*, 14(1), 85-92.
- Ivanova, E. A. (2000). *Stereotype as a cultural phenomenon* (Doctoral dissertations). Moscow, Russia: RUDN University.
- Kenesbaev, I. (2007). *Phraseological dictionary.* Almaty, Kazakhstan: Arys.
- Khudoiberganova D. (2022). *Explanatory dictionary of anthropocentric linguistic terms.* Tashkent, Uzbekistan: Tubo Publishing House.
- khunov A., Essenova K., Suambekova G., Imatayeva A., & Osmanova Z. (2024). Linguistic and Cultural Expression of the Macro Concept of "Family" in Kazakh–Dungan Proverbs. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 12(1), 57-70.
- Khussainova G., Tleuberdiev B., Shakenova M., Aybarsha I., & Roziyeva D. (2024). The Cultural Spectrum of Colors: Exploring Kazakh, Korean and English Color Concepts. *International Journal of Society, Culture and Language*, 12(3), 81-94.
- Kirilina, A. V. (1999). *Gender: linguistic aspects / A.V. Kirilina.* Moscow, Russia: Institute of Sociology of the Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Kon, I. S. (1968). National character - myth or reality? *Foreign literature*, 9, 215-229.

- Krasnyh, V. (2002). *Ethnopsycholinguistics and linguacultural studies: course of lectures*. – Moscow, Russia: Gnosis.
- Lenotyev, A. A. (1993). Language consciousness and image of the world. *Language and consciousness: paradoxical rationality*, 1, 16-21.
- Lipman, U. (2004). *Public opinion*. New York, USA: Institute of the Public Opinion Foundation.
- Lipmann, W. (1922). *Public opinion* (with a new introduction by Michael Curtis). New York, USA: Harcourt.
- Löschmann, M. (2001). *Was tun gegen Stereotype? Interkulturelle Kommunikation in Wirtschaft und Fremdsprachenunterricht* (p. 147-201). Gerhard Wazel. Institut für Interkulturelle Kommunikation e.V. (Hrsg.). Frankfurt-am-Main: Lang.
- Madvaliev, A. P., Begmatov, E., & Hojiev A. (2022). *Explanatory Dictionary of Uzbek Language*. Uzbekistan, Tashkent: G.Gulam polygraphy.
- Manukovsky, M. V. (2005). *Stereotypes of consciousness in intercultural communication. Theory of intercultural communication*. Voronezh, Russia: Voronezh State University Press.
- Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Linguistic and cultural studies*. Moscow, Russia: Academy.
- Metelkina, U. S. (2002). *Social stereotypes: processes of formation, types and use in politics (information approach)* (Doctoral dissertation) Russia: Novosibirsk.
- Nelson, T. (2003). *Psychology of prejudice. Secrets of patterns of thinking, perception and behavior*. Saint Petersburg, Russia: Prime-Euroznak.
- Pavlovskaya, A. V. (1998). Ethnic stereotypes in light of intercultural communication. *Bulletin of Moscow State University*, 1(19), 94-97.
- Potapova, O. V. (2005). *Linguistic ethnic stereotypes and their representation in Belarusian, Russian and Polish lexicography* (Doctoral dissertations). Minsk, Belarus: Yanka Kupala State University of Grodno.
- Prokhorov, U. E. (2008). *National sociocultural stereotypes of verbal communication and their role in the Russian language of foreigners* (5<sup>th</sup> eds.). Russia, Moscow: Pedagogy press.
- Prokhorov, U. E., & Sternin, I. A. (2006). *Russian communicative behavior*. Moscow, Russia: Flint.
- Sadokhin A. P., & Grushevitskaya, T. G. (2010). *Culturology*. Moscow, Russia: UNITY-DANA.
- Semendyaeva, O. Yu. (1986). *Stereotype as a social and socio-psychological phenomenon* (Doctoral dissertations). Moscow, Russia: Institute Sociological Research of Russian Academy of Sciences.
- Shmelev, V. U., & Sazhenova, S. A. (2012). Religious stereotype: towards the formulation of the problem. *Series "Political Science. Religious Studies*, 2(9), 213-217.
- Silinsky, S. V. (1991). National stereotypes of thinking and speech communication. *Psycholinguistics and intercultural interaction*, 1(8), 273-275.
- Sorokin, U. A. (1978). Stereotype, stamp, cliché: On the problem of defining concepts. *Communication: Theoretical and pragmatic problems*, 133-138.
- Tolstaya, S. M. (1995). *Stereotype in ethnolinguistics* (pp. 124-127). Speech and mental stereotypes in synchrony and diachrony. In Proceeding of the Conference. Moscow, Russia: Institute of Slavic and Balkan Studies of the Russian Academy of Sciences.