Sociolinguistic Analysis Of Audiovisual Artistic Works

Mamadjanova Nargiza Mahmujanovna

Associate Professor, Andijan State University, Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract: This article examines the issue of sociolinguistic analysis of audiovisual works of art. It also analyzes the issues of language variety in works of art. In addition, it discusses the different interpretations of these issues from the perspectives of linguists, literary critics, and historical novelists.

Introduction: In the world of linguistics, translation issues have been the focus of researchers' attention for their relevance since the last century. In the world of film, text analysis - the analysis of film discourse and its translation problems in texts from other national cinemas - is one of the issues that is of interest to researchers in the field of linguistics today.

Research in the field

Sociolinguistic analysis of audiovisual works of art should not be limited to the question of whether or not linguistic diversity is accurately depicted. This question has intrigued linguists and literary critics, and has led to numerous studies of how accurately historical novelists depict particular dialects (e.g. McCafferty 2005). However, research has shown that the answers to this question are different. A common trend is the tendency to minimize and obscure linguistic variation in works of art.

More specifically, the complex nature of the local dialect used in society can be simplified by overemphasizing some linguistic features in artistic depictions, neglecting others, or by changing the situations in which certain features are displayed. Stylistic diversity at the level of individual characters is often reduced, resulting in a phenomenon called "homogeneity," characterized by the use of the same speech style among characters. Such tendencies are a sign of stereotyping, in which reduced linguistic variation is associated with broad social categories, leading to simplified and homogenized representations of language use in certain social groups. The association of dialect with the "peasant" archetype is one of the most persistent and obvious examples of this stereotyping phenomenon.

The variability of dialect differences and the reduction of stereotypical representation cannot be generalized to all artistic representations. Factors such as genre, authors, performers, market position, target audience, and other aspects of the pragmatics of fiction influence the quantity and quality of sociolinguistic representations in complex ways. As shown in the chapters in the edited collection by Taavitsainen and Melchers, some literary representations of dialect are recognized for their high accuracy and detail. Familiarity with the dialect depicted is an important factor, as is the author's or director's narrative strategy, which may emphasize realism, social criticism, or deliberate exaggeration. The comedy genre portrays linguistic diversity differently from drama or action films. Furthermore, actors who work with dialect trainers may perform dialects differently from those who have first-hand experience. However, even experienced actors may be forced to adapt their speech to stereotypes during performance (see Planchenault). Genre, authors, performers, market position, target audience, and other aspects of the pragmatics of fiction limit the quantity and quality of sociolinguistic representations in complex ways. Some literary representations of dialect are given a high degree of precision and detail (see, for example, the chapters in Taavitsainen and Melchers 1999). Familiarity with the dialect depicted is an important factor here, as is the author's or director's strategy of depiction, whether it is aimed at realism, social criticism, or deliberate exaggeration. Comedy approaches linguistic diversity differently than drama or action films. Actors who have worked with dialect coaches will perform dialect

differently than those who have first-hand experience. However, even experienced actors may find themselves forced to repeat stereotypes of their speech during performance (see Planchenault's discussion of this issue).

The interaction between language and society is clearly manifested in cinema. Here, dialogues in films serve as both a mirror and a driving force for sociolinguistic phenomena. Language in films has a broader meaning than a simple narrative of events; it embodies the cultural, social, and ideological foundations of its time and creates a rich ground for studying the interrelationship between linguistic behavior and social structures.

Cinema is a complex yet fascinating journey into the past. As a popular art form situated within the complex interplay of economic, cultural, and political spheres, cinema inevitably bears the hallmarks of a journey into social consciousness. Each frame, each sound, carries with it the subtleties of the era in which it was created, the values of society, technological advances, and historical contexts. As a technological art, cinema is largely defined by its unique ability to automatically capture sights and sounds, while serving as a vivid documentation of cultural moments and experiences.

Cinema, like the novel and the theater, is primarily a storytelling medium, as it expresses stories in a time and space context. However, the early stages of cinema were characterized by an undeveloped narrative structure and the absence of a clear cinematic language. Films made during this period, often shot with still cameras, served primarily as visual spectacles intended to amaze the audience. André Gaudreault called this early aesthetic "attraction", and noted that its focus was on engaging the audience through visual novelty rather than complex storytelling. This phase, called "cinematography-attraction", contrasted sharply with the "institutional cinema" that emerged after 1914, which focused more on storytelling.

Tom Gunn criticizes early filmmaking for its tendency to prioritize the visual rhetoric of images over coherent narratives. He describes attractions as often focusing on spectacle and immediacy at the expense of long-term narrative development or psychological depth. This pragmatic evolution—the fact that early cinema engaged audiences through visual spectacle—was an important sign of the shift to a format that valued structured narrative and narrative continuity. The changing relationship between audiences and cinema played a crucial role in the emergence of cinema as both a medium of entertainment and communication.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, unlike early cinema, today's cinema has focused on storytelling, thus redefining cinema as a storytelling medium. Audiences have engaged with these films primarily through a pragmatic relationship with the technological marvel of projection.

REFERENCES

1. Zindell D. The Broken God. – New York: Spectra, 1993. – 704 p.

2. Alim, H. Samy, Award Ibrahim & Alastair Pennycook (eds.). 2009. Global linguistic flows: Hip Hop cultures, youth identities, and the politics of language. New York / Oxford: Routledge.

3. Bednarek, Monika. 2010. The Language of Fictional Television. London/New York: Continuum.

4. Bleichenbacher, Lukas. 2008. Multilingualism in the movies: Hollywood characters and their linguistic choices. Tübingen: Francke.

5. Bucholtz, Mary. 2011. Race and the re-embodied voice in Hollywood film. Language and Communication 31. 255-265.

6. Coupland, Nikolas. 2007. Style. Language variation and identity. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

7. Fairclough, Norman. 1995. Media discourse. London: Edward Arnold.

8. Kozloff, Sarah. 2000. Overhearing film dialogue. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

9. N.M.Mamadjanova. Entering the world cinematography and film discourse. Europian journal of innovation in nonformal education. (EJINE) April 2025