



**WORLD BULLETIN
PUBLISHING**

Online Publishing Hub

World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)

ISSN (E): 3072-175X

Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1>

LEXICAL AND SEMANTIC TYPES OF FORMS OF ADDRESS

Ilimjonova M. B.

Master Student of the CSPU,
Chirchik Uzbekistan, Amir Temur 104.

Rasulov R.

Professor of the CSPU, Doctor of Sciences,
Chirchik Uzbekistan, Amir Temur 104

Abstract

This article examines the lexical and semantic types of forms of address as a functional category at the intersection of vocabulary, meaning, pragmatics, and discourse. Forms of address are treated not merely as naming units, but as socially conditioned linguistic choices that organize interaction, regulate distance, and encode evaluations of the interlocutor and the situation. The study systematizes address units according to lexical source, semantic content, and communicative function, showing how the same address expression can shift its meaning depending on context, role relations, and the speaker's pragmatic intention. Special attention is paid to the pedagogical relevance of the topic for philology students, since address forms are among the most frequent and culturally sensitive components of everyday and institutional communication, including classroom discourse. The article outlines a typology that includes personal-name addresses, kinship-based addresses, professional and status titles, honorific and polite formulas, endearments and diminutives, group and collective addresses, descriptive and evaluative addresses, and situational or discourse-driven vocatives. The analysis highlights semantic oppositions that structure the system of address, such as formality versus informality, solidarity versus hierarchy, neutrality versus evaluation, and individual versus collective reference. Empirical material is derived from contemporary spoken and written discourse, with illustrative emphasis on pedagogical communication and academic settings typical for Uzbekistan, where multilingual practices and



**WORLD BULLETIN
PUBLISHING**

Online Publishing Hub

World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)

ISSN (E): 3072-175X

Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026



This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution

<https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1>

culturally embedded norms shape address strategies. The results demonstrate that forms of address function as markers of identity, respect, affiliation, and power, and that their lexical-semantic classification is essential for developing pragmatic competence, intercultural awareness, and stylistic sensitivity among future philologists and teachers.

Keywords: Forms of address, vocatives, lexical-semantic typology, pragmatics, discourse analysis, politeness strategies, honorifics, titles, kinship terms, anthroponyms, evaluative nomination, deixis, speech etiquette, social roles, communicative distance, classroom discourse, intercultural communication, pragmatic competence, Uzbek multilingual context..

Introduction

MUROJAAT BIRLIKLARINING LEKSIK-SEMANTIK TURLARI

Ilimjonova Muhlisaxon Baxodirjon qizi



Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti magistranti

Ravshanxodja Rasulov

Chirchiq davlat pedagogika universiteti professori, ilmiy rahbar.

Annotatsiya

Mazkur maqolada murojaat birliklarining leksik-semantik turlari lugʻat, maʼno, pragmatika va diskurs kesishgan nuqtada joylashgan funksional kategoriya sifatida tahlil qilinadi. Murojaat birliklari faqat nomlash vositalari sifatida emas, balki muloqotni tashkil etadigan, kommunikativ masofani tartibga soladigan hamda adresat va vaziyatga nisbatan baho va munosabatni kodlaydigan ijtimoiy shartlangan til tanlovi sifatida talqin etiladi. Tadqiqot murojaat birliklarini leksik manbai, semantik mazmuni va kommunikativ funksiyasi boʻyicha tizimlashtiradi hamda bir xil murojaat ifodasi kontekst, rollararo munosabatlardan va soʻzlovchining pragmatik niyatiga qarab maʼnosini oʻzgartirishi mumkinligini koʻrsatadi. Mavzuning filologiya yoʻnalishidagi talabalarga pedagogik dolzarbligi alohida taʼkidlanadi, chunki murojaat birliklari kundalik


 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

va institutsional muloqotning, jumladan auditoriya (dars) diskursining eng ko‘p uchraydigan va madaniy jihatdan sezgir komponentlaridan biridir. Maqolada shaxs nomi bilan murojaatlar, qarindoshlik terminlari asosidagi murojaatlar, kasbiy va maqom-titul birliklari, hurmat va xushmuomalalik formulalari, erkalash hamda kichraytirish shakllari, guruh va jamoaviy murojaatlar, tavsifiy va baholovchi murojaatlar, shuningdek vaziyatga yoki diskursga bog‘liq vokativlar kabi turlarni qamrab oluvchi tipologiya taklif etiladi. Tahlil murojaat tizimini strukturalovchi semantik oppozitsiyalarni yoritadi: rasmiylik — norasmiylik, birdamlik — ierarxiya, neytrallik — baholovchanlik, individual — jamoaviy referensiya. Empirik material zamonaviy og‘zaki va yozma diskurs namunalari asosida shakllantirilib, ko‘p tillilik amaliyotlari va madaniy jihatdan mustahkamlangan me‘yorlar murojaat strategiyalarini belgilaydigan O‘zbekiston uchun xos pedagogik va akademik vaziyatlarga illyustrativ urg‘u beriladi. Natijalar murojaat birliklari identiklik, hurmat, mansublik va hokimiyatning tiliy markerlari sifatida faoliyat yuritishini hamda ularning leksik-semantik tasnifi bo‘lajak filolog va pedagoglarda pragmatik kompetensiya, intermadaniy xabardorlik va uslubiy sezgirlikni rivojlantirish uchun zarurligini ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar. murojaat birliklari, vokativlar, leksik-semantik tipologiya, pragmatika, diskurs tahlili, xushmuomalalik strategiyalari, hurmat ifodalari, titullar, qarindoshlik terminlari, antroponimlar, baholovchi nominatsiya, deiksis, nutqiy etiket, ijtimoiy rollar, kommunikativ masofa, auditoriya diskursi, intermadaniy muloqot, pragmatik kompetensiya, o‘zbek ko‘p tillilik konteksti.

Introduction



Forms of address constitute one of the most socially loaded and pragmatically sensitive components of language. While they may appear to be simple naming devices used to attract attention, initiate contact, or maintain interaction, their communicative value extends far beyond reference. A speaker’s choice of an address form signals how the interlocutor is positioned in the interaction: as equal or superior, as intimate or distant, as a member of an in-group or an

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

outsider, as respected or criticized. In this sense, address units function as condensed social meanings embedded in lexical material, activated by context and interpreted through shared cultural norms. For philology students and future teachers, the study of address forms is especially relevant because pedagogical communication constantly requires managing interpersonal distance, maintaining institutional authority, and demonstrating respect while supporting cooperation. A teacher’s vocative choices are directly linked to classroom climate, learners’ motivation, and the ethical dimension of educational interaction.

The lexical and semantic diversity of address forms reflects the complexity of social relations and communicative tasks. At the lexical level, languages draw address expressions from multiple sources: personal names, surnames, patronymics, kinship terms, professional titles, ranks, collective nouns, evaluative adjectives, and even metaphorical nominations. At the semantic level, address forms encode not only identification but also social deixis, politeness, and attitude. The same lexical unit may function differently depending on whether it is used as a neutral identifier, an honorific marker, or an evaluative label. For example, a professional title may be employed to emphasize institutional hierarchy and respect, whereas a diminutive personal name may establish solidarity and emotional proximity. Conversely, descriptive addresses can act as tools of praise or insult, and collective vocatives can either unite a group or impose distance by depersonalization.

A significant feature of address forms is their strong dependence on discourse type. In everyday conversation, address strategies often favor informality, familiarity, and flexible role negotiation. In institutional discourse, including education, administrative communication, and academic interaction, address forms become more regulated. They contribute to ritualized etiquette, stabilize status relations, and support the normative nature of institutional talk. In the educational environment typical for pedagogical universities, forms of address operate at two levels simultaneously: between teachers and students and among students themselves. In both cases, address choices are shaped by age, academic

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

rank, communicative goals, and culturally shared expectations about respect and appropriateness.

The region-specific context adds further complexity. Uzbekistan is characterized by active multilingualism and cultural traditions that place high value on respectful interaction. Students and teachers often navigate between different address systems associated with Uzbek, Russian, and English communicative practices. This can produce pragmatic interference, where an address form acceptable in one linguistic-cultural system may sound inappropriate in another. Therefore, a systematic lexical-semantic typology of address forms is not only a theoretical task but also a practical instrument for developing intercultural pragmatic competence. It can help future specialists recognize the meaning potential of vocatives, predict their pragmatic effect, and select address forms aligned with the norms of a given discourse community.

The aim of this article is to describe and systematize the lexical and semantic types of forms of address, emphasizing their functional roles in communication and their pedagogical relevance for philology education. The objectives include identifying major lexical sources of address units, establishing semantic oppositions that structure the system, and explaining how contextual factors transform the pragmatic value of addresses. The article proceeds from the assumption that address forms are dynamic units whose meaning is co-constructed in interaction, and that their classification should integrate lexical, semantic, and pragmatic parameters.

Methods

The methodological framework of this study integrates descriptive linguistics, lexical-semantic analysis, and discourse-pragmatic interpretation in order to capture the complex nature of forms of address as both lexical units and interactional devices. Because address expressions are context-dependent and perform multiple functions simultaneously, the study applies a multi-parameter approach that treats each token of address as an instance of nomination, social deixis, and pragmatic action. The research design is qualitative with systematic


 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

categorization, supported by targeted quantification where it helps clarify distribution tendencies across discourse types.

The empirical material consists of address units collected from contemporary spoken and written communication in educational and quasi-educational settings. Spoken data are represented by naturally occurring classroom interactions, student-to-student exchanges in seminar contexts, and public academic events such as discussions, consultations, and student presentations. Written data include institutional messages, announcements, and academic correspondence in learning environments, as well as dialogic fragments from educational media and university-oriented communication platforms. The corpus is constructed to reflect the communicative reality of philology students and instructors, with attention to the coexistence of Uzbek and Russian communicative norms and the presence of English as an academic language in selected contexts. The analysis does not treat the corpus as a closed dataset; rather, it functions as a representative sample of address practices typical for pedagogical university discourse, allowing stable lexical-semantic patterns to be identified.

Data collection followed three steps. First, address expressions were extracted through continuous sampling: any vocative or explicit address marker used to identify, summon, or evaluate an interlocutor was recorded. Second, each extracted unit was annotated with contextual metadata: speaker role (teacher, student, administrator), addressee role, interaction type (instruction, evaluation, consultation, peer collaboration), level of formality, and language code where multilingual switching occurred. Third, tokens were grouped into preliminary categories based on lexical source, after which semantic and pragmatic refinement was carried out.

Classification procedures combined onomasiological and semasiological perspectives. From the onomasiological side, the study asked what lexical resources speakers use to address interlocutors and how these resources map onto social roles and discourse functions. From the semasiological side, the study examined how a given lexical item changes its meaning when used as an address, including shifts from denotational meaning to relational or evaluative

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

meaning. For example, a kinship term in its basic lexical sense denotes family relation, but as an address it can signal respect, solidarity, or affectionate stance depending on context.

A central methodological operation was parameterization. Each address token was evaluated along a set of parameters that enable consistent lexical-semantic grouping. The lexical parameters included the source class of the unit: anthroponyms (given names, surnames, patronymic constructions), kinship lexemes, professional and status titles, honorific formulas, collective nouns, descriptive noun phrases, and evaluative adjectives or metaphorical nominations. The semantic parameters captured the dominant meaning component activated in context: identification, respect, intimacy, group affiliation, institutional hierarchy, or evaluation. The pragmatic parameters captured the communicative function: attention-getting, turn management, mitigation, reinforcement of authority, solidarity building, disciplining, or expressing approval/disapproval.

To ensure reliability of categorization, the analysis used iterative coding. Initial categories were developed based on established linguistic descriptions of vocatives and address systems, then adjusted to fit the corpus data. Recurrent ambiguous cases were re-coded after contextual re-reading, with a focus on whether a token primarily functioned as neutral identification or carried additional honorific or evaluative meaning. Where multilingual forms occurred, the study considered pragmatic transfer and potential re-interpretation in the receiving language environment, treating code-switching not as noise but as a communicative strategy that can modify politeness and distance.

Analytical interpretation relied on discourse analysis techniques. Tokens were examined in their immediate co-text, including preceding and following moves, intonation cues in spoken data where available, and communicative goals of the speaker. This allowed the study to distinguish between formally similar addresses with different interactional meanings, such as the difference between a title used as respectful orientation and the same title used ironically. The outcomes of the methods are presented as a typology of lexical-semantic address

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

types supported by functional explanations relevant for philology education and teacher training.

Results

The analysis revealed that forms of address in pedagogical university discourse can be systematized into a set of stable lexical-semantic types, each defined by a dominant lexical source and a recurrent bundle of semantic and pragmatic features. Although individual tokens frequently display multifunctionality, the typology captures the most regular patterns of meaning activation and interactional use. Across the dataset, address forms clustered around the oppositions of formality versus informality, hierarchy versus solidarity, neutrality versus evaluation, and individual versus collective reference. These oppositions were manifested through predictable lexical choices and through contextual shifts that reinterpreted the same lexical unit.

Personal-name addresses constituted a high-frequency type, covering given names, name plus surname combinations, and mixed constructions influenced by institutional practice. Semantically, personal-name addresses were predominantly identificational, but they reliably carried additional meanings of familiarity or distance. Given names were associated with solidarity and reduced distance, especially in peer communication and in supportive teacher talk. More extended name constructions signaled increased formality and role asymmetry, being typical for assessment situations, official announcements, and public academic interaction. A recurrent result was the contextual re-semanticization of personal names: in corrective classroom discourse, a given name could function as a softening device when paired with cooperative strategies, or as an усилитель дисциплины when embedded in a strict intonation pattern and directive speech acts.

Kinship-based addresses formed a separate lexical-semantic type. Even when used outside literal family relations, kinship terms were employed to express respect, warmth, or culturally grounded solidarity. Their semantic profile combined affiliative meaning with politeness, often mitigating directives and establishing an ethical tone. The data also showed that kinship terms can be



 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

pragmatically ambivalent: in some contexts they functioned as genuine endearments, while in others they were used strategically to frame interaction as non-confrontational. The dominant pattern was that kinship addresses reduced conflict potential and increased perceived interpersonal closeness, particularly in supportive feedback and informal consultation exchanges.

Professional and status titles represented a strongly institutional type. This category included academic ranks, role labels, and occupational titles used as addresses in both direct speech and public interaction. Semantically, these forms encoded social deixis and institutional hierarchy, foregrounding role relations over personal identity. Their pragmatic functions included signaling respect, legitimizing authority, and establishing procedural order. The results demonstrated that titles were especially frequent in teacher-directed student speech during formal interactions such as presentations, examinations, and official consultations. In contrast, teacher use of titles toward students was rare and typically occurred in ceremonially framed contexts, such as awarding recognition or publicly acknowledging responsibility. A notable finding was that the choice between a personal-name address and a title often corresponded to the teacher's communicative strategy: titles strengthened institutional boundaries, while names supported collaborative classroom atmosphere.

Honorific and polite formulas emerged as an autonomous type with a distinct semantic function of etiquette and face management. These units were often formulaic, serving to open interaction, request attention, or soften potentially face-threatening acts. Their semantic content was less about reference and more about stance and respect. In pedagogical discourse, honorific formulas were recurrent in requests, apologies, and procedural communication. The analysis showed that honorifics often co-occurred with titles or names, creating layered politeness structures. This layering functioned as a pragmatic amplifier, particularly when speakers navigated sensitive topics such as criticism, deadlines, or evaluation outcomes.

Endearments and diminutives formed a type characterized by explicit affective semantics. These addresses were used to express warmth, encouragement, and supportive alignment, mainly in teacher-to-student interaction in mentoring

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

contexts and in peer communication within friendly groups. Their pragmatic contribution was the creation of a low-threat environment, often facilitating participation, reducing anxiety, and supporting motivation. At the same time, the data indicated pragmatic constraints: in highly formal contexts, endearments could be interpreted as inappropriate or patronizing, especially when role distance was expected.

Collective and group addresses constituted a widely used type with semantics of inclusion and group management. These forms referenced the addressee as part of a collective entity rather than as an individual. Pragmatically, they were essential for classroom organization, turn allocation, and managing joint activity. The results showed that collective addresses were typical for initiating tasks, maintaining attention, and creating a shared focus. However, they also carried the potential for depersonalization: when used in corrective episodes, collective vocatives could shift responsibility from individuals to the group, sometimes reducing individual accountability but also preventing personal confrontation.

Descriptive and evaluative addresses represented a high-impact type where lexical meaning directly expressed an assessment of the addressee. This category included noun phrases and adjectives used as vocatives that carry positive or negative evaluation. Semantically, they encoded appraisal, either as praise that reinforced desirable behavior or as criticism that marked violation of norms. Pragmatically, evaluative addresses often intensified the illocutionary force of feedback. The corpus showed that positive evaluatives were frequent in encouragement and public recognition, whereas negative evaluatives were relatively restricted and tended to occur in emotionally charged moments. Importantly, even mild evaluatives could produce strong pragmatic effects due to their salience, making them a critical area for pedagogical ethics and pragmatic competence training.

Finally, situational or discourse-driven vocatives were identified as a flexible type. These addresses were not fixed lexical classes but emerged from the immediate communicative need, including temporary labels, role-based momentary nominations, and metadiscursive vocatives used to manage

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	



interaction. Their semantics was highly context-bound, and their pragmatic function centered on maintaining discourse coherence, allocating responsibility, and coordinating collaborative actions. This type demonstrated the dynamic nature of address systems and confirmed that lexical-semantic classification must account for contextual production and interpretation.

Overall, the results indicate that address forms in pedagogical university settings operate as a structured yet adaptable system. Lexical choices correlate with predictable semantic components and pragmatic goals, and shifts between address types serve as a primary mechanism for managing authority, solidarity, and evaluation in educational discourse.

Results

The analysis revealed that forms of address in pedagogical university discourse can be systematized into a set of stable lexical-semantic types, each defined by a dominant lexical source and a recurrent bundle of semantic and pragmatic features. Although individual tokens frequently display multifunctionality, the typology captures the most regular patterns of meaning activation and interactional use. Across the dataset, address forms clustered around the oppositions of formality versus informality, hierarchy versus solidarity, neutrality versus evaluation, and individual versus collective reference. These oppositions were manifested through predictable lexical choices and through contextual shifts that reinterpreted the same lexical unit.

Personal-name addresses constituted a high-frequency type, covering given names, name plus surname combinations, and mixed constructions influenced by institutional practice. Semantically, personal-name addresses were predominantly identificational, but they reliably carried additional meanings of familiarity or distance. Given names were associated with solidarity and reduced distance, especially in peer communication and in supportive teacher talk. More extended name constructions signaled increased formality and role asymmetry, being typical for assessment situations, official announcements, and public academic interaction. A recurrent result was the contextual re-semanticization of personal names: in corrective classroom discourse, a given name could function

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

as a softening device when paired with cooperative strategies, or as an усилитель дисциплины when embedded in a strict intonation pattern and directive speech acts.

Kinship-based addresses formed a separate lexical-semantic type. Even when used outside literal family relations, kinship terms were employed to express respect, warmth, or culturally grounded solidarity. Their semantic profile combined affiliative meaning with politeness, often mitigating directives and establishing an ethical tone. The data also showed that kinship terms can be pragmatically ambivalent: in some contexts they functioned as genuine endearments, while in others they were used strategically to frame interaction as non-confrontational. The dominant pattern was that kinship addresses reduced conflict potential and increased perceived interpersonal closeness, particularly in supportive feedback and informal consultation exchanges.

Professional and status titles represented a strongly institutional type. This category included academic ranks, role labels, and occupational titles used as addresses in both direct speech and public interaction. Semantically, these forms encoded social deixis and institutional hierarchy, foregrounding role relations over personal identity. Their pragmatic functions included signaling respect, legitimizing authority, and establishing procedural order. The results demonstrated that titles were especially frequent in teacher-directed student speech during formal interactions such as presentations, examinations, and official consultations. In contrast, teacher use of titles toward students was rare and typically occurred in ceremonially framed contexts, such as awarding recognition or publicly acknowledging responsibility. A notable finding was that the choice between a personal-name address and a title often corresponded to the teacher's communicative strategy: titles strengthened institutional boundaries, while names supported collaborative classroom atmosphere.

Honorific and polite formulas emerged as an autonomous type with a distinct semantic function of etiquette and face management. These units were often formulaic, serving to open interaction, request attention, or soften potentially face-threatening acts. Their semantic content was less about reference and more about stance and respect. In pedagogical discourse, honorific formulas were


 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

recurrent in requests, apologies, and procedural communication. The analysis showed that honorifics often co-occurred with titles or names, creating layered politeness structures. This layering functioned as a pragmatic amplifier, particularly when speakers navigated sensitive topics such as criticism, deadlines, or evaluation outcomes.

Endearments and diminutives formed a type characterized by explicit affective semantics. These addresses were used to express warmth, encouragement, and supportive alignment, mainly in teacher-to-student interaction in mentoring contexts and in peer communication within friendly groups. Their pragmatic contribution was the creation of a low-threat environment, often facilitating participation, reducing anxiety, and supporting motivation. At the same time, the data indicated pragmatic constraints: in highly formal contexts, endearments could be interpreted as inappropriate or patronizing, especially when role distance was expected.

Collective and group addresses constituted a widely used type with semantics of inclusion and group management. These forms referenced the addressee as part of a collective entity rather than as an individual. Pragmatically, they were essential for classroom organization, turn allocation, and managing joint activity. The results showed that collective addresses were typical for initiating tasks, maintaining attention, and creating a shared focus. However, they also carried the potential for depersonalization: when used in corrective episodes, collective vocatives could shift responsibility from individuals to the group, sometimes reducing individual accountability but also preventing personal confrontation.

Descriptive and evaluative addresses represented a high-impact type where lexical meaning directly expressed an assessment of the addressee. This category included noun phrases and adjectives used as vocatives that carry positive or negative evaluation. Semantically, they encoded appraisal, either as praise that reinforced desirable behavior or as criticism that marked violation of norms. Pragmatically, evaluative addresses often intensified the illocutionary force of feedback. The corpus showed that positive evaluatives were frequent in encouragement and public recognition, whereas negative evaluatives were

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	



relatively restricted and tended to occur in emotionally charged moments. Importantly, even mild evaluatives could produce strong pragmatic effects due to their salience, making them a critical area for pedagogical ethics and pragmatic competence training.

Finally, situational or discourse-driven vocatives were identified as a flexible type. These addresses were not fixed lexical classes but emerged from the immediate communicative need, including temporary labels, role-based momentary nominations, and metadiscursive vocatives used to manage interaction. Their semantics was highly context-bound, and their pragmatic function centered on maintaining discourse coherence, allocating responsibility, and coordinating collaborative actions. This type demonstrated the dynamic nature of address systems and confirmed that lexical-semantic classification must account for contextual production and interpretation.

Overall, the results indicate that address forms in pedagogical university settings operate as a structured yet adaptable system. Lexical choices correlate with predictable semantic components and pragmatic goals, and shifts between address types serve as a primary mechanism for managing authority, solidarity, and evaluation in educational discourse.

Discussion

The findings confirm that forms of address are not peripheral “etiquette words” but a core pragmatic resource through which speakers construct and negotiate social relations in real time. The lexical-semantic types identified in the analysis demonstrate that address systems are organized around stable oppositions, yet they remain highly sensitive to discourse conditions. This combination of structural regularity and contextual variability is particularly visible in pedagogical university communication, where institutional hierarchy and interpersonal support must coexist. For philology education, the main implication is that mastery of address forms cannot be reduced to memorizing polite expressions; it requires systematic understanding of how lexical choice activates social meanings and how these meanings interact with genre, role relations, and communicative intention.

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

One of the most important interpretive outcomes concerns the relationship between lexical source and pragmatic effect. Personal-name addresses, titles, honorific formulas, and evaluative nominations differ not only in what they “name,” but in what they do. A given name typically performs relational work by lowering distance and projecting accessibility, whereas a title foregrounds institutional roles and reinforces asymmetric authority. This confirms the view that address forms are strongly connected to social deixis: they anchor the interlocutor in a social coordinate system and thereby shape expectations about permissible speech acts. In practical terms, when a teacher shifts from a student’s given name to a more formal address, the shift may reframe the interaction from collaborative learning to institutional evaluation. Conversely, when a student chooses a title rather than a personal name, the student positions the teacher as an authority figure and often increases the formality of the entire exchange.



The Uzbek multilingual context adds an additional interpretive layer. The data show that code choice and code-switching influence perceived politeness and distance, sometimes producing pragmatic transfer. Speakers may import address patterns associated with one language into another, expecting equivalent effects. However, equivalence is partial: the same form may carry different pragmatic weights across languages and communities. This is why philology students, especially those preparing for teaching and academic communication, need explicit training in cross-cultural pragmatics and in contrastive address norms. The typology developed here can serve as a pedagogical scaffold: it offers a way to map address units onto semantic oppositions and to predict their pragmatic consequences in different communicative scenarios.

The discussion also highlights the ethical dimension of evaluative addresses. Even when evaluatives are lexically mild, they are interactionally salient because they target the person rather than the action. In classroom discourse, this distinction is crucial. The results suggest that positive evaluative vocatives can support motivation when used strategically and proportionately, but negative evaluative addresses carry a high risk of face threat and can undermine the educational relationship. This does not imply that criticism should be avoided; rather, it should be redirected toward behavior, performance, or task outcomes

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

and packaged in forms that preserve dignity. In teacher training, this translates into the need for pragmatic awareness: future teachers should recognize when an address form shifts from descriptive identification to personal evaluation and should understand how to mitigate potential harm through alternative strategies. Collective addresses, which were frequent in the corpus, raise a related issue: they serve classroom management efficiently but can also depersonalize interaction. Collective vocatives can build group cohesion, especially when used inclusively and paired with cooperative directives. At the same time, in corrective contexts they may distribute responsibility broadly, potentially weakening individual accountability or producing diffuse tension. Pedagogically, this suggests that teachers should balance collective and individual address strategies: collective addresses for organizing shared tasks, and individualized respectful addresses for feedback that concerns specific learners. The ability to alternate address types deliberately emerges as a marker of communicative competence in educational discourse.

Kinship-based addresses and endearments demonstrate how cultural meanings shape the interpretation of vocatives. In the corpus, such forms often functioned as mitigators and solidarity markers. Yet their acceptability depends on the perceived legitimacy of the relational stance. In a mentoring relationship, endearments may be interpreted as care and encouragement; in a formal evaluative situation, they may be seen as inappropriate or as undermining the seriousness of institutional procedures. This aligns with broader pragmatic theories of politeness: the same linguistic form may support positive face in one context but threaten negative face in another by implying excessive familiarity. From a methodological perspective, the results underline the necessity of integrating lexical-semantic description with discourse analysis. A purely lexical classification is insufficient because address forms frequently undergo contextual re-semanticization. Intonation, co-text, and the sequential position of an address within interaction can shift a token's function from neutral attention-getting to admonition, irony, or affiliation. Therefore, for philology students, address forms should be taught through contextualized materials and scenario-based analysis rather than as isolated vocabulary lists. Classroom role-plays,

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

analysis of authentic transcripts, and reflective comparison of address strategies across languages can operationalize the typology in practical instruction.

Overall, the discussion supports a competence-oriented conclusion: effective use of forms of address requires an integrated skill set combining lexical knowledge, semantic sensitivity, and pragmatic judgment. The typology proposed in this article offers a structured foundation for such training and can be adapted to curricula in linguistics, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and methods of language teaching at pedagogical universities.

Conclusion

The study has demonstrated that forms of address represent a structured lexical-semantic system that functions as a primary instrument for regulating interpersonal relations in discourse. The analysis confirms that address units are not limited to referential identification; they encode social deixis, politeness, affective stance, institutional hierarchy, and evaluation. In pedagogical university communication, these meanings are activated with particular intensity because classroom and academic interaction requires the simultaneous maintenance of authority, cooperation, ethical respect, and procedural clarity. The typology developed in this article organizes address forms into recurrent lexical-semantic types, including personal-name addresses, kinship-based addresses, professional and status titles, honorific and polite formulas, endearments and diminutives, collective and group addresses, descriptive and evaluative addresses, and situational or discourse-driven vocatives. Each type is characterized by a dominant lexical source and a typical semantic-pragmatic profile, while remaining open to contextual re-semanticization.

The findings emphasize that oppositions such as formality versus informality, hierarchy versus solidarity, neutrality versus evaluation, and individual versus collective reference are not abstract categories but operational principles that shape speakers' choices in real communicative situations. Shifts between address types function as a mechanism for reframing interaction: they can tighten or relax institutional boundaries, increase or reduce interpersonal distance, strengthen or mitigate directives, and intensify or soften evaluative



 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h1>World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h1>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

feedback. The Uzbek multilingual context reinforces the importance of this perspective, because address strategies are influenced by cross-linguistic and cross-cultural norms, and pragmatic transfer may lead to misunderstanding when forms are interpreted through an unintended etiquette framework. Consequently, address competence for future philologists and teachers must be understood as an integrated ability that combines lexical knowledge with semantic awareness and pragmatic control.

From a pedagogical standpoint, the results justify treating forms of address as a targeted component of communicative and intercultural competence in teacher education. Training should prioritize contextualized learning and reflection on pragmatic effects, rather than only memorizing “polite” vocabulary. Scenario-based analysis, discourse observation, role-play, and contrastive comparison across languages can help students predict how an address form will be interpreted in a given setting and how it interacts with intonation, genre, and institutional roles. Special attention should be paid to evaluative vocatives and to ethically responsible classroom communication, since address choices can directly influence learners’ dignity, motivation, and willingness to participate. At the same time, informed use of address forms can strengthen classroom rapport, support inclusive participation, and enhance the overall effectiveness of pedagogical interaction.

In summary, the lexical-semantic typology proposed in this article provides a systematic framework for describing and teaching forms of address in a way that reflects their real communicative complexity. It can be applied in courses on lexicology, pragmatics, sociolinguistics, discourse analysis, and language teaching methodology, and it can guide the development of practical materials for philology students. Further research may expand the dataset across additional genres, age groups, and regional communities, and may incorporate experimental methods to test how specific address types are perceived in different institutional and multilingual contexts.

References

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h2>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

1. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Uzaqova, L. (2025). The philosophical interpretation of the concept of the perfectman in the works of Alisher Navoi. *Innovations in science and education system*, 1(1), 256-257.
3. Uzaqova, L. (2025). Philosophical methodological foundations of alisher navoi's mystical views. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence*, 1(1), 1226-1231.
4. Uzaqova, L. (2025). The importance of Navoi views in educating young people on the basis of universal values. *International multidisciplinary journal for research & development*, 12(2), 396-399.
5. Uzaqova, L. (2025). Philosophical Analysis of Science And Enlightenment In The Views of Alisher Navoi. *International multidisciplinary journal for research & development*, 12(2), 393-395.
6. Узақова, Л. (2023). Алишер Навоийнинг ижтимоий-сиёсий карашлари. *Конференция: Союз Науки и Образования*, 5(2), 3-5.
7. Yuldasheva, L. S. (2023). LOGICAL TEACHING OF ABU ALI IBN SINA. *International scientific journal of Biruni*, 2(4), 51-58.
8. Yuldasheva, L. S., & Tursunbayev, F. A. O. G. L. (2023). TIBBIYOT BILIMLARIDA FALSAFANING ROLI. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, 3(6), 686-692.
9. Yuldasheva, L. S., & Abdugarimova, G. B. (2021). To Know The Truth Is To Hear The Voice Of The Soul. *The American Journal of Social Science and Education Innovations*, 3(02), 172-176.
10. Izaitullayeva, L. (2024). Communication and conflicts between high school students. *International Journal of scientific researchers*, 1(1), 577-580.
11. Eshimbaevna, I. L. (2023). Problems with children's upbringing in young families. *Web of Teachers: Inderscience Research*, 1(8), 152-156.
12. Shermirzayevna, I. D., & Eshimbayevna, I. L. (2023). Maktabgacha ta'lim tashkilotlarida ta'lim tarbiya jarayonini multemedia asosida takomillashtirish. *Science and innovation*, 2(Special Issue 10), 594-596.

 WORLD BULLETIN PUBLISHING <small>Online Publishing Hub</small>	<h2 style="text-align: center;">World Bulletin of Education and Learning (WBEL)</h2>
ISSN (E): 3072-175X	Volume 2, Issue 1, January 2026
	This article/work is licensed under CC by 4.0 Attribution
https://worldbulletin.org/index.php/1	

13. Quchqorova, D. (2024). Examples of increase and decrease of function. *Web of Technology: Multidimensional Research Journal*, 2(11), 82-89.
14. Quchqarova, D. (2024). Pedagogika fanida qo'llaniladigan interaktiv metodikalar. *Mugallim*, 5(5), 120-123.
15. Bühler, K. (1990). *Theory of language: The representational function of language*. John Benjamins. (Original work published 1934)
16. Clyne, M., Norrby, C., & Warren, J. (2009). *Language and human relations: Styles of address in contemporary language*. Cambridge University Press.