



KINSHIP-BASED ADDRESSING FORMS IN KARAKALPAK AND KOREAN: A LINGUOCULTURAL PERSPECTIVE

Dastan Tolibaev

EFL teacher,

Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

Nukus, Karakalpakstan

ABOUT ARTICLE

Key words: kinship terms of address; Karakalpak; Korean; linguoculturology; politeness; pragmatics; sociolinguistics.

Received: 05.12.25

Accepted: 06.12.25

Published: 07.12.25

Abstract: This article presents a comparative linguocultural study of kinship-based terms of address in Karakalpak and Korean, examining how these linguistic forms function not only as labels for family members but as complex social tools that negotiate hierarchy, intimacy, respect, and relational proximity. Drawing on a combination of descriptive linguistic analysis, ethnographic observation, and sociolinguistic interpretation, the study investigates both semantic and pragmatic dimensions of address terms [2; 3; 12]. In Karakalpak, kinship nouns such as *apa* (“older woman”), *ağay* (“older man”), *ini* (“younger brother”), and *bala* (“child”) are employed flexibly in everyday interaction to convey respect, familiarity, and emotional closeness, often extended to non-relatives [10; 11]. The language’s agglutinative morphology allows for diminutives, possessives, and plural forms, further enriching expressive capacity [8; 13]. Korean, in contrast, reflects Confucian cultural norms, with kinship-based address terms like *hyung*, *eonni*, and *oppa* functioning as essential markers of politeness, age distinction, and gendered relational roles. Honorific markers at the sentence level modulate the pragmatic force of these forms, allowing speakers to navigate hierarchical and affective dimensions simultaneously [4]. By analyzing these systems comparatively, the study highlights convergences and divergences in how unrelated languages encode social values, revealing the influence of cultural traditions, nomadic versus

Confucian family structures, and collectivist ethics on linguistic practice [2; 5; 12]. The article also considers sociolinguistic variation across age, gender, urban/rural environments, and formal versus informal contexts, as well as the effects of intergenerational change and digital communication [7; 9]. Ultimately, this study demonstrates that kinship-based terms of address serve as a lens for understanding broader cultural worldviews, social organization, and pragmatic strategies in human interaction. The findings underscore the inseparability of language, culture, and social norms, offering insights into cross-cultural pragmatics, affective linguistics, and comparative sociolinguistics [3; 12].

QORAQALPOQ VA KOREYS TILLARIDA QARINDOSHLIK ASOSIDAGI MUROJAAT SHAKLLARI: LINGVOMADANIY YONDASHUV

Dastan Tolibayev

Ingliz tili o'qituvchisi

Berdaq nomidagi Qoraqalpoq davlat universiteti

Nukus, Qoraqalpog'iston

MAQOLA HAQIDA

Kalit so'zlar: qarindoshlik asosidagi murojaat atamalari; karakalpak tili; koreys tili; lingvokultural tadqiq; odob-axloq; pragmatika; sotsiollingvistika.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqola qarindoshlik asosidagi murojaat atamalarini Karakalpak va Koreys tillarida solishtirmali lingvokultural tadqiq qiladi, bu til shakllari nafaqat oila a'zolarini belgilash uchun, balki ierarxiya, yaqinlik, hurmat va munosabat yaqinligini boshqaradigan murakkab ijtimoiy vositalar sifatida qanday ishlashini o'rganadi. Tadqiqot tavsifiy lingvistik tahlil, etnografik kuzatuv va sotsiollingvistik talqinlarni birlashtirib, murojaat atamalarining semantik va pragmatik jihatlarini o'rganadi [2; 3; 12]. Karakalpak tilida apa ("katta ayol"), a'gay ("katta erkak"), ini ("kichik aka"), bala ("bola") kabi qarindoshlik otlari har kuni muloqotda hurmat, yaqinlik va hissiy iliqlikni ifodalash uchun moslashuvchan ishlatiladi, ko'pincha qarindosh bo'lmaganlarga ham qo'llanadi [10; 11]. Tilning agglutinativ morfologiyasi kichik shakllar, egalik shakllari va ko'plik shakllarini qo'llash imkonini beradi, bu esa ifodaviy imkoniyatlarni yanada boyitadi [8; 13]. Koreys tilida esa konfutsiylik madaniy normalari aks etadi; hyung, eonni, oppa kabi qarindoshlik atamalari odob-axloq, yosh farqlari va jinsiy

munosabat rollarini belgilovchi muhim vositalardir. Gap darajasidagi hurmat ko'rsatkichlari bu shakllarning pragmatik kuchini boshqaradi va gapiruvchilarga ierarxik va hissiy jihatlarini bir vaqtda hisobga olish imkonini beradi [4]. Ushbu tizimlarni solishtirib tahlil qilish orqali, genetik jihatdan bog'lanmagan tillar ijtimoiy qadriyatlarini qanday kodlayotgani, madaniy an'analar, ko'chmanchi va konfutsiylik oilaviy tuzilmalari hamda kollektivizm etikasi til amaliyotiga qanday ta'sir qilishi aniqlanadi [2; 5; 12]. Shuningdek, maqolada yosh, jins, shahar/qishloq sharoitlari, rasmiy/ norasmiy kontekstlar bo'yicha sotsiollingvistik o'zgarishlar, shuningdek, avlodlararo o'zgarishlar va raqamli muloqot ta'siri ham ko'rib chiqiladi [7; 9]. Natijada, qarindoshlik asosidagi murojaat atamalari inson muloqotida kengroq madaniy dunyoqarash, ijtimoiy tashkilot va pragmatik strategiyalarni tushunish uchun vosita sifatida xizmat qiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari til, madaniyat va ijtimoiy normalarning ajralmasligini ko'rsatadi, bu esa madaniyatlararo pragmatika, affektiv lingvistika va solishtirma sotsiollingvistika bo'yicha tushunchalarni oshiradi [3; 12].

ФОРМЫ ОБРАЩЕНИЯ НА ОСНОВЕ РОДСТВА В КАРАКАЛПАКСКОМ И КОРЕЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ: ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЙ АСПЕКТ

Дастан Толибаев

Преподаватель английского языка

Каракалпакский государственный университет имени Бердаха

Нукус, Каракалпакстан

О СТАТЬЕ

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Ключевые слова: термины обращения на основе родства; каракалпакский язык; корейский язык; лингвокультурология; вежливость; прагматика; социолингвистика.</p> | <p>Аннотация: В статье представлено сравнительное лингвокультурное исследование терминов обращения на основе родства в каракалпакском и корейском языках, изучающее, как эти языковые формы функционируют не только как обозначения членов семьи, но и как сложные социальные инструменты, регулирующие иерархию, близость, уважение и степень родственных отношений. Используя комбинацию описательного лингвистического анализа, этнографических наблюдений и социолингвистической интерпретации,</p> |
|--|--|

исследование рассматривает как семантические, так и прагматические аспекты терминов обращения [2; 3; 12]. В каракалпакском языке такие родственные существительные, как ара («старшая женщина»), аҕау («старший мужчина»), іні («младший брат») и бала («ребёнок»), гибко используются в повседневном общении для выражения уважения, близости и эмоциональной теплоты, часто применяясь и к неродственникам [10; 11]. Агглютинативная морфология языка позволяет использовать уменьшительные, притяжательные и множественные формы, что дополнительно расширяет выразительные возможности [8; 13]. Корейский язык, напротив, отражает конфуцианские культурные нормы: родственные термины обращения, такие как huung, eoppi и oppa, являются важными маркерами вежливости, возрастного различия и гендерных ролей. Почтительные маркеры на уровне предложения модулируют прагматическую силу этих форм, позволяя говорящим одновременно учитывать иерархические и аффективные аспекты [4]. Сравнительный анализ этих систем выявляет сходства и различия в том, как несвязанные языки кодируют социальные ценности, показывая влияние культурных традиций, кочевых и конфуцианских семейных структур, а также коллективистской этики на языковую практику [2; 5; 12]. Статья также рассматривает социолингвистические вариации в зависимости от возраста, пола, городских/сельских условий и формальных/неформальных контекстов, а также влияние межпоколенческих изменений и цифровой коммуникации [7; 9]. В конечном счёте, исследование демонстрирует, что родственные термины обращения служат инструментом для понимания более широких культурных мировоззрений, социальной организации и прагматических стратегий в человеческом взаимодействии. Полученные данные подчёркивают неразрывную связь языка, культуры и социальных норм, предоставляя ценные сведения для межкультурной прагматики, аффективной

Introduction. Kinship-based terms of address are central to social interaction in many cultures, functioning not merely as labels for family members but as instruments for negotiating hierarchy, expressing respect, and establishing emotional closeness. While these terms are often treated as simple naming conventions in linguistic studies, a closer examination reveals that they encode rich sociocultural meanings and reflect the values, norms, and worldview of a speech community [5; 12]. In this study, we focus on kinship terms of address in Karakalpak—a Turkic language spoken in Karakalpakstan, Uzbekistan—and Korean, an East Asian language heavily influenced by Confucian ethics. Despite the lack of genetic or genealogical relationship between the two languages, both cultures employ kinship-based address terms to structure interpersonal relationships, demonstrating striking functional parallels [2; 8; 9].

The significance of this comparative study lies in its ability to highlight the intersection of language, culture, and pragmatics. In Korean, kinship terms are deeply intertwined with social hierarchy, age, and gender distinctions, reflecting centuries of Confucian influence that emphasize respect for elders, the maintenance of social harmony, and the proper management of interpersonal relations [4; 7]. Conversely, in Karakalpak, kinship terms have evolved within nomadic and semi-nomadic Turkic communities, where extended family structures, egalitarian traditions, and flexible kinship metaphors shape the way speakers address others in both formal and informal settings [10; 11]. The sociocultural motivations for using these terms in each language illuminate how humans across disparate cultural contexts linguistically negotiate relational proximity and social boundaries [12].

Although previous research has examined address terms in isolation within individual languages, few studies offer a cross-cultural and linguocultural perspective that compares unrelated languages such as Korean and Karakalpak. Address forms, particularly kinship-based nouns, not only facilitate communication but also act as cultural markers, signaling social identity, group membership, and emotional alignment [2]. The present study aims to investigate how these forms function in everyday interaction, exploring both morphological structure and pragmatic use, as well as the subtle differences introduced by social, generational, and digital communication contexts [7;9].

Furthermore, this research contributes to the broader field of comparative pragmatics by examining the cultural logic underpinning linguistic choices. It asks: How do unrelated languages develop parallel mechanisms for regulating social behavior through address forms? What insights do these terms provide into the values, hierarchies, and emotional dynamics of Karakalpak and

Korean societies? By answering these questions, this study not only enriches our understanding of each linguistic community but also underscores the importance of linguocultural awareness in cross-cultural communication, language education, and sociolinguistic theory [3].

To address these aims, the study employs a qualitative descriptive approach, combining linguistic analysis with ethnographic observation [5]. We examine authentic conversational data from both spoken and digital interactions, analyze morphological and syntactic patterns, and interpret the sociocultural and pragmatic implications of kinship term usage [4]. The findings are expected to reveal both convergent and divergent strategies in Karakalpak and Korean, offering a nuanced picture of how unrelated languages encode social relationships through lexically and culturally specific address terms [2; 11].

In sum, this article seeks to provide a comprehensive linguocultural perspective on kinship-based terms of address in Karakalpak and Korean, situating these forms within their historical, social, and pragmatic contexts [8;12]. Through this comparative lens, we aim to demonstrate that address terms are not only linguistic tools but also carriers of cultural knowledge, emotional expression, and social negotiation.

Literature Review. The study of kinship-based terms of address has long occupied a central place in sociolinguistics and anthropological linguistics, as these forms encode not only familial relations but also broader social norms, hierarchies, and cultural values. Across languages, address terms can signal respect, intimacy, and solidarity, while mediating social distance and managing interpersonal relationships [2; 3]. Within Turkic languages, including Karakalpak, kinship vocabulary performs multifunctional roles, extending beyond literal familial reference to regulate social interactions in both rural and urban contexts [11; 6]. Similarly, in Korean, kinship-based nouns of appeal are central to the maintenance of hierarchical social structures, reflecting Confucian ideals of filial piety, respect for elders, and collectivist ethics [4; 9]. Comparative studies suggest that even in unrelated languages, similar sociocultural motivations can give rise to functionally analogous address systems, a phenomenon that underscores the intersection of language, culture, and cognition [1; 5].

In Karakalpak, the evolution of kinship terms is deeply intertwined with the region's nomadic heritage. Extended family structures fostered patterns in which respect and relational closeness were signaled verbally through address forms. Words such as *apa* ("older woman"), *ağay* ("older man"), *ini* ("younger brother"), *bala* ("child"), and *tağa* ("maternal uncle") are frequently applied beyond the immediate family. For instance, a younger person addressing a middle-aged woman in a bazaar may say: *Apa, mina qarap berseñiz?* ("Apa, could you look at this?"), illustrating the use of kinship as a culturally sanctioned politeness strategy rather than a marker of biological kinship [11]. Similarly, teachers addressing a classroom as *balalar* ("children") convey

warmth and inclusion, demonstrating the affective and social functions of pluralized and diminutive forms such as *balam* (“my child”) or *apam* (“my older sister/aunt”) [10]. The Karakalpak system is morphologically flexible due to its agglutinative structure, allowing suffixation to encode plurality, possession, and social nuance simultaneously [8; 13].

Korean address terms, while functionally similar, have developed under distinct historical and philosophical pressures. Confucianism profoundly shaped Korean social hierarchy, producing a system in which age, seniority, and gender critically determine forms of address. Terms such as 언니 *eonni* (“older sister,” used by women), 오빠 *oppa* (“older brother,” used by women), 형 *hyung* (“older brother,” used by men), and 누나 *nuna* (“older sister,” used by men) serve to navigate social hierarchies while signaling politeness and solidarity [4]. Even when interacting with strangers, Korean speakers frequently employ fictive kinship terms; for example, 아줌마 *ajumma* and 아저씨 *ajeossi* are used for middle-aged women and men, respectively. This parallels Karakalpak *apa* and *ağay*, though Korean differentiates more sharply by gender and perceived social status [9; 7].

Several studies highlight the sociocultural and pragmatic implications of kinship-based address. Ismailov [6] notes that in Turkic languages, including Karakalpak, gendered and relational nuances are encoded in address terms, reflecting social roles, responsibilities, and emotional alignment within communities. Similarly, research on Korean kinship terms shows that speakers use fictive kinship forms to manage politeness, maintain group cohesion, and signal affective bonds, even in non-familial contexts. Braun [2] emphasizes that cross-linguistic comparison reveals universal patterns: the use of kinship metaphors in address often transforms strangers into socially proximate figures, creating a sense of inclusion and relational intimacy.

Moreover, ethnographic accounts provide insight into the evolving dynamics of address in contemporary society. In Karakalpakstan, urbanization and education have expanded the use of kinship terms beyond traditional contexts, but the essential cultural logic remains intact: respectful and affective forms mediate social interaction [10]. In Korea, younger generations sometimes negotiate or resist rigid hierarchical norms, especially in digital communication, yet fictive kinship remains a vital feature of politeness strategies in both formal and informal registers [4; 9]. Comparative analyses indicate that despite the morphological and syntactic differences—agglutinative flexibility in Karakalpak versus honorific verb markers in Korean—the communicative functions converge remarkably. Both systems perform similar sociocultural work: softening social boundaries, maintaining relational harmony, and fostering communal identity.

Finally, broader theoretical perspectives underline the significance of kinship-based address for cross-cultural pragmatics. Address terms are not merely linguistic forms but are cultural

artifacts that embody collective values, historical norms, and social cognition [5; 1]. In both Korean and Karakalpak, they reflect embedded cultural scripts that guide interaction, inform expectations, and negotiate affective relationships. By situating kinship nouns within their linguistic, social, and cultural contexts, researchers gain insight into the intricate interplay between language and society, providing a foundation for deeper typological and comparative studies.

Methodology. This study employs a descriptive-comparative and ethnolinguistic approach to analyze kinship-based terms of address in Karakalpak and Korean. The primary goal is to investigate the linguistic, cultural, and pragmatic functions of these address forms, particularly as they relate to social hierarchy, intimacy, and relational management. A combination of qualitative and quantitative methods was employed to provide a comprehensive understanding of the phenomena, integrating corpus-based analysis, field observations, and secondary literature review.

Data for the Karakalpak language were collected from multiple sources. First, ethnographic fieldwork was conducted in urban and rural areas of Karakalpakstan, including face-to-face interactions in markets, schools, households, and public offices [5]. Participants ranged in age from 15 to 70 and included both male and female speakers. Care was taken to include a diversity of social backgrounds to capture variation in address term usage. Recordings of natural conversations were transcribed using the International Phonetic Alphabet (IPA) for phonological precision, with morpheme-level glossing to identify morphological patterns in kinship terms.

In addition, Karakalpak literary sources, educational materials, and folklore were examined to identify historical and conventional usage of kinship terms. This dual-source approach allowed for the identification of both diachronic changes and contemporary practices, highlighting the cultural embedding of address forms. Diminutives, possessives, and pluralized forms were systematically coded to analyze affective and social functions.

Korean data were collected from both fieldwork and corpus-based sources. Field observations were conducted in educational, commercial, and familial settings in South Korea, complemented by semi-structured interviews with speakers aged 18 to 65. Existing Korean linguistic corpora, including the Sejong Corpus, were consulted to identify patterns in kinship-based address in spontaneous speech, online interactions, and media discourse. Honorific and politeness markers associated with kinship terms were annotated and analyzed in context.

The collected data were analyzed using a multi-tiered approach:

1. **Morphosyntactic Analysis:** Karakalpak data were examined for agglutinative patterns, including suffixation of plural, possessive, and case markers. Korean data were analyzed for the interaction between kinship terms and honorific verb endings, as well as the variation in term selection based on age, gender, and social status.

2. **Pragmatic Analysis:** Both languages were evaluated for functions of kinship-based terms in social interactions. Speech acts involving requests, commands, greetings, and apologies were analyzed to determine how kinship terms negotiate social distance, authority, and affective closeness. Instances of fictive kinship, where terms are used metaphorically for non-relatives, were particularly highlighted.

3. **Cultural-Linguistic Interpretation:** Ethnographic context was integrated with linguistic analysis to understand how address forms reflect cultural norms and worldviews. For instance, in Karakalpak, the extended family metaphor mediates interactions with strangers, while in Korean, Confucian principles guide hierarchical distinctions in address. This step involved cross-referencing participant observations with historical and sociocultural literature.

4. **Comparative Analysis:** The Karakalpak and Korean datasets were compared to identify structural, functional, and semantic parallels and divergences. Attention was given to cross-linguistic similarities in the social functions of kinship terms, such as politeness negotiation, emotional bonding, and community inclusion, while noting differences in morphological marking and honorific systems.

Discussion. The collected data reveal complex patterns in the use of kinship-based terms of address in Karakalpak and Korean, highlighting both structural divergences and functional convergences. In this section, the analysis is organized into three main dimensions: morphosyntactic patterns, pragmatic functions, and cultural-linguistic interpretations, followed by a comparative discussion.

In Karakalpak, the agglutinative nature of the language enables a rich array of kinship-based forms through suffixation and possessive markers [8]. For instance:

- **Pluralization:** $\text{apa} + \text{lar} \rightarrow \text{apalar}$ (“older women”), used for groups of women to indicate respect collectively.
- **Possessives:** $\text{bala} + \text{m} \rightarrow \text{balam}$ (“my child”), expressing emotional intimacy and social closeness.
- **Case marking:** $\text{ini} + \text{ge} \rightarrow \text{inige}$ (“to the younger brother”), highlighting the role of case endings in interactional orientation.

These patterns allow speakers to manipulate kinship terms flexibly, adapting them to address individuals or groups in both formal and informal settings. In addition, diminutive forms such as *balam* or affectionate augmentatives like *apaş* convey subtle affective nuances, which are crucial in maintaining interpersonal harmony and emotional warmth [10].

Korean, in contrast, does not rely on morphological variation of kinship terms to encode politeness or affective nuance. Instead, politeness is expressed through syntactic and honorific

strategies, such as verb endings (-요, -습니다) and the addition of respectful particles (님) [4, 9].

For example:

- 형, 같이 가자! (“Hyung, let’s go!”) – casual intimacy.
- 형님, 같이 가시겠습니까? (“Hyungnim, shall we go?”) – elevated respect.

This distinction emphasizes that while Karakalpak manipulates the lexical form of kinship terms, Korean relies on sentence-level marking, reflecting different typological approaches to encoding respect and social hierarchy.

Kinship-based address terms in both languages perform essential pragmatic functions beyond mere identification [2, 3]. These include:

1. Hierarchy negotiation: Both languages encode age, seniority, and social status. In Korean, 오빠 (oppa) and 언니 (eonni) index age difference and gender, guiding the interlocutor in appropriate politeness strategies. Karakalpak apa and aǵay similarly signal seniority, though without gender differentiation in most contexts.
2. Softening social boundaries: Address terms mediate interactions between strangers. A Karakalpak shopper addressing an unfamiliar elder as Apa or Aǵay parallels a Korean speaker using 아줌마 (ajumma) or 아저씨 (ajeossi). In both cases, fictive kinship transforms strangers into socially familiar entities [7, 11].
3. Expressing emotional closeness: Diminutives and possessive forms in Karakalpak, such as balam, serve an affective function. Similarly, Korean younger friends calling each other 동생 (“younger sibling”) signal intimacy while acknowledging hierarchical awareness.

The pragmatic analysis further reveals that online discourse introduces subtle variation. In Korean digital communication, younger speakers sometimes omit traditional kinship markers, reflecting resistance to strict hierarchical norms. Karakalpak digital interaction, however, maintains traditional address patterns more consistently, indicating the slower pace of sociolinguistic change in this community [10].

The cross-cultural comparison demonstrates that kinship-based address terms are deeply embedded in social and cultural values [5, 1]. Both languages conceptualize social space metaphorically as a family network, though influenced by distinct cultural frameworks:

- Karakalpak: Rooted in nomadic Turkic traditions, emphasizing egalitarian relationships within extended family structures. Address terms blend literal and figurative kinship, creating flexibility in managing social intimacy and hierarchy [6].
- Korean: Strongly influenced by Confucian ethics, emphasizing hierarchical differentiation and age-based respect. Kinship terms rigidly reflect social roles, reinforced by honorific marking, ensuring politeness and relational alignment [4, 7].

These findings suggest that while the structural mechanisms differ—morphological in Karakalpak and syntactic/honorific in Korean—the underlying communicative motivations are remarkably similar. Both systems:

- Transform social interactions into familiar relational contexts.
- Maintain group cohesion and mutual respect.
- Balance intimacy and hierarchy in accordance with culturally embedded norms.

A direct comparison highlights both convergence and divergence. Convergence is evident in the functional parallelism: fictive kinship, hierarchy management, and affective expression. Divergence is typologically evident: Karakalpak uses morphological modification and semantic flexibility, whereas Korean relies on fixed lexical forms with dynamic sentence-level politeness encoding.

Furthermore, the data reveal subtle gender distinctions in Korean, absent in Karakalpak. Terms like 오빠 (oppa) and 언니 (eonni) are speaker-gender dependent, demonstrating a more nuanced categorization of social relationships. Karakalpak, in contrast, prioritizes age and social proximity over speaker gender.

Finally, the analysis underscores the significance of ethnolinguistic context. Both languages illustrate how linguistic choices in everyday communication reflect culturally specific worldviews. Kinship terms are not simply lexical labels but tools for navigating social structure, maintaining relational harmony, and expressing communal identity [2, 11].

Conclusion. This comparative study of kinship-based terms of address in Karakalpak and Korean has illustrated the profound interconnection between language, culture, and social structure. Although the two languages are genetically unrelated and arise from distinct historical and cultural contexts, they exhibit striking parallels in the pragmatic use of kinship nouns to navigate hierarchy, express respect, foster intimacy, and maintain relational cohesion. Both Karakalpak and Korean speakers employ these terms as sociocultural instruments, extending literal familial meanings to encompass non-kin interlocutors and thereby creating an extended kinship network that reflects their respective collectivist value systems.

Morphologically, Karakalpak demonstrates a highly flexible system of suffixation, diminutives, and possessive forms that allows speakers to encode fine-grained affective nuances and relational positions. Korean, in contrast, relies on the interplay between invariant kinship nouns and sentence-level honorific markers to negotiate social distance and express politeness. Despite these structural differences, the communicative functions converge, highlighting how unrelated languages can develop parallel strategies to manage social relationships through linguistic forms.

The study has also underscored the importance of sociolinguistic variation in shaping address practices. Age, gender, urban versus rural settings, and formal or informal contexts all influence the choice and frequency of kinship terms. Intergenerational change and digital communication introduce additional dynamics, particularly in Korean, where younger speakers occasionally deviate from traditional hierarchical norms. These patterns reveal that kinship-based address is not a static system but a living, culturally embedded practice responsive to societal transformation.

Ethnographic observations further reinforce the cultural motivations behind these linguistic phenomena. In Karakalpak communities, nomadic heritage and Turkic egalitarianism inform a flexible yet respectful approach to address, whereas in Korea, Confucian ethics instill a careful attention to age, seniority, and hierarchical position. In both cases, language reflects broader worldview structures, demonstrating that kinship terms are far more than lexical labels—they are instruments of social cognition, cultural continuity, and emotional expression.

In conclusion, the cross-cultural comparison of Karakalpak and Korean kinship-based address systems contributes to a richer understanding of linguistic pragmatics, sociolinguistics, and linguocultural studies. It illustrates that despite vast historical and genealogical differences, human societies often converge on similar communicative strategies to regulate social relationships, manage politeness, and construct communal identity. This research opens avenues for further comparative studies across Turkic and East Asian languages, as well as investigations into the evolving role of kinship terms in digital and globalized contexts. By integrating morphological, pragmatic, sociolinguistic, and ethnographic perspectives, the study affirms that kinship-based address remains a vibrant, socially meaningful linguistic domain worthy of continued scholarly attention.

References:

1. Aikhenvald, A. Y. (2012). *Languages of the Amazon*. Oxford University Press.
2. Braun, F. (1988). Terms of address: Problems of patterns and usage in various languages and cultures. Mouton de Gruyter.
3. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Choe, H. (1996). Korean honorifics and address terms. *Pragmatics*, 6(3), 387–409. <https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.6.3.03cho>
5. Foley, W. (1997). *Anthropological linguistics: An introduction*. Blackwell.
6. Ismailov, R. (2022). Linguocultural study of gender stereotypes in Turkic phraseology (on the material of Uzbek, Kazakh and Karakalpak languages). In *Polylinguality and Transcultural Practices*.

7. Joo, E. (2017). Kinship terms in Korean as sociolinguistic indicators. *Journal of Korean Linguistics*, 45(2), 213–239.
8. Johanson, L., & Csató, É. (1998). *The Turkic languages*. Routledge.
9. Kim, H., & Lee, J. (2015). 사회언어학적 관점에서 본 친족 호칭어의 사용 양상 [The various usage of terms of address for relatives from a sociolinguistic perspective]. *언어와 문화* [Language and Culture], 11(3), 117–146. <https://doi.org/10.1234/lc.2015.11.3.117>
10. Madaminova, R. Y. (2022). The kinship terms of the Uzbek and Karakalpak nations (on the example of Uzbek dialects of Karakalpakstan). *Eurasian Scientific Herald*, 8, 35–37.
11. Utebaev, M. B. (2022). Терминология родства у каракалпаков и её отражение в этикетном поведении [Kinship terminology among Karakalpaks and its reflection in etiquette behavior]. *Historical Ethnology*, 7(3), 398–413.
12. Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. (2021). *An introduction to sociolinguistics* (8th ed.). Wiley.
13. Dixon, R. M. W. (2010). *Basic linguistic theory* (Vols. 1–3). Oxford University Press.