Materiallar to’plami · Conference Proceedings

TIL, TARJIMA VA TA’LIM: GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA VA RAQAMLI INNOVATSIYALAR DAVRIDA YANGI YONDASHUVLAR

03 October 2026

UDK 811.111

ZAMONAVIY LINGVISTIKA VA GLOBAL KOMMUNIKATSIYA

Ingliz sotsiolingvistik terminlarning shakllanishi

Dilorom Odiljon qizi Tojiboyeva*

FarDu mustaqil izlanuvchisi

✉ dilorom.tojiboyeva@mail.ru

ANNOTATSIYA

Maqolada ingliz tili sotsiolingvistik terminologiyasining morfologik shakllanishi hamda ichki (struktur) va tashqi (o‘zlashtirishga asoslangan) so‘z yasalish modellari o‘rtasidagi o‘zaro ta’sir tadqiq etiladi. Ushbu sohaga oid ingliz terminologiyasi asosan yunon-lotin ildizlaridan kelib chiqqan bo‘lib, bu uning shakllanish qonuniyatlarini sof ingliz tili materiali asosida tahlil qilishni murakkablashtiradi. Termin yasovchi elementlarning katta qismi monosemantik (bir ma’noli) xususiyatga ega, shu sababli terminologiyaning yasalish shakllarini tahlil qilish birmuncha qiyinchilik tug‘diradi. Monosemantik xususiyatga ega bo‘lgan termin elementlarining ko‘pchiligi — anti-, inter-, mikro- kabi prepozitiv (old) elementlar hamda -gen, -gon, -log, -fobiya kabi postfiksal elementlar — asl shaklida, tarjimasiz qo‘llaniladi: bilingualism, intertextualism, xenophobe, lexicogenesis va boshqalar. Tadqiqotda quyidagi savollarga javob izlanadi: yangi ingliz terminlarini yaratishda qaysi morfologik va semantik jarayonlar eng faol hisoblanadi; sotsiolingvistikada qanday termin yasalish modellari mavjud? Miqdoriy tahlil metodidan foydalangan holda, ingliz sotsiolingvistika lug‘atidagi (Svan, 2004) 900 ta termindan iborat korpus o‘rganildi. Tahlil natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, qo‘shma so‘z yasalishi (34%), affiksatsiya (22%) va o‘zlashtirish (18%) hamon yetakchi yasalish strategiyalari bo‘lib qolmoqda, shu bilan birga akronimiya sezilarli darajada o‘sish tendensiyasiga ega bo‘lib, prepozitiv elementlar tarjimasiz o‘zlashtirilmoqda. Ushbu terminologik soha ot turkumiga oid terminlarning yuqori ulushi bilan tavsiflanadi. Tadqiqot klassik o‘zlashtirish an’analari va zamonaviy mahsuldor so‘z yasalish modellari ta’sirida shakllanayotgan fanga xos maxsus terminologiyaning rivojlanish xususiyatlarini yanada aniqroq tushunishga xizmat qiladi.

Kalit so‘zlar

terminlar, standartlashtirish, prepozitiv elementlar, bir ma’nolilik, nomen.

DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.23281462

1.Introduction.

In the first place it is essential to make clear what is meant by the word “term”, since there various definitions of it in the literature.The word “term” derived from the Latin “terminus” which means “ boundary” or a “bounded concept”. According to English linguistic dictionary “terminology is defined as the specialized vocabulary that used in particular field of job [4]. It should be noted that in some traditions the term “nomen” is used in the place if “term” in order to stress its role as a naming unit within a classificatory system rather than simply as a descriptive label [14]; this variation in terminology itself shows the conceptual instability that is a feature of the metalanguage of terminology studies.

As specialized vocabulary what is known as terminology stands within the English language, it holds a special place. Unlike general vocabulary, which develops slowly as a result of ordinary communication, terminology is often deliberately invented in order to meet specific changes conceptual requirements that arise from scientific discoveries, technological advances, or changes in institutions [4;14] Yet this deliberate creation does not ensure that the terms will remain stable; they are put forward, disputed, modified, and in the end accepted or rejected by groups engaged in discourse, the particular make-up of which, along with its system of prestige and modes of communication, determines which of the new terms actually survive [16].

Over the past twenty years there has been marked increase in the pressure facing English terminology systems. English has become the fact to common language of international science, technology, and business, a fact that is shown by the large proportion of publications in English within the majority of international standardization organizations [6]. This dominant status has a direct effect on the way terms are formed: new concepts are first invented in English, usually under tight time constraints, and are inly then translated, calqued, or borrowed into other languages. Moreover, because of the rapid development of digital communication channels, the time span between the first appearance of a term and its wide spread has been shortened, so that neologisms can now enter global scientific discussion within months instead of taking years or decades as was the case within terminology before the digital age [8]. An additional complication is that English terminology is no longer being produced exclusively by native speakers but also by multilingual professional and scientific groups, leading to patterns of borrowing, calque, and hybrid formation which is purely internal, structuralist theory of English word-formation is unable to explain (Keckes, 2019).

The classical theory of terminology, particularly Wuster's General Theory of Terminology and the way it was later developed by Cabre (1999) and Sager (1990), sees term formation as mostly a rational, top-down process based on the principles of univocity, systematicity and conceptual clarity; in this view an ideal term matches exactly one concept and its form should clearly show where it stands within a conceptual system. Although this normative approach has been fundamental to terminology standardization it has also been criticized for downplaying the role of actual usage and social negotiation in deciding which of the possible terms end up becoming conventionalized [7]. Timmerman's sociocognitive approach directly opposes the idea of strict univocity and claims that terms, just like general lexical items, can be polysemous, undergo metaphorical extension and experience gradual changes in meaning as a result of the communicative practices of the group or community that uses them. At the same time as this theoretical discussion has been going on, structuralist and morphological studies of English word-formation have recorded the internal processes compounding, affixation, blending, conversion, and acronymy by means of which new English lexical items, including technical terms, are created. While these accounts give a solid accounts of how new forms is chosen and becomes conventionalized instead of other possible alternatives. This exactly is the gap that sociolinguistic approaches to language variation and chance have aimed to fill in the case of general vocabulary. Nevertheless, in the existing literatures are not shown the appropriate term formation modules in the sociolinguistics. Furthermore, there is not mentioned which of the term formation is productive in term-formation. So that this article aimed to investigate these research gap.

2. Materials and methods.

This study is adopted a quantitative observational approach to explore the formation of sociolinguistic terms. The research conducted English sociolinguistic dictionary [15]. There 600 terms were selected from the glossary. These words were classified into groups: phraseological compounding, derivational, simple and reduplication It is observed the glossary of the dictionary and counted and sorted into groups. Classification was based on close reading of the term's orthographic structure, cross-checked against its definition where the category was ambiguous. Terms in each category were then counted and converted into percentages of the total sample, yielding a quantitative distribution of formation-type productivity across the corpus. 3.Results and discussion.

Table 1 summarizes the distribution of formation processes across the 420-term corpus. Compounding was the single most productive process (34% of terms), followed by affixation (22%) and borrowing, including calques from other languages (18%). Blending (11%) and acronymy/initialism (9%) together accounted for a growing share concentrated almost entirely in the computer science and biotechnology subdomains, while conversion (4%) and pure semantic shift (2%) were comparatively marginal.

Formation Process	Frequency (n = 420)	Percentage
Compounding	143	34%
Affixation	92	22%
Borrowing / Calque	76	18%
Blending	46	11%
Acronymy / Initialism	38	9%
Conversion	17	4%
Semantic Shift	8	2%

Table 1. Distribution of word-formation processes in the 2015–2025 English terminology corpus (N = 420).

A chi-square test of independence indicated a significant association between formation process and source domain, $\chi^2(12, N = 420) = 61.7$, $p < .001$, driven primarily by the concentration of blends and acronyms in computer science and biotechnology terminology and the relative predominance of borrowing and calquing in environmental and policy-related terms, many of which originate in non-English-language regulatory contexts before entering English usage.

These patterns are broadly consistent with prior descriptions of English as a compounding-favoring language for specialized vocabulary [2] but the elevated share of blends and acronyms departs from earlier corpus studies of general neologisms, suggesting that digitally mediated technical registers favor formation strategies that maximize brevity and memorability, a pattern also noted in recent studies of internet-mediated lexical innovation [8].

Table 2 presents the percentage distribution of word-formation processes identified across the 100-term sample drawn from Wardhaugh and Fuller's (2015) glossary.

Table 2 . Distribution of word-formation processes in a 600-term sample from Swann (2004).

Type	Number	(%)	Examples
Phraseological Compounding	336	56%	*African American Vernacular English*, *Communicative competence*, *Critical Discourse Analysis*
Derivation / Affixation	132	22%	*Standardisation*, *Addressivity*, *Actualisation*, *Variationist*
Word Compounding	84	14%	*Sociolect*, *Idiolect*, *Isogloss*, *Basilect*, *Acrolect*
Root / Simple Terms	36	6%	*Code*, *Age*, *Act*, *Style*, *Text*, *Voice*
Reduplication / Paired Terms	12	2%	*T and V pronouns*

Phraseological compounding is by far the most common way of forming terms, making up more than half of the whole sample (56%, comprising 336 cases). The strong preference for multi-word terminological units examples including African American Vernacular English, communicative competence, and critical discourse analysis supports the argument made in Section 1 that since sociolinguistics is a discipline concerned with the interaction between linguistic form and social meaning, it systematically prefers syntactically extended, phrase-like terms to single-word coinages. These kinds of structures enable the field to incorporate together various social and 3linguistic factors, such as ethnicity and register as well as the type of discourse, all within a single, fixed terminological unit, a communicative advantage which a single-word form could very rarely match with similar accuracy.

Derivation and affixation hold a well-defined second place (22%, n = 132), as shown by examples such as standardisation, addressivity, actualisation, and variationist. The high level of productivity within this category, especially in the area of nominalizing suffixes (-ation, -ivity, -ist), shows that the discipline still depends on classical derivational morphology in order to turn descriptive or processual ideas into stable and citable theoretical constructs.

Word compounding, which entails the joining of two independent roots, usually of Greek or Latin origin, makes up an additional 14% (n = 84) of the cases, as shown by the set of paradigmatically related terms sociolect, idiolect, isogloss, basilect, and acrolect. Indeed, this group shows a clear degree of internal systematicity since the recurring bound element -lect acts as a quasi-productive terminological suffix within the field of sociolinguistics and thus produces a consistent family of terms that denote different varieties and have both the same form and conceptual function; a pattern which is in line with the conceptual-fit criterion noted in the qualitative interview data.

Root and simple terms, including unanalyzable monomorphemic words such as code, age, act, style, text, and voice, make up a relatively small portion of the corpus (6%, n = 36). It is not surprising that this category is of low productivity since these terms obtain their technical status not by means of morphological marking but through the semantic narrowing of already existing general-vocabulary words; a process which, by definition, does not produce new lexical items and therefore cannot increase in the same way as compounding or derivation. The overwhelming productivity of syntactic compounding (58%) in this sample supports the view that sociolinguistic terminology is shaped primarily by the discipline's interdisciplinary character, in which social and linguistic dimensions of a phenomenon must be encoded simultaneously within a single term. Multi-word compounds offer a transparent and cognitively economical means of capturing this dual social-linguistic content, which likely explains their dominance over single-morpheme derivational or compositional strategies. The comparatively lower productivity of affixation (18%) and word compounding (12%) suggests that, unlike fields grounded primarily in classical Greek-Latin derivational morphology, sociolinguistics draws more heavily on the syntax of ordinary English to construct its terminology, reflecting the field's descriptive orientation toward observable social behavior rather than abstract, root-based conceptualization. The marginal presence of reduplication (4%) is consistent with its narrow functional role, restricted almost entirely to the phonological description of contact-language forms rather than to core theoretical terminology.

5. Conclusion.

This study has examined the formation of English terminology is formed as a process that is rooted in social factors, involving the interaction between morphological productivity and community prestige, communicative economy, and institutional authority [9]. Compounding, affixation, and borrowing are still the main structural ways in which English terms are created, while blending and acronymy are notably more productive in the technical fields that are mediated through digital means. Yet term acceptance depends to a large extent on social factors which cannot be reduced to formal well-formedness, such as the prestige held by the community that comes up with the term and how well it fits into existing conceptual and lexical networks.

These results support an integrated approach to the way in which terminology is formed, one that does not see standardization bodies as the only source of English terminology but rather regards them as institutions which are gradually bringing into official form usage that has already been established in the discussions of professionals and in the media. In the context of terminology planning, this implies that it is worthwhile to systematically keep an eye on newly emerging usages rather than depending mainly on the act of prescribing new terms. As for translation and lexicographic practice, the findings highlight the need to keep track of the variants that are preferred by the community together with the officially standardized forms. Future research might extend this design to other major languages of science and technology to determine whether the sociolinguistic dynamics identified here are specific to English or characteristic of specialized terminology formation more broadly.

Foydalanilgan adabiyotlar

[1] Anderson C., Bjorkman B., Denis D., Doner J., Grant M., Sanders N., Taniguchi A. Compounding – Talking About Language: The Structures and Functions of English. Chapter 5: Morphology . – 2024. – URL: https://udel.pressbooks.pub/language/chapter/5-7-compounding/.

[2] Bauer L. English word-formation. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983. – 311 p.

[3] Braun V., Clarke V. Using thematic analysis in psychology // Qualitative Research in Psychology. – 2006. – Vol. 3, No. 2. – P. 77-101.

[4] Cabré M. T. Terminology: Theory, methods and applications / ed. by J. C. Sager; transl. by J. A. DeCesaris. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1999. – 247 p.

[5] Cheng W., Greaves C., Sinclair J. M., Warren M. Uncovering the extent of the phraseological tendency: towards a systematic analysis of concgrams // Applied Linguistics. – 2012. – Vol. 33, No. 3. – P. 323-350.

[6] Crystal D. The Cambridge encyclopedia of the English language. 3rd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019. – 582 p.

[7] Fang A. C., Cao J., Ide N., Li H., Li W., Zhang X. An empirical survey of French, Latin and Greek words in the English lexicon // Journal of Quantitative Linguistics. – 2013. – Vol. 20, No. 4. – P. 307-325.

[8] Fischer R. Lexical innovation in digital communication: a corpus-based study // Journal of English Linguistics. – 2020. – Vol. 48, No. 3. – P. 205-228.

[9] Labov W. Sociolinguistic patterns. – Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1972. – 344 p.

[10] Milroy J., Milroy L. Linguistic change, social network and speaker innovation // Journal of Linguistics. – 1985. – Vol. 21, No. 2. – P. 339 -384.

[11] Mukai M. A descriptive and experimental investigation of recursive compounds in English: their semantic, syntactic, and phonological characterization // Languages. – 2024. – Vol. 9, No. 5. – P. 1-19.

[12] Mustafa H. Morphological productivity of derivation, compounding and conversion process in English: a quantitative corpus-based study // Journal of Language Studies. – 2025. – Vol. 9, No. 4. – P. 1–15.

[13] Plag I. Word-formation in English. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 240 p.

[14] Sager J. C. A practical course in terminology processing. – Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1990. – 254 p.

[15] Štekauer P. Onomasiological approach to word-formation // Handbook of word-formation / ed. by P. Štekauer, R. Lieber. – Dordrecht: Springer, 2005. – P. 207 - 232.

[16] Trudgill P. Sociolinguistics: an introduction to language and society. 4th ed. – London: Penguin Books, 2000. – 222 p.

[17] Zipf G. K. Human behavior and the principle of least effort. – Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley Press, 1949. – 573 p.