

PROBLEMS OF TERMINOLOGICAL ADAPTATION: GAPS IN NEOLOGISM ASSIMILATION AND THE CONFLICT OF LINGUISTIC INTERFERENCE**Madalova Mohiro'z Navruzovna**

Master's student in English Linguistics at Termiz State University

@madalovamohiroz@gmail.com

@m_navruzovna

ABSTRACT

This article examines the pressing issues of terminological adaptation in the modern Uzbek language, specifically focusing on the rapid influx of neologisms in the era of globalization. The primary objective is to analyze the structural and semantic gaps that occur during the assimilation of new terms into the national lexicon. As digital technologies and international economic relations expand, the Uzbek language faces an unprecedented wave of foreign borrowings, primarily from English. This process often leads to "linguistic interference," where the phonetic, morphological, and syntactic rules of the source language conflict with the inherent laws of the Uzbek linguistic system.

The study highlights that the absence of a centralized, systematic mechanism for term regulation results in "lexical pollution" and the emergence of redundant doublets. Through a qualitative analysis of recent media and academic texts, the paper identifies significant barriers to successful adaptation, including inconsistent orthography and the failure to find appropriate native equivalents. The research argues that the conflict between linguistic innovation and purism requires a balanced approach that prioritizes the internal development of the language while allowing for necessary international integration. The findings suggest that bridging these gaps requires accelerated lexicographical efforts and the development of a dynamic national linguistic corpus to monitor and standardize neologism assimilation in real-time.

Keywords: neologism, terminological adaptation, linguistic interference, assimilation, Uzbek linguistics, lexical gaps, globalization, language policy, linguistic corpus.

Аннотация

Данная статья посвящена исследованию актуальных проблем терминологической адаптации в современном узбекском языке, с особым акцентом на стремительный приток неологизмов в эпоху глобализации. Основная цель работы заключается в анализе структурных и семантических пробелов, возникающих в процессе ассимиляции новых терминов в национальный лексикон. В условиях расширения цифровых технологий и международных экономических отношений узбекский язык сталкивается с беспрецедентной волной иностранных заимствований, преимущественно из английского языка. Этот процесс часто приводит к «лингвистической интерференции», при которой фонетические, морфологические и синтаксические правила языка-источника вступают в конфликт с внутренними законами узбекской лингвистической системы.

В исследовании подчеркивается, что отсутствие централизованного, систематического механизма регулирования терминологии приводит к «лексическому загрязнению» и появлению избыточных дублетов. Путем качественного анализа современных медийных и академических текстов в работе выявлены значительные барьеры на пути успешной адаптации, включая непоследовательность орфографии и трудности с поиском адекватных эквивалентов в родном языке. Автор утверждает, что конфликт между лингвистическими инновациями и пуризмом требует сбалансированного подхода, отдающего приоритет внутреннему развитию языка при сохранении необходимой международной интеграции. Результаты показывают, что для преодоления этих пробелов необходимы ускоренные лексикографические усилия и создание



динамичного национального лингвистического корпуса для мониторинга и стандартизации ассимиляции неологизмов в режиме реального времени.

Ключевые слова: неологизм, терминологическая адаптация, лингвистическая интерференция, ассимиляция, узбекское языкознание, лексические лакуны, глобализация, языковая политика.

INTRODUCTION

The linguistic landscape of the 21st century is characterized by an unprecedented rate of lexical transformation, driven primarily by the forces of digital globalization and cross-cultural integration. In the context of the Uzbek language, this evolution manifests through the continuous influx of neologisms—newly coined words or expressions that emerge to define contemporary realities. However, the transition of the Uzbek language from a traditional lexical framework to a modernized globalized system is not without friction. As established by Crystal (2003), the dominance of English as a global lingua franca has created a "linguistic hegemony" that forces developing languages to rapidly adapt or face functional marginalization¹. For the Uzbek language, the primary challenge lies in "Terminological Adaptation"—the process of integrating foreign concepts without disrupting the internal structural integrity of the native tongue. The current state of Uzbek linguistics reveals a significant gap between the speed of social change and the pace of institutional standardization. According to recent research by the Alisher Navoi University of Uzbek Language and Literature (2022), over 60% of new terms entering the Uzbek discourse originate from Information Technology (IT) and international economics. Many of these terms, such as "blockchain," "marketplace," or "freelance," enter the language in their raw phonological form without undergoing necessary morphological filters. This creates a state of "Linguistic Interference," where the phonetic and grammatical structures of English or Russian begin to override the Turkic logic of the Uzbek language. This phenomenon is often described by purists as "linguistic pollution," while pragmatists view it as an inevitable sign of "innovation."

The problem is further compounded by "Gaps in Neologism Assimilation." Assimilation is not merely the adoption of a word; it is the process of making that word "native" through phonetic, graphic, and semantic alignment. In Uzbekistan, the lack of a centralized Digital Terminological Database has led to a chaotic distribution of new terms. For instance, a single English concept might be translated in four different ways across various national media outlets, creating what sociolinguists call "lexical redundancy." This lack of uniformity hinders the educational system and official bureaucracy, as stakeholders struggle to identify the "correct" version of a newly introduced term.²

Furthermore, the conflict between "Innovation" and "Interference" highlights a deeper socio-political tension. While the Law "On the State Language" of the Republic of Uzbekistan mandates the preservation of national linguistic identity, the practical reality of the global market demands speed. Academic studies suggest that when a language fails to provide a native equivalent for a technology within the first six months of its introduction, the foreign term becomes permanently entrenched, making later "purification" efforts futile³. This "time-lag" in

¹ Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press. (Global lisoniy gegemoniya haqida)

² Dadabaev, H. (2021). *Issues of Military and Social Terminology in Uzbek Linguistics*. Tashkent. (O'zbek tilidagi terminologik muammolar bo'yicha).

³ Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge. (Yangi terminlarning singishi va vaqt faktori haqida).



terminological development is the primary barrier to successful adaptation in the modern Uzbek context.

The theoretical framework of this article rests on the premise that neologisms are a sign of a living, breathing language, but their uncontrolled assimilation poses a threat to linguistic ecology. The conflict of "Linguistic Interference" is particularly visible in the syntax of young urban speakers, where code-switching and the use of unadapted borrowings have become a status symbol rather than a communicative necessity. This study argues that the current "gaps" are not just missing words, but missing institutional mechanisms to monitor and guide the evolution of the language.⁴

In conclusion, the introduction of this research seeks to establish that the adaptation of neologisms in the Uzbek language is currently at a critical crossroads. The dual pressure of maintaining national identity while participating in global progress has created a unique set of terminological barriers. By analyzing the structural gaps in assimilation and the psychological factors of interference, this paper aims to propose a more dynamic model for linguistic regulation—one that moves beyond mere prohibition and towards proactive, technology-driven adaptation.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND METHODOLOGY

The scholarly investigation into neologisms and terminological adaptation is rooted in the broader theory of "Language Contact" and "Lexical Diffusion." Within the global academic framework,⁵ laid the foundation for understanding "Linguistic Interference," defining it as the deviation from the norms of either language which occurs in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language. In the context of modern Uzbek, this interference is no longer just a bilingual phenomenon but a systemic structural pressure from "Global English."

argues that neologisms are the "pulse of a language," indicating its health and adaptability. However, in Uzbek linguistics, the focus has shifted toward the *quality* of this pulse.⁶ Prominent Uzbek linguists like H. Dadabaev (2019) have criticized the "mechanical borrowing" of terms, where words are imported without considering the phonetic and morphological harmony of the Uzbek language. Dadabaev emphasizes that the gap in neologism assimilation often arises from a lack of "semantic transparency"—when a borrowed term like "rebranding" or "hedging" enters the lexicon, it remains an opaque foreign body for the majority of native speakers because it lacks a rooted morphological connection to Turkic stems.⁷

Furthermore, N. Mahmudov (2017) discusses the "purism vs. pragmatism" debate in his works on the state of the mother tongue. He notes that the barrier to assimilation is often psychological; the prestige associated with foreign terms (especially in IT and business) leads to the rejection of native equivalents. This creates a "terminological vacuum" where local words exist but are deemed "not modern enough," leading to what this study defines as Linguistic Interference. For example, the use of "loyal" instead of "sodiq" or "vafodor" in corporate settings illustrates a shift where the foreign term displaces the native one not due to a lack of vocabulary, but due to sociolinguistic pressure.⁸ This research employs a Mixed-Methods

⁴ Alisher Navoi University Report (2022). *Statistical Analysis of Neologisms in Uzbek Mass Media*. (Statistik ma'lumotlar uchun)

⁵ Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.

⁶ Crystal, D. (2000). *Language Death*. Cambridge University Press.

⁷ Dadabaev, H. (2019). *O'zbek terminologiyasi masalalari*. Toshkent: Akademnashr.

⁸ Mahmudov, N. (2017). *Til va madaniyat*. Toshkent: Ma'naviyat



Qualitative and Quantitative Approach to analyze the current state of neologism assimilation in Uzbekistan. The methodology is structured into three distinct phases:

The study analyzed a dataset of 500 neologisms collected from major Uzbek digital news platforms (e.g., *Kun.uz*, *Gazeta.uz*) and social media segments (Telegram channels of government ministries) between 2021 and 2024. This phase utilized Descriptive Statistics to categorize borrowings by domain (IT, Finance, Medicine) and origin.

Example Analysis: During the data collection, it was observed that the term “*cloud computing*” is used in three variations: “*bulutli hisoblash*” (translated), “*klaud kompyuting*” (transliterated), and “*bulutli texnologiyalar*” (hybrid). The lack of a single standard confirms the “Adaptation Gap” hypothesized in the introduction.

We applied the Assimilation Scale (based on Haugen’s Model) to evaluate how deeply these terms have integrated. We tested 50 selected terms for phonetic and morphological adaptation.

Analysis: Terms like “*bloger*” (blogger) showed 100% assimilation as they take Uzbek suffixes naturally (*bloger-lar-imiz*). Conversely, terms like “*interface*” (interfeys) show Linguistic Interference, as their pluralization and case endings often conflict with the vowel harmony rules in rapid speech.

A comparative review was conducted between the “*Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language*” (O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati) and current media usage. The objective was to measure the “Time-Lag”—the duration between a word’s popular emergence and its official dictionary entry. The primary tool used was Linguistic Observation and Semantic Mapping. By mapping the semantic field of new borrowings against existing Uzbek synonyms, the study identifies where “interference” causes “lexical crowding,” leading to the eventual death of native synonyms.

RESULTS

The empirical analysis of the 500 neologisms collected from digital media, official government channels, and social networks between 2021 and 2024 reveals critical trends in the linguistic evolution of the modern Uzbek language. The findings are categorized into four primary quantitative and qualitative areas:

Data analysis shows that 72% of the sampled neologisms originate directly from the English language, often mediated through digital platforms. The distribution across professional domains is as follows:

Information Technology (IT): 38%

Economics and Digital Marketing: 24%

Social Trends and Lifestyle: 12%

Medicine and Specialized Sciences: 26%

Terms in the IT sector exhibit the lowest rate of translation. High-frequency words such as “*backend*,” “*interface*,” and “*framework*” are used in their raw phonological form. As noted by R. Sayfullayeva (2020), this creates an “unassimilated lexical layer” that exists outside the traditional phonetic rules of the Uzbek language, leading to a functional disconnect for non-English speakers.

The results indicate that 45% of identified neologisms lack a standardized spelling in the national press.⁹

The term “*Content*” appears in Uzbek discourse in three distinct forms: *kontent* (transliteration), *mazmun* (native equivalent), and *mundarija* (contextual narrowing).

The data shows that the transliterated form “*kontent*” has displaced the native “*mazmun*” in 85% of digital media instances. This confirms Weinreich’s (1953) theory of

⁹ Sayfullayeva, R. (2020). *Hozirgi o‘zbek tili: muammolar va yechimlar* (Modern Uzbek Language: Problems and Solutions). Tashkent: Mumtoz so‘z.



"Linguistic Interference," where the prestige associated with the source language (English) triggers the abandonment of functional native synonyms, resulting in "lexical crowding."

A comparative study was conducted between the sampled neologisms and the latest edition of the *"Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language"* (O'zbek tilining izohli lug'ati).

Only 12% of the terms widely used in public discourse are officially recorded in national dictionaries.¹⁰

This leaves 88% of new terms in a "lexicographical vacuum." According to A. Madvaliyev (2018), this lack of institutional regulation forces journalists and public officials to "improvise" spelling and meaning, which is the primary cause of the terminological instability observed in the current Uzbek media landscape.

While Uzbek easily accepts foreign nouns by attaching national suffixes (e.g., "*SMM-chilarimiz*"), the results show a breakdown in syntax when it comes to complex phrases.¹¹

Phrases such as *"targetni nastroyka qilish"* (setting the target) represent a "grammatical hybridity." These structures violate the internal logic of Uzbek verb formations. Out of the 500 terms, 15% displayed this form of "Frankenstein syntax," where English roots are awkwardly merged with Russian-influenced auxiliary verbs and Uzbek endings.

Table: Adaptation Scale of Neologisms in Uzbek

Sector	Primary Adaptation Method	Level of Interference
IT / Software	Direct Transliteration	High
Business / Marketing	Hybridization	Moderate
Social / Lifestyle	Semantic Shift	Low

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study underscore a pivotal tension in the modern Uzbek linguistic landscape: the conflict between the necessity for rapid technological innovation and the preservation of linguistic structural integrity. The results, showing that 72% of neologisms are direct borrowings, suggest that the Uzbek language is currently undergoing a phase of "passive assimilation." According to Crystal (2003), when a language adopts terms without morphological adaptation, it risks becoming a "satellite language" to the dominant global tongue, in this case, English.¹² The high frequency of IT and marketing terms entering the lexicon in their raw form indicates that the Uzbek terminological system is currently unable to generate native equivalents at the speed required by the digital economy.

The most critical issue identified in the research is the phenomenon of Linguistic Interference. The displacement of functional native synonyms—such

¹⁰ Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.

¹¹ Madvaliyev, A. (2018). *O'zbek terminologiyasi va leksikografiyasi masalalari* (Issues of Uzbek Terminology and Lexicography). Tashkent: National Encyclopedia of Uzbekistan.

¹² Crystal, D. (2003). *English as a Global Language*. Cambridge University Press.



as "*mazmun*" by "*kontent*" or "*vafodor*" by "*loyal*"—demonstrates that interference is not merely a technical problem but a sociolinguistic one. As argued by Mahmudov (2017), the "prestige factor" of English terms often overrides the semantic utility of Uzbek words. This creates a "lexical hierarchy" where native terms are relegated to traditional or poetic contexts, while borrowed terms dominate professional and modern discourses. This study posits that if this trend continues without institutional intervention, the Uzbek language may suffer from "functional narrowing," where it becomes less capable of describing modern scientific and technical realities using its own internal resources¹³.

Furthermore, the "Recognition Gap" of 8 to 10 years between the emergence of a neologism and its lexicographical recording is a major barrier to standardization. The results showed that 88% of used neologisms are not in dictionaries, which explains the orthographic chaos found in national media. Madvaliyev (2018) emphasizes that in the absence of an authoritative digital corpus, the media becomes the "de facto" academy, often promoting incorrect or hybridized forms. The "Frankenstein syntax" identified in the results (e.g., "*targetni nastroyka qilish*") is a direct consequence of this lack of regulation. It represents a systemic breakdown where the grammatical logic of the language is being reshaped by external syntactic patterns.¹⁴

However, the discussion must also acknowledge the resilience of Uzbek morphology. The ability of the language to attach suffixes like *-chilik* or *-lash* to foreign roots (e.g., "*marketologchilik*") shows that the language is attempting to "digest" these foreign bodies. The challenge lies in moving from this spontaneous, often messy adaptation toward a "managed evolution." As suggested by Baker (2018), the goal should not be total purism—which is impossible in a globalized world—but "terminological transparency," where new words are adapted to fit the phonetic and aesthetic norms of the national language.¹⁵

CONCLUSION

The analysis conducted in this study leads to the inescapable conclusion that the Uzbek language is currently navigating its most significant terminological crisis of the post-independence era. The data reveals that the "Recognition Gap"—the 88% discrepancy between active media usage and official dictionary entries—is not merely a clerical delay but a systemic failure of linguistic regulation. This study has demonstrated that "Linguistic Interference" has moved beyond simple word-borrowing into the realm of "syntactic erosion," where the very logic of Uzbek sentence construction is being compromised by unadapted foreign hybrids. If the current rate of "passive assimilation" continues, the Uzbek language risks a future of functional fragmentation, where technical and professional discourses become entirely alienated from the national linguistic root.

However, the resilience of Uzbek morphology identified in the results suggests that the language possesses the inherent tools to survive this transition if proactive measures are taken. The conflict is not between "modernity" and "tradition," but between "chaotic interference" and "structured innovation." To bridge the identified gaps and mitigate the risks of linguistic pollution, the following evidence-based solutions are proposed:

The government and the Alisher Navoi University must move away from decadal paper dictionaries toward a dynamic, digital "Living Corpus." This platform should provide standardized equivalents for new international terms within 48 hours of their widespread emergence in the media, effectively closing the "time-lag" that currently fuels orthographic chaos. Borrowed terms must undergo mandatory phonetic and graphic adaptation before being

¹³ Mahmudov, N. (2017). *Til va madaniyat (Language and Culture)*. Tashkent: Ma'naviyat.

¹⁴ Madvaliyev, A. (2018). *O'zbek terminologiyasi masalalari*. Tashkent: National Encyclopedia.

¹⁵ Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge



utilized in official state documentation and textbooks. ¹⁶For instance, following the Turkish model of successful adaptation, terms should be spelled according to Uzbek orthoepy (e.g., shifting from the Russian-mediated "*interfeys*" to a more phonetically native "*interfeys*" or a calculated native equivalent). Instead of "mechanical borrowing," linguistic committees should prioritize the revival of dormant Turkic roots to describe new technologies. As noted in the discussion, the success of the term "*sun'iy intellekt*" proves that semantic translation is more sustainable than raw transliteration for long-term assimilation. Media outlets, which currently act as the primary engines of "linguistic interference," must be held to higher terminological standards. Creating a unified "Style Guide" for journalists can prevent the "Frankenstein syntax" identified in this study's results.

In summary, the evolution of the Uzbek language in the face of globalization is inevitable, but its "ifloslanishi" (pollution) is avoidable. By closing the institutional gaps in terminology and adopting a managed approach to neologisms, Uzbekistan can ensure that its national language remains a robust vehicle for both cultural identity and global scientific progress.

References

1. Alisher Navoi University Report. Statistical Analysis of Neologisms in Uzbek Mass Media. – Tashkent: TSUULL Press, 2022. – 45 p.
2. Baker, M. In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation. – London: Routledge, 2018. – 394 p.
3. Crystal, D. English as a Global Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 212 p.
4. Crystal, D. Language Death. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2000. – 202 p.
5. Dadabaev, H. Issues of Military and Social Terminology in Uzbek Linguistics. – Tashkent: Muharrir, 2021. – 180 b.
6. Dadabayev, H. O'zbek terminologiyasi masalalari. – Toshkent: Akademnashr, 2019. – 208 b.
7. Madvaliyev, A. O'zbek terminologiyasi va leksikografiyasi masalalari. – Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi, 2018. – 240 b.
8. Mahmudov, N. Til va madaniyat. – Toshkent: Ma'naviyat, 2017. – 160 b.
9. Sayfullayeva, R. Hozirgi o'zbek tili: muammolar va yechimlar. – Toshkent: Mumtoz so'z, 2020. – 256 b.
10. Weinreich, U. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. – New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953. – 148 p.

¹⁶ Madvaliyev, A. (2018). *O'zbek terminologiyasi va leksikografiyasi masalalari*.

