



NEOLOGISMS IN THE AGE OF MEDIA GLOBALIZATION: TRANSLATION ISSUES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND UZBEK

Qarjaubayev Orazali Yesbosin uli

a master's student at the department of
foreign languages and literature at
the faculty of foreign philology at the
National university of Uzbekistan
<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20061518>

ARTICLE INFO

Qabul qilindi: 01-may 2026 yil
Ma'qullandi: 04- may 2026 yil
Nashr qilindi: 06- may 2026 yil

KEY WORDS

*Neologisms; Media globalization;
Discourse analysis; Translation
strategies; Corpus linguistics;
Pragmatics; Borrowing; Hybrid
translation; Media language..*

ABSTRACT

The expansion of global media ecosystems has intensified cross-linguistic interaction, leading to the rapid circulation of neologisms across languages. In this context, English functions as a primary generator of lexical innovation, while Uzbek increasingly integrates these innovations into its media discourse. This study explores how neologisms are translated from English into Uzbek within contemporary media environments shaped by globalization. Unlike traditional equivalence-based approaches, the research adopts a discourse-functional perspective, examining how meaning is negotiated in real communicative contexts. The study is based on a small specialized corpus of English and Uzbek media texts (2021–2025), focusing on emerging lexical items in technology, digital culture, and socio-political communication. The findings indicate that translation challenges extend beyond lexical gaps to include pragmatic mismatch, audience design, and ideological framing. Translators frequently employ hybrid strategies that combine borrowing with semantic adaptation, reflecting both global influence and local linguistic norms. The study argues that neologism translation should be understood as a dynamic process of meaning reconstruction rather than direct transfer. These findings contribute to translation studies by highlighting the role of media globalization in shaping translation practices and by proposing a more flexible, discourse-oriented model for handling neologisms..

Introduction.

The globalization of media has fundamentally transformed how languages interact, evolve, and influence each other. In particular, the rapid spread of digital media has created an environment in which neologisms emerge and circulate at unprecedented speed. As argued by

Blommaert (2010), globalization leads to the mobility of linguistic resources, resulting in hybrid and fluid language practices.

English plays a dominant role in this process, acting as a source language for many neologisms related to technology, social media, and global culture. [2: 79] Uzbek media discourse increasingly reflects this influence, incorporating English-derived lexical innovations into everyday communication.

However, translating these neologisms is not a straightforward process. Traditional translation models based on equivalence are often insufficient, as neologisms frequently lack stable meanings and are embedded in specific cultural and ideological contexts. As Pym (2014) suggests, translation should be viewed as risk management, where translators make strategic decisions under conditions of uncertainty. [9: 47]

This study aims to investigate how neologisms are translated in English–Uzbek media discourse and to identify the underlying patterns and challenges. The research is guided by the following questions:

1. How are neologisms functionally adapted in Uzbek media texts?
2. What discourse-level challenges arise in their translation?
3. How does media globalization influence translation choices?

The hypothesis is that **neologism translation in Uzbek media is increasingly characterized by hybridization, combining global lexical forms with local communicative functions.**

Literature Review.

Recent scholarship has moved beyond viewing neologisms as purely lexical phenomena. Hohenhaus (2005) argues that neologisms must be understood within their sociocultural context, as their meaning depends on usage rather than form alone. [5: 361]

In media studies, Fairclough (2006) emphasizes that language is shaped by power relations and globalization processes, which influence how new terms are introduced and normalized. This perspective is particularly relevant for understanding how English neologisms enter Uzbek media discourse.

From a translation standpoint, House (2015) proposes a functional-pragmatic model, arguing that translation should preserve meaning at the level of discourse rather than individual words. [6: 83] Similarly, Chesterman (2016) highlights the importance of norms and conventions in shaping translation strategies. [3: 146]

Corpus-based approaches have also gained prominence. Baker (2006) demonstrates that corpus linguistics can reveal patterns in translation that are not immediately visible through traditional analysis. This approach is useful for studying neologisms in media texts, where usage patterns are crucial. [1: 73]

In Central Asian linguistics, recent studies have noted the growing influence of English on Uzbek vocabulary, particularly in digital communication (Yusupov, 2021). However, there is still limited research on how these neologisms are translated and adapted in media contexts. [10: 42]

This study integrates discourse analysis and corpus-based methods to provide a more comprehensive understanding of neologism translation.

Methodology.

Unlike purely descriptive approaches, this study adopts a **mixed qualitative framework combining discourse analysis and micro-corpus analysis**.

Data Collection. A specialized corpus of approximately 30 English media texts and their Uzbek counterparts was compiled from:

- International news platforms (e.g., BBC, CNN)
- Uzbek media websites (Kun.uz, Gazeta.uz)
- Social media excerpts embedded in news articles

Analytical Procedure. The analysis was conducted in three stages:

1. Identification of Neologisms

Terms were selected based on recency, frequency, and absence in traditional dictionaries.

2. Discourse Function Analysis

Each neologism was analyzed in context to determine its communicative function (e.g., persuasive, evaluative, technical).

3. Strategy Mapping

Instead of fixed categories, strategies were identified as continuums, ranging from global retention to local adaptation.

Analytical Framework. The study applies:

- Discourse analysis (Fairclough, 2006) [6: 154]
- Translation norms theory (Chesterman, 2016) [3: 182]
- Risk-based translation model (Pym, 2014) [9: 137]

This methodology allows for a deeper understanding of how translation operates in real media contexts.

Results.

Unlike traditional categorization, the results are presented through functional patterns of translation behavior.

4.1. Global Retention Pattern.

In many cases, neologisms are retained with minimal modification, reflecting their global recognition.

Examples: “hashtag activism” → “hashtag aktivizmi”; “fintech” → “fintech”

Interpretation: These terms function as global markers of modernity and are not fully localized.

4.2. Hybridization Pattern.

A combination of borrowing and semantic explanation is frequently observed.

Examples: “deepfake” → “deepfake (soxta video texnologiyasi)”; “gig economy” → “gig iqtisodiyoti (vaqtinchalik ishlar bozori)”

Interpretation: This strategy balances global familiarity with local comprehension.

4.3. Functional Substitution Pattern.

In some cases, translators replace neologisms with culturally familiar expressions.

Examples: “influencer” → “ijtimoiy tarmoqdagi mashhur shaxs”; “cancel culture” → “ommaviy rad etish holati”

Interpretation: The focus shifts from lexical form to communicative function.

4.4. Pragmatic Reframing Pattern.

Neologisms may be translated differently depending on ideological or contextual factors.

Examples: “woke” → translated variably as “ijtimoiy ongli” or omitted depending on context

Interpretation: Translation reflects not only linguistic but also sociopolitical considerations.

Discussion.

The findings suggest that neologism translation in Uzbek media is not a fixed process but a dynamic negotiation shaped by globalization.

Blommaert’s (2010) concept of linguistic mobility is evident in the widespread borrowing of English terms. However, the presence of hybrid and adaptive strategies indicates that Uzbek maintains its linguistic identity while engaging with global discourse. [2: 168]

House’s (2015) functional approach is supported by the prevalence of strategies that prioritize meaning over form. [6: 125] Similarly, Pym’s (2014) risk management model explains why translators combine multiple strategies when dealing with uncertain or unstable meanings. [9: 184]

The results also highlight the importance of audience design. Translators must consider the target audience’s familiarity with global concepts, which influences the degree of adaptation or explanation.

Overall, the study demonstrates that media globalization leads to increased hybridity in translation practices, rather than simple borrowing or substitution.

Conclusion.

This study has explored the translation of neologisms in English–Uzbek media discourse within the context of globalization. The findings reveal that translation challenges are not limited to lexical gaps but involve broader discourse and pragmatic factors.

The analysis identified four main patterns: global retention, hybridization, functional substitution, and pragmatic reframing. These patterns reflect the complex interaction between global linguistic influence and local communicative needs.

The study contributes to translation studies by proposing a discourse-oriented framework for analyzing neologism translation. It also provides practical insights for translators working in media environments characterized by rapid linguistic change.

Future research may expand the corpus and investigate audience reception of translated neologisms.

References:

1. Baker, M. (2006). «Translation and Conflict». 208 p.
2. Blommaert, J. (2010). «The Sociolinguistics of Globalization». Cambridge University Press. 230 p.
3. Chesterman, A. (2016). «Memes of Translation». 225 p.
4. Fairclough, N. (2006). «Language and Globalization». 186 p.
5. Hohenhaus, P. (2005). «Lexicalization and Institutionalization of Neologisms». (353-373 p.) 21 p.
6. House, J. (2015). «Translation Quality Assessment». 160 p.
7. Koskinen, K. (2010). «Translating Institutions». 187 p.
8. Munday, J. (2016). «Introducing Translation Studies». 394 p.
9. Pym, A. (2014). «Exploring Translation Theories». 192 p.
10. Yusupov, O. (2021). «English Influence on Uzbek Media Language». (38-48 p.) 11 p.