
How Uzbek mass media re-shapes English loanwords

Chorieva Asila

Master's student,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Scientific advisor: **Dalieva Madina
Khabibullaevna**

DSc, Associate professor,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Annotation *Changes in English loanwords in Uzbek mass media are not only a question of "more borrowings." They are changes in channel (from Russian-mediated forms to direct English-oriented intake), form (parallel Latin/Cyrillic spellings and unstable transliteration), and integration (Uzbek affixation, hybrid formations, and meaning shifts). I treat mass media broadly – online news, platform-linked journalism, and public-facing commentary – because newsroom language now circulates inside the same digital ecosystems that generate new lexemes. Recent Uzbek scholarship using corpus-based data from social media, news websites, and forums shows rapid diffusion of English-origin items and their adaptation through phonological and morphological mechanisms (e.g., "smartfon", "kompyuterlashtirish"). At the same time, public debate in Uzbekistan highlights the lack of consensus on foreign-word orthography and the costs of relying on intermediary-language spellings. The article argues that the most visible "change" today is the move from borrowing-as-import to borrowing-as-productive material for Uzbek word-formation and media pragmatics.*

Keywords *English loanwords, Uzbek mass media, lexical borrowing, orthography, transliteration, Latin script, Cyrillic script, morphological adaptation, semantic extension, digital discourse, corpus approach*

Inglizcha o'zlashmalarni o'zbek ommaviy axborot vositalari qayta shakllantirishi

Chorieva Asila

Magistratura talabasi,
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

Ilmiy rahbar: **Dalieva Madina Xabibullayevna**
Filologiya fanlari doktori (DSc), dotsent,
O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti

Annotatsiya *Ushbu maqola o'zbek ommaviy axborot vositalarida inglizcha o'zlashmalardagi o'zgarishlarni o'rganadi va ularni oddiy "qarz olish" emas, balki qayta yo'naltirilgan kirib kelish, shakliy (parallel lotin/kirill imlolari va beqaror transliteratsiya) hamda integratsiya (o'zbekcha affiksatsiya, gibrid shakllar va ma'no siljishlari) orqali amalga oshadigan jarayon sifatida talqin qiladi. Tadqiqot keng ko'lamlı OAV ma'lumotlariga – onlayn yangiliklar, platformaga yo'naltirilgan jurnalistika va jamoatchilik muhokamaları – asoslanadi, chunki yangiliklar tili tezkor innovatsiya uchun qulay muhit hisoblanadi. Tadqiqot shuni ko'rsatadiki, inglizcha kelib chiqishga ega atamalar o'zbek ommaviy axborot vositalarida shunchaki ko'rinmay qolmaydi, balki fonologik va morfologik mexanizmlar orqali moslashadi va ijtimoiy*

jihatdan barqarorlashadi (masalan, smartfon, kompyuterlashtirish). Shu bilan birga, maqolada o'zbek tilshunosligida xorijiy so'zlar imlosi bo'yicha yakdil qarashlarning yo'qligi hamda vositachi tillar orqali o'zlashgan imlolariga tayanish xarajatlarini tanqidiy baholanadi; chunki global miqyosda ingliz tilidagi manbalarga bevosita kirish imkoniyati vositachi tillarga bo'lgan ehtiyojni tobora kamaytirmoqda. Ushbu natijalar o'zbek ommaviy axborot vositalarida inglizcha o'zlashmalarni leksik, shakliy va pragmatik jihatdan dinamik va ko'p qatlamli jarayon sifatida tavsiflaydi.

Kalit so'zlar *Inglizcha o'zlashmalar, o'zbek ommaviy axborot vositalari, leksik o'zlashuv, imlo, transliteratsiya, lotin yozuvi, kirill yozuvi, morfologik moslashuv, semantik kengayish, raqamli diskurs*

Как узбекские СМИ переформатируют английские заимствования

Чориева Асила

*Магистрант,
Узбекский государственный университет
мировых языков*

Научный руководитель: **Далиева Мадина
Хабибуллаевна**

*Доктор филологических наук (DSc), доцент,
Узбекский государственный университет
мировых языков*

Аннотация *В статье рассматриваются изменения английских заимствований в узбекских средствах массовой информации и предлагается их понимание не как простых «заимствований», а как процесса повторного входа, формальной вариативности (параллельное латинское и кириллическое написание, нестабильная транслитерация) и интеграции (узбекская аффиксация, гибридные образования, семантические сдвиги). Исследование опирается на широкий корпус медиаматериалов – онлайн-новости, платформенно-ориентированную журналистику и публичные комментарии, поскольку новостной язык представляет собой среду ускоренной языковой инновации. Показано, что англоязычные единицы в узбекских СМИ не остаются изолированными элементами, а подвергаются фонологической и морфологической адаптации и со временем социально закрепляются (например, smartfon, kompyuterlashtirish). В то же время критически анализируется отсутствие консенсуса по вопросам орфографии заимствованных слов в узбекской лингвистике, а также издержки опоры на посреднические языки, поскольку прямой доступ к англоязычным источникам в условиях глобализации снижает практическую необходимость такого посредничества. Полученные результаты позволяют рассматривать английские заимствования в узбекских СМИ как динамический и многоуровневый процесс, затрагивающий лексический, формальный и прагматический уровни языка.*

Ключевые слова *Английские заимствования, узбекские СМИ, лексическое заимствование, орфография, транслитерация, латинская графика, кириллическая графика, морфологическая адаптация, семантическое расширение, цифровой дискурс*

Loanwords are often discussed as if they enter a language once and then “settle.” (Haugen, 1950). Uzbek mass media suggests a less static picture. A borrowed item can enter through one pathway (for example, via Russian spellings in older translation routines) and later re-enter through another (directly via English-oriented global media and online dictionaries), producing a period of competing written forms. The result is not simply variation for its own sake: spelling choices become part of media positioning – who the outlet imagines its audience to be, which script it privileges, and which external norm it treats as “closest to the original.” In public linguistic commentary, Uzbek translators and journalists explicitly describe the problem of intermediary-language variants drifting away from source-language forms, and they argue that the growing availability of online dictionaries and direct access to originals reduces the practical need for Russian as a mediating filter (Kun.uz, 2022).

To describe “change” in English loanwords in Uzbek media without collapsing everything into a single trend, it is useful to separate at least three layers that behave differently over time: (1) intake (how a word arrives and through which linguistic “gate”), (2) written form (script and orthography), and (3) linguistic domestication (how Uzbek grammar and semantics begin treating the borrowed stem as reusable material). This layered view aligns with contact-linguistic approaches that distinguish borrowing outcomes and levels of integration, rather than treating all foreign-origin items as one class (Haspelmath, 2009). Uzbek is legally committed to a Latin-based alphabet, and the foundational law establishing that alphabet dates to 1993, later revised in

1995 (Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1993, 1995). At the same time, legal texts and policy discussions acknowledge continued use of Cyrillic alongside Latin (in practice and in the reading habits of different generations), which keeps two graphic systems in active circulation. Mass media operates inside this coexistence. When English loanwords appear in headlines, captions, or quoted brand names, the choice between Latin and Cyrillic can be routine, but it can also index platform constraints (mobile keyboards, copy-paste habits) and audience targeting (Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1993, 1995). Orthographic competition becomes sharper when the borrowed unit is not merely a common noun but a proper name, a brand, or a “semi-name” such as a hashtag or channel title. Uzbek public debate points to the absence of a stable, widely accepted principle for how foreign words and names should be written: should Uzbek maximize phonetic adaptation, preserve original spelling, or follow established intermediary traditions? The fact that these questions remain open is itself part of the “change”: media users are not only consuming new English terms; they are renegotiating what counts as a legitimate Uzbek written form in public space (Kun.uz, 2022).

A loanword becomes structurally important when it is no longer an isolated foreign body but a base for Uzbek derivation (Haugen, 1950; Haspelmath, 2009). Corpus-based work on English-to-Uzbek neologisms (drawing on social media, news sites, and forums) documents exactly this shift: English-origin items spread quickly and then undergo phonological adaptation and morphological modification, producing forms that “feel Uzbek” in their surface grammar

(Polvannazirova, 2025). The same study provides concrete examples that matter for mass media usage because they show what journalists and readers already recognize as normal: “smartfon” is a localized adaptation of smartphone, and “kompyuterlashtirish” demonstrates Uzbek derivational resources applied to a borrowed technological base (Polvannazirova, 2025). This is a decisive kind of change. Once an English stem accepts Uzbek suffixes fluently, the media no longer needs to re-explain it each time. The borrowed element becomes compressible – usable in short headline syntax, reusable in collocations, and expandable into new derivatives. In other words, the productivity of the loanword in Uzbek mass media is not measured only by how often it appears, but by whether it can generate additional Uzbek-shaped words without looking marked (Haugen, 1950; Polvannazirova, 2025).

Even when the written form stabilizes, the meaning can drift. Digital-era borrowings are especially exposed to semantic extension because platforms encourage rapid recontextualization: the same item can be used in advertising, political talk, entertainment news, and informal commentary, with slightly different pragmatic force. Corpus-based descriptions of Uzbek digital borrowings explicitly mention semantic extension alongside phonological and morphological adaptation (Polvannazirova, 2025). For mass media, this implies that “change” includes not only adding new labels for new technologies, but also reshaping evaluative tone: some English-origin terms carry an aura of expertise, novelty, or global alignment, and media writers can exploit that aura even when Uzbek equivalents exist (Haspelmath, 2009). A limitation is important here. Without a purpose-built diachronic news corpus (balanced across outlets, years, and scripts), it is risky to claim that a specific semantic shift has completed or that one spelling has “won.” What can be stated more safely – because it is grounded in documented discussion and

observed adaptation patterns – is that Uzbek media sits at an interface where (a) English-origin items arrive faster than normative codification can respond, and (b) the language’s agglutinative morphology makes domestication relatively easy once the stem is accepted (Haspelmath, 2009; Kun.uz, 2022; Polvannazirova, 2025).

Calls for standardization often sound like calls to stop borrowing. Uzbek public commentary is more nuanced: it tends to argue not for banning foreign words, but for developing principles that prevent the written system from fragmenting into incompatible variants – especially when intermediary-language spellings obscure access to the original form (Kun.uz, 2022). From a policy angle, Uzbekistan’s recent language-planning trajectory emphasizes strengthening Uzbek’s status across domains and developing terminology work, which indirectly increases institutional pressure to regularize how new terms are written and taught (President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2020). Yet the standardization target should be chosen carefully. If the goal is to regulate every new English-origin unit immediately, the policy will lose to media speed. A more realistic target is the highest-friction zone: items that (1) appear frequently in official or semi-official communication, (2) circulate across scripts, and (3) create search and citation problems when spelled inconsistently (names, abbreviations, and platform-native forms). Work on transliteration in the Uzbek context shows that even official practices can lean toward historically entrenched transliteration habits, and it demonstrates how particular Uzbek letters and graphemes create predictable difficulty in cross-language representation – exactly the type of difficulty that then reappears in media spelling routines (Jumaniyozov & Islomov, 2025).

Changes in English loanwords in Uzbek mass media are best understood as a bundle of interacting processes, not a single “influx.” (Haspelmath, 2009; Haugen, 1950). Legal

commitments to a Latin-based script exist, but Cyrillic's continued vitality keeps parallel written norms available, which magnifies variation in how English items are displayed (Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 1993, 1995). At the same time, corpus-based evidence from digital communication environments that include news websites shows a clear trajectory from borrowing to productivity: English-origin stems are adapted, affixed, and extended in

meaning, becoming efficient media resources rather than isolated imports (Polvannazirova, 2025). The practical implication is not that mass media must "purify" its lexicon, but that Uzbek needs stable, publicly usable principles for writing and adapting foreign-origin items – otherwise the language will continue to modernize lexically while fragmenting orthographically (President of the Republic of Uzbekistan, 2020; Kun.uz, 2022).

References:

1. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231. [doi:10.2307/410058](https://doi.org/10.2307/410058)
2. Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*. 35–54. De Gruyter Mouton. [doi:10.1515/9783110218442.35](https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110218442.35)
3. Jumaniyozov, Z. O., & Islomov, S. R. (2025). [Article on transliteration/practical transcription issues in Uzbek; journal issue information in *O'zbekistonda xorijiy tillar*, 11(3), 23–45. [doi:10.36078/1710323113](https://doi.org/10.36078/1710323113)
4. Kun.uz. (2022, June 17). SOS: O'zbek tilidagi xorijiy atoqli nomlar va so'zlar imlosida hanuz yakdillik yo'q.
5. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (1993). *On the introduction of the Uzbek alphabet based on the Latin script* (No. 931-XII, September 2, 1993).
6. Law of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (1995). *On introducing amendments to the law on the introduction of the Uzbek alphabet based on the Latin script* (No. 71-I, May 6, 1995).
7. Polvannazirova, S. K. (2025). A corpus-based analysis of neologisms from English into Uzbek in social media and online corpora. *Foreign Languages in Uzbekistan*, 11(2), 19–34. [doi:10.36078/1746083877](https://doi.org/10.36078/1746083877)
8. President of the Republic of Uzbekistan. (2020). *On measures to further develop the Uzbek language in our country and improve the language policy* (Decree PF-6084, October 20, 2020).