

MORPHOLOGICALLY STRUCTURED TERMS

Khaydarova Charos
Kokand University

Abstract: This article examines the morphological structure of methodological terms in English and Uzbek from a comparative-analytical perspective. The study classifies terms into several categories, including simple, affixal, compound, abbreviated, and calqued forms. The findings demonstrate that affixation and compounding are the most productive word-formation strategies in both languages. However, English shows a stronger tendency toward compounding, whereas Uzbek predominantly relies on affixation. The analysis reveals both universal and language-specific characteristics of terminological formation. In addition, the study offers practical insights into the standardization, translation, and pedagogical application of methodological terminology, which is particularly important in multilingual educational contexts.

Key words: terminology, morphology, affixation, compounding, abbreviation, calquing, pedagogy, methodology.

Introduction

Terminological research plays a significant role not only in general linguistics but also in pedagogy and teaching methodology. In educational sciences, precise and systematically organized terminology is essential for effective communication, accurate translation, and the standardization of academic discourse. Methodological terms, in particular, function as core elements of professional language, reflecting theoretical concepts and instructional practices.

As numerous scholars emphasize, terminology constitutes an integral component of the language system and involves complex morphological, semantic, and syntactic processes (Likh, 1974, p. 56; Kosaka, 2024, p. 117). From this perspective, the analysis of term formation contributes to a deeper understanding of how specialized knowledge is linguistically encoded. This article aims to investigate methodological terms in English and Uzbek with a specific focus on their morphological structure, identifying dominant word-formation patterns and comparing their productivity across the two languages.

Literature Review

Terminology has been examined from various linguistic perspectives, including structural, semantic, functional, and sociocognitive approaches. In the field of pedagogy and methodology, scholars have highlighted the necessity of systematic terminological analysis to ensure clarity and consistency in educational discourse.

Crystal (2008) emphasizes the universality of morphological processes such as affixation and compounding, noting that although these processes exist across languages, their degree of productivity depends on typological and structural features. Crystal's observations are particularly relevant to comparative studies, as they allow researchers to identify both shared mechanisms and language-specific tendencies in term formation.

More recent research has increasingly focused on pedagogical and methodological terminology in multilingual contexts. Kosaka (2024) underscores the importance of comparative terminological studies for effective communication in international academic environments. According to Kosaka, such studies should not only identify structural similarities between languages but also consider cultural, educational, and institutional factors that shape the development of terminology. These insights provide a theoretical foundation for the present study, which compares English and Uzbek methodological terms from a morphological standpoint.

Methodology



This study employs a comparative-analytical approach. Methodological terms were collected from pedagogical and linguistic sources in both English and Uzbek. The selected terms were then analyzed and classified according to their morphological structure.

For analytical clarity, all terms were grouped into the following categories:

1. Simple terms
2. Affixal terms
3. Compound terms
4. Abbreviated terms
5. Calqued terms

This classification enabled a systematic comparison of word-formation strategies in the two languages and facilitated the identification of dominant morphological patterns.

Results

The morphological analysis produced the following results:

Simple terms:

English: lesson, test, grammar

Uzbek: *til* (language), *nutq* (speech), *dars* (lesson)

Affixal terms:

English: teacher (teach + -er), learner (learn + -er), communicative (communicate + -ive)

Uzbek: *o'qituvchi* (teach + -uvchi), *o'rganuvchi* (learn + -uvchi), *kommunikativ* (kommunikatsiya + -iv)

Compound terms:

English: classroom, language learning, feedback loop

Uzbek: *tilshunoslik* (linguistics), *qo'llanma* (manual), *darslik* (textbook)

Abbreviated terms:

English: ESL (English as a Second Language), CLT (Communicative Language Teaching)

Uzbek: OTM (*Oliy ta'lim muassasasi* – Higher Education Institution)

Calqued terms:

English → *Uzbek:* mother tongue – *ona tili*

Discussion

The findings indicate that English and Uzbek share several common morphological strategies in term formation, most notably affixation and compounding. This confirms the productivity of internal linguistic resources in the creation of methodological terminology (Crystal, 2008, p. 214).

At the same time, clear language-specific preferences emerge. Compounding is more productive in English, reflecting its analytical structure and flexibility in combining lexical units. In contrast, Uzbek relies more heavily on affixation, which aligns with its agglutinative nature. Abbreviations appear frequently in both languages, illustrating the globalized character of modern pedagogical terminology and the need for concise forms in academic and professional communication. Calquing, meanwhile, serves as an important mechanism for borrowing and adapting international concepts into national terminological systems.

Conclusion

The morphological study of methodological terms is relevant not only to linguistic theory but also to pedagogical practice. The present analysis demonstrates that while many aspects of term formation are universal, each language exhibits distinct structural features shaped by its typological characteristics.

A comparative examination of English and Uzbek methodological terms contributes to improved standardization, more accurate translation, and more effective use of terminology in educational



contexts. Future research may expand this analysis to additional languages or explore semantic and pragmatic dimensions of pedagogical terminology.

References

1. Crystal, D. (2008). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Blackwell.
2. Kosaka, T. (2024). *Terminology and Pedagogy: Cross-linguistic Perspectives*. Tokyo: Springer.
3. Likh, G. (1974). *Semantika*. Moscow: Penguin Books.
4. Šarčević, S. (1997). *New Approach to Legal Translation*. The Hague: Kluwer Law International.
5. Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards New Ways of Terminology Description: The Sociocognitive Approach*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

