

**DIGITAL COMMUNICATION AND THE EVOLUTION OF
JARGON IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK**

Turamuratova Sevara Botirovna

Assistant teacher, Ma'mun university

turamuratova.s@mamunedu.uz

Botirova Anabibi Bahromovna

Assistant teacher, Ma'mun university

botirova.a@mamunedu.uz

Abstract

Digital communication has become an important catalyst of lexical change in contemporary languages. This article examines how digital communication contributes to the formation and evolution of jargon in English and Uzbek, two typologically distinct languages that participate in the same technological environment of social networks, instant messengers, and online communities. The study uses a comparative descriptive approach and synthesizes findings reported in previous linguistic research on English internet jargon and Uzbek digital discourse. The analysis focuses on word-formation mechanisms, including abbreviation and acronymisation, blending and clipping, affixation, semantic change, direct borrowing, phonological adaptation, and platform-specific coinage. The reviewed literature indicates that English digital jargon frequently develops through abbreviation, blending, clipping, semantic extension, and platform-related coinage, whereas Uzbek digital jargon is strongly influenced by borrowing from English and Russian and by the integration of borrowed bases into Uzbek morphological patterns. Despite these formal differences, both languages use digital jargon for efficient communication, group identification, generational

differentiation, and the expression of digital-community membership. Because the present study is based on secondary sources rather than a newly collected corpus, the findings are interpreted as an integrative comparative account rather than as statistically representative evidence.

Keywords: digital communication, jargon, internet slang, neologism, sociolinguistics, English language, Uzbek language, computer-mediated communication, language change.

Introduction

Language changes in response to the communicative environment in which it is used. Digital communication has accelerated this process by creating highly interactive spaces in which new lexical forms can be produced, circulated, and conventionalised rapidly. McCulloch describes the internet as a large-scale environment in which language change can be observed in real time [1]. In such environments, jargon and slang are important not only because they shorten communication, but also because they help users express membership in particular social, professional, and generational communities.

English occupies a particularly influential position in global digital communication. Research on internet discourse has documented abbreviations such as LOL and BRB, blends such as vlog and webinar, semantic extensions such as viral, and platform-related terms such as retweet [1–4]. These forms demonstrate that digital vocabulary may develop through several interacting lexical mechanisms rather than through abbreviation alone.

Uzbek digital discourse has developed under the influence of both English and Russian. Previous research describes the frequent borrowing of English-origin digital vocabulary and its adaptation to Uzbek grammatical patterns. Examples such as layk bosish, post qilish, and trendda bo‘lish illustrate the integration of borrowed lexical bases into Uzbek constructions [5–7]. The rapid circulation of such forms through social media and

messaging platforms has increased the visibility and speed of lexical innovation.

Although English internet jargon and Uzbek digital borrowing have been examined in previous studies, a comparative description of the two languages remains useful because the languages differ structurally while sharing similar digital communicative conditions. The aim of this article is therefore to compare the principal mechanisms and sociolinguistic functions of digital jargon formation in English and Uzbek.

Materials and Methods

The study employs a comparative descriptive method and qualitative synthesis of secondary linguistic sources. The material is based on published research concerning English internet slang and cyberneologisms, as well as studies of Uzbek social-media discourse and English borrowings in Uzbek. The sources include work by McCulloch, Jumanazarova and Khamitov, Posteguillo, Babelyuk, Hakimova, Jaloliddinova, and Polvannazirova [1–7].

For the purposes of comparison, lexical phenomena were grouped into the following categories: (1) abbreviation and acronymisation; (2) blending and clipping; (3) affixation and grammatical integration; (4) semantic change, including broadening and metaphorical extension; (5) direct borrowing; (6) phonological adaptation; and (7) platform-specific coinage. The analysis then considered the pragmatic functions of the forms, particularly efficiency, group identity, generational differentiation, and digital-community membership.

The study does not present a newly collected or statistically balanced English–Uzbek corpus. Consequently, examples and frequency-related observations are interpreted as patterns reported in the reviewed literature rather than as measurements produced by an original corpus.

Results

The reviewed literature indicates that English digital jargon is formed through several productive mechanisms. Abbreviation and acronymisation are

represented by forms such as LOL, BRB, and AFK, which emerged in computer-mediated communication and became widely recognisable. Blending and clipping are illustrated by vlog and webinar. Semantic change is visible when existing words acquire digital meanings: viral can describe online content that spreads rapidly, while cloud can refer to remote data storage. Platform-specific coinage is represented by retweet, a term closely associated with the communicative functions of a social-media platform [1–4].

Uzbek digital jargon shows a strong role for direct borrowing and morphological integration. English-origin forms such as layk, post, trend, and hayp occur in Uzbek digital discourse and can combine with native words, suffixes, and light verbs. Expressions such as layk bosish, post qilish, and trendda bo‘lish demonstrate that borrowed roots may be incorporated into Uzbek grammatical constructions [5–7].

Phonological and orthographic adaptation may accompany borrowing, particularly when foreign lexical material is adjusted to the conventions of Uzbek usage. At the same time, the foreign origin of many forms remains recognisable. This combination allows borrowed digital vocabulary to function within Uzbek discourse while retaining an association with international digital culture.

Another common pattern concerns sociolinguistic differentiation. English digital jargon varies across communities such as gamers, programmers, and younger social-media users. Uzbek digital discourse likewise contains Anglicisms, native innovations, and code-switching among Uzbek, Russian, and English. These forms may therefore signal community membership, familiarity with digital practices, or generational identity [2, 5–7].

Discussion

The comparison suggests that English and Uzbek do not rely on exactly the same formal resources when developing digital jargon. English frequently uses abbreviation, blending, clipping, semantic extension, and platform-related coinage. Uzbek digital discourse, in contrast, shows a particularly visible role for borrowing and the grammatical integration of borrowed material into Uzbek structures. These differences are consistent with the contrasting morphological profiles of the two languages, although morphology alone cannot explain every lexical development.

Despite their formal differences, the sociolinguistic functions of digital jargon are broadly comparable. In both languages, shortened or informal forms can increase communicative efficiency and simultaneously distinguish insiders from users who are unfamiliar with a particular digital community. Jargon therefore operates not only as a lexical resource but also as a social signal.

The Uzbek case is especially relevant to questions of language contact. Digital platforms provide a major channel through which English technical and social-media vocabulary enters Uzbek. Borrowed forms can then be adapted to Uzbek syntax and morphology, producing hybrid expressions that are understandable within Uzbek digital discourse. The rapid circulation of such forms also creates a challenge for lexicography and language teaching because dictionaries and pedagogical materials may not change as quickly as online vocabulary.

However, the evidence should not be interpreted as demonstrating that English always depends on abbreviation or that Uzbek digital jargon depends only on borrowing. Both languages employ multiple mechanisms, and the relative productivity of those mechanisms can vary by platform, community, period, and lexical field. A more precise comparison would require a balanced corpus collected from comparable English and Uzbek digital platforms.

Limitations

The principal limitation of the study is its reliance on secondary sources. The reviewed studies differ in research design, data sources, and analytical focus, which limits direct statistical comparison. In addition, the article does not establish a single time period, sample size, or platform-balanced corpus for English and Uzbek. Therefore, the results should be regarded as a qualitative synthesis of documented patterns. Future research could address these limitations by constructing parallel English and Uzbek social-media corpora of comparable size, time period, and platform coverage and by measuring the productivity and frequency of individual word-formation mechanisms.

Conclusion

Digital communication is an important environment for the formation, circulation, and social evaluation of jargon in both English and Uzbek. The comparison shows a difference in the forms through which digital vocabulary is commonly created: English internet jargon frequently includes abbreviation, blending, clipping, semantic extension, and platform-specific coinage, while Uzbek digital jargon is strongly shaped by English and Russian borrowing together with morphological and phonological adaptation. Nevertheless, the two languages share important sociolinguistic functions of digital jargon, including communicative efficiency, group identification, and generational differentiation.

Because the present article is based on secondary research, its conclusions should be understood as a comparative synthesis rather than as the results of a statistically representative corpus study. More systematic corpus-based research would make it possible to measure changes over time, compare platforms and user groups, and identify the mechanisms that are most productive in contemporary English and Uzbek digital discourse.

References

1. McCulloch G. Because Internet: Understanding the New Rules of Language. — New York: Riverhead Books, 2019. — 336 p.
2. Jumanazarova N.I., Khamitov E.E. A Linguistic Analysis of the Evolution of Internet Slang // Central Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Management Studies. — 2024. — Vol. 1, Iss. 1. — DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14416280.
3. Posteguillo S. Netlinguistics and English for Internet Purposes // Ibérica. — 2002. — Vol. 4. — P. 21–38.
4. Babelyuk O.A. English Cyberneologisms in Contemporary Internet Discourse: Semantic and Sociocultural Aspects // Modern Philology. — 2025. — No. 3. — P. 9–19. — DOI: 10.32782/modernph-2025.3.1.
5. Hakimova Z. The Structural and Semantic Analysis of Jargons in English and Uzbek Languages // O‘zMU xabarlarlari — ACTA NUUz. Filologiya. — 2024. — № 1/10/1. — P. 341–343.
6. Jaloliddinova N. Ijtimoiy tarmoqlardagi o‘zbek tili: lingvistik xususiyatlar va diskurs tahlili // Zamonaviy filologiya muammolari. — 2025. — № 4. — B. 1–9.
7. Polvannazirova S.Kh. Lexical Innovations in the Uzbek Language through English Borrowings in Social Media and Online Communication // Journal of Foreign Languages Education. — 2025. — Iss. 4. — P. 1–8.