ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ VOLUME 5 ISSUE 8 AUGUST 2026

ADAPTING ENGLISH STARTUP TERMS IN UZBEK: A CORPUS STUDY OF FIVE NAMING FAMILIES

Bekmuradov Jakhongir
PhD Researcher, Karshi State University
Email: Jakhongirbek93@gmail.com

DOI: 10.67620/sai.58c0001

ABSTRACT

Startup and digital-business vocabulary in Uzbek has expanded rapidly, with English as the principal donor language. The lexicon is heterogeneous: retained English spellings coexist with orthographically adapted forms and descriptive Uzbek expressions, yet these outcomes are usually described term by term rather than compared on common measures. This study compares the adaptation profiles of five purposively selected English startup terms: startup, accelerator, hackathon, FinTech and crowdfunding. The data come from the Uzbek Startup Discourse Corpus, which comprises 1,011 written texts (1,133,478 tokens) from 65 source domains. Each term was analysed as a naming family aggregating its spelling and inflectional variants, and families were compared on frequency, document range, variant inventory, dominant-form share, morphological integration and register distribution. The results show contrasting profiles: startap combines 11,192 occurrences, 87.0% document range, 90.1% dominance and an extensive affixal paradigm; akselerator is a stable adapted form (84.1%); xakaton, hakaton and hackathon all take Uzbek morphology while spelling remains unresolved; fintech (55.5%) and fintex (44.0%) compete with each other and, in official prose, with the descriptive expression moliyaviy texnologiyalar; kraudfanding is 90.7% dominant but occurs in only 27 documents. The findings indicate that orthographic stabilisation, morphological integration, variant dominance and discourse-wide distribution are related but analytically distinct dimensions of adaptation.

ACCEPTED

07.09.26

Keywords: *lexical borrowing; orthographic adaptation; morphological integration; terminological variation; corpus linguistics; Uzbek; startup terminology.*

CC BY

1. Introduction

The vocabulary of startups, venture financing and digital business has grown quickly in many languages, and Uzbek is no exception. State innovation programmes, IT parks, venture funds, technology media and universities have produced a substantial body of Uzbek-language writing in which concepts such as startup, accelerator, hackathon, financial technology and crowdfunding are discussed routinely. Most of this conceptual apparatus originated in English, and English remains the dominant donor language for the field.

The outcomes of this contact are not uniform. In Uzbek written discourse the same concept may be expressed by a retained English spelling (*startup*, *accelerator*, *hackathon*), by an orthographic adaptation to the Latin-based Uzbek alphabet (*startap*, *akselerator*, *xakaton*), by more than one adapted spelling (*xakaton* and *hakaton*; *fintex* and *fintek*), or by a descriptive expression built from Uzbek lexical resources

(*moliyaviy texnologiyalar* 'financial technologies'). These alternatives coexist in current usage, and their relative weight differs from one concept to another.

Descriptions of such items often treat them individually, judging a loanword "adapted" or "unadapted", "integrated" or "foreign". Such labels obscure the fact that adaptation has several components. A term may be orthographically adapted but rarely used; it may be morphologically integrated in every spelling while its spelling is unsettled; it may have one clearly preferred spelling and still be confined to a narrow band of texts. Only a comparison of several terms measured on the same dimensions can show whether these components move together or independently.

This study makes that comparison for five English-derived startup terms in contemporary Uzbek written discourse: *startup*, *accelerator*, *hackathon*, *FinTech* and *crowdfunding*. The five were selected purposively from a larger validated analysis of startup terminology (hereafter the source analysis; see Data sources) because they illustrate contrasting adaptation patterns; they are not claimed to be statistically representative of the whole startup lexicon. The evidence comes from the Uzbek Startup Discourse Corpus, a collection of 1,011 written texts, and each term is analysed as a naming family that aggregates its spelling and inflectional variants. Because the data are written, the study makes no claims about pronunciation.

The aim of the study is to compare how the five terms differ in orthographic adaptation, morphological integration, variant competition, frequency and document range. Three research questions guide the analysis:

RQ1. What orthographic and nominative variants are attested for the five selected English startup terms in contemporary Uzbek?

RQ2. How do the five naming families differ in frequency, document range, dominant-form share and morphological integration?

RQ3. What do these differences reveal about the adaptation and stabilisation of English startup terminology in contemporary Uzbek?

The paper contributes a multidimensional comparison that separates four dimensions of adaptation, namely orthographic stabilisation, morphological integration, variant dominance and discourse-wide distribution, and provides corpus evidence that they do not necessarily develop at the same rate.

2. Theoretical Background

2.1 Lexical borrowing and adaptation

Lexical borrowing has been described since Haugen (1950) and Weinreich (1953) as a process in which a form from a donor language is taken over and progressively accommodated to the recipient system. Later work in contact linguistics (Thomason & Kaufman, 1988; Winford, 2003; Matras, 2009) stresses that accommodation is gradual and multidimensional: a loanword may be adapted at the phonological, orthographic, morphological and syntactic levels to different degrees, and its frequency and social diffusion are further independent variables (Poplack, Sankoff & Miller, 1988; Haspelmath, 2009). Two distinctions are central here. The first is between retention, in which the donor spelling is preserved (*startup*, *accelerator*), and orthographic adaptation, in which the form is respelled according to recipient-language conventions (*startap*, *akselerator*). The second is between orthographic adaptation and morphological integration, that is, the term's participation in the inflectional and derivational system of the recipient language. In an agglutinative language such as Uzbek, morphological integration is directly observable in written texts through plural, possessive and case suffixes and through derivation. Because the present evidence is written, adaptation is discussed only in orthographic and morphological terms.

2.2 Terminological variation

Terminology research has moved away from the assumption that one concept should correspond to one term. Cabré (1999) and Temmerman (2000) treat variation as a normal property of specialised communication, and Freixa (2006) proposes a typology of causes of denominative variation that includes functional, discursive, cognitive and interlinguistic factors. In a borrowing situation, variation takes at least

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

two forms. Orthographic variation involves competing spellings of the same borrowed item (*xakaton*, *hakaton*, *hackathon*). Nominative competition involves alternative naming strategies for the same concept, typically a borrowed form against a descriptive expression created from native resources (*fintech* against *moliyaviy texnologiyalar*). Both types may be sensitive to register, since institutional and legal texts often prefer forms that differ from those of media or industry communication. Terminology theory also distinguishes usage-based conventionalisation from prescriptive codification (Sager, 1990): a form may be widely used, and even used by official bodies, without having been formally standardised. This distinction is retained throughout the present study.

2.3 Corpus-based terminology research

Corpus methods allow variation and integration to be quantified rather than merely illustrated (Sinclair, 1991; Biber, Conrad & Reppen, 1998; Daille, 2017). Two measures are especially relevant. Raw or normalised frequency indicates how often a family is used; document range, or dispersion, indicates how widely it is used across texts (Gries, 2008). The two need not agree: a term repeated many times in a handful of documents can reach a high frequency while remaining narrowly distributed. Within a family, the share of the dominant variant and an entropy measure over variants describe how concentrated or dispersed usage is among competing forms, and the number of affixed forms indicates the extent of morphological integration. Register comparison adds a further layer by testing whether variant preferences differ across text types. The study applies these measures to the five selected families.

3. Materials and Methods

3.1 Corpus

The data come from the Uzbek Startup Discourse Corpus, a collection of 1,011 Uzbek-language written texts totalling 1,133,478 tokens and 67,355 lexical types. The texts were drawn from 65 source domains, including web-based media and news portals, government and presidential websites, legal databases, startup-ecosystem organisations, international development agencies and universities. By metadata type, the corpus consists of 896 webpages, 67 research papers, 35 legal texts, 10 books, 2 reports and 1 guide. Document length is highly variable: the mean is 1,121.1 tokens, the median 289 tokens, and the shortest and longest texts contain 7 and 93,555 tokens respectively. This heterogeneity is deliberate, since the study concerns term behaviour across official, media, industry and academic writing.

3.2 Naming-family approach

Each English term was analysed as a naming family: the set of all attested orthographic and inflectional forms that realise the same borrowed item, aggregated case-insensitively. The *startup* family, for instance, comprises the *startap* group (*startap*, *startaplar*, *startapchilar*, etc.), the *startup* group (*startup*, *startups*, *startuplar*) and the *start-up* group (*start-up*, *start-uplar*). Family-level counts resolve overlap between forms and therefore differ from standalone word-list counts; family figures from the source analysis are used throughout. *FinTech* (capitalised) labels the family, lowercase *fintech* the corpus variant; the family total covers *fintech*, *fintex* and *fintek* only. The descriptive expression *moliyaviy texnologiyalar* was analysed separately as a competing naming strategy within the register comparison and is not included in the family total.

3.3 Measures

The following measures were taken from the source analysis for each family:

- total family frequency: all occurrences of all forms in the family;
- document range: the number of corpus documents in which the family occurs, also expressed as a percentage of the 1,011 documents;
- normalised frequency: occurrences per million tokens (npm);
- variant inventory: the number of distinct attested forms, and the number and share of forms carrying Uzbek affixes;

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

- dominant-form share: the proportion of family occurrences accounted for by the leading variant group;
- normalised variant entropy (Hn): an index of how evenly occurrences are spread across variant groups, higher values indicating less concentrated variation;
- average occurrences per covered document.

Register distribution was examined by identifying the leading variant in each document and comparing government/legal, sector/media and academic texts; association strength is reported as Cramér's V with a permutation p-value. Institutional status records whether forms are attested in official materials and whether formal codification was established; all five families received the status 'Partial'. All statistics are reported as computed in the source analysis; no new tests were computed for this article.

3.4 Selection of terms

The five families were chosen purposively from the source analysis. They display contrasting combinations of the measures above, from a high-frequency, widely distributed, strongly integrated adaptation (*startap*) to a dominant adapted spelling with very narrow distribution (*kraudfanding*), with unresolved orthographic and nominative competition in between (*hackathon*, *FinTech*). They are diagnostic cases, not a statistically representative sample of Uzbek startup terminology.

4. Results

Table 1 summarises the comparative profile of the five families and Table 2 the distribution of variant groups within each; three comparative patterns are then discussed.

Table 1.

Comparative profile of the five naming families in the Uzbek Startup Discourse Corpus (N = 1,011 documents)

Term family	Family frequency	Document range (% of corpus)	npm	Attested forms	Dominant variant (share)	Affixed forms (% of inventory)	Hn	Main adaptation pattern
startup → *startap*	11,192	880 (87.0%)	9,874.0	84	*startap* (90.1%)	73 (86.9%)	0.343	broadly conventionalised adapted form
accelerator → *akselerator*	591	209 (20.7%)	521.4	34	*akselerator* (84.1%)	31 (91.2%)	0.632	stable adapted form vs. retained spelling
FinTech → *fintech* / *fintex* / *fintek*	427	172 (17.0%)	376.7	13	*fintech* (55.5%)	10 (76.9%)	0.649	spelling competition plus borrowed-vs-descriptive naming competition
hackathon → *xakaton* / *hakaton* / *hackathon*	172	66 (6.5%)	151.7	29	*xakaton* (60.5%)	26 (89.7%)	0.860	morphologically integrated, orthographically unresolved
crowdfunding → *kraudfanding*	162	27 (2.7%)	142.9	7	*kraudfanding* (90.7%)	5 (71.4%)	0.445	dominant adapted form, narrow distribution

Note. npm = occurrences per million tokens; Hn = normalised variant entropy. Family frequency aggregates all spelling and inflectional variants case-insensitively. The *FinTech* total covers *fintech*, *fintex* and *fintek* only; the descriptive expression *moliyaviy texnologiyalar* is not included.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Table 2.

Variant-group distribution within each naming family

Family	Variant group	Type	Frequency	Share
startup	*startap*	orthographically adapted Uzbek form	10,086	90.1%
	startup	retained English spelling	842	7.5%
	start-up	retained hyphenated English spelling	264	2.4%
accelerator	*akselerator*	orthographically adapted Uzbek form	497	84.1%
	accelerator	retained English spelling	94	15.9%
hackathon	*xakaton*	adapted spelling with initial *x*	104	60.5%
	hakaton	alternative adapted spelling with initial *h*	36	20.9%
	hackathon	retained English spelling	32	18.6%
FinTech	*fintech*	retained/lowercased international spelling	237	55.5%
	fintex	Uzbek-oriented orthographic adaptation	188	44.0%
	fintek	marginal adapted spelling	2	0.5%
crowdfunding	*kraudfanding*	orthographically adapted Uzbek form	147	90.7%
	crowdfunding	retained English spelling	15	9.3%

Note. Shares are percentages of the family total in Table 1.

4.1 Relatively stabilised adapted forms: *startap* and *akselerator*

The *startup* family is by far the most frequent and most widely distributed item in the set. It occurs 11,192 times (9,874.0 npm) in 880 of the 1,011 documents, that is, in 87.0% of the corpus. Its variant inventory comprises 84 attested forms, of which 73 (86.9%) carry Uzbek affixes, with 67 distinct affix combinations. The adapted spelling *startap* accounts for 90.1% of all occurrences (10,086), and the retained spellings form two much smaller groups: *startup* (842; 7.5%) and *start-up* (264; 2.4%). The normalised variant entropy is correspondingly low (Hn = 0.343).

The morphological paradigm of *startap* is the richest in the set. Plural, possessive and case suffixes are all attested (*startaplar*, *startaplarni*, *startapingiz*, *startapimiz*), as is derivation (*startapchilar*, *startapchilik*). The form also enters hybrid compounds such as *startap-loyiha*, *startap-ekotizim* and *IT-startaplar*. Its syntactic embedding is equally extensive, with 558 izofa constructions, 330 attributive uses and LV-coded constructions in 100 documents. Frequent collocates such as *loyihalar(ni)* 'projects', *ekotizim(i)* 'ecosystem', *qo'llab-quvvatlash* 'support', *istiqbolli* 'promising' and *innovatsion* show that the term functions as an ordinary Uzbek noun within the vocabulary of innovation policy. Register differences are significant but weak (Cramér's V = 0.115, permutation p = 0.001); government/legal texts are more orthographically uniform, with *startap* the leading form in 109 such documents against 11 for *startup* and 1 for *start-up*. Official use of *startap* and *startap loyiha* is documented, but full codification was not established.

The *accelerator* family shows a similar shape at a much lower level: 591 occurrences (521.4 npm) in 209 documents (20.7%), the second-widest document range in the set. The adapted spelling *akselerator* accounts for 84.1% of occurrences (497) and the retained spelling *accelerator* for 15.9% (94). Of the 34 attested forms, 31 (91.2%) are affixed, with 25 affix combinations covering plural, possession, case and

derivation in *-lik* (*akseleratorlar*, *akseleratori*, *akseleratoriga*, *akseleratorlik*). Compounds such as *startap-akselerator* and *pre-akselerator* are attested, along with 53 izofa and 35 attributive constructions. Register differences were not statistically confirmed (Cramér's V = 0.118, permutation p = 0.249). Official forms *akselerator* and *akseleratorlar* are documented, while formal terminological codification remained under discussion. The family's Hn of 0.632 is considerably higher than that of *startup*, reflecting the persistence of retained *accelerator*, but the competition is a simple adapted-versus-retained one rather than a contest between several adapted spellings.

4.2 Orthographic and nominative competition: *hackathon* and *FinTech*

The *hackathon* family (172 occurrences; 151.7 npm; 66 documents, 6.5%) shows the highest variant entropy in the set (Hn = 0.860). Three spellings compete: *xakaton* with initial *x* (104; 60.5%), *hakaton* with initial *h* (36; 20.9%) and retained *hackathon* (32; 18.6%). At issue is the rendering of English initial *h*, for which Uzbek orthography offers both *x* and *h*.

Orthographic instability has not prevented morphological integration. Of the 29 attested forms, 26 (89.7%) are affixed, and all three spellings take Uzbek suffixes: *xakatonlar*, *xakatonlarni*, *xakatonda*, *xakatoniga*; *hakatoni*, *hakatonlarni*; *hackathonlar*. Constructional evidence comprises 13 izofa and 5 attributive uses. Whatever its spelling, the family therefore inflects as an Uzbek noun. Register shows a comparatively strong association with variant choice (Cramér's V = 0.333, permutation p = 0.005): all 9 government/legal documents containing the family are led by *xakaton*, whereas sector/media documents split between *xakaton* (18), *hakaton* (13) and *hackathon* (8). Official materials nevertheless contain all three spellings, so institutional use has not produced orthographic uniformity.

The *FinTech* family (427 occurrences; 376.7 npm; 172 documents, 17.0%) presents a different type of competition. Within it, the retained international spelling *fintech* (237; 55.5%) and the Uzbek-oriented adaptation *fintex* (188; 44.0%) are nearly balanced, and *fintek* is marginal (2; 0.5%); Hn is 0.649. The inventory is small (13 forms, 10 of them affixed, 76.9%). Case, plural and possessive forms are attested for both main spellings (*fintechlar*, *fintechni*, *fintechga*; *fintexning*, *fintexni*, *fintexda*), and hybrid formations such as *fintech-hub* and *fintex-akselerator* also occur. Constructional evidence includes 56 izofa and 17 attributive uses; the single LV document falls below the two-document confirmation threshold.

Beyond spelling, the family competes with the descriptive Uzbek expression *moliyaviy texnologiyalar*. This expression was analysed as a separate naming strategy and is not part of the 427 family total. The register comparison, based on 160 documents after the exclusion of 30 ties, is significant (Cramér's V = 0.281, permutation p < 0.001) and shows a clear split. In government/legal documents the descriptive form leads in 6 documents, *fintech* in 2 and *fintex* in 1. In sector/media documents the borrowed spellings predominate and are almost evenly divided, *fintech* leading in 55 and *fintex* in 53, against 19 for the descriptive form. In academic documents *fintech* leads in 18, *fintex* in 4 and the descriptive form in 2. Official materials document *moliyaviy texnologiyalar*, *fintex* and *FinTech*. *FinTech* is thus the clearest case in the set of competition operating on two levels at once: between spellings of the borrowed item, and between borrowing and descriptive naming.

4.3 Variant dominance versus discourse distribution: *kraudfanding*

The *crowdfunding* family is the smallest in the set: 162 occurrences (142.9 npm) in 27 documents (2.7% of the corpus). The adapted spelling *kraudfanding* accounts for 90.7% of occurrences (147) and retained *crowdfunding* for 9.3% (15); Hn is 0.445. The inventory contains 7 forms, 5 of them affixed (71.4%), mainly case forms (*kraudfandingni*, *kraudfandingning*, *kraudfandingga*, *kraudfandingdan*, *kraudfandingda*). Constructional evidence is thin: 13 izofa and 2 attributive uses, and a single LV document below the confirmation threshold. Right-hand collocates cluster on *platforma* 'platform' (*platformalari*, *platformasi*). Register differences were not statistically confirmed (Cramér's V = 0.273, permutation p = 0.379), with only 26 documents entering the test. Official government use of *kraudfanding* is documented, but no normative definition or spelling codification was established.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Startup offers a telling contrast: the dominant adapted shares of the two families are almost identical, 90.7% for *kraudfanding* and 90.1% for *startap*, yet *startup* occurs in 880 documents and *crowdfunding* in 27. Occurrences per covered document also differ (12.72 versus 6.00), but the decisive difference is document range: *kraudfanding* is a settled spelling in the texts that use it, while such texts form a very small part of the corpus. Dominant-form share measures how much agreement there is on a form where the concept is discussed; document range measures how widely the concept is discussed at all. A high dominant share alone is not evidence of broad conventionalisation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Adaptation is term-specific rather than uniform

The five families do not occupy positions on a single scale from "foreign" to "integrated". *Startap* combines high frequency, very wide document range, strong dominance and an extensive paradigm; *akselerator* is dominant and fully integrated but far less widespread; *xakaton* is morphologically integrated but orthographically unsettled; *FinTech* is split almost evenly between *fintech* and *fintex* and additionally challenged by a descriptive expression; *kraudfanding* is dominant but narrowly distributed. Ordering the families by frequency (*startup* > *accelerator* > *FinTech* > *hackathon* > *crowdfunding*), by dominant share (*crowdfunding* ≈ *startup* > *accelerator* > *hackathon* > *FinTech*) and by entropy (*hackathon* > *FinTech* > *accelerator* > *crowdfunding* > *startup*) yields three different rankings. Within the present dataset, then, adaptation outcomes are term-specific, and a one-dimensional label cannot describe them adequately. The findings do not explain why the profiles differ; the age of a concept in Uzbek discourse, its institutional salience and the availability of a transparent descriptive equivalent are possible factors that the present data cannot test.

5.2 Orthographic stabilisation and morphological integration can develop at different rates

Hackathon is the clearest illustration. Its affixed-form share (89.7%) is comparable to those of *startup* (86.9%) and *accelerator* (91.2%), and every spelling accepts plural, case and possessive suffixes. Morphologically, the word is an Uzbek noun. Yet its spelling is the least settled in the set, and the official record itself contains three spellings. *FinTech* shows the same dissociation in a milder form: both *fintech* and *fintex* are inflected, while neither has clearly prevailed. These cases indicate that morphological integration can proceed despite unresolved orthographic variation: in the present data, suffixation is attested across competing base forms. Orthographic stabilisation, by contrast, is a slower and more socially mediated process that depends on the convergence of writing conventions across producers and registers. The register results are consistent with this reading: for *startup* and *hackathon*, government/legal texts are more uniform than sector/media texts, and it is in the latter that competing spellings persist.

5.3 High variant dominance does not equal broad discourse distribution

The *startup–crowdfunding* comparison shows that a dominant adapted form can arise in two different situations: as the outcome of corpus-wide use, or as the practice of a small set of documents in which the concept happens to be discussed. The 90.7% dominance of *kraudfanding* is not weaker than the 90.1% dominance of *startap*, but it rests on 27 documents rather than 880. In the broad sense, conventionalisation—a term becoming part of the general written repertoire of a discourse community—involves both agreement on form and diffusion across texts. The corpus indicates that these can be separated, and that share-based descriptions of loanword status should be accompanied by document-range measures. *FinTech* shows the reverse: its document range (17.0%) is the third-widest in the set, yet no spelling clearly dominates, so diffusion has not yet produced orthographic agreement.

5.4 Corpus evidence, terminology planning and codification

The results bear on terminology work in Uzbek, but the inference from corpus to norm must be handled carefully. All five families are attested in official materials: for *startup* and *hackathon* the adapted spelling leads in government/legal documents, and for *accelerator* and *crowdfunding* official use of the adapted spelling is documented. Yet none of the five has progressed beyond partial institutional status;

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

official use coexists with unresolved variation, and for *hackathon* the official record is itself heterogeneous. Corpus conventionalisation, institutional usage and formal codification are therefore three distinct states, and dominance in the corpus should not be reported as standardisation. What the corpus can offer planners is a description of the options in circulation and their register distribution: for *FinTech*, for instance, that the descriptive expression *moliyaviy texnologiyalar* leads in official prose while *fintech* and *fintex* divide sector/media writing. Whether a planning body should ratify the dominant borrowed form, the descriptive form, or both is a normative decision that corpus evidence can inform but not settle.

6. Conclusion

This study set out to compare how five purposively selected English startup terms differ in orthographic adaptation, morphological integration, variant competition, frequency and document range in contemporary Uzbek written discourse. On the evidence of the Uzbek Startup Discourse Corpus, the five families display distinct profiles. *Startap* is a broadly conventionalised adapted form with very high frequency, a document range of 87.0%, 90.1% dominance and a rich affixal paradigm. *Akselerator* is a stable adapted form (84.1%) competing only with the retained spelling. The *hackathon* family is morphologically integrated in all three of its spellings while *xakaton*, *hakaton* and *hackathon* continue to compete. *FinTech* shows a near-even division between *fintech* and *fintex* together with competition from the descriptive expression *moliyaviy texnologiyalar*, which leads in official prose. *Kraudfanding* is 90.7% dominant yet restricted to 27 documents.

Theoretically, orthographic stabilisation, morphological integration, variant dominance and discourse-wide distribution thus emerge as related but analytically distinct dimensions of adaptation. A borrowed term may be integrated while orthographically unstable, or strongly dominant in its adapted form while narrowly distributed. Descriptions of loanword status in Uzbek, and by extension in other recipient languages of English digital terminology, should measure these dimensions separately.

The study's limitations follow from its design. The five terms were chosen as contrasting cases and are not a statistically representative sample; the evidence is written and says nothing about pronunciation; and the corpus reflects a particular composition of sources dominated by web texts. Further research could extend the same multidimensional comparison to a larger number of naming families, apply register-sensitive analysis across all of them with adequate document counts, and track change across successive corpus versions.

REFERENCES

1. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Cabré, M. T. (1999). *Terminology: Theory, methods and applications*. John Benjamins.
3. Daille, B. (2017). *Term variation in specialised corpora: Characterisation, automatic discovery and applications*. John Benjamins.
4. Freixa, J. (2006). Causes of denominative variation in terminology: A typology proposal. *Terminology*, 12(1), 51–77.
5. Gries, S. Th. (2008). Dispersions and adjusted frequencies in corpora. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 403–437.
6. Haspelmath, M. (2009). Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook* (pp. 35–54). De Gruyter Mouton.
7. Haugen, E. (1950). The analysis of linguistic borrowing. *Language*, 26(2), 210–231.
8. Matras, Y. (2009). *Language contact*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Poplack, S., Sankoff, D., & Miller, C. (1988). The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation. *Linguistics*, 26(1), 47–104.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

10. Sager, J. C. (1990). *A practical course in terminology processing*. John Benjamins.
11. Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.
12. Temmerman, R. (2000). *Towards new ways of terminology description: The sociocognitive approach*. John Benjamins.
13. Thomason, S. G., & Kaufman, T. (1988). *Language contact, creolization, and genetic linguistics*. University of California Press.
14. Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Linguistic Circle of New York.
15. Winford, D. (2003). *An introduction to contact linguistics*. Blackwell.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ