



SOCIOLINGUISTIC FACTORS IN THE FORMATION OF SOCIAL PROTECTION TERMINOLOGY

Elmirzayeva Maftuna Dusrmuod qizi

Lecturer at the Department of Practical English

Karshi State University

Email: maftunaelmirzayeva7@gmail.com

Annotation. *This study investigates the sociolinguistic factors that influence the formation and development of social protection terminology in English and Uzbek. Social protection terms emerge within a complex interaction of social policies, cultural values, legal frameworks, and public discourse. The research explores how socio-economic reforms, institutional changes, globalization processes, and media discourse contribute to the evolution, borrowing, and semantic transformation of key terms in this domain. Special attention is given to the role of social stratification, national identity, political ideology, and public communication practices in shaping terminological usage. The findings demonstrate that social protection terminology is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a reflection of society's socio-political priorities and cultural worldview.*

Key words: *social protection terminology, sociolinguistics, linguistic formation, socio-economic reforms, institutional discourse, borrowing, semantic change, English–Uzbek comparison, language policy, public communication*

Introduction. Social protection terminology represents a specific layer of socio-political vocabulary that emerges at the intersection of language, society, and state policy. As societies evolve, the concepts related to welfare, social assistance, pension systems, subsidies, and compensations are continuously reshaped by socio-economic conditions and legislative reforms. Consequently, the terminology used to describe these phenomena is also influenced by various sociolinguistic factors such as the structure of society, language contact, political ideology, institutional practices, and media communication (Baker, 2018).

The formation of social protection terminology differs across linguistic communities because each society conceptualizes social welfare according to its own historical experiences and cultural values. For instance, the English terms *welfare*, *social security*, and *universal credit* reflect the institutional traditions of the United Kingdom and the United States, while the Uzbek equivalents *ijtimoiy ta'minot*, *nafaqa*, and *moddiy yordam* reflect local administrative practices and social norms. These differences reveal how language functions as a tool for encoding national socio-political models (Newmark, 1988).



Sociolinguistic factors play a crucial role in shaping these terminological systems. Globalization contributes to a rise in international borrowings such as *subsidy*, *compensation*, and *benefit*, which are gradually adapted into Uzbek. At the same time, internal socio-political reforms in Uzbekistan create new terminology or reshape existing terms, reflecting changing state priorities. Thus, terminological formation is influenced not only by linguistic mechanisms but also by state discourse, media representation, and public perception.

Given these dynamics, this research aims to analyze the sociolinguistic determinants behind the formation and development of social protection terminology in English and Uzbek. The study explores how cultural background, social stratification, political ideology, and institutional discourse contribute to term creation, borrowing, normalization, and semantic change. Through a comparative sociolinguistic approach, the research seeks to reveal the socio-cultural logic that underlies the linguistic representation of social protection systems in both languages.

This research employs a comparative sociolinguistic methodology integrating both qualitative and descriptive approaches. The main methods include:

1. Sociolinguistic analysis. Used to identify the social, political, and cultural factors that influence term formation in English and Uzbek. This method helps reveal how societal transformations, policy reforms, and institutional discourse shape terminological systems.

2. Comparative linguistic analysis. Applied to compare English and Uzbek social protection terms at semantic, structural, and conceptual levels. This includes analyzing correspondences and discrepancies between *benefit*, *allowance*, *subsidy*, *welfare*, *social security* and their Uzbek equivalents.

3. Discourse analysis. Official documents, media texts, government policies, and public communications were analyzed to observe how social protection terminology is used in real contexts. Particular attention was given to the discursive framing of welfare practices.

4. Etymological and historical analysis. Used to trace the origins, borrowing processes, and semantic evolution of selected terms across time. This approach clarifies how foreign borrowings become integrated into the Uzbek terminological system.

The study identified several key sociolinguistic factors affecting the development of social protection terminology in English and Uzbek. **Socio-economic reforms as a driving force of terminology formation.** Changes in economic policy, welfare models, and state-sponsored programs generate new terminological units. For example, the term *universal credit* in English and *ijtimoiy yordamning yangi tartibi* in Uzbek emerged in response to structural reforms.

Influence of institutional and bureaucratic discourse. Governmental institutions ministries, pension funds, employment centers serve as the primary source for creating



standardized terms. Terminological stability is strongly influenced by official documentation and legislation.

Uzbek social protection terminology shows extensive borrowing from English due to globalization and international cooperation. Terms like *subsidy*, *compensation*, *benefit* increasingly appear in hybrid or adapted forms (*subsidiya*, *kompensatsiya*).

Cultural ideas about family, community support, and social solidarity shape the interpretation and usage of certain terms. For example, English *welfare* carries political connotations, while Uzbek *moddiy yordam* reflects communal values.

Mass media plays a role in normalizing and popularizing social protection terminology. News discourse frames terms in ways that influence public perception and usage.

Many terms undergo semantic shift across languages. For example: *benefit* has financial, legal, and social meanings; Uzbek *nafaqa* is narrower and associated mostly with pensions.

Terminology usage differs among policy makers, academics, social workers, and the general public, showing sociolinguistic stratification.

The findings indicate that social protection terminology is shaped not only by linguistic structures but by broader social processes. The term formation patterns reflect the realities of each society: English-speaking countries maintain long-standing welfare institutions; therefore, terminology such as *welfare*, *social security*, *universal credit* carries ideological and political nuances. The meanings are shaped largely by public debates, socio-economic narratives, and governmental reforms. In Uzbekistan, the formation of social protection terminology is strongly linked to state reforms, linguistic modernization, and the need to conceptualize new socio-economic realities. Borrowings from English coexist with native terms shaped by historical traditions of community support.

Comparative evidence shows that: Uzbek tends to use **syntactic constructions** (e.g., *nogironlik bo'yicha nafaqa*), English tends to use **compact nominal structures** (e.g., *disability allowance*).

Sociolinguistic pressures such as political ideology, modernization, and linguistic policy affect how borrowed terms are adapted, standardized, or reinterpreted. The role of the state is particularly strong in Uzbekistan, where official institutions regulate terminological norms, while in English contexts, public discourse has greater influence. The linguistic representation of social protection reflects each society's worldview, values, and socio-political agenda.

Conclusion

The study demonstrates that the formation of social protection terminology is a multifaceted process deeply influenced by sociolinguistic factors. The development of welfare-related terms depends not only on linguistic mechanisms but also on socio-economic reforms, institutional discourse, globalization, media communication, and



cultural traditions. Thus, the study contributes to understanding how language encodes social policy concepts and highlights the importance of sociolinguistic analysis in interpreting and translating social protection terms.

References

1. **Baker, M.** Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies. – London: Routledge, 2018.
2. **Hatim, B., Mason, I.** The Translator as Communicator. – London: Routledge, 2005.
3. **Newmark, P.** A Textbook of Translation. – London: Prentice Hall, 1988.
4. **Neubert, A., Shreve, G.** Translation as Text. – Kent: Kent State University Press, 1992.
5. **Komissarov, V. N.** Teoriya perevoda: Lingvisticheskiye aspekty. – Moskva: Vysshaya Shkola, 1990.
6. **Nida, E. A.** Toward a Science of Translating. – Leiden: Brill, 1964.
7. **Crystal, D.** The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
8. **Holmes, J.** An Introduction to Sociolinguistics. – London: Longman, 2013.
9. **Trudgill, P.** Sociolinguistics: An Introduction. – London: Penguin Books, 2000.
10. **Fishman, J.** Sociolinguistics: A Brief Introduction. – Rowley: Newbury House, 1971.
11. **Nizomova, M. B.** Ingliz va o‘zbek tillarida sotsiolingvistik hodisalar talqini. – Toshkent: Fan, 2020.
12. **Qosimova, M., To‘xtaboyeva, S.** Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari. – Toshkent: Fan va Texnologiya, 2019.