ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

PHONETIC AND MORPHOLOGICAL ADAPTATION OF ENGLISH IT TERMS IN UZBEK

Ergashaliyeva Mohiro‘ybegim Bahromjon qizi
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Student, Faculty of English Language and Literature
ergashboevamohiroybegim@gmail.com
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24005032

Abstract. The article analyses the phonetic and morphological adaptation of English information technology (IT) terms in Uzbek. Two layers are distinguished: older terms borrowed via Russian (kompyuter, server, brauzer) and newer terms borrowed directly from English (apdeyt, skrinshot, deploy). The first layer is shown to adapt mainly by spelling, the second by pronunciation. Morphologically, the loanwords are fully integrated into Uzbek agglutinative grammar: they take case, possessive and plural suffixes and form verbs with -la(-sh) or the light verbs qil- and bo‘l-. Spelling inconsistencies and proposals for standardisation are discussed.
Keywords: loanword, IT terminology, phonetic adaptation, morphological adaptation, language contact, intermediary language, norm.

Annotatsiya. Maqolada o‘zbek tiliga ingliz tilidan o‘zlashgan axborot texnologiyalari (IT) terminlarining fonetik va morfologik moslashuvi tahlil qilinadi. Terminlar ikki qatlamga ajratiladi: rus tili vositasida kirgan eski qatlam (kompyuter, server, brauzer) va ingliz tilidan bevosita kirayotgan yangi qatlam (apdeyt, skrinshot, deploy). Birinchi qatlam asosan yozilish bo‘yicha, ikkinchisi talaffuz bo‘yicha moslashishi ko‘rsatiladi. Morfologik jihatdan o‘zlashmalar o‘zbek tilining agglutinativ tizimiga to‘liq bo‘ysunadi: ular kelishik, egalik va ko‘plik qo‘shimchalarini oladi, -la(-sh) va qil-/bo‘l- yordamchi fe’llari orqali fe’l hosil qiladi. Ishda imlodagi nomuvofiqliklar va me’yorlashtirish bo‘yicha takliflar ham beriladi.
Kalit so‘zlar: o‘zlashma, IT terminologiyasi, fonetik moslashuv, morfologik moslashuv, til kontakti, vositachi til, me’yor.

Аннотация. В статье анализируется фонетическая и морфологическая адаптация английских терминов информационных технологий (ИТ) в узбекском языке. Выделяются два пласта: ранние термины, заимствованные через русский язык (kompyuter, server, brauzer), и новые термины, заимствованные непосредственно из английского (apdeyt, skrinshot, deploy). Показано, что первый пласт адаптируется преимущественно по написанию, второй — по произношению. В морфологическом отношении заимствования полностью подчиняются агглютинативной системе узбекского языка: принимают падежные, притяжательные аффиксы и аффиксы множественного числа, образуют глаголы с помощью -la(-sh) и вспомогательных глаголов qil- и bo‘l-. Рассматриваются орфографические расхождения и предлагаются пути нормализации.
Ключевые слова: заимствование, ИТ-терминология, фонетическая адаптация, морфологическая адаптация, языковой контакт, язык-посредник, норма.

Introduction

Over the past decade, the influx of IT terms into Uzbek has accelerated sharply. The main reasons are the spread of digital services, the expansion of IT education and the gradual displacement of Russian by English as the intermediary language.

Statistics confirm the scale of this process. As of 1 January 2026, the number of subscribers connected to the internet via mobile networks in the country reached 33.3 million, 4.3 times more than in 2015 [20]. As the digital environment expands, IT vocabulary is moving beyond narrow professional circles into everyday speech.

The issue also occupies a special place in state language policy. Decree PF-5850 set the task of enhancing the prestige of Uzbek as the state language [18]. Decree PF-6084 named ensuring the active integration of the state language into modern information and communication technologies as one of its main directions [19]. This task cannot be fulfilled on a scientific basis without knowing the regularities of IT term adaptation.

As a result, several forms now compete for a single concept: apdeyt / yangilanish / obnovleniye (‘update’), app / aplikatsiya / ilova (‘application’). This situation calls for a systematic study of the terms on the basis of adaptation regularities.

Aim: to identify the ways in which English IT terms adapt phonetically and morphologically in Uzbek.

Objectives:

1. To classify IT loanwords by their route of entry (via Russian or directly).
2. To identify sound substitutions and changes in stress.
3. To analyse adaptation to inflectional and word-formation patterns.
4. To show spelling inconsistencies and propose directions for standardisation.

Scientific novelty: IT loanwords are divided into two layers according to their route of entry, and the phonetic and morphological features of each layer are described systematically; phonetic criteria for identifying the layer and a three-level classification of integration are proposed; the distribution of the -la- and qil- models across the layers is shown.

Practical significance: the results can be used in compiling IT terminological dictionaries, in software localisation, in translation practice and in teaching the university courses “Modern Literary Uzbek” and “Terminology”.

Literature Review

The theoretical foundation for the analysis of loanwords was laid by E. Haugen. He distinguishes two processes in borrowing: the importation of a foreign element and its substitution by native elements [1]. U. Weinreich systematised interference phenomena in language contact [2].

Haugen divides loans into three types: loanwords, loanblends and loanshifts [1]. All three occur in Uzbek IT vocabulary. Server and bag are loanwords; veb-sahifa (‘web page’) and kiberxavfsizlik (‘cybersecurity’) are loanblends; sichqoncha (‘mouse’) and tarmoq (‘network’) are loanshifts, i.e. native words that have acquired a new meaning. This article focuses mainly on the first two types, since phonetic and morphological adaptation manifests itself precisely in them. Haugen also observed that bilingual speakers tend to import foreign elements in their original form, whereas monolinguals tend to substitute native elements [1]. This observation is important for explaining the difference between the layers of Uzbek IT terminology.

S. Thomason and T. Kaufman showed that the lexicon is the first layer to be borrowed in language contact [3]. M. Haspelmath distinguishes adaptation from integration: the former is a change in the form of a word, the latter its entrenchment in the system [4]. S. Poplack and co-authors proposed criteria for distinguishing nonce borrowings from established loanwords [5]. This distinction is particularly important for IT jargon.

The problem of the intermediary language has been studied extensively in Russian linguistics. L. P. Krysin describes the entry of a foreign word into a language as a step-by-step process: the word is first used in speech, then adapts graphically and grammatically, and is finally recorded in dictionaries [13]. Many international terms that entered Uzbek in the 20th century had already passed through these stages in Russian and entered Uzbek in a ready-made form. This explains their spelling-based adaptation. D. Winford emphasises that the social status of the source and recipient languages and the speakers' degree of bilingualism determine the adaptation strategy in language contact [14].

In Uzbek terminology studies, R. Daniyarov substantiated the principle of the systemic organisation of terminology [6]. A. Madvaliyev analysed the structural models of terms [7]. H. Dadaboyev notes the nativisation of loan terms through phonetic and grammatical adaptation, e.g. kompyuterizatsiya → kompyuterlashtirish ('computerisation') [8]. Recent studies have begun to distinguish an intermediate layer of artificial intelligence terms borrowed via Russian from a layer borrowed directly from English [9].

There are two main approaches in loanword phonology. According to the first, adaptation is based on the speaker's perception of the source pronunciation (the perceptual approach). According to the second, it is governed by the phonological system of the recipient language (the phonological approach) [15]. C. Paradis and D. LaCharité showed that in loanwords the source segment is preserved as far as possible and the necessary changes are minimal [16]. The Uzbek data show that these factors operate differently depending on the layer: in the old layer, spelling and Russian phonology prevail, whereas in the new layer the perception of English pronunciation takes the lead. The matrix language model proposed by C. Myers-Scotton is useful for analysing morphological integration. According to this model, in mixed speech one language (the matrix language) supplies the grammatical frame and system morphemes, while the other contributes only content stems [17].

Research gap: existing studies focus mainly on official and scientific terminology. The two layers of IT terms (via Russian and direct) have not been analysed comparatively from the phonetic and morphological points of view on the basis of colloquial data. This article aims to fill this gap.

Material and Methods

The research material consists of [N] English IT terms collected from four types of sources:

– the Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language (2006–2008) [10];
– technology sections of leading online media (2020–2026);
– Uzbek-language IT Telegram channels and programming course materials;
– oral examples recorded from the speech of programmers.

Selection criterion: a term must be used with Uzbek suffixes in at least three independent sources. This separates established loanwords from one-off code-switching [5].

Criteria for identifying the layer. Signs of Russian mediation: the spelling-based pronunciation of final -er as [er] (server, printer); [x] in place of English [h] (xaker); Russian suffixes (fleshka, -

atsiya). Signs of direct borrowing: a pronunciation-based form (apdeyt, bag) and the preservation of [h] (hosting, heshteg).

Methods: the descriptive method; etymological analysis (comparison of English, Russian and Uzbek forms); phonetic analysis (identification of sound correspondences on the basis of IPA transcription); morphemic and word-formation analysis; frequency (quantitative) analysis.

Table 1. Composition of the research material

Source type	Period	Number of terms
Explanatory Dictionary of the Uzbek Language [10]	2006–2008	[ ]
Technology sections of online media	2020–2026	[ ]
Telegram channels and programming courses	2022–2026	[ ]
Recordings of oral speech	2026	[ ]
Total (without duplicates)	—	[N]

The criteria for identifying the layer are summarised in the table below. The vowel [æ] indicates the period rather than the layer, since in modern Russian it is also rendered as э (бэкенд, хэштег). Therefore, [h] and Russian suffixes were taken as the main criteria for determining the route.

Table 2. Criteria for identifying the layer

Feature	Via Russian	Direct
English [h]	[x]: xaker	[h]: hosting, heshteg
Basis of the form	spelling: monitor, printer	pronunciation: apdeyt, bag
Russian suffix	present: fleshka, -atsiya	absent
English [æ] (period marker)	[a]: skaner	[e]: bekend
Approximate period of entry	1990–2010	after 2010

Transcription conventions. English forms are given in British-standard IPA transcription, Uzbek forms in the current Latin script. Square brackets [ ] are used when pronunciation is shown separately. Russian intermediate forms are given in Cyrillic. Incorrect or unattested forms are marked with an asterisk (*).

Degrees of Loanword Integration

According to their degree of integration into Uzbek, the terms in the corpus fall into three groups. The classification is based on the integration criteria proposed by S. Poplack and co-authors: graphic form, acceptance of grammatical suffixes and participation in word formation [5].

Table 3. Degrees of integration

Level	Features	Examples
1. Unadapted (xenism)	original spelling retained, suffixes rarely added	Wi-Fi, Bluetooth, USB, backend
2. Partially adapted	original spelling retained, but Uzbek suffixes added	deploy qilmoq, login’ga, frontend’chi

Level	Features	Examples
3. Fully adapted	Uzbek spelling, full paradigm, participation in word formation	fayl, apdeyt, bekend, kodlamoq

The same term may occur at different levels in different texts: backend / bekend, Wi-Fi / vay-fay. This shows that the term is in transition from level 1 to level 3. Preliminary observations suggest that levels 1–2 prevail in professional correspondence, while level 3 prevails in the mass media. This hypothesis should be tested against corpus frequencies.

Separating a suffix with an apostrophe at level 2 (login'ga) is not provided for by the current spelling rules [12]. It reflects speakers' desire to mark the boundary between a foreign stem and an Uzbek suffix in writing. Phonetic adaptation is fully manifested mainly in level 3 forms, so the next section focuses on them.

Phonetic Adaptation

Main finding: terms borrowed via Russian adapt according to spelling, those borrowed directly according to pronunciation. This difference is especially evident in [æ], [h] and final -er.

Table 4. Examples of phonetic adaptation

English	IPA	Uzbek	Layer	Process
hacker	/ˈhækə/	xaker	via Russian	[h]→[x], [æ]→[a], spelling-based -er
server	/ˈsɜːvə/	server	via Russian	[ɜː]→[e], spelling-based -er
Bluetooth	/ˈbluːtuːθ/	blutuz	via Russian	[θ]→[z], loss of length
browser	/ˈbraʊzə/	brauzer	via Russian	[aʊ]→[au]
gadget	/ˈgædʒɪt/	gadjet	via Russian	[dʒ]→dj (in writing)
update	/ˈʌpdeɪt/	apdeyt	direct	[ʌ]→[a], [eɪ]→[ey]
bug	/bʌg/	bag	direct	[ʌ]→[a]
backend	/ˈbækend/	bekend	mixed	[æ]→[e]
hashtag	/ˈhæʃtæg/	heshteg	direct	[h] preserved, [æ]→[e]
hosting	/ˈhəʊstɪŋ/	hosting	direct	[h] preserved, [əʊ]→[o]
screenshot	/ˈskriːnʃɒt/	skrinshot	direct	[iː]→[i], cluster preserved
Wi-Fi	/ˈwaɪfaɪ/	vay-fay	mixed	[w]→[v], [aɪ]→[ay]

Vowels

Vowel length is not phonologically distinctive in Uzbek, so [iː] and [uː] become short [i] and [u]. English [ʌ] consistently yields [a]. [æ], however, is reflected in two ways: as [a] in the old layer (xaker, skaner) and as [e] in the new layer (bekend, heshteg). Weak [ə] is replaced by the vowel of the spelling.

The dual reflex of [æ] is a clear marker of a change of period. In the Soviet period, Russian usually rendered [æ] by the letter a (хакер, сканер), and the Uzbek forms were taken from these. In recent loans, by contrast, [æ] is rendered as e in both Russian and Uzbek: bekend, heshteg, bekap (backup). Interestingly, Uzbek a is acoustically close to English [æ] in many positions. The choice of e nevertheless shows that the influence of the Russian spelling tradition persists even in the new layer.

The shortening of long vowels could in principle neutralise meaning distinctions. English ship and sheep are pronounced identically in Uzbek, but such pairs hardly occur among IT terms, so this phenomenon causes no practical problems.

Diphthongs

Uzbek has no diphthongs, so they split into a vowel + [y] or a vowel + vowel sequence: [eɪ]→ey (geym), [aɪ]→ay (onlayn), [aʊ]→au (brauzer). [əʊ] usually becomes pure [o] (hosting).

Vowel + [y] sequences also exist in native Uzbek words (choy, boy, say), so the diphthongs [eɪ], [aɪ] and [ɔɪ] adapt without difficulty: geym, onlayn, deploy. For [aʊ], however, Uzbek has no ready-made model. It is usually rendered as two separate vowels, which increases the number of syllables: the two-syllable English browser becomes the three-syllable bra-u-zer in Uzbek.

Consonants

– [w] does not exist in Uzbek and is always replaced by [v]: veb, vidjet.

– [θ] and [ð] yield [t]/[d] or, via Russian, [z]: tred (thread), blutuz.

– In the old layer, [h] changed to [x] under Russian influence (xaker). Since Uzbek has the phoneme [h], it is preserved in the new layer. This is a reliable marker of the layer.

– [ŋ] corresponds fully to the Uzbek phoneme ng: hosting, marketing.

– Although [dʒ] corresponds to Uzbek j, it is spelled dj under the influence of Russian orthography: gadjet, vidjet.

The general regularity of consonant adaptation is as follows: a sound that exists in Uzbek ([h], [ŋ]) is preserved, and one that does not ([w], [θ], [ð]) is replaced by the closest sound. This is consistent with the principle of preservation and minimality described by Paradis and LaCharité [16]. The only exception is found in words borrowed via Russian: in them [h] was replaced by [x] under the influence of Russian phonology, even though Uzbek has [h].

Word-final voiced consonants are devoiced in colloquial speech: bag [bak], veb [vep]. This is the same as in native Uzbek words (kitob [kitop] ‘book’) [23]. When a vowel-initial suffix is added, the voiced pronunciation is restored: bagi [bagi], vebi [vebi]. Thus, loanwords are also fully subject to Uzbek positional phonetic rules.

Stress and Syllable Structure

In Uzbek, stress usually falls on the final syllable and shifts to a suffix when one is added. Preliminary observations show that the same shift occurs in loanwords (apdeytlár). This conclusion requires experimental phonetic verification.

For example, in English update /ˈʌpdeɪt/ and backend /ˈbækend/ the stress falls on the first syllable, whereas in Uzbek apdeyt and bekend it is heard on the final syllable. Words borrowed via Russian may retain Russian stress (kompyúter), but when a suffix is added the stress still moves to the suffix (kompyuterlár). This is consistent with the mobile nature of Uzbek stress [23].

Word-initial consonant clusters (skrinshot, strim, sprint) are preserved in the speech of young bilingual speakers. Prothesis, which occurs colloquially in older Russian loans (istakan ‘glass’), is rarely observed in IT terms.

Graphic Adaptation

Phonetic adaptation is also reflected in writing. In the Uzbek Latin script, loanwords are rendered in two ways: transliteration, i.e. letter-by-letter transfer (monitor, server), and transcription, i.e. transfer of the pronunciation (apdeyt, skrinshot). Transliteration of the Russian form prevails in the old layer, whereas transcription of the English pronunciation prevails in the new layer.

Three problems are observed in graphic adaptation:

– the retention (web, Bluetooth) or replacement (veb, blutuz) of letters and combinations absent from the Uzbek alphabet, such as w and th;

– the choice between j and dj for [dʒ] (gadjet / gajet);

– the use of different characters for o‘, g‘ and the glottal stop sign (‘, ', `, ‘), which complicates text search and automatic processing.

In Uzbek texts in the Cyrillic script, the Russian spelling is retained directly (компьютер), whereas in the Latin script the soft sign is dropped (kompyuter). The parallel use of two scripts gives rise to additional variants of the same term.

Morphological Adaptation

Main finding: English IT terms enter Uzbek only as stems; English grammatical suffixes are not borrowed. All grammatical meanings are expressed by Uzbek suffixes.

Inflection

Loan nouns have the full paradigm of Uzbek nouns: fayl-lar-im-ni ‘my files (acc.)’, server-da-gi ‘which is on the server’, bag-lar-ni ‘the bugs (acc.)’. The English plural suffix -s is not borrowed (fayllar, not *fayls). Words ending in -ing are treated as unanalysable stems: hosting-ga, marketing-ni.

Table 5. Case paradigm of loan nouns

Case	fayl	server	link	hosting
Nominative	fayl	server	link	hosting
Genitive (-ning)	faylning	serverning	linkning	hostingning
Accusative (-ni)	faylni	serverni	linkni	hostingni
Dative (-ga)	faylga	serverga	linkka	hostingga
Locative (-da)	faylda	serverda	linkda	hostingda
Ablative (-dan)	fayldan	serverdan	linkdan	hostingdan

In the dative case, loanwords ending in k take the form -ka, just like native Uzbek words (linkka, yurakka) [12]. Thus, the rules of suffix allomorph selection apply fully to loanwords. Possessive suffixes are added in the same way: faylim 'my file', serveringiz 'your server', linki 'its link'.

From the perspective of the Myers-Scotton model [17], Uzbek acts as the matrix language in such forms: it supplies all system morphemes (case, possessive, plural and person-number suffixes), while English contributes only the content stem. For example, in deploy qil-di-m 'I deployed', the only English element is deploy; all other grammatical meanings are expressed by Uzbek means.

Verb Formation

English verbs enter Uzbek as nouns and are then verbalised. This corresponds to the cross-linguistically widespread light verb strategy [11].

Table 6. Verb formation models

Model	Examples	Comment
noun + -la-	kodlamoq, formatlamoq, skanerlamoq, bloklamoq, layklamoq	the most productive synthetic model
noun + qil-	deploy qilmoq, restart qilmoq, apdeyt qilmoq, skrinshot qilmoq	analytic model, predominant in the new layer
adjective/noun + bo'l-	onlayn bo'lmoq, oflayn bo'lmoq	stative meaning
noun + -lashtir-	kompyuterlashtirish, avtomatlashtirish	replaces Russian -izatsiya [8]

The -la- and qil- models often compete: bloklamoq / blok qilmoq. The longer a term is in use, the more likely it is to shift to the synthetic -la- form. This hypothesis should be tested by frequency analysis.

Voice and Non-finite Forms

Loan verbs are also fully integrated into the Uzbek voice system. In the synthetic model, the voice suffix is attached directly after -la-; in the analytic model, the auxiliary verb changes.

Table 7. Voice forms of loan verbs

Voice	Synthetic model	Analytic model
Active	bloklamoq	deploy qilmoq
Passive	bloklanmoq	deploy qilinmoq / deploy bo'lmoq
Causative	bloklatmoq	deploy qildirmoq
Reciprocal	bloklashmoq	rarely used

In the analytic model, the passive meaning is expressed in two ways: deploy qilindi and deploy bo'ldi. The second form is particularly common in professional speech (ilova apdeyt bo'ldi 'the app got updated') and indicates that the agent of the action is irrelevant.

Participles and converbs are also formed freely: bloklangan akkaunt 'blocked account', deploy qilingan versiya 'deployed version', apdeyt qilib 'having updated', kodlab 'coding'. This shows

that loan verbs can function in all non-finite forms of the Uzbek verb, i.e. that they are fully grammatically integrated.

Word Formation

– -chi (agent suffix): bekendchi, frontendchi (colloquial). It competes with English -er: geymer / o‘yinchi.

– -li / -siz (‘with / without’): internetli, parolsiz, internetsiz.

–Hybrid compounds: veb-sahifa, kiberxavfsizlik, onlayn-do‘kon, IT-mutaxassis.

Words with the English suffix -er enter Uzbek as unanalysable stems, so Uzbek suffixes attach to them freely: blogerlik, frilanserlik, geymerlar. Here -lik conveys the meaning of a profession or activity. The English suffix is not observed to become an independent word-forming element in Uzbek: forms such as *kodyer or *deployer do not occur.

Abbreviations

Abbreviations also take Uzbek suffixes, but their spelling is inconsistent: ITda, IT-da, IT’da, IT da. Their pronunciation also varies: English [ay-ti] and letter-by-letter [i-te].

Abbreviations also participate in word formation: IT-chi (colloquially ‘IT specialist’), SMM-chi. This shows that abbreviations have acquired the grammatical status of ordinary nouns.

Discussion

The results show that a change of intermediary language is under way in Uzbek IT terminology: English is replacing Russian. This process gives rise to three problems.

The change of intermediary language has three main causes. First, the learning of foreign languages, especially English, is supported at the level of state policy [22]. Second, IT content (software documentation, courses, forums) is created mainly in English and reaches Uzbek users without translation. Third, mass IT education programmes have introduced young speakers directly to English terminology: within the One Million Uzbek Coders project, more than 1 million people received certificates in 2019–2022 [21].

Thus, the regularity noted by Haugen [1] is confirmed by the Uzbek data: as the degree of bilingualism increases, loanwords approach the original pronunciation. Whereas the old layer was shaped by speakers with a command of Russian, the new layer is being shaped by young people with a command of English.

1. Difficulty of identifying the layer. Many new terms appeared simultaneously in Russian jargon (лайк, апдейт, баг). Therefore, a conclusion of direct borrowing should rely only on phonetic features, especially the preservation of [h]. Cases without such markers should be labelled as mixed.

2. Variation. The same term occurs in several spellings: vay-fay / vayfay / Wi-Fi, heshteg / xeshteg / hashtag, gadjet / gajet. Variation is especially strong in the new layer, since it has not yet been recorded in dictionaries.

Table 8. Main spelling variants in the new layer

English	Attested variants	Proposed form
Wi-Fi	Wi-Fi, vay-fay, vayfay	vay-fay
hashtag	hashtag, heshteg, xeshteg	heshteg
backend	backend, bekend	bekend
screenshot	screenshot, skrinshot, skrin	skrinshot

English	Attested variants	Proposed form
gadget	gadjet, gajet	no norm established

The proposed forms are based on two principles: closeness to pronunciation and full use of the resources of the Uzbek alphabet (including the preservation of [h]). In the pair gadjet / gajet these two principles conflict: j is consistent with Uzbek spelling, while dj is traditional. In such cases, the final decision should be made by the competent terminological body.

3. Competition between loanwords and Uzbek equivalents. Uzbek equivalents have become established for a number of concepts: ilova (app), sichqoncha (mouse), yuklab olish (download), dasturiy ta'minot (software). For others, the loanword prevails: apdeyt / yangilanish, skrinshot / ekran tasviri. The viability of an equivalent depends on its brevity and its ability to take suffixes.

Observations suggest that three conditions matter for an Uzbek equivalent to win this competition. First, it must be short (one or two words). Second, it must allow a convenient verb to be formed (yuklamoq 'to upload', saqlamoq 'to save'). Third, it must be proposed before or at the same time as the loanword. Ilova and sichqoncha meet all three conditions. Ekran tasviri, by contrast, is long and does not form a convenient verb, which is why skrinshot qilmoq is prevailing.

Proposals for standardisation:

– Attach suffixes to abbreviations without separators, in accordance with the current spelling rules: ITda, USBga [12].

– Preserve English [h] in new loanwords (hosting, heshteg), since Uzbek has this phoneme.

– Accept the Uzbek equivalent as the norm in official and academic texts, and the loanword in colloquial and professional speech.

– Create an electronic dictionary that records the variants of IT terms.

Conclusion

1. Uzbek IT terminology has two layers: an old layer borrowed via Russian and a new layer borrowed directly from English.

2. The old layer adapts according to spelling, the new layer according to pronunciation. The preservation of [h] is the main phonetic marker of direct borrowing, and the [æ]→[e] shift is the main marker of the new period.

3. Morphologically, loanwords enter only as stems and are fully subject to the Uzbek agglutinative system.

4. English verbs are borrowed as nouns and verbalised with -la- or qil-; the analytic qil- model predominates in the new layer.

5. The strong variation in the new layer calls for orthographic and terminological standardisation.

By degree of integration, loanwords fall into unadapted, partially adapted and fully adapted groups. Many new terms are currently in transition from level 1 to level 3, which is the main source of variation.

The results are also relevant to the theory of loanword phonology. They show that within a single language a change of intermediary language is accompanied by a change of adaptation strategy, i.e. a shift from spelling-based to perception-based adaptation.

Future research should examine stress shift using experimental phonetic methods and the -la- / qil- competition on a large corpus.

References

1. Haugen E. The analysis of linguistic borrowing // Language. – 1950. – Vol. 26, No. 2. – P. 210–231.
2. Weinreich U. Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems. – New York: Linguistic Circle of New York, 1953.
3. Thomason S. G., Kaufman T. Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics. – Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.
4. Haspelmath M. Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues // Haspelmath M., Tadmor U. (eds.). Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook. – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009. – P. 35–54.
5. Poplack S., Sankoff D., Miller C. The social correlates and linguistic processes of lexical borrowing and assimilation // Linguistics. – 1988. – Vol. 26, No. 1. – P. 47–104.
6. Daniyarov R. O‘zbek terminologiyasining shakllanishi va rivoji [Formation and development of Uzbek terminology]: Abstract of Doctoral Dissertation in Philology. – Tashkent, 1988.
7. Madvaliyev A. O‘zbek terminologiyasi va leksikografiyasi masalalari [Issues of Uzbek terminology and lexicography]. – Tashkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2017.
8. Dadaboyev H. O‘zbek terminologiyasi [Uzbek terminology]. – Tashkent: Yoshlar nashriyoti, 2019.
9. [Author]. Sun’iy intellekt terminlarining genetik qatlamlari [Genetic layers of artificial intelligence terms] // Xorijiy lingvistika va lingvodidaktika [Foreign Linguistics and Linguodidactics]. – [year, issue, pages]. – URL: https://inscience.uz/index.php/foreign-linguistics/article/download/6128/5958/17908
10. O‘zbek tilining izohli lug‘ati [Explanatory dictionary of the Uzbek language]. In 5 vols. – Tashkent: O‘zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi, 2006–2008.
11. Wohlgemuth J. A Typology of Verbal Borrowings. – Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton, 2009.
12. O‘zbek tilining asosiy imlo qoidalari [Basic spelling rules of the Uzbek language]. Approved by Resolution No. 339 of the Cabinet of Ministers of the Republic of Uzbekistan of 24 August 1995.
13. Krysin L. P. Inoyazychnye slova v sovremennom russkom yazyke [Foreign words in modern Russian]. – Moscow: Nauka, 1968.
14. Winford D. An Introduction to Contact Linguistics. – Oxford: Blackwell, 2003.
15. Kang Y. Loanword phonology // van Oostendorp M. et al. (eds.). The Blackwell Companion to Phonology. – Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011.
16. Paradis C., LaCharité D. Preservation and minimality in loanword adaptation // Journal of Linguistics. – 1997. – Vol. 33, No. 2. – P. 379–430.
17. Myers-Scotton C. Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002.
18. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-5850 of 21 October 2019 “On measures to radically enhance the prestige and status of the Uzbek language as the state language”. – URL: https://lex.uz/acts/-4561730

19. Decree of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PF-6084 of 20 October 2020 “On measures to further develop the Uzbek language and improve language policy in the country”. – URL: https://yuz.uz/uz/news/mamlakatimizda-ozbek-tilini-yanada-rivojlantirish-va-til-siyosatini-takomillashtirish-chora-tadbirlari-togrisida
20. National Statistics Committee of the Republic of Uzbekistan. The number of mobile internet subscribers in Uzbekistan has increased 4.3 times in 10 years. – 2026. – URL: https://stat.uz/en/press-center/news-of-committee/69655-zbekistonda-mobil-internet-abonentlari-soni-10-jilda-4-3-barobarga-oshgan-4
21. O‘zbekistonda ijtimoiy tarmoqlardan foydalanuvchilar soni ma’lum qilindi [The number of social network users in Uzbekistan announced] // Zamin.uz. – URL: https://zamin.uz/uz/jamiyat/123155-ozbekistonda-ijtimoiy-tarmoqlardan-foydalanuvchilar-soni-malum-qilindi.html
22. Resolution of the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan No. PQ-5117 of 19 May 2021 “On measures to bring the popularisation of foreign language learning in the Republic of Uzbekistan to a qualitatively new level”.
23. Shoabdurahmonov Sh., Asqarova M., Hojiyev A., Rasulov I., Doniyorov X. Hozirgi o‘zbek adabiy tili [Modern literary Uzbek]. Part 1. – Tashkent: O‘qituvchi, 1980.