Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

THE FORMATION OF NEW TERMS AND THE FUNCTION OF NEOLOGISMS IN ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN TOURISM DISCOURSE

Akhmadova Maftunaxon Ibodullo kizi
Trainee Teacher (Subject: English), Department of Foreign Languages, Faculty of Languages, Samarkand State Pedagogical Institute

Abstract: This article analyzes the mechanisms of new term formation and the linguistic-pragmatic functions of neologisms in tourism discourse based on a comparative study of the English and Russian languages. Under the influence of globalization and digital transformations, the tourism sector acts as a highly dynamic environment for lexical innovation. The study explores electronic tourism (e-tourism) terms, eco-tourism concepts, and contemporary travel practices that have emerged in recent years. Developed in accordance with the international IMRAD structure, this paper details the methodological framework, structural-statistical findings, borrowing patterns, and functional loads of neologisms in target texts. The results show that English functions as the primary donor language due to its role as a global lingua franca, while the Russian language serves as an adaptive receptive environment that alters these items according to its internal morphological rules.

Keywords: tourism discourse, neologisms, terminological system, English language, Russian language.

Introduction

In modern linguistic research, the study of specialized types of discourse related to specific socio-economic spheres occupies a prominent place. Today, as a result of rapid globalization, the intensification of intercultural communication, and the unprecedented development of digital technologies, tourism has transformed into one of the most dynamically expanding global industries. Tourism discourse manifests itself not merely as a byproduct of economic exchanges, but as an independent linguistic system with its own complex structural organization, specific communicative goals, and a constantly updating terminological apparatus [1; 14-b.]. At the center of this expanding system lie industry terms and neologisms that represent newly emerged concepts, services, and behavioral trends among travelers.

In the investigation of industry-specific vocabulary, a tourism term often goes beyond the boundaries of a strict, emotionally neutral scientific concept. Instead, it frequently subordinates itself to the laws of advertising, public relations, consumer psychology, and cross-cultural media communication. Therefore, studying the formation of new terms in the tourism sector and tracking their linguistic functions in texts is highly relevant from the perspectives of linguistic asymmetry, cross-linguistic integration, and critical discourse analysis. It is well established that English serves as the absolute lingua franca of the international tourism industry [2; 45-b.]. Global reservation networks, international aviation standards, and global hospitality guidelines are primarily developed in English and disseminated worldwide. Conversely, the Russian language acts as a highly receptive environment that intercepts this terminological flow, processes it based on its internal phonetic and structural laws, and transmits it further to regional consumers [3; 88–89-b.].

The main purpose of this study is to identify the primary methods of neologism formation in modern English and Russian tourism discourse, to examine their semantic configurations, and to shed light on their functional-pragmatic features from a comparative

Asian Journal of Technology and Applied Sciences
ISSN: 2301-xxxx (online) | IF: 10.01 | Vol: 1, issue 1
Available: http://asiansciencejournal.org

perspective. To achieve this purpose, the research tasks include categorizing new terms into distinct thematic groups, identifying the linguistic transformations that occur during cross-linguistic borrowing, and revealing the underlying communicative mechanisms by which neologisms influence consumer behavior.

Methods

To ensure the reliability of the empirical research and the scientific validity of the conclusions drawn, a set of complementary modern linguistic methods was employed. During the initial stage of data collection, the purposive sampling method was applied to gather a relevant textual corpus. To build the research database, linguistic materials were extracted from reputable international travel magazines (such as Lonely Planet and Vokrug sveta), global digital travel platforms (Booking.com, TripAdvisor, Expedia), and the official web portals of major international tour operators published in both English and Russian between 2020 and 2026. In total, a comprehensive card index consisting of 450 newly emerged terminological units and neologisms was compiled and analyzed.

During the structural and semantic analysis of the collected material, the following methodical approaches were systematically used:

Conceptual and contextual analysis was utilized to study the exact situational meaning of new terms within texts and their immediate surrounding linguistic environment. This approach is essential because many neologisms manifest their full pragmatic and emotional load only within a specific textual configuration [4; 102-b.].

The comparative-contrastive method helped track the systemic transition patterns of English terminological models into the Russian language system, including the stages of phonetic, graphic, and morphological adaptation [5; 56–58-b.].

The component analysis method allowed for the identification of subtle semantic shifts and changes within the internal semantic components (semes) of the targeted terms.

The structural-statistical method was used to process the obtained linguistic data, convert them into quantitative indicators, and present the structural distribution in tabular form.

Results

The lexical-semantic and comparative analyses conducted indicate that neologisms in modern tourism discourse do not represent a scattered or accidental collection of words. Instead, they form specific, highly organized and systemic thematic micro-groups. Under the influence of rapid digitalization and global ecological movements, fundamental structural shifts have occurred within tourism terminology. By analyzing the English and Russian language corpora, the thematic directions of the new terms with the highest frequency were identified and summarized in the table below.

Table 1. Thematic distribution of new tourism terms by count and percentage indicators

Thematic and Functional Groups	English Corpus (%)	Russian Corpus (%)	Sample Units (English / Russian)
E-tourism (Electronic tourism and digital services)	31.2%	34.5%	Booking online, m-travel, QR-check-in / Онлайн-бронирование, Тайм-слот, Чек-ин
Ecological and sustainable tourism	24.5%	18.2%	Glamping, Voluntourism, Staycation /

(Eco-tourism)			Глэмпинг, Волонтуризм, Стейкейшн, Эко-курорт
New formats of transport and logistics	18.3%	19.1%	Low-cost carrier, Carsharing, Ridesharing / Лоукостер, Каршеринг, Райдшеринг
Hospitality and new types of accommodation	15.0%	14.2%	Boutique-hotel, Capsule hotel, Flashpacking / Бутик-отель, Капсульный отель, Флешпекинг
Specialized and creative tourism directions	11.0%	14.0%	Bleisure tourism, Dark tourism, Gastro-tour / Блейжер-туризм, Дарк-туризм, Гастротур

The empirical research results show that the absolute majority of neologisms within the English language corpus are formed through word-blending (telescoping) and morphological shortening. For instance, highly popular terms like bleisure (business + leisure), glamping (glamorous + camping), and staycation (stay + vacation) emerged due to the rich internal derivational capabilities of the English morphological system [6; 74-b.].

A completely different structural picture is observed when examining the Russian language corpus. Direct lexical borrowings, specifically transcribed or transliterated units from English, constitute nearly 65 percent of the neologisms recorded in modern Russian tourism discourse. The remaining 35 percent corresponds to calquing (word-for-word translation) or hybrid word-formation models that attach native affixes to borrowed roots. For example, the English term glamping entered the Russian language without any initial semantic modification as глэмпинг, while staycation was directly adopted as стейкейшн.

Furthermore, from a functional perspective, the analyzed neologisms were found to perform three main communicative roles within tourism texts:

The nominative (informative) function precisely names a newly invented digital service, logistics format, or hospitality object.

The pragmatic (illocutionary) function evokes a specific aesthetic mood, generates consumer desire, and encourages the potential traveler to purchase the tourism product [7; 210-b.].

The regulative (legal-normative) function defines, clarifies, and limits the legal relations between the service provider and the client using precise, unambiguous terms.

Discussion

When analyzing the ongoing trends in the formation of new terms in tourism discourse, we must take into account their unique socio-linguistic and cultural nature. As many contemporary researchers have noted, the language of tourism is highly flexible, moving very rapidly from narrow professional circles into the sphere of international mass consumption [8; 33-b.]. In general linguistics, this socio-linguistic process is known as determinologization, which implies the gradual loss of narrow, specialized terminological characteristics and a subsequent transition into common, everyday language usage [9; 112-b.]. For example, terms such as charter, overbooking, voucher, and catering, which were used exclusively by aviation

and tourism management specialists at the end of the last century, have now become a natural part of the everyday active vocabulary in both English and Russian.

In the English language space, conversion (the structural shift of a word from one part of speech to another without any changes to its morphological markers) plays an active role in generating neologisms. The widely used term booking, which emerged from the nominalization of the verb to book, is nowadays a fundamental concept in electronic tourism platforms [10; 45–46-b.]. In the Russian language, this term has been borrowed directly and, in turn, has triggered entirely new internal word-formation chains. For instance, from the borrowed English root book, specific verb and noun forms such as букировать, забукать, and букирование have been generated according to the internal grammatical rules of Russian [11; 123-b.]. This state of affairs clearly demonstrates that borrowed terms are not static elements but fully adapt to the morphological system of the receiving language.

From a broader sociolinguistic perspective, Graham Dann, in his fundamental work, describes the language of tourism as an effective means of social control and psychological manipulation [12; 85-b.]. New terms used in advertising texts are not merely neutral information carriers, but symbols of social prestige, luxury, and modern attractiveness. In Russian tourism discourse, the strong tendency to use English neologisms instead of native Russian words (for example, using сити-тур instead of экскурсия, бутик-отель instead of отель, or стейкейшн instead of отпуск) is directly related to the desire to exert a strong psychological impact on the consumer, making the offered product appear more expensive, modern, and elite [13; 144-b.].

The massive entry of digital tourism applications (e-tourism) and mobile travel services (m-travel) into daily life requires the systematic unification and standardization of international terminology [14; 92-b.]. Consequently, terms used in automated web interfaces such as cancellation policy, non-refundable, check-in, check-out, and boarding pass have become internationally standardized across cultures. In Russian tourism websites, these units are often presented without any translation, using either their original Latin graphic form or easily understandable transliterations (аннуляция, нон-рефандабл, чекин). This structural development indicates that the global tourism space is rapidly striving toward a unified linguistic shell to reduce transactional friction.

However, linguistic asymmetry and significant semantic shifts can also occur during this intensive borrowing process. For instance, while the original English term promotion implies a broad, long-term marketing strategy, in Russian tourism practice its meaning is narrowed down to mean a specific, short-term discount or promotional offer (акция, спецпредложение) [15; 76-b.]. Moreover, it is observed that some complex neologisms gradually lose their original precise architectural or conceptual meaning due to being used in incorrect advertising contexts. For example, the term infinity pool, which architecturally refers to a swimming pool where the water flows over one or more edges, producing a visual effect of water with no boundary, is sometimes misused in digital travel advertisements to refer to any ordinary modern swimming pool [16; 52-b.]. Studying such semantic deviations holds significant practical value for teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and improving translation theory within the higher education system.

Conclusion

Based on the systemic and comparative study of modern English and Russian tourism discourse, the following scientific conclusions have been reached:

Tourism discourse is an inherently interdisciplinary and multifunctional linguistic space whose terminological system undergoes continuous, rapid modifications. In this communicative system, new terms and neologisms do not merely name newly emerged

objects or services, but carry out powerful socio-pragmatic, aesthetic, and manipulative functions designed to shape consumer behavior.

English acts as the primary conceptual and structural donor in the formation of modern global tourism vocabulary. In English, neologisms are created mostly through blending, shortening, and conversion in a highly compact and attractive format. The Russian language receives these ready-made models and subordinates them to its own phonetic and morphological rules via transcription, transliteration, and hybrid word-formation.

The functional nature of new terms in texts depends directly on the text genre. While informative and legal-regulative neologisms predominate in official tour contracts, corporate policies, and insurance documents, emotional-expressive and pragmatic neologisms lead the way in promotional travel brochures, digital ads, and lifestyle tourism blogs on social networks.

The rapid development of electronic tourism (e-tourism) has led to an extensive unification of the international terminological base and accelerated the process of determinologization. The transition of narrow industry terms into common language facilitates cross-cultural communication while simultaneously influencing the unique national-cultural identity of the receiving languages. Regular monitoring of these linguistic processes is highly important for modern lexicography and specialized translation practice.

REFERENCES

1. Crystal D. English as a Global Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 212 p.
2. Gotti M. The Language of Tourism as a Specialized Discourse // Translating Tourism: Linguistic and Cultural Aspects. – Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, 2006. – P. 15–34.
3. Dann G. M. S. The Language of Tourism: A Sociolinguistic Perspective. – Wallingford: CAB International, 1996. – 298 p.
4. Aliyeva N. M. Chet tillarni o'qitishda sohaviy diskurs tahlili. – Toshkent: Fan, 2021. – 142 b.
5. Komissarov V. N. Teoriya perevoda (lingvisticheskie aspekty). – Moskva: Vysshaya shkola, 1990. – 253 s.
6. Morozov M. A., Morozova N. S. Informatsionnye tehnologii v turizme. – Moskva: Akademiya, 2014. – 272 s.
7. Bhatia V. K. Analysing Genre: Language Use in Professional Settings. – London: Longman, 1993. – 246 p.
8. Reformatskiy A. A. Vvedenie v yazykovedenie. – Moskva: Aspekt Press, 2006. – 536 s.
9. Fedorov A. V. Osnovy obshchey teorii perevoda. – Sankt-Peterburg: Filologicheskiy fakul'tet SPbGU, 2002. – 416 s.
10. Dann G. M. S. Tourism as a Language of Social Control // Altre Modernità. – Milano, 2012. – № 7. – P. 81–95.
11. Serebryakova S. V. Pragmatika turisticheskogo diskursa. – Stavropol': SGU, 2010. – 156 s.
12. Buhalis D. eTourism: Information technology for strategic tourism management. – London: Pearson Education, 2003. – 378 p.
13. Shcherbakova O. V. Angloyazychnye zaimstvovaniya v sovremennom russkom turistichem diskurse // Vestnik MGOU. Seriya: Lingvistika. – Moskva, 2018. – № 3. – S. 74–82.