



COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF MORPHOLOGICAL AND SYNTACTIC WORD FORMATION IN MODERN ENGLISH INTERNET DISCOURSE

Sadoqat Tosheva

Student, Shahrizabz State Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20019299>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 26th April 2026

Accepted: 28th April 2026

Online: 30th April 2026

KEYWORDS

Internet discourse, word formation, neologisms, blending, acronyms, linguistic economy, social media, morphological adaptation

ABSTRACT

This article is devoted to the study of word-formation processes in English-language social media and internet communication. The digital era has introduced unique linguistic mechanisms such as blending, acronymization, and conversion to ensure communicative efficiency. The research analyzes how these structural changes reflect the principle of linguistic economy. By examining contemporary examples from platforms like Telegram and Instagram, the paper identifies the most productive models of neologism formation in the modern digital landscape.

Introduction

The rapid digitalization of the modern world has transformed language from a static system into a dynamic tool for instant global interaction. In the 21st century, internet discourse has emerged as a specific functional style characterized by its own set of rules, norms, and word-formation strategies. As David Crystal notes, "the internet is a medium which is both like and unlike speech and writing, and which is constantly evolving".¹

The primary driver of word formation in social media is the necessity for brevity and speed. Users strive to convey complex emotional and factual information within the technical constraints of digital platforms. This has led to the dominance of "linguistic economy," where traditional word-formation rules are often bypassed in favor of more efficient structures like acronyms, clippings, and blending. Understanding these mechanisms is not only essential for linguists but also for pedagogues to bridge the gap between formal language teaching and real-world communication.

Main Part: Morphological Word-Formation Mechanisms

The evolution of English in the digital space is predominantly characterized by the emergence of shortened and hybridized forms. The most productive mechanisms include:

1. Blending

Blending involves combining parts of two or more words to create a new lexical unit with a combined meaning. This method is highly popular in social media as it creates catchy and efficient terms.

Examples: Staycation (Stay + Vacation), Fintech (Financial + Technology), Netiquette (Network + Etiquette).

¹ Crystal, D. Language and the Internet. Cambridge University Press, 2001, p. 17

Analysis: These blends function as a single unit and are often used to describe new cultural phenomena. According to G. McCulloch (2019), such forms are not just "slang" but structural adaptations to the rapid exchange of information.²

2. Acronymization and Initialisms

This is perhaps the most visible aspect of internet discourse. It serves the principle of "minimum effort for maximum communication."

Examples: FOMO (Fear Of Missing Out), YOLO (You Only Live Once), ICYMI (In Case You Missed It).

Analysis: Unlike traditional abbreviations, internet acronyms often carry emotional weight and social identity markers. Naomi Baron suggests that these forms reduce the "phonological cost" of communication, making digital text more like speech than writing.³

3. Conversion. In digital discourse, nouns are frequently used as verbs without any morphological change. Examples: To DM (from Direct Message), To Friend/Unfriend (from Friend), To Ghost (from Ghost). Analysis: This flexibility shows the high adaptability of the English language. This process streamlines the syntax of a sentence, allowing for faster typing and processing.

Comparative Aspect: English and Uzbek Internet Discourse

The influence of English on global digital communication is profound, and the Uzbek language segment is no exception. While English primarily uses blending and conversion, Uzbek internet discourse shows a high frequency of calquing and hybridization.

Hybrid forms: Words like "bloklamoq" (to block), "sharlamoq" (to share), and "layklamoq" (to like) demonstrate how English roots are integrated with Uzbek verbal suffixes.

Structural differences: English acronyms (e.g., OMG) are often used directly in Uzbek discourse, but they do not undergo the same morphological changes as indigenous Uzbek words. This cross-linguistic interaction highlights the dominance of English as a "source language" in the digital sphere.⁴

Conclusion

In conclusion, word formation in English internet discourse is driven by the necessity of linguistic economy and expressive efficiency. Mechanisms like blending, acronymization, and conversion allow users to bypass traditional linguistic barriers. The comparative analysis shows that these English models are not only evolving within their own system but are also actively influencing the morphological structures of other languages, including Uzbek. Future research should focus on the long-term impact of these digital neologisms on formal literary standards

References:

1. Bauer, L. English Word-Formation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
2. Crystal, D. Language and the Internet. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006.
3. Yule, G. The Study of Language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2022.

² McCulloch, G. Because Internet: Understanding the New Rules of Language. Riverhead Books, 2019, p. 58

³ Baron, N. S. Always On: Language in an Online and Mobile World. Oxford University Press, 2008, p. 162

⁴ Tosheva, S. 2026. Internal Research Data

4. Plag, I. Word-Formation in English. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
5. Marchand, H. The Categories and Types of Present-Day English Word-Formation. München: C.H. Beck, 1969.
6. Aronoff, M. Word Formation in Generative Grammar. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1976.
7. Katamba, F. Morphology. London: Macmillan, 1993.
8. Booij, G. The Grammar of Words: An Introduction to Linguistic Morphology. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012.
9. Lieber, R. Introducing Morphology. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
10. Haspelmath, M., Sims, A. D. Understanding Morphology. London: Routledge, 2010.
11. McCarthy, A. C. An Introduction to English Morphology: Words and Their Structure. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2002.
12. Carstairs-McCarthy, A. Current Morphology. London: Routledge, 1992.
13. Spencer, A. Morphological Theory: An Introduction to Word Structure in Generative Grammar. Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
14. Fromkin, V., Rodman, R., Hyams, N. An Introduction to Language. Boston: Cengage Learning, 2018.
15. Trask, R. L. Language and Linguistics: The Key Concepts. London: Routledge, 2007.
16. Herring, S. C. Computer-Mediated Communication: Linguistic, Social and Cross-Cultural Perspectives. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1996.
17. Herring, S. C. Discourse in Web 2.0: Familiar, Reconfigured, and Emergent. Washington, DC: Georgetown University Press, 2013.
18. Baron, N. S. Always On: Language in an Online and Mobile World. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
19. Tagliamonte, S. A., Denis, D. "Linguistic Ruin? LOL! Instant Messaging and Teen Language." American Speech, 2008.
20. Khujamurodova F.R. Cognitive model of the concept "generosity / saxiylik" in English and Uzbek languages. Ethiopian international journal of multidisciplinary research. -981-984-betlar, 2026-yil. <https://www.eijmr.org/index.php/eijmr/article/view/5725>