COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC TERMS IN THE UZBEK AND KYRGYZ LANGUAGES

Shermatova Gulzoda
Republic of Uzbekistan Under the Ministry of Preschool and School Education Department of Native Language and Literature of the Republican Education Center Methodologist of Kyrgyz language and literature
Orcid:0000-0003-2126-8500
shermatova.gulzoda@mail.ru
DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23071214

Abstract

In this article, psycholinguistic terms in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages are analyzed based on the criteria of comparative typology, nomination, semantics, and terminological equivalence. The article covers the main terms actively used in modern psycholinguistic literature: psycholinguistics (психолингвистика), language processing (тилди кайра иштетүү), language acquisition (тилди өздөштүрүү / тилди үйрөнүү), bilingualism (билингвизм / кош тилдүүлүк), lexical access (лексикалык жетүү / лексемага жетүү), lexicon / mental lexicon (лексикон / менталдык лексикон), word recognition (сөздү тануу), lexical decision (лексикалык чечим), semantic representation (семантикалык репрезентация), semantic network (семантикалык тармак), priming / pre-activation (прайминг / алдын ала активдештирүү), phonological processing (фонологиялык кайра иштетүү), speech perception (кепти кабыл алуу), speech production (кеп өндүрүү / кеп жаратуу), speech.

Keywords: psycholinguistics, psycholinguistic terminology, term, nomination, semantics, terminological equivalence, Uzbek language, Kyrgyz language, bilingualism, mental lexicon, calquing, borrowed term.

Introduction. Since the second half of the 20th century, linguistics has increasingly focused on studying linguistic phenomena not merely based on their structural features, but also within the framework of their interrelation with the human psyche, thinking, and cognitive activity. This approach, aimed at identifying the mechanisms of the human perception, acquisition, processing, and manifestation of language in speech activity, accelerated the integration of linguistics with psychology, cognitive science, and neuroscience. As a result, psycholinguistics, dedicated to the comprehensive study of the relationship between language and mental processes, emerged and has steadily developed as an independent scientific discipline.

The main directions of psycholinguistic research are related to the study of human speech activity and its cognitive mechanisms. Specifically, the perception and formation of speech, language acquisition, word recognition, the organization and functioning of the mental lexicon, the processing of semantic and syntactic information, bilingualism, memory, and other psycho-cognitive processes constitute important research objects of psycholinguistics. In this regard, psycholinguistics is not limited to describing the formal structure of language units, but also studies the mechanisms of their formation, preservation, activation and processing in the process of speech activity in the human mind.

Along with the development of this science, its specific terminological system was also formed. English serves as one of the primary sources of modern psycholinguistic terminology, and as a result of the assimilation or translation of these terms into other languages, national terminological systems are emerging. The Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages are no exception to this process. However, the formation, nomination methods, semantic structure, and terminological equivalence of psycholinguistic terms in these two related Turkic languages require a special comparative-typological study.

In the Uzbek language, alongside international terms such as psycholinguistics, bilingualism, lexicon, pragmatics, and reference, calqued units such as language processing, language acquisition,

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

semantic network, phonological processing, and short-term memory are also actively used. Similarly, in the Kyrgyz language, along with borrowings like психолингвистика, билингвизм, лексикон, прагматика, and референция, national or calqued terms such as тилди кайра иштетүү, тилди өздөштүрүү, семантикалык тармак, фонологиялык кайра иштетүү, and кыска мөөнөттүү эс тутум have been formed.

From this perspective, the comparison of the psycholinguistic terminology of the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages makes it possible not only to determine the translation equivalents of the terms, but also to establish how they are designated, what semantic content they express, and to what extent they are equivalent to each other.

Methods of comparative-typological, structural-semantic, componential, nominative, and terminological analysis were used in the study. The terms were initially identified by their English forms, and then their equivalents in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages were compared.

The following criteria were used as the basis for determining terminological equivalence:

1. Complete equivalence – the meaning of a term corresponds almost completely in both languages.

2. Partial equivalence – although the core concept is shared, there is a difference in the semantic scope or nominative form of the term.

3. Borrowed equivalence – the adoption of an international term in a phonetically or morphologically adapted form.

4. Calque equivalence – the translation of a foreign-language term's components using native language resources.

5. Variant equivalence – the presence of two or more terms for a single concept in one or both languages.

The nomination of psycholinguistic terms in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages is carried out using several main methods. The first group consists of the direct assimilation of international terms. For example, the term psycholinguistics is used as psixolingvistika in Uzbek and психолингвистика in Kyrgyz. The term is an international scientific unit consisting of Greek and Latin components, and it is assimilated in almost identical phonetic and morphological forms in both languages.

A similar situation is observed in terms such as pragmatics – pragmatika – прагматика, lexicon – leksikon – лексикон, reference – referensiya – референция, and coreference – koreferensiya – кореференция. Such units demonstrate that international scientific terminology is directly entering the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages. Their advantage is that the correspondence between terms is maintained in international scientific communication. The second active method is calquing. In this case, the components of the English term are recreated using equivalent units in the Uzbek or Kyrgyz languages. For example: language processing – tilni qayta ishlash – тилди кайра иштетүү. Here, the language component is expressed as “til” in Uzbek and “тил” in Kyrgyz, while “processing” is expressed as “qayta ishlash” and “кайра иштетүү”. Thus, the semantic-structural model of the English term is preserved in both languages. Similarly, the process of calquing is observed in terms such as semantic network – semantik tarmoq – семантикалык тармак; phonological processing – fonologik qayta ishlash – фонологиялык кайра иштетүү; structural ambiguity – strukturaviy noaniqlik – структуралык бүдөмүктүк; and short-term memory – qisqa muddatli xotira – кыска мөөнөттүү эс тутум [1. – P.165]. The third method is the creation of terms based on national derivational means. For example, the term lexicalization is expressed as leksiklashuv in Uzbek and лексикалдашуу in Kyrgyz. In both languages, the international root “lexical” is combined with national word-forming affixes to form the name of the process. This phenomenon shows that the term-formation capabilities of the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages are typologically close.

Psycholinguistic terms can be semantically divided into several groups. The first group consists of terms related to language acquisition and development. “Language acquisition” is expressed in Uzbek as tilni o'zlashtirish, and in Kyrgyz as тилди өздөштүрүү. “Language development”[2. –P.350], on the other hand, is given as til rivojlanishi – тилдин өнүгүшү. Although these terms are closely related, their semantic content is not exactly the same. Acquisition refers to the process of mastering a language

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

system, while development refers to the progression of an existing language ability. Therefore, it is not appropriate to use them as terminological synonyms. “Second language acquisition”, meanwhile, exhibits almost complete equivalence in the forms ikkinchi tilni o'zlashtirish – экинчи тилди өздөштүрүү. The syntactic model of this term is also identical in both languages: attribute + noun + object in the accusative case + unit denoting a process. The second group comprises terms related to bilingualism. For “bilingualism”, the forms “bilingvizm” / “ikki tillilik” exist in Uzbek, and “билингвизм”/ “кош тилдүүлүк” in Kyrgyz. This phenomenon is a clear manifestation of terminological variation. On the one hand, there is an international term, and on the other, a term created based on the capabilities of the national language. The third group encompasses units related to lexical-semantic processing. This includes terms such as lexical access, lexicon, word recognition, lexical decision, lexical ambiguity, semantic representation, semantic network, and semantic features[4. – P.199-200].

The term lexicon can be used in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages as leksikon – лексикон, and in its specific psycholinguistic form as mental leksikon – менталдык лексикон. Here, “lexicon” is interpreted not in the sense of an ordinary dictionary, but as a system of lexical knowledge stored in human memory. The term lexical ambiguity [5. –P.87-132] can be rendered as leksik noaniqlik – лексикалык бүдөмүктүк. It is scientifically incorrect to completely equate it with “homonymy”, because lexical ambiguity can arise on the basis of polysemy as well as homonymy. Therefore, the concept of “lexical ambiguity” is semantically broader. Semantic representation represents an international borrowing model in the form of semantik reprezentatsiya – семантикалык репрезентация. Semantic network, on the other hand, is a calqued term in the form of semantik tarmoq – семантикалык тармак. One of the important areas of psycholinguistics is the study of speech production and perception. In this field, terms such as speech perception, speech production, speech errors, phonological processing, phonological awareness, and phonological encoding are actively used. Speech perception is expressed in Uzbek as nutqni idrok qilish and in Kyrgyz as кепти кабыл алуу. Although these terms are semantically equivalent, their nominative means differ. In Uzbek, the phrase “idrok qilish” (perceiving) is used, while in Kyrgyz, the phrase “кабыл алуу” (“qabul qilish” / accepting) is used. Thus, the semantic equivalence here is high, but the lexical-nominative equivalence is only partial. For “speech production” [6. –P. 75-80], the forms “nutq hosil qilish” – “кеп өндүрүү” are used. The English component “production” is expressed in Uzbek as “hosil qilish” and in Kyrgyz as “өндүрүү”.

This situation shows that the same scientific concept is designated using different lexical means in related languages. One of the terms that deserves special attention is speech errors / slips of the tongue. In the Uzbek language, the forms nutqiy xatolar / til toyilishi, and in the Kyrgyz language, кептик каталар / тил тайгаланышы can be used. In particular, the preservation of metaphorical nomination in both languages is observed in the pair slips of the tongue → til toyilishi – тил тайгаланышы. Consequently, the figurative model in English can retain its semantic basis in other languages as well. They are presented in the forms phonological processing – fonologik qayta ishlash – фонологиялык кайра иштетүү, phonological awareness – fonologik anglash – фонологиялык аңдоо, phonological encoding – fonologik kodlash – фонологиялык коддоо. In these terms, the international "phonological" component is preserved, and the second component denoting the process is formed on the basis of national language means. Terminological equivalence is of particular importance when comparing Uzbek and Kyrgyz psycholinguistic terminology. “Equivalence is determined not only by the correspondence of the translation form, but also by the content of the scientific concept represented by the term” [7. – P. 17-32]. Full equivalence is clearly visible in terms such as psycholinguistics – psixolingvistika – психолингвистика, pragmatics – pragmatika – прагматика, reference – referensiya – референция. Calque equivalence is manifested in units such as language processing – tilni qayta ishlash – тилди кайра иштетүү, semantic network – semantik tarmoq – семантикалык тармак, phonological processing – fonologik qayta ishlash – фонологиялык кайра иштетүү. Partial equivalence is observed in terms such as lexical access, speech perception, and speech production. In

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

this case, the general content of the concept corresponds, but there is a certain difference in the way it is expressed or in its semantic components. Terminological variability is seen in units such as bilingualism – bilingvizm / ikki tillilik – билингвизм / кош тилдүүлүк, priming – priming / oldindan faollashtirish – прайминг / алдын ала активдештирүү, inference – inferensiya / xulosa chiqarish – инференция / тыянак чыгаруу. Such a phenomenon shows that psycholinguistic terminology is still in the process of formation and standardization. In particular, the parallel use of an international term with a national alternative determines the dynamics of the terminological system's development.

Based on the analyzed material, the following nominative models of psycholinguistic terms in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages are identified:

1. International borrowing model: psixolingvistika – психолингвистика; pragmatika – прагматика; leksikon – лексикон; referensiya – референция.

2. Adjective + noun model: semantik tarmoq – семантикалык тармак; fonologik qayta ishlash – фонологиялык кайра иштетүү.

3. Noun + verb model: tilni qayta ishlash – тилди кайра иштетүү; nutqni idrok qilish – кепти кабыл алуу.

4. International root + national derivational affix model: leksik + lash + uv → leksiklashuv
лексик + алдаш + уу → лексикалдашуу.

5. Parallel borrowing and national term model: bilingvizm / ikki tillilik билингвизм / кош тилдүүлүк.

These models show that there is a close relationship between international scientific terminology and the internal capabilities of the national languages in the psycholinguistic terminology of the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages. A comparative-typological analysis of psycholinguistic terms in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages allowed us to arrive at the following scientific conclusion. Firstly, the assimilation of international terms is an active process in the formation of psycholinguistic terminology in both languages. The forms of terms such as psycholinguistics, pragmatics, lexicon, reference, and coreference in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages demonstrate a high level of stability in international terminological units.

Secondly, the calquing method is also one of the productive nominative mechanisms. Units such as tilni qayta ishlash – тилди кайра иштетүү (language processing), semantik tarmoq – семантикалык тармак (semantic network), fonologik qayta ishlash – фонологиялык кайра иштетүү (phonological processing), and qisqa muddatli xotira – кыска мөөнөттүү эс тутум (short-term memory) show that the structural-semantic model of English terms is recreated through national linguistic means.

Thirdly, the parallel use of national alternatives with international terms in the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages creates terminological variation. Units such as bilingvizm – ikki tillilik – билингвизм – кош тилдүүлүк (bilingualism) and priming – oldindan faollashtirish – прайминг – алдын ала активдештирүү (priming) are vivid examples of this phenomenon.

Fourthly, it is not enough to determine terminological equivalence based solely on formal correspondence. The semantic volume of terms, component composition, method of nomination, and the degree of coverage of the scientific concept must also be taken into account. In this regard, equating "lexical ambiguity" with "homonymy," "lexicon" with a simple "dictionary," and "language acquisition" with "language development" can lead to a violation of terminological accuracy.

Fifthly, the relatedness of the Uzbek and Kyrgyz languages creates a typological proximity in certain models of term formation, in particular, in calquing, affixation, and the formation of syntactic combinations. At the same time, the specific semantic and nominative capabilities of the national language are manifested in the expression of certain concepts.

In general, Uzbek and Kyrgyz psycholinguistic terminology is a system that is being formed under the influence of international terms, national lexical sources, and the term-creation capabilities of both languages. The comparative-typological study of this terminology serves as an important basis for identifying similarities and differences between terms in the two languages, regulating terminological

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.

variants, creating a database of common scientific terms, and developing a future Uzbek-Kyrgyz psycholinguistic electronic dictionary.

References

1. Harley T. A. The Psychology of Language: From Data to Theory. – Psychology Press. – P.165.
2. Field J. Psycholinguistics: The Key Concepts. – Routledge. – P.350.
3. Aitchison J. The Articulate Mammal: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics. – Routledge. – P.199-250.
4. Levelt W. J. M. Speaking: From Intention to Articulation. – MIT Press. – P. 161-180.
5. Clark H. H., Clark E. V. Psychology and Language: An Introduction to Psycholinguistics. – Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. – P. 87-132.
6. Караулов Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность. – Москва.1987. – Б. 75-80.
7. Леонтьев А. А. Основы психолингвистики. – Москва. – Б. 17-32.
8. Жинкин Н. И. Механизмы речи. – Москва. 1958. – Б. 180.
9. Рахматуллина Л. И. Психолингвистические основы изучения языка. – Москва. – Б. 66.
10. Sayfullayeva R. va boshqalar. Hozirgi o‘zbek tili. – Toshkent. 2023. – B.345.

© 2026 International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Applications . All Rights Reserved.