

SOCIO-CULTURAL DETERMINANTS OF LEXICAL INNOVATION: AN ETYMOLOGICAL ANALYSIS

СОЦІОКУЛЬТУРНІ ЧИННИКИ ЛЕКСИЧНИХ ІННОВАЦІЙ: ЕТИМОЛОГІЧНИЙ АНАЛІЗ

Stoika O.Ya.,

orcid.org/0000-0002-7695-6100

Doctor of Pedagogical Sciences, Professor,

Professor at the Department of Applied Linguistics

Uzhhorod National University,

Chief Research Fellow at the Department of Comparative Pedagogy

Institute of Pedagogy of the National Academy of Educational Sciences of Ukraine

Kucheriava S.M.,

orcid.org/0009-0002-1035-1202

Student at the International Economic Relations Faculty

Uzhhorod National University

With the advent of the computer and the dawn of the digital age, access to information has become easier. People are now able to easily share experiences and integrate foreign loanwords into their own sociocultural space. The development of modern languages is inseparable from socio-cultural processes, which significantly influence lexical change and borrowing. Every major change in society can be easily traced back to linguistic changes. Technological progress, globalization, and intercultural communication introduce new concepts into people's everyday lives. As a result, languages need new ways to describe these changes. This results in a major issue that linguists and translators face. It is they who primarily take responsibility of normalizing linguistic units. However, there is no one system that would make it possible. That is the reason why it is essential to comprehend the factors that influence the emergence of lexical innovations and the patterns governing their occurrence.

Scholars such as William Labov and James Armstrong provide important insights into language change and the nature of lexical innovation. David Crystal examines the relationship between language and technological development, particularly in the context of the Internet and digital communication. Yu. Savina and Yu. Laskava focus on the functioning of borrowings and the external and internal factors that influence their emergence. The works of Einar Haugen and Peter Burke are relevant to the study of language contact and the role of social, cultural, and historical interaction in linguistic change. Translation-related aspects of lexical innovation are addressed in the studies of Lawrence Venuti and Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, whose works help explain how new lexical units and culture-specific concepts are transferred and adapted across languages.

This article examines the socio-cultural determinants that influence the emergence and development of lexical innovations. The main focus is on such factors as technological progress, economic and trade relations, political and historical events, and cultural exchange. The study also considers how these external changes interact with internal linguistic needs. These include the principle of language economy and the naming of new concepts. The analysis reveals that lexical innovation is closely connected with changes in social practices, technological development, cultural interaction, and historical circumstances, which affect both the formation of new lexical units and the ways they are translated and integrated into another language. The study employs a qualitative approach based on etymological, comparative, and contextual analysis of selected lexical innovations. Particular attention is drawn to the role of translation in the spread of the new lexicon. By examining the etymology and development of new words, the study aims to show how changes in society and culture are reflected in vocabulary and how lexical innovations become part of the language over time.

Key words: lexical innovation, socio-cultural factors, communication, neologisms, lexical units.

З появою комп'ютера та настанням цифрової ери доступ до інформації став простішим. Тепер люди можуть легко обмінюватися досвідом та інтегрувати іноземні запозичення у свій соціокультурний простір. Розвиток сучасних мов нерозривно пов'язаний із соціокультурними процесами, які суттєво впливають на лексичні зміни та запозичення. Кожну значну зміну в суспільстві можна легко простежити через мовні зміни. Технологічний прогрес, глобалізація та міжкультурна комунікація вводять нові поняття в повсякденне життя людей. Як наслідок, мовам потрібні нові способи опису цих змін. Це стає серйозною проблемою, з якою стикаються лінгвісти та перекладачі. Саме вони в першу чергу беруть на себе відповідальність за нормалізацію мовних одиниць. Однак не існує єдиної системи, яка б це уможливила. Саме тому надзвичайно важливо розуміти чинники, що впливають на появу лексичних інновацій, та закономірності, які регулюють їх виникнення.

Такі вчені, як Вільям Лабов та Джеймс Армстронг, надають важливі уявлення про мовні зміни та природу лексичних інновацій. Девід Крістал досліджує взаємозв'язок між мовою та технологічним розвитком, зокрема в контексті Інтернету та цифрової комунікації. Ю. Савіна та Ю. Ласкава зосереджуються на функціонуванні запозичень та зовнішніх і внутрішніх чинниках, що впливають на їхнє виникнення. Праці Ейнара Хаугена та Пітера Берка є актуальними для дослідження мовного контакту та ролі соціальної, культурної й історичної взаємодії в мовних змінах. Аспекти лексичних інновацій, пов'язані з перекладом, розглядаються в дослідженнях Лоуренса Венуті, Жана-Поля

Віне та Жана Дарбельне, чії праці допомагають пояснити, як нові лексичні одиниці та культурно-специфічні поняття передаються та адаптуються між мовами.

У цій статті досліджуються соціокультурні детермінанти, що впливають на виникнення та розвиток лексичних інновацій. Основна увага приділяється таким факторам, як технологічний прогрес, економічні та торговельні відносини, політичні та історичні події, а також культурний обмін. У дослідженні також розглядається, як ці зовнішні зміни взаємодіють із внутрішніми мовними потребами. До них належать орієнтація на економіку та найменування нових понять. Результати аналізу показують, що лексичні інновації тісно пов'язані зі змінами в суспільних практиках, технологічним розвитком, культурною взаємодією та історичними обставинами, які впливають як на формування нових лексичних одиниць, так і на способи їх перекладу та інтеграції в іншу мову. Дослідження застосовує якісний підхід, що ґрунтується на етимологічному, порівняльному та контекстуальному аналізі вибраних лексичних інновацій. Особлива увага приділяється ролі перекладу в поширенні нового лексику. Аналізуючи етимологію та розвиток нових слів, дослідження має на меті показати, як зміни в суспільстві та культурі відбиваються на лексиці та як лексичні інновації з часом стають частиною мови.

Ключові слова: лексичні новоутворення, соціокультурні чинники, комунікація, неологізми, лексичні одиниці.

Problem statement. The importance of language as a conduit for information, a qualifier of experience, the primary means of communication, and a material expression of mentality is becoming increasingly evident. It is language that reflects objective, cognised reality and serves as one of the distinctive markers of a nation. It enables communication across all social spheres, and since every act of communication is purposeful, the communication process encompasses not only linguistic but also socio-psychological aspects. Communication is an intersubjective process that involves the participants' comprehension of the essence of the subject matter; consequently, every communicative process entails the integration of activity, communication, and cognition. The possibility of communication and mutual understanding is achieved through the development within society of an established system of linguistic norms, amongst which great importance is associated with lexical semantics manifestations. Language helps people describe the world around them. It also changes when the world changes. New events and experiences can affect the way people use language.

However, over time and as a result of extra- and intralinguistic factors, they may undergo transformation. These factors can be connected with both language and society. Social changes can lead to changes in vocabulary. Cultural contact can also influence the development of new words and meanings. Technological progress is another important factor. The results of these transformations more often remain on the periphery of the semantic structures of lexemes, whilst less frequently affecting their core. It is precisely the latter case that attests to the emergence of linguistic innovations through lexical-semantic processes. In the vast majority of cases, such phenomena refer to a specific time in the history of society and to significant events that occurred during that time – whether it's good or bad. At the moment of their emergence, the linguistic code shifts, and unification is established, leading to the development of new evaluative connotations.

The analysis of recent research and publications. Lexical innovation has been widely studied from different linguistic perspectives. Armstrong [2] studies the nature of lexical innovation and the emergence of new lexical forms. Hickey [10] and Labov [12] focus on such aspects of lexical innovation as internal and external factors that influence language change. Carling et al. [5] analyse the causes of lexical borrowing, and Haugen [9] studies borrowing as a result of language contact and bilingual interaction. Burke [4] also considers the connection between language and communication. These studies show that lexical development is influenced by both internal linguistic processes and external social factors.

Also, recent studies pay attention to the influence of social and technological changes nowadays. Babelyuk [3] examines lexical innovations in the context of a digital and multicultural society. Ocheretian and Marchenko [14] investigate the functioning of lexical innovations in modern English Internet discourse. Ezurike and Ibileye [8] analyse Gen-Z neologisms and their morphosemantic features. Savina and Laskava [1] study the use of Anglicisms in professional speech, and Crystal [7] examines the influence of the Internet on language use. Chipier [6] focuses on business translation and the transfer of professional terminology between languages.

Several scholars have also examined the connection between translation and lexical development. Vinay and Darbelnet [15] describe translation procedures that contribute to linguistic adaptation, while Venuti [16] emphasizes the cultural dimension of translation. Hutchins and Somers [11] discuss lexical transfer in machine translation, and Malamitidou [13] examines translation as a form of language contact that can contribute to linguistic change. Therefore, previous research covers different aspects of lexical innovation. These include borrowing, language contact, social change, digital communication, and translation. However, the interaction between these factors and their combined influence on lexical development remains insufficiently explored.

Identification of previously unresolved aspects of the general problem addressed in this article.

Although lexical innovation and language change have been extensively studied, the influence of socio-cultural factors on the emergence of new lexical units has not always been examined as a complex and interconnected process. There is a lot of research that focuses mostly on different types of innovations, such as neologisms, borrowings, or semantic changes, but not enough attention is paid to the connection between socio-cultural determinants and lexical development. Thus, a broader approach to understanding the socio-cultural changes leading to lexical innovation is needed. The present paper aims to fill this gap by investigating the relation of socio-cultural factors with the emergence and development of new lexical units.

Task setting. This article aims to identify and analyse the socio-cultural determinants that influence the emergence and development of lexical innovations. The task is to determine how social transformations, cultural contact, technological progress, and significant historical events contribute to the creation of new lexical units and the development of new meanings. Particular attention is paid to the connection between linguistic change and the social context in which new lexical units emerge. The study also seeks to identify possible patterns in the development and spread of lexical innovations. Furthermore, understanding these processes is relevant to translation, as new lexical units often carry specific cultural associations and connotations that should be considered when selecting an appropriate equivalent in another language.

Presentation of the Main Findings. The study analyses 15 lexical units related to technological, economic, political, historical, and cultural changes. The analysis covers different periods of lexical development and focuses on the origin, development, meaning, and integration of the selected lexical units. They were selected based on their etymological origin and their connection with lexical innovation. Most of the analysed words have become part of everyday vocabulary, while their meanings and forms have developed over time.

The democratization of public life and the liberalization of social and moral principles caused continuous changes in the information landscape, which in turn influenced the development of language and lexical systems. Lexical innovations are the outcome of language contact and they make language work well in public life. Every small change in life can be seen in the language changes, as it evolves and adjusts to the current situation in the community's life [12].

The emergence of new lexical units in the language is faced with conservatism on the part of

native speakers, caused by the desire to maintain the status quo. Thus, only the new lexical units that do not duplicate existing ones are established in usage, truly fulfilling the role of expressing and solidifying new ideas and concepts, as well as newly developed connotations and associations, while filtering out homonymy and similar issues [3, pp. 9–12].

Lexical innovation occurs when a speaker employs a phrase that combines a fundamental expression with a new meaning. New contexts encourage the development of unusual neosemes; however, this phenomenon is possible only if the original lexical-semantic variant's semantics serve as the foundation for the derived meaning. A neologism is a nominative unit formed according to an existing productive and regular word-formation model in the language during a specific historical period of society's development, and may enter the category of commonly used vocabulary provided it is relevant to speech and used frequently. In such a case, the neologism retains the marker of novelty for a certain period of time [2].

If a significant number of neolexemes have rapidly appeared in speech to denote facts and phenomena that humanity had not previously encountered, a portion of which will then enter linguistic circulation, and linguists must analyse, standardise and introduce them into the sphere of codification.

According to Savina Yu. O. and Laskava Yu. V., the emergence of lexical borrowings is influenced by both external historical and socio-economic factors and internal linguistic needs. Among the external causes, they highlight the intensification of economic and trade relations between different countries, their increasing interaction in global politics and the economy, the development of innovative and digital technologies, as well as the expansion of the Internet as a global communication space [1].

However, lexical innovations do not emerge in a vacuum, and they do not remain restricted to a single community. Translation largely mediates the global circulation of new concepts, products, and ideas. It functions not just as a technical transfer of meanings, but as an active mechanism of linguistic adaptation. When people encounter foreign innovations that appear because of technological, economic, or cultural shifts, in fact translators are the primary agents responsible for deciding how to incorporate this lexicon. They may use direct borrowing, adapt the word phonetically, or create a calque. Consequently, translation serves as a crucial bridge between external socio-cultural determinants and internal lexical development. It shapes how neologisms and lexical innovations are integrated into the target language [13, pp. 2–6].

Internal linguistic factors are associated with the tendency of the language toward economy, precision, and the need to fill lexical gaps. As Carling et al. point out, a significant number of borrowings emerge due to the necessity of naming new objects, concepts, and phenomena that previously had no established equivalents [5, pp. 13–17]. Even though the systematic demand for new vocabulary is established by internal linguistic needs, they do not appear in isolation. Hickey emphasizes that external changes in society, culture, and technology stimulate these changes. To understand these external factors that influence the lexical shift, it is crucial to examine each determinant individually [10].

One of the most important factors causing lexical innovation is technological and scientific development. The emergence of new technologies introduces new things that were previously unknown to a particular community and therefore require nomination. According to David Crystal, the rapid evolution of digital technologies makes languages expand. They may create new lexical units using their own word-formation resources, assign new meanings to existing words, or borrow terms from other languages. For instance, the development of digital technologies has helped the international circulation of such units as *smartphone*, *podcast*, *streaming*, and *interface* [7]. The term *smartphone* combines *smart*, used since the thirteenth century to describe someone intelligent, and *phone*, a shortened form of *telephone*, from Greek *tele* (“far”) and *phone* (“voice”). The term was used by Ericsson for its GS88 in 1997 and later became widely associated with advanced mobile phones. Similarly, the word *interface* was first recorded in 1874 to describe a common boundary between two bodies. Its modern technological meaning developed in the twentieth century, when it came to refer to a point of interaction between systems and, later, to computer devices or systems [15]. Their spread shows that technological and lexical innovations are closely connected.

When something new appears in reality, there is a new word or term to describe it. In this case, translation acts as an initial filter for new lexical units. Technical translators and localizers decide whether a term should be directly imported or adapted via calquing, drawing on insights from machine translation studies [11].

Economic and trade relations between different societies also facilitate the movement of words across linguistic boundaries. As highlighted in sociolinguistic studies on globalization and language contact by Einar Haugen, the exchange of goods, services, technologies, and professional practices frequently intro-

duces new concepts into another linguistic community [9, pp. 9–16].

It results in the names associated with these concepts also being transferred from one language to another. For example, marketing strategies and corporate vocabulary, such as *start-up*, *franchising*, *outsourcing*, and *logistics*, frequently spread with the help of international trade agreements and business translation. This way, lexical borrowing and adaptation reflect not only linguistic contact but also broader processes of economic and social interaction. The history of *franchising* shows a long semantic development: from “freedom” in the sixteenth century and “citizenship or membership” in the seventeenth century to a legal privilege in the eighteenth century and a business practice in the twentieth century. Its modern meaning therefore developed through several stages of semantic change [15]. Here, translators serve as mediators by selecting appropriate equivalents or keeping international trade terms. Carefully analysing the target audience, translators decide how to adapt financial and business vocabulary to make new economic concepts clear and successfully adopted in the new language [6, pp. 220–225].

Political and historical developments have a major impact on lexical innovation. As Ezurike and Ibileye point out, major societal upheavals, such as wars, revolutions, border shifts, regime changes, and global socio-political movements, introduce entirely new lexical units to the community [8]. Ideological terms, institutional names, and crisis-related jargon are caused by historical events (such as historical terms like *perestroika* and *glasnost*, or modern digital-era political terminology). The word *perestroika* comes was first proposed in Soviet political discourse in 1981; it became widely known in English in 1985 during Mikhail Gorbachev’s leadership. Similarly, *glasnost* comes from Russian, meaning “openness to public scrutiny”. It became widely used in English after Gorbachev prominently used the term in 1985, linking the word directly to the political changes of that period [15]. In political translation, texts capture these systemic societal shifts, where translators navigate loaded narratives. Consequently, lexical innovations serve as direct linguistic snapshots of specific historical epochs, preserving the etymology of the crises or transformations that created them [4].

Cultural contact represents another significant determinant of lexical innovation. As Ocheretian and Marchenko note, when people interact through tourism, media, and migration, they exchange not only material goods but also traditions, food, art, and entertainment. When a new cultural phenomenon appears in another society, its original name comes with it

[14, p. 469]. Such words as *pizza*, *sushi*, *ballet*, and *karaoke* illustrate how lexical units spread beyond their original communities together with the cultural meaning they have. The word *pizza* was borrowed from Italian and was recorded in English in 1845. It originally referred to a “cake”, “tart”, or “pie”, but later became associated with the Italian dish known internationally. The word *karaoke* entered English from Japanese in 1979. It combines Japanese *kara* (“empty”) with *oke*, a shortened form of *okesutora* (“orchestra”), and spread internationally together with the entertainment practice [15]. Etymological analysis proves that the origin of a word provides direct evidence of the cultural pathways through which a concept entered a language. In translation, when interpreting culture-specific items (*realia*), translators frequently use domestication or foreignization strategies. They decide whether to introduce a raw borrowing or an explanatory descriptive translation [16].

The passage of new ideas from one language community to another is part and parcel of the process of translation. Translation is an important bridge between languages and cultures, especially when there is no existing equivalent of a socio-cultural concept, as Jean-Paul Vinay and Jean Darbelnet note in their comparative stylistics studies. Translators are always challenged by the need to translate lexical innovations through direct transfer, phonetic/grammatical adaptation, descriptive translation, or calques. The role of translation is particularly visible in the formation of loan translations (*calques*). Unlike direct borrowings, a calque copies the semantic or structural pattern of a foreign lexical unit by means of the indigenous resources of the recipient language (e.g. translating the English *skyscraper* structurally into French *gratte-ciel* or German *Wolkenkratzer*) [17].

Conclusion and prospects for further research.

In summary, this article examines the main determinants and patterns of the emergence of lexical innovations. It introduces different socio-cultural factors that have a major impact on the linguistic community. By paying attention to how social transformations, cultural contact, technological progress, and signif-

icant historical events shape language, the research demonstrated that new lexical units and meanings do not appear in isolation. Language is a direct reflection of the social context. Finally, the findings underscore the high relevance of these processes to translation practice. As the new lexical units are often related to specific culture and special connotations, the translators have to pay attention to the contextual nuances when choosing the corresponding equivalents in the target language. These linguistic inventions reflect the swift social, intercultural and technological transformations that have characterized digital society of our time. These lexical units are most common at a number of important points of growth such as science, technology, medicine, politics, economics, advertising and fiction. These areas are characterized by the rapid development of new concepts and the need to name new phenomena. This results in an increase in new terminology. Interestingly, the process of neologization also includes alteration of existing lexical units. It happens in an effort to articulate the changing understanding of concepts, especially those of relationships and family.

The findings show that technological and social changes are among the main factors behind the emergence of new lexical units, while cultural contact contributes to their integration through borrowing, calquing, and translation. Cultural and historical changes can also influence the development of new meanings and vocabulary related to changing social practices and concepts. The analysis therefore confirms that lexical innovation reflects both the emergence of new realities and the ways languages adapt these realities to their own linguistic and cultural systems.

Despite these insights, there are several prospects for future investigation. Further research could examine how emerging artificial intelligence tools and automated translation systems cope with real-time lexical neologisms and socio-political jargon. Since this lexicon conveys a cultural connotation, it can create a problem when rendering it to another language.

REFERENCES:

1. Савіна Ю. О., Ласкава Ю. В. Функціонування англіцизмів у професійному мовленні. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського. Серія: Філологія. Журналістика*. 2023. Том 34 (73). No 3. С. 60–65. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2710-4656/2023.3/11>
2. Armstrong J. The problem of lexical innovation. *Linguistics and Philosophy*. 2016. 39(2). P. 87–118. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-015-9185-9>
3. Babelyuk O. A. Lexical Innovations in the English Language: Responding to the Demands of a Digital Multicultural Society. *Lviv Philological Journal*. 2024. No. 16. P. 9–14. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32447/2663-340x-2024-16.2>
4. Burke P. Languages and communities in early modern Europe. Cambridge University Press. 2004. 226 p.
5. Carling G. et al. The causality of borrowing: Lexical loans in Eurasian languages. *PLOS ONE*. 2019. Vol. 14. No. 10. P. 1–33. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223588>

6. Chipier S. Business translation. *Perspectives*. 2002. Vol. 10. No. 3. P. 215–233. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1080/0907676x.2002.9961446>
7. Crystal D. Language and the internet. Cambridge University Press. 2006. 284 p.
8. Ezurike I. P., Ibileye P. G. Lexical Innovation: A Morphosemantic Study of Gen-Z Neologisms. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science*. 2025. Vol. IX. No. 1. P. 4551–4563. URL: <https://doi.org/10.47772/ijriss.2025.9010349>
9. Haugen E. I. The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behavior. 2nd ed. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1969. 699 p.
10. Hickey R. Internally– and externally-motivated language change. *The handbook of historical sociolinguistics*. 2012. P. 387–407. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118257227.ch21>
11. Hutchins W. J., Somers H. L. An introduction to machine translation. Academic Press Inc. 1992. 362 p.
12. Labov W. Principles of Linguistic Change. Oxford, UK: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010. 448 p. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444327496>
13. Malamatidou S. Why changes go unnoticed: The role of adaptation in translation-induced linguistic change. *Lingua*. 2017. Vol. 200. P. 22–32. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lingua.2017.08.001>
14. Ocheretian T., Marchenko V. Features of functioning of lexical innovations in modern english internet discourse. *YoungScientist*. 2020. Vol. 11. No. 87. P. 469–470. URL: <https://doi.org/10.32839/2304-5809/2020-11-87-101>
15. Oxford English Dictionary. Oxford University Press. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/OED/6534811477>
16. Vinay J.-P., Darbelnet, J. Comparative Stylistics of French and English. John Benjamins Publishing. 1995. 358 p.
17. Venuti L. The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation (Translation Studies). London: Routledge, 1994. 368 p.



Стаття поширюється на умовах
ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 31.08.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 18.09.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 15.10.2026