

SYNTAXIC METHOD OF CREATING TERMINOLOGICAL LEXICON OF THE U. S. HIGHER EDUCATION

СИНТАКСИЧНИЙ СПОСІБ УТВОРЕННЯ ТЕРМІНОЛОГІЧНОЇ ЛЕКСИКИ ВИЩОЇ ОСВІТИ США

Fedorenko S.V.,
orcid.org/0000-0001-8517-9975
Doctor of Science in Pedagogy, Professor,
Professor at the Philology and Translation Department
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design

Kornyeysheva I.O.,
orcid.org/0000-0003-4617-6741
Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor at the Philology and Translation Department
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design

Isakova Ye.P.,
orcid.org/0000-0002-8487-042X
Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor,
Head of the Philology and Translation Department
Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design

The article highlights the features of the syntactic method of forming the terminological vocabulary of the U. S. higher education. Various approaches to the classification of terminological formation are considered. Through a continuous sample of specialized texts of different genres, two types of terms were identified according to their syntactic method of their formation: compound terms and terminological phrases, which are syntactic constructions, consisting of two or more interconnected components. It is noted that compound terms differ from phrases in the way that they are characterized by certain semantic and syntactic features, which include: an established sequence of components of the compound term, declension of only the last component, the presence of semantic relations between individual components, tendencies towards lexicalization and idiomatization of the meaning of a compound term. It is stated that terminological phrases, being analytical in nature, are an integral part of any specialized terminological system, and the U. S. higher education sphere is no exception. It is outlined that terminological phrases demonstrate a greater ability to clarify the meaning of a concept or process due to their ability to provide additional explanatory or clarifying professional characteristics expressed in commonly used lexical units. It is emphasized that due to their increased length and, accordingly, bulkiness, polycomponent terminological word-groups are significantly inferior in number to two-component terminological phrases. It is concluded that the syntactic method of creating terms in the U. S. higher education sector is quite productive. This is explained by the fact that by using a terminological phrase it is easier to convey the belonging of a particular terminological word-group to a classification series. This affiliation is based on the genus-specific relationship of concepts, which explains the widespread use of the syntactic method of term formation in the specialized language of the U. S. higher education.

Key words: terminological vocabulary of the U. S. higher education, compound term, terminological word-group, syntactic construction, syntactic method of term formation, specialized language.

У статті висвітлено особливості синтаксичного способу творення термінологічної лексики вищої освіти США. Розглянуто різні підходи до класифікації способів термінотворення. Шляхом суцільної вибірки із різноманітних фахових текстів виявлено терміни двох типів відповідно до їх синтаксичного способу творення: терміни-композити та термінологічні словосполучення, що є синтаксичними конструкціями, кожна з яких складається із двох або більше пов'язаних між собою компонентів. Зазначено, що терміни-композити відрізняються від словосполучень тим, що вони характеризуються певними семантичними і синтаксичними ознаками, які включають: установлену послідовність складників композита, відмінювання лише останнього складника, наявність семантичних відношень між окремими складниками, тенденції до лексикалізації та ідіоматизації значення композита. Звернено увагу на те, що термінологічні словосполучення, будучи аналітичними за своєю природою, є невід'ємною частиною будь-якої фахової терміносистеми, і галузь вищої освіти США не є виключенням. Окреслено, що термінологічні словосполучення виявляють більшу здатність уточнювати значення поняття чи процесу завдяки своїй спроможності надавати додаткові пояснювальні або уточнюючі фахові характеристики, виражені загальновживаним лексичним одиницям. Наголошено, що через свою збільшенну довжину і відповідно громіздкість полікомпонентні термінологічні словосполучення значно поступаються у кількості двокомпонентним терміносполукам. Зроблено висновок, що синтаксичний спосіб творення термінів галузі вищої освіти США є досить продуктивним, що пояснюється тим, що за допомогою термінологічного словосполучення легше передати належність тієї чи іншої терміносполуки до класифікаційного ряду. Ця належність базується на родо-видовому співвідношенні понять, чим і пояснюється широке використання синтаксичного способу творення термінів у фаховій мові вищої освіти США.

Ключові слова: термінологічна лексика вищої освіти США, термін-композит, термінологічне словосполучення, синтаксична конструкція, синтаксичний спосіб термінотворення, фахова мова.

Problem statement. In the modern globalized educational space, English occupies a leading place as the language of science, technology and education. The study of the terminological vocabulary of the U. S. higher education sphere is of particular interest. As it is the USA that today have set trends in the formation of educational standards, models of learning and scientific communication. Over the past century, the United States has emerged as a leader in the overall globalization processes of social development as a result not only of its economic prosperity and political power, but also of progressive trends in the field of higher education [14]. In addition, due to the rapid development of American higher education and its modernization in accordance with the challenges of modern society, the terminology of this field is rapidly updated. At the same time, the dynamic nature of the professional language of American higher education is evidenced by its innovative lexical and semantic processes, which indicate the implementation of new possibilities of the language system [15].

Terminological vocabulary is an important component of professional communication, and the methods of its creation reflect the laws of language development and the dynamics of scientific and educational discourse.

One of the most productive ways of forming terms in modern English is syntactic, which involves the creation of new nominations by combining words into phrases of various types. Analysis of syntactic models allows us to further trace the mechanisms of the emergence of new terminological units, their structural organization and semantic motivation.

The relevance of this study is determined by the need to study the terminologies of the humanities (in particular, the terminology of the American higher education system). This will expand existing knowledge of terminological vocabulary, which until recently was based largely on the analysis of terminology of the technical and natural sciences. Turning to educational terminology seems timely due to the fact that the active replenishment of the terminology of the U. S. higher education with new concepts and terms makes it possible to identify current trends in the formation of terminological vocabulary. Furthermore, observing various terminologies allows us to see the impact of society on language, as well as to trace the main trends in the development of general literary language through an analysis of the linguistic processes occurring within them, since terminological vocabulary is extremely susceptible to all changes occurring in language. The need to study the terminology of the U. S. higher education system is also driven by such practical tasks

of linguistics as the systematization of terminologies, the compilation of dictionaries of different specialized languages, the solution of various problems of teaching foreign languages, and issues of adequate translation.

Analysis of recent research and publications. The problem of term formation occupies an important place in modern linguistics, because terms are the main means of nominating concepts in scientific and educational discourse. The work of both Ukrainian (I. Kocan, T. Kyiak, V. Leichyk, T. Panko, L. Symonenko and others) and foreign scholars (G. Budin, T. Cabré, L. Drozd, L. Roudny and others) highlight the issues of structure, semantics and methods of term formation.

In Ukrainian linguistics, a significant contribution to the study of various aspects of educational terminology is presented in the works of such Ukrainian linguists as: T. Bevz (functional and stylistic features of educational vocabulary); O. Dubinchuk (organization of educational terminology); S. Fedorenko (lexical and semantic features of the terminology of higher education in the USA); V. Harapko (structural and semantic features of English-language pedagogical terms); L. Knodel (translation of English-language educational vocabulary); N. Kostenko (structural, semantic and functional parameters of English-language educational terms); N. Pasichnyk (semantic and functional aspects of English-language didactic vocabulary); K. Sheremeta (structural, semantic and functional features of the U. S. higher education terminology); N. Stefanova (extralingual factors of forming modern English-language educational terminology); L. Verhun (translational correspondence of educational vocabulary of English and Ukrainian); V. Yakovleva (translation of educational terminology), etc.

When it comes to the specialized language of the U. S. higher education, it exploits terminology to accurately convey information about the learning process and pedagogical technologies, regulatory requirements, academic achievements of students, and to popularize knowledge [19; 21]. However, despite the significant number of works on terminology in modern linguistics, the issue of the syntactic method of creating the terminological vocabulary of the U. S. higher education has not yet received sufficient coverage.

Setting the task. The aim of the article is to study the features of the syntactic method of forming terms in American higher education. The set goal presupposes classifying the main types of word combinations, and analyzing the patterns of their functioning.

Presentation of the main material. The implementation of term formation occurs due to the word formation methods available in a particular national language and its lexical resources in accordance with syntactic, analytical and derivational processes [12]. The involvement of each of these processes is determined by various factors, a significant role among which belongs not only to the specifics of the structural structure of the language, but also to the conceptual categories that contribute to the grouping of various word-formation models [16, p. 224]. According to L. Tomilenko, the process of word formation of terms is mostly controlled, and therefore its essence reproduces the volume of scientific information that provides disclosure of the content of a particular concept [12, p. 85-86].

Regarding the methods of term formation in the English language, there are different approaches to their classification. In particular, O. Turchak distinguishes such ways of word formation as: morphological, morphological-syntactic, lexical-syntactic and lexical-semantic [13, p. 248]. Similarly, other Ukrainian researchers include the following main methods of term formation: morphological (affixation, word formation, contraction); semantic, which is based on the development of special meanings of commonly used words of the national language; borrowing [5, p. 27]. In turn, A. Diakov, T. Kyiak and Z. Kudelko emphasize three main ways of creating terms: 1) giving commonly used lexical units of the native language the status of terms; 2) forming terms by borrowing from other languages; 3) borrowing terms from other disciplinary areas [3, p. 9-10]. More generalized in modern linguistics is the division of terms into: 1) simple/single-word; 2) compound terms; 3) terminological word-groups with a prepositional elements or without them [1].

In our study, we rely on the latter of the above-mentioned distributions of terms by structural parameters.

Through quantitative analysis of the isolated research corpus, which is formed by 650 terminological units, selected by continuous sampling from 24 professional texts of various genres, according to the syntactic method of creation, two types of terms were identified:

- word terms or single-word terms with a total number of 123 (19% of the total number of the isolated research corpus);
- compound terms, which include 7 (1%) terminological units;
- terminological word combinations with a total number of 520 units (80%), which are syntactic

constructions, each of which consists of two or more interconnected components.

In our study, we consider in detail only the terms of the last two types mentioned above, which represent the syntactic method of creating the analyzed lexical units.

According to the syntactic method of creation, 7 terminological composite units (1% of the total amount of the studied material) were found in the analyzed sample, formed by combining two independent words (e.g.: *capstone*, *checklist*, *portfolio*, *workshop*, *yearbook*) or through a hyphen (*drop-add*, *drop-out*).

Compound terms have two or more constituent bases in their structure. [4, p. 4]. Ukrainian linguist O. Selivanova [11] considers a compound term as a syntactic and grammatical unity. The philologist claims that a compound term is "a nominative unit, integrally designed graphically and lexico-grammatically..., which has two or more onomasiological features" [11, p. 228]. According to E. Laniuk [7], lexical units in the composition of a compound term "limit their semantic and grammatical (morphological-syntactic) versatility and independence. Based on the meanings of the components, they are subject to new paradigmatic and syntagmatic functions" [7, p. 182].

Compound terms differ from word combinations in that they are characterized by certain semantic and syntactic features, which include: an established sequence of components of the compound term, declension of only the last component, the presence of semantic relations between individual components, tendencies towards lexicalization and idiomatization of the meaning of the composite [8, p. 195]. It should be noted that thanks to composition, the vocabulary of the language is improved and productively replenished, allowing the maximum amount of information to be conveyed in a concise and capacious form [9].

Analysis of the identified compound terms in the U. S. higher education sphere made it possible to isolate such models and their variants by parts of speech:

- 1) N + N model (four terminological units): *capstone*, *portfolio*, *workshop*, *yearbook*;
- 2) V + N model (one terminological unit): *checklist*;
- 3) V + V model (one terminological unit): *drop-add*;
- 4) V + Adv model (one terminological unit): *drop-out*.

It should be noted that composite terms function in the terminological system of American higher

education according to the same principle as single-base terms: they can be used independently (e.g.: *capstone*, *portfolio* та ін.) and in terminological phrases (e.g.: *portfolio approach*).

As mentioned above, in our sample, all seven isolated compound terms are two-component, i.e. formed from two constituent stems. For example, let us consider the noun *portfolio* (Lat. *portafoglio* – paper case), which is used to refer to a method of assessing students. The first root word is of Latin origin, *port*, meaning “to carry”. Some common English words that use this root include *import*, *export*, *deport*, *report*. Also in English, this word is used to refer to a place where ships load and unload goods or take shelter from a storm [22, p. 1153]. The other word – *folio* – is used in the following meanings, such as: 1) a sheet of paper folded once to make two sheets or four pages of a book or manuscript; 2) a volume having the largest pages previously made from such a sheet; 3) a sheet of a manuscript or book numbered only on the front side [22, p. 579].

Sometimes the meaning of the components of compound words may not coincide with the meanings of the corresponding independent words. [3, p. 106-107]. For instance, the compound term *capstone* is formed by combining two separate words – *cap* (“headgear”; “cap”) and *stone*. Regarding the sphere of the U. S. higher education, the term *capstone* means an interdisciplinary educational component lasting one semester (the last semester of the entire period of study) or one academic year (the last year of study), which involves the implementation of a certain project activity. In the U. S. higher education specialized language, this compound term is part of such terminological phrases as: *capstone course*, *capstone project*, *capstone research*, *capstone workshop*.

Thus, in the analyzed terminological system, compound terms of prepositional formation were identified, which are characterized by the simple addition of two full-meaning words, mainly non-derivative nouns. Given the small number of compound terms identified in the studied sample (seven lexical units), it was established that word-composition is not a productive way of forming terms of the U. S. higher education specialized language.

According to our calculations, terminological word combinations (TWC) turned out to be the most common type of term formation in higher education in the USA. In the analyzed terminological system, there are 520 TWCs, which is 80% of their total number (650 terminological units) and testifies to their dominance. In modern linguistics, a terminological word combination is understood as

a syntactic construction formed from two or more semantically and syntactically related component words, and which names a special concept, subject or process of a certain field of knowledge [10; 20].

Terminological phrases, being analytical in nature, are an integral part of any specialized terminological system, and the U. S. higher education sector is no exception. The high productivity of TWCs is due to “the manifestation of a universal general linguistic tendency to eliminate contradictions between a limited number of nominative means and an unlimited number of objects of nomination by using phrases in the nominative function” [17, p. 14]. Unlike synthetic terms, analytical terms demonstrate a greater ability to clarify the meaning of a concept or process due to their ability to provide additional explanatory or clarifying professional characteristics expressed in commonly used lexical units. [18]. By adding attributive components to a term, we obtain a TWCs, which, due to explanatory or clarifying characteristics, differs from other concepts of the same class. The basis of a TWC is a dominant word / core word (the so-called supporting component or nuclear component), which is surrounded by additional meanings [10, p. 97].

Therefore, TWC are formed as a result of the complication of the syntactic construction, that is, the concretization of the supporting component, e.g.: *learning – asynchronous learning – asynchronous learning platform*; *awareness – career awareness – career awareness class*. In the structure of the TS, the main (nuclear) word conveys a generic feature (categorical meaning), and the dependent component conveys a specific feature (indicates specific features of objects, phenomena, or processes).

TWC performs not only a nominative function, but also helps to determine the scope of the concept it denotes and understand its place in the system of other concepts in the field of the U. S. higher education. As noted by O. Chuiashkova, unlike single-word terms, terminological phrases: demonstrate a greater ability to clarify meaning due to dependent words; are almost not subject to the harmful effects of homonymy, are noticeably less synonymous; are characterized by the possibility of more flexible classification and systematization according to certain models [18, p. 32]. The components that make up terminological word-groups are combined according to certain lexical and grammatical rules in accordance with the law of valence, which implies the ability to enter into a phrase when forming a lexical and semantic series of words [2].

Based on the analysis, we systematize all terminological associations of the studied field of

the U. S. higher education (520 units) by the number of structural components within the TWC, dividing them into:

- two-component TWCs (443 units): *civic engagement curriculum integration, signature work, STEM education*. In the vast majority of these TWCs are formed by adding an additional component (mostly an adjective or noun) to the main component (noun). The role of the latter “is reduced to clarifying or concretizing the base” [6, p. 28].
- three-component TWCs (68 units): *collaborative action research, culturally relevant pedagogy, hybrid learning environment, University Without Walls*;
- multicomponent TWCs (four-, five-, six- and more components) – 9 units: *individual advanced development experience, general educational development tests, integrative learning VALUE rubric, Valid Assessment of Learning in Undergraduate Education (VALUE)*.

As the analysis showed, in the studied terminology there is a small number of multicomponent terminological compounds (9 units, which is 1.7% of the total number of TWCs and 1.4% of the total number of studied terms), which include four or more components, for example. The basis of multicomponent TWCs is a two-membered phrase, and each added component, expressed by a noun or adjective, specifies a complex educational concept. The use of multicomponent terminological compounds in the field of the U. S. higher education is explained by the desire to give the term that names a complex concept greater semantic accuracy. It

should be emphasized that due to their increased length and, accordingly, bulkiness, multicomponent TWCs are significantly inferior in number to two-component TWCs.

Therefore, we conclude that from a pragmatic point of view of communication in the field of American higher education, multicomponent compounds are quite often subject to the process of ellipsis, that is, abbreviation of the entire compound or its part. The active use of multi-component nomination tools for the formation of new terms is no longer just a trend, but a given in modern terminology, which is explained not least by their ability to convey the most complex concepts, and, accordingly, by their greater information content compared to single-word terms, ease of creation, predominant monosemanticity, and semantic clarity and certainty.

Conclusions. Summing up the aforementioned, we can state that the syntactic method of creating terms in the field of higher education in the USA is quite productive. The productivity of this method is due to the fact that with the help of terminological word combinations it is easier to convey the belonging of a particular term combination to a classification series. This belonging is based on the genus-specific relationship of concepts, which explains the widespread use of the syntactic method of forming terms in the specialized language of the U. S. higher education.

The scope for further research lies in studying the pragmatic aspect of translating the U. S. higher education terminological word combinations extracted from different types of specialized texts.

REFERENCES:

1. Біян Н. О. Лексико-семантична та структурна класифікація термінів в англійській мові. *Іноземна філологія*. 2009. № 121. С. 142–149.
2. Гаращенко Л. Аналітичні терміни загальнотехнічної галузі. *Вісник Національного університету «Львівська політехніка»*. Серія «Проблеми української термінології». 2012. № 733. С. 96–100.
3. Д'яков А. С., Кияк Т. Р., Куделько З. Б. Основи термінотворення: семантичні та соціолінгвістичні аспекти: монографія. К.: KM Academia, 2000. 218 с.
4. Клименко Н. Ф. Словотворча структура і семантика складних слів у сучасній українській мові. К.: Наукова думка, 1984. 251 с.
5. Колосова С. О., Радецька С. В. Формування англійської термінології індустрії моди. *Наукові записки Ніжинського державного університету ім. Миколи Гоголя. Філологічні науки*. 2016. № 1. С. 26–29.
6. Кочан І. М. Динаміка і кодифікація термінів з міжнародними компонентами у сучасній українській українській мові: монографія. Львівський національний університет ім. І. Франка, 2004. 566 с.
7. Ланюк Е. Т. До питання про становлення галузевої лексичної системи (на матеріалі німецької торговельно-економічної лексики: дис. ... канд. філолог. наук. Львівський національний університет ім. Івана Франка, 1974. 278 с.
8. Міщенко А. Лінгвістика фахових мов та сучасна модель науково-технічного перекладу. Монографія. Вінниця: Нова книга, 2013. 448 с.
9. Радочинська Л. Г. Особливості словоскладання в англійській мові. *Materialy Miedzynarodowej naukowi-praktycznej konferencji "Aktualne problemy nowoczesnych nauk – 2014" (Przemysl)*. 2014. № 16. С. 56–60.

10. Саламаха М. Я. Англомовна терміносистема охорони довкілля: структура, семантика, прагматика. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня кандидата філологічних наук. Львівський національний університет ім. Івана Франка, 2016. 317 с.
11. Селіванова О. О. Сучасна лінгвістика: напрями та проблеми: підручник. Полтава: Довкілля-К, 2008. 711 с.
12. Томіленко Л. М. Термінологічна лексика в сучасній тлумачній лексикографії української літературної мови: монографія. Івано-Франківськ: Фоліант, 2015. 160 с.
13. Турчак О. М. Особливості словотвору економічної термінології. *Вісник Дніпропетровського університету імені Альфреда Нобеля. Серія: Філологічні науки.* 2016. № 2. С. 247–252.
14. Федоренко С. В. Теорія і методика формування гуманітарної культури студентів вищих навчальних закладів США. Дисертація на здобуття ступеня доктора педагогічних наук. Київ, 2017. 551 с.
15. Федоренко С., Шеремета К. Студіювання фахової мови в лінгводидактичному та власне лінгвістичному аспектах. *Наукові записки Національного університету «Острозька академія».* Серія «Філологія». 2021. № 11 (79). С. 42–45. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2021-11\(79\)-42-45](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2021-11(79)-42-45)
16. Філіппова Н. М. Метафора в термінології (на матеріалі соматизмів в англомовній суднобудівній термінології). *Матеріали міжнародної наукової конференції «Проблеми української термінології»* (1-2 жовтня 2010 р., Львів). 2010. С. 85–87.
17. Цимбал Н. Ономасіологічний погляд на термінотворення в органічній хімії. *Українська мова.* 2007. № 1. С. 30–36.
18. Чуєшкова О. В. Аналітичні номінації в економічній терміносистемі (структурно-типологічний аспект): дисертація на здобуття ступеня кандидата філологічних наук. Харківський національний університет ім. В. Н. Каразіна, 2002. 217 с.
19. Шеремета К. Б. Структурно-семантичні та функційні особливості термінології фахової мови вищої освіти США. Дисертація на здобуття ступеня доктора філософії за спеціальністю 035 Філологія. Національний технічний університет України «Київський політехнічний інститут імені Ігоря Сікорського», 2025. 289 с.
20. Янковець О. В. Англійська прикордонна термінологія: структурно-семантичний, когнітивний і функціональний аспекти. Дисертація на здобуття наукового ступеня доктора філософії. Чернівецький національний університет імені Юрія Федьковича; Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, 2021. 316 с.
21. Fedorenko S. V., Isakova Ye. P., Kornyeueva I. O. Semantic relationships in the terminology system of the U.S. higher education (based on the materials from the websites of the U.S. higher education institutions). *Закарпатські філологічні студії.* 2025. № 41, т. 2. С. 140–146. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/tps2663-4880/2025.41.2.23>
22. Macmillan English Dictionary for Advanced Learners / M. Rundell (ed.). Bloomsbury Publishing, 2011. 1748 p.

Дата першого надходження рукопису до видання: 29.10.2025

Дата прийнятого до друку рукопису після рецензування: 28.11.2025

Дата публікації: 30.12.2025