



CODEN [USA]: IAJPBB

ISSN: 2349-7750

**INDO AMERICAN JOURNAL OF
PHARMACEUTICAL SCIENCES**<http://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3243568>Available online at: <http://www.iajps.com>

Research Article

**THEORY AND PRACTICE OF CREATING AND JUSTIFYING
ECONOMIC TERMS**Natalya Serbinovskaya¹¹Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia**Article Received:** April 2019**Accepted:** May 2019**Published:** June 2019**Abstract:**

This article presents the results of a theoretical synthesis of research in the field of terminology and terminography for the further study of particular terminological systems, features of their structure, patterns and development trends. The problems of the formation and development of Russian marketing terminology in the era of rapid market transformations of the Russian economy are analyzed.

Keywords: *economic terminology, terminological field, term system, lexical system.***Corresponding author:****Natalya Serbinovskaya**

Don State Technical University, Rostov-on-Don, Russia

E-mail: n.serbinovskaya@mail.ru

QR code



Please cite this article in press Natalya Serbinovskaya., Theory And Practice Of Creating And Justifying Economic Terms., Indo Am. J. P. Sci, 2019; 06[06].

INTRODUCTION:

The formation and development of terminology (a terminological field) is perceived as a basic, preparatory stage in the formation of a normalized set of special nominations - a term system.

At each stage of existence in the structure of the terminological field

One can single out the core in the form of a term system - an ordered set of interdependent exact notions of a separate field of knowledge - and the periphery, on which special nominations are located that do not meet all the requirements for the term. In vast areas of knowledge, where objects of scientific attention are subjected to multidimensional research, it is possible that not one, but several particular terminological systems exist. In this case, the terminological field has a polynuclear structure.

In order to clearly present the structure of the terminological field, it seems rational to begin its analysis from the nuclear part of the term system.

It seems that its structure is formed by special nominations of only one type - terms. It makes sense to describe them in detail from the normative point of view.

From the standpoint of the normative approach, which aims at streamlining the aggregations of special nominations, it is not about the signs of the term, but about the requirements that are imposed on units of the language that claim to have the status of terms.

The requirements for an ideal term are analyzed in the works of A.A. Reformat'skiy, D.S. Lotte, V.M. Leychik, S.V. Grineva, I.N. Volkova, A.V. Superanskaya, V.D. Tabanakova et al. Some of these requirements (belonging to the sphere of special communication, the purpose for expressing a logical concept, the accuracy of meaning and definiteness) do not need additional explanation, since the discussion of the corresponding signs of the term was in the previous paragraph. We list the remaining requirements, accompanied by the necessary comments.

1. The term must be consistently correlated with other special nominations of the same field of knowledge, that is, it must be systematic. The quality of consistency was also mentioned in the previous paragraph. However, it is necessary to emphasize it again, since consistency is crucial for streamlining the totality of terms of one area of knowledge. Any term can fully function only as a member of a certain terminological system. The terminology system can include only terms that are clearly related to each other and which reflect the coordinated position of the researchers operating with them. Of course, the consensus of scientists in relation to each term can hardly be expected. But the point is that, despite the absence of absolute unity of views, a significant generality of opinions can be noted, which is associated with generally accepted theoretical propositions. The generality of opinion does not prevent the improvement of the theory of the term and allows the use of a systematic approach in the study and ordering of the term system. It is important to note, scientists put forward the requirement of consistency of the term in the first place and believed that consistency helps to remove ambiguity.

2. The term should be unambiguous. Since the semantics of each term within the framework of the terminological system including it is determined by the semantics of the remaining terms, it should be used in it with only one meaning. A.A. Reformat'skiy, although in a less categorical form, writes about the tendency of the term to uniqueness as a reflection of consistency, emphasizing that the terms are words that tend to be monosemantic and that exist within certain terminologies (terminological fields — NS).

It should be noted that in the practice of terminology this requirement is far from being always fulfilled: in many term systems polytematic terms of a certain type are found, when one lexical form has multiple meanings based on metonymic associations, for example, it is used to denote the process and its result, the object and the science studying it etc.

3. It should be noted that the term should not be exceeded. It is a requirement that the circumstances of the two rules of course, since it is automatically fulfilled while observing the above-mentioned requirements of uniqueness and definiteness.

4. It's not a matter of course. This is a special name. It makes it possible to complete its compliance with the rules of the law.

5. The term should be expressive and stylistically neutral. The internal content of the term changes only in connection with the development of science itself, the formation of new ideas and, as a result, the refinement of concepts. G.O. Winokur defines this feature of terms as "intellectual purity". In this regard, A.A. Reformat'skiy notes: "... because terminology is ideally a strict and "smart" set of terms, i.e. reflecting on the purely intellectual side of the word, expression is not peculiar to it".

6. The term should be a brief, compact notation. This requirement is considered by many terminologists, but there is no consensus on the need to comply with it. The brevity of the form is a quality that, in accordance with the principle of saving language means, can be presented to any language unit, therefore it is not specific to a term. In addition, the researchers point to the possibility of a negative impact of brevity on the degree of accuracy of the semantics of the term.

Indeed, not always a considerable length, in particular a composite character, a term should be qualified as its shortcoming. Sometimes only the verbosity of the term ensures its accuracy. Thus, in marketing, a multi-component term is the development of a new product concept and its verification cannot be shorter, because it means a single procedure: the development of a new product implies that the initial understanding of a new product transforms into a concept of its creation, which should be tested on a group of target consumers to determine the degree of its attractiveness.

7. In the work of I.N. Volkova is making a demand for terminological implantation, which means that only a special nomination that has been used for a long time in the field of functioning and recognized by various scholars can receive the status of a term. If the second part of the definition of this requirement seems rational (recognition of the term indirectly

demonstrates the objectivity of the knowledge gained), the first one looks vague, since it is not clear what time can be considered sufficient for the "terminologization" of a special nomination.

It should be recalled that, speaking of the requirements for an ideal term, the majority of researchers push them against the background of its inclusion in the term system. Therefore, the most important requirements can be reduced to the ability of a special nomination to objectively represent a quantum of knowledge of a certain area in strict correlation with other quanta belonging to the same system. True, the constant expansion and deepening of knowledge, the implementation of scientific research at the same time by many scientists makes the constancy of the term system impossible, therefore one cannot but agree that "the main semasiological characteristics of terms (monosemy, no synonymy) exist as the leading trend in this functional class of words", which "never not fully implemented".

The study of terminology and the emerging terminological system of the economy led to the conclusion that this terminology is complex (hierarchical, heterogeneous), open, and developing.

According to the degree of universality of using the nomination of the economy in the composition of the terminological field can be divided into three categories.

1. General nominations are nominations that are uniform for the economy in all its special fields and other economic areas, for example: quality, price, market, competition, research, analysis, etc.
2. Basic nominations are the terms of economic specialties (professions), for example: product policy, product movement, marketing research, etc.
3. Specific economic nominations are nominations that are applied only in any particular (narrow) field of activity: industry, service, network marketing, marketing in tourism, etc.

CONCLUSION:

Today, the economic term system needs streamlining, which can be done through the use of graph theory, which will allow correlation of definitions in chains of terms, starting from basic, primary and ending with the latter, conveying the most particular and specific meanings within clusters. The development of principles for defining terms is the prospect of this study. Of course, what has been said here does not mean that the application of graph theory is advisable only in relation to the terminographic processing of a set of economic nominations, but the terminological field studied in this dissertation, due to the spontaneity and speed of formation, requires close attention of terminologists and recourse to standard work using an effective technique.

REFERENCES:

1. Andresson H.A. 1987. Terms of economics in Estonian, English, German and Russian. Tatarstan, Russia: TSU.
2. Bagova S.R. 1997. Structural and semantic analysis of complex words in the economic vocabulary of the English language. Questions of Romance-Germanic and Russian philology. Pyatigorsk, Russia: Pyatigorsk State Linguistic University.
3. Borhvald Yu.V. 2000. Historical terminology of the Russian language. Krasnoyarsk, Russia.
4. Golubkov E.P. 2003. Marketing Research: Theory, Methodology and Practice: Moscow, Russia: FinPress.
5. Maslova V.A. 2004. Lingvokulturologiya. Moscow, Russia: Academia.
6. Serbinovskaya N.V. 2010. Terminological field "Marketing" in the Russian language: a monograph. Moscow, Russia: Electronic library of the federal system of educational resources. URL: http://window.edu.ru/window/library?p_rid=67635.