ONE-COMPONENT AND MULTI-COMPONENT TERMS IN AVIATION TERMINOLOGY

Tashpulatova Sayfura Bakhodirovna
Senior teacher of Kimyo International University in Tashkent, Samarkand branch
e-mail: sayfurabaxadirovna@gmail.com

Annotation. *This study explores the structural features of one-component and multi-component terms in Aviation English. It analyzes their formation, usage, and functional roles in professional communication. The findings show that both types of terms are essential for ensuring clarity and precision in aviation discourse.*

Key words: *Aviation English, terminology, one-component terms, multi-component terms, lexical structure, linguistic analysis, ESP.*

Annotatsiya. *Ushbu tadqiqot Aviation Englishdagi bir komponentli va ko‘p komponentli terminlarning tuzilma xususiyatlarini o‘rganadi. Unda ularning shakllanishi, qo‘llanilishi va professional muloqotdagi funksional roli tahlil qilinadi. Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, har ikki turdagi terminlar aviatsiya nutqida aniqlik va ravshanlikni ta’minlash uchun muhim hisoblanadi.*

Kalit so‘zlar: *Aviatsiya ingliz tili, terminologiya, bir komponentli terminlar, ko‘p komponentli terminlar, leksik tuzilma, lingvistik tahlil, maxsus maqsadlar uchun ingliz tili.*

Аннотация. *Данное исследование рассматривает структурные особенности однокомпонентных и многокомпонентных терминов в Aviation English. В нём анализируются их формирование, использование и функциональные роли в профессиональной коммуникации. Результаты показывают, что оба типа терминов являются важными для обеспечения ясности и точности в авиационном дискурсе.*

Ключевые слова: *Авиационный английский, терминология, однокомпонентные термины, многокомпонентные термины, лексическая структура, лингвистический анализ, английский для специальных целей.*

Aviation terminology represents a specialized lexical system designed to ensure clarity, precision, and safety in international communication [2]. Due to the high-risk nature of aviation operations, language must be standardized and unambiguous, which makes terminology a key component of aviation discourse [4]. One of the important structural features of this terminology is the distinction between one-component and multi-component terms. One-component terms, or single-word units, are simple in form and widely used in routine communication. Examples such as pilot, runway and altitude demonstrate their frequency and functional importance. These terms are often

semantically specialized forms of general English vocabulary adapted to the aviation domain [3].

In contrast, multi-component terms consist of two or more lexical units and typically function as fixed expressions. Terms such as air traffic control, flight management system, and instrument landing system illustrate how complex concepts are represented through structured combinations of words. These constructions often take the form of noun phrases and reflect hierarchical relationships between components [1]. From a linguistic perspective, multi-component terms are more informative but also more complex. Each element contributes to the overall meaning, making such terms more precise but harder to process for non-native speakers. This aligns with research showing that complex terminology increases cognitive load in second-language comprehension [5].

The comparison of one-component and multi-component terms shows that they perform complementary functions in aviation communication. Single-word terms contribute to speed and efficiency, while multi-word expressions provide clarity and specificity. Both are essential for maintaining effective communication in operational contexts [2]. Furthermore, understanding the structural and functional differences between these types of terms is crucial for teaching Aviation English. ESP-based approaches emphasize the importance of teaching terminology in context rather than as isolated lexical units [6]. In addition to structural differences, one-component and multi-component terms in aviation terminology also differ in their functional distribution across communication contexts. One-component terms are more frequently used in high-speed, real-time communication, particularly in pilot–controller interactions where brevity is essential. Their short form reduces the risk of transmission errors and supports rapid information exchange under time pressure.

By contrast, multi-component terms are more common in technical documentation, training materials, and maintenance discourse, where precision and completeness are prioritized over speed. In such contexts, extended terminological units help to avoid ambiguity by specifying exact systems, procedures, or components.

In addition to structural differences, one-component and multi-component terms in aviation terminology also differ in their functional distribution across communication contexts. One-component terms are more frequently used in high-speed, real-time communication, particularly in pilot–controller interactions where brevity is essential. Their short form reduces the risk of transmission errors and supports rapid information exchange under time pressure. By contrast, multi-component terms are more common in technical documentation, training materials, and maintenance discourse, where precision and completeness are prioritized over speed. In such contexts, extended terminological units help to avoid ambiguity by specifying exact systems, procedures, or components.

Another important aspect is the role of abbreviation and acronym formation, which often develops from multi-component terms. For example, complex expressions such as flight management system or instrument landing system are frequently reduced to FMS and ILS in professional communication. This process reflects a tendency toward linguistic economy while preserving semantic clarity [2]. Furthermore, the formation of multi-component terms often follows syntactic patterns typical of English technical language, especially noun–noun combinations (e.g., air traffic control) and adjective–noun structures (e.g., final approach fix). These patterns demonstrate how English efficiently encodes complex concepts through compact structures, which is a characteristic feature of specialized discourse [1].

From a pedagogical perspective, learners of Aviation English must develop the ability to decode internal relationships within multi-component terms. Difficulty often arises not from individual words, but from understanding how components interact semantically. Therefore, teaching strategies should include structural analysis and contextualized practice to enhance comprehension. In addition, the study of terminology reveals that aviation language tends toward standardization and unification, which limits variability in term formation. This distinguishes it from general language and ensures consistency in international communication, where misunderstanding can have serious consequences [2]. From a linguistic perspective, the study of aviation terminology provides valuable insights into word formation, lexical structure, and the functional organization of specialized language. It also highlights the importance of context in interpreting meaning, particularly in professional communication. Therefore, this study aims to analyze the structural characteristics of one-component and multi-component terms in Aviation English, focusing on their formation, usage, and role in communication. By examining these features, the research seeks to contribute to a better understanding of aviation terminology and its application in both linguistic studies and language teaching.

In conclusion, one-component and multi-component terms form the structural basis of Aviation English terminology. Their combined use ensures both efficiency and precision in communication. A clear understanding of these linguistic features is essential not only for effective communication but also for successful teaching and learning in aviation contexts. Another important aspect is the role of abbreviation and acronym formation, which often develops from multi-component terms. For example, complex expressions such as flight management system or instrument landing system are frequently reduced to FMS and ILS in professional communication. This process reflects a tendency toward linguistic economy while preserving semantic clarity .

References:

1. Crystal D. English as a Global Language. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003. – 212 p.

2. ICAO. Manual on the Implementation of ICAO Language Proficiency Requirements (Doc 9835). – Montreal: International Civil Aviation Organization, 2010. – 164 p.

3. Bowles H. Aviation English: Exploring its structure and use. – Bern: Peter Lang, 2010. – 210 p.

4. Estival D., Farris C., Molesworth B. Aviation English: A lingua franca for pilots and air traffic controllers. – London: Routledge, 2016. – 196 p.

5. Evans V., Green M. Cognitive Linguistics: An Introduction. – Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2006. – 830 p.

6. Tashpulatova Sayfura Bakhodirovna. (2026). Linguistic Challenges in Aviation English For Non-Native Speakers. International Journal Of Literature And Languages, 6(04), 29–31.