

THE INFLUENCE OF SLANG AND ARGOT ON PUBLIC AND SCIENTIFIC COMMUNICATION: POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE ASPECTS**Farrukh Bakhramovich Khakimov**

Student, Faculty of Philology

Mamun University

Khiva, Uzbekistan

e-mail: slswlasow@gmail.com

ABSTRACT: Language is not only a practical tool for human interaction but also an essential instrument in shaping thought, culture, and identity. In the modern era, the increasing mobility of people, the intensification of digital communication, and the blending of social groups have made language more dynamic than ever before. Within this dynamic system, slang and argot occupy a unique place. They serve as instruments of creativity, expressiveness, and group solidarity, but at the same time they challenge the conventional norms of standardized communication.

This article explores the dual influence of slang and argot on both public and scientific discourse. On the one hand, slang can enrich vocabulary, increase the accessibility of communication, and serve as a valuable tool for engaging younger generations in academic or professional environments. On the other hand, excessive reliance on non-standard linguistic forms can dilute precision, undermine authority, and erode the clarity of academic expression.

Keywords: slang, argot, scientific style, communication, academic discourse, digitalization.

INTRODUCTION

Language has always played a pivotal role in human society, functioning not only as a medium of communication but also as a carrier of cultural memory and identity. From ancient rhetoric to modern social networks, language reflects the evolution of thought, values, and interpersonal relations. Within this broad system, slang and argot occupy a special niche. They arise in response to social needs—whether to establish in-group boundaries, to challenge authority, or to create new means of expression—and thus serve as markers of belonging and differentiation.

In public communication, slang often performs the function of reducing distance between speakers, adding expressiveness, and reinforcing solidarity. For example, the adoption of youth slang by advertising or political discourse demonstrates its effectiveness in capturing attention and appealing to emotions. Argot, although more specialized, fulfills similar functions in professional or closed communities where speed, secrecy, or precision within a group is more valued than external clarity.

In contrast, the scientific sphere is traditionally characterized by accuracy, neutrality, and standardization. Scientific communication is not only an exchange of information but also a means of establishing credibility, building knowledge, and ensuring replicability. Every term and formulation must carry unambiguous meaning to avoid distortion in interpretation. For this reason, the infiltration of slang into scientific contexts is perceived with caution. The language of science demands clarity and stability, whereas slang is inherently flexible, situational, and ephemeral.

Nevertheless, the rapid expansion of digital communication in the 21st century has blurred the boundaries between formal and informal registers. Social media, blogs, podcasts, and other hybrid formats have created new communicative spaces where scientific ideas are often presented in simplified and emotionally charged language. This raises pressing questions: Should scientists embrace elements of slang to popularize their work, or should they resist such tendencies to safeguard rigor? Can argot, when carefully integrated, serve as a tool of efficiency within professional scientific groups, or does it create barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration?

These questions underline the significance of the present study. By analyzing the impact of slang and argot on both public and scientific communication, the article seeks to identify not only their risks but also their potential contributions to modern discourse. The growing relevance of the problem lies in the digital transformation of society, which accelerates linguistic change and demands new approaches to the regulation of language in academic contexts.

METHODS

The methodology of this study is grounded in a comparative and interdisciplinary approach, combining tools of linguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis. Since slang and argot are phenomena deeply embedded in social practice, their analysis requires both qualitative and quantitative methods.

First, a comparative analysis was conducted to highlight distinctions between slang, argot, and the scientific style of language. For this purpose, corpora of spoken and written texts were examined, including youth communication on digital platforms, transcripts of professional group interactions, and selected academic articles. The comparison aimed to identify the structural and stylistic differences among these varieties of language.

Second, a content analysis was applied to trace lexical and stylistic markers of slang and argot. Specific attention was given to semantic shifts, metaphorical expressions, abbreviations, and word formation patterns that distinguish non-standard varieties from scientific discourse. The content analysis also examined frequency and context of usage, which helped to reveal patterns of integration into different communicative environments.

Third, a functional approach was used to evaluate the purposes and effects of slang and argot in communication. For instance, slang often functions as a tool for humor, solidarity, or identity construction, whereas argot serves professional secrecy, efficiency, or precision within closed groups. These functions were contrasted with the aims of scientific style, which include accuracy, transparency, and universality.

Finally, the methodology incorporated case studies to illustrate practical implications. Examples were drawn from online academic forums, student discussions, and instances of science popularization in mass media. This made it possible to assess the benefits and risks of integrating slang and argot into public and scientific communication, with an emphasis on the digital environment.

By combining these methods, the study ensured a comprehensive perspective that captures not only linguistic structures but also their social functions and communicative consequences.

RESULTS

The findings of the study demonstrate the complex and often contradictory influence of slang and argot on communication, particularly within academic contexts. Several major results were identified:

Dilution of Scientific Language. The presence of slang in academic writing reduces the precision of formulations. Expressions borrowed from informal contexts often lack clear boundaries of meaning, which leads to ambiguity and subjectivity. This problem becomes critical in disciplines where terminological clarity is essential for replicability and cumulative knowledge building.

Decline of Authority. The authority of scientific discourse is traditionally associated with its formal, standardized, and impersonal style. When researchers employ informal vocabulary or slang in scientific texts, the perceived credibility of their work diminishes. Readers may question not only the professionalism of the author but also the reliability of the results.

Impact on Education. The spread of slang into educational environments has mixed consequences. On the one hand, it can create a more engaging atmosphere and reduce barriers between students and teachers. On the other, overreliance on slang reduces students' ability to master academic writing conventions, complicating their participation in scholarly communication. This is particularly evident in student essays, theses, and research papers, where informal expressions may substitute for precise terminology.

Positive Contributions. Despite the risks, slang and argot are not entirely detrimental. Slang expands linguistic flexibility, enhances creativity, and increases the accessibility of communication, making it easier to present complex ideas in simplified form. Argot, in turn, often enhances efficiency within professional groups by enabling concise and highly specialized communication. For example, medical jargon allows practitioners to exchange information quickly and accurately, although such communication may be opaque to outsiders.

Overall, the results reveal that slang and argot function as double-edged tools: while they may enrich and democratize language, they simultaneously pose challenges to the integrity, precision, and authority of scientific discourse.

DISCUSSION

The findings of this study emphasize the dual role of slang and argot in communication. On one hand, they act as engines of linguistic innovation, enriching vocabulary, reflecting social dynamics, and allowing for more engaging and creative expression. On the other hand, their excessive use in academic contexts creates risks that cannot be ignored.

A key point is the tension between accessibility and precision. Scientific communication aims to be universal and transparent, allowing knowledge to be transmitted across cultures, disciplines, and generations. Slang, however, is inherently local and situational. What may be understood by one group of speakers can easily be misinterpreted by another, creating barriers instead of bridges. In a globalized scientific community, such risks are especially problematic, as research must remain intelligible to international audiences.

Another important aspect concerns the popularization of science. In recent years, there has been growing recognition of the need to communicate scientific findings to the public in an accessible manner. Here, the use of slang can be effective. For instance, science communicators often rely on humor, metaphors, or informal phrases to make complex information more relatable. This approach can increase public interest in science and reduce the perception of academia as distant or elitist. However, there is a fine line between simplification and oversimplification. When slang dominates, the scientific essence may be lost, and credibility may suffer.

The discussion also highlights the role of digitalization. Online platforms blur the boundaries between professional and personal registers, accelerating the diffusion of slang into contexts traditionally governed by formal norms. This creates new challenges for scientists, educators, and editors who must decide when and how informal language is appropriate. The digital environment also demonstrates the speed with which slang evolves—expressions that are trendy today may be outdated tomorrow—further complicating their integration into long-term academic communication.

Finally, the findings suggest the importance of linguistic awareness and editorial responsibility. Rather than categorically rejecting slang and argot, the scientific community should develop strategies for their conscious and limited use. Clear guidelines can help ensure that informal language contributes to, rather than undermines, the goals of scholarly communication.

CONCLUSION

Slang and argot exert a significant yet ambiguous influence on modern communication. They promote linguistic creativity, enhance group identity, and support the popularization of knowledge. At the same time, they risk eroding academic standards, diminishing precision, and undermining the credibility of scientific discourse.

The study concludes that effective communication in both public and scientific contexts requires a careful balance between innovation and tradition. While slang and argot should not be dismissed outright, their integration into academic communication must remain limited, purposeful, and critically evaluated. For science popularization, informal language may serve as a powerful tool to bridge the gap between experts and the public. In scholarly writing, however, the preservation of clarity, neutrality, and rigor remains paramount.

As digitalization continues to reshape communication practices, the influence of slang and argot will only increase. The challenge for academia lies in cultivating linguistic literacy that embraces

creativity without sacrificing responsibility. By consciously managing the coexistence of formal and informal registers, the scientific community can ensure that language remains both innovative and precise—capable of advancing knowledge while remaining accessible to society at large.

REFERENCES

1. Baranov, A. N. *Slang and Its Role in Modern Communication*. Moscow: Flinta, 2019.
2. Vendina, T. I. *Russian Argot: Structure, Functioning, History*. Moscow: Nauka, 2016.
3. Golovin, B. N. *Introduction to Linguistics: A Textbook*. St. Petersburg: Lan, 2020.
4. Kazakova, T. A. *The Scientific Style of Speech: Theory and Practice*. St. Petersburg: Zlatoust, 2018.
5. Krysin, L. P. *Sociolinguistic Aspects of Modern Russian*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Culture, 2017.