

**THE HISTORY OF THE STUDY OF SOCIAL MEDIA MARKETING TERMS****Elmatov Shokir Nurmatovich**

Senior lecturer at the University of information technologies and management, Uzbekistan

**Abstract**

Social media marketing (SMM) terminology has emerged as a dynamic and rapidly evolving field at the intersection of linguistics, marketing, communication studies, and digital technology. This article provides a detailed historical analysis of the study of social media marketing terms, tracing their development from the early days of digital marketing to the present era of influencer marketing, user-generated content, and AI-driven strategies. It examines the chronological evolution of key terms, the methodological approaches used in their study, and their linguistic characteristics (borrowing, neologism formation, abbreviation, and semantic shift). Within the anthropocentric paradigm, these terms are viewed as reflections of human social behavior, interaction, and cultural adaptation in digital spaces. The study highlights both universal trends in global scholarship and the specific challenges of terminology research in languages such as Uzbek, where many terms are adopted through English.

**Keywords:** social media marketing, terminology, history of study, digital marketing, neologisms, user-generated content, influencer marketing, anthropocentric paradigm, contrastive linguistics.

**Introduction.** The rapid development of social media platforms since the late 1990s has fundamentally transformed marketing practices and generated a vast array of new terminology. Terms such as *hashtag*, *engagement*, *influencer*, *content creator*, *story*, *reel*, *user-generated content (UGC)*, *electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM)*, and *viral marketing* have become integral to both professional practice and academic discourse.

The study of these terms is not merely a matter of lexicography; it reveals how language adapts to technological and social change. In the anthropocentric paradigm, social media marketing terms serve as linguistic evidence of human communicative needs, social interaction patterns, and the construction of digital identities.

This article aims to provide a comprehensive historical overview of the research on social media marketing terminology, analyzing key periods, major contributions, and the principles underlying their classification and study.

**Methods.** The study employs a historical-descriptive and comparative-analytical methodology. Data were collected through a systematic review of academic literature, including bibliometric analyses, monographs, and journal articles on digital marketing, social media studies, and terminology research. Chronological periods were identified based on major technological and platform developments. Special attention was given to linguistic aspects (neologism formation, borrowing, semantic change) and the integration of marketing terminology into broader linguistic frameworks. Uzbek and international sources were consulted to highlight both global trends and local adaptation processes.

**Results.** The roots of social media marketing terminology lie in earlier concepts of digital and internet marketing. Terms such as *e-marketing*, *online marketing*, and *electronic commerce* appeared in the 1990s with the commercialization of the internet. Early platforms like Usenet (1980s) and Six Degrees (1997) introduced concepts of online communities and user interaction, though systematic marketing terminology was still limited. Research during this period focused primarily on the potential of the internet for direct communication rather than structured marketing strategies.

The launch of Facebook (2004), YouTube (2005), and Twitter (2006) marked a turning point. New terms emerged rapidly: *profile*, *friend request*, *tweet*, *hashtag*, *like*, *share*, and *post*.

Academic interest grew in the study of user-generated content and electronic word-of-mouth (eWOM). Kaplan and Haenlein (2010) provided one of the foundational definitions of social media, emphasizing user-generated content and Web 2.0 foundations. During this period, research shifted from general digital marketing to platform-specific strategies and the linguistic analysis of new communicative practices.

The rise of Instagram (2010), Pinterest, and Snapchat introduced visual and ephemeral content, generating terms such as *story*, *filter*, *influencer*, and *engagement rate*. Influencer marketing became a distinct field, with terms like *micro-influencer* and *brand collaboration*. Bibliometric studies show a sharp increase in academic publications on social media marketing during this decade. Research began to incorporate linguistic perspectives, examining how new terms spread through borrowing (mostly from English) and how they function in professional discourse.

The dominance of TikTok, Reels, and short-form video content introduced terms such as *reel*, *algorithm*, *for you page (FYP)*, *creator economy*, and *authenticity*. The integration of artificial intelligence brought terms like *AI-generated content*, *chatbot marketing*, and *personalization*. Recent bibliometric analyses (e.g., studies covering 2011–2021 and beyond) demonstrate exponential growth in research output, with increasing attention to terminology standardization, cross-cultural adaptation, and the semantic evolution of marketing language.

In Uzbek linguistics and terminology studies, many of these terms are borrowed directly from English (*influencer*, *content*, *engagement*, *viral*) or adapted through calquing and semantic extension. Research in this context often focuses on the integration of international terminology into Uzbek professional discourse and the creation of native equivalents where possible.

**Discussion.** The history of studying social media marketing terms reflects broader shifts in linguistics and communication studies. Early research was largely descriptive and marketing-oriented, focusing on practical application. Over time, the field has become more interdisciplinary, incorporating linguistic analysis of neologism formation, semantic change, and pragmatic functions.

From an anthropocentric perspective, these terms are not neutral labels but active participants in shaping human digital behavior. They encode new forms of social interaction, identity construction, and economic activity (e.g., the creator economy). The rapid emergence of platform-specific jargon demonstrates language's adaptability to technological innovation and human communicative needs.

Key challenges in the study of this terminology include:

- High rate of neologism creation and obsolescence
- Heavy reliance on English as the source language
- Platform-specific meanings that evolve quickly
- The need for terminological standardization in non-English languages, including Uzbek

Comparative analysis shows that while global research emphasizes pragmatic and functional aspects (illocutionary force in digital communication), local studies (such as in Uzbek scholarship) often prioritize semantic classification, borrowing mechanisms, and cultural adaptation. This dual approach enriches our understanding of how marketing language functions both universally and culture-specifically.

The study of social media marketing terms also connects to broader themes in contemporary linguistics, including the impact of globalization on professional vocabularies, the role of digital media in language change, and the cognitive representation of new communicative practices.

**Conclusion.** The history of the study of social media marketing terminology spans from the early days of internet marketing to the sophisticated, data-driven, and AI-integrated strategies of today. It is characterized by rapid lexical innovation, interdisciplinary research, and increasing attention to linguistic and cultural dimensions.

Future research should focus on corpus-based analysis of contemporary usage, cross-linguistic comparison (including Uzbek-English), and the development of terminological resources that support both academic study and professional practice. Understanding the historical trajectory of these terms provides valuable insights into how language evolves in response to technological and social transformation, reinforcing the view of language as a fundamentally human and dynamic system.

**References:**

1. Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
2. Ballmer, T.T. & Brennenstuhl, W. (1981). *Speech Act Classification*. Springer.
3. Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts*. Cambridge University Press.
4. Traugott, E.C. and other historical pragmatics studies on speech act verbs.
5. Verschueren, J. (1980). *On Speech Act Verbs*. John Benjamins.