



## **The phenomenon of paronymy in contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology as a destabilising factor in professional communication**

**Nadiia Reznik\***

Doctor of Economics, Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9588-5929>

**Olena Yumachikova**

PhD in Philology, Senior Lecturer

Vinnytsia National Agrarian University

21008, 3 Sonyachna Str., Vinnytsia, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6909-3175>

**Yuliia Havryliuk**

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0774-3494>

**Nataly Shevchenko**

PhD in Economics, Associate Professor

National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine

03041, 15 Heroiv Oborony Str., Kyiv, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8506-1782>

**Kostiantyn Mazur**

PhD in Literary Studies, Associate Professor

Adam Mickiewicz University

61-712, 1 Wieniawskiego Str., Poznań, Poland

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3040-3471>

### **Suggested Citation:**

Reznik, N., Yumachikova, O., Havryliuk, Yu., Shevchenko, N., & Mazur, K. (2025). The phenomenon of paronymy in contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology as a destabilising factor in professional communication. *International Journal of Philology*, 29(1), 82-100. doi: 10.31548/philolog/1.2025.82.

\*Corresponding author



Copyright © The Author(s). This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

**Abstract.** In the context of the dynamic development of modern economic terminology, marked by the active incorporation of foreign loanwords, there is an increasing need for an in-depth and comprehensive investigation of linguistic phenomena capable of destabilising professional communication. One such linguistic phenomenon is paronymy, which can lead to the use of imprecise and ambiguous terminology in the field of economics. This article aimed to identify, systematise, and analyse paronyms that are most frequently used in contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology. The research involved an analysis of current resources, including electronic databases of Ukrainian legislation and lexicographic sources – both general explanatory dictionaries and specialised economic dictionaries and reference materials. Based on the linguistic analysis conducted, the most common paronymic pairs used in modern Ukrainian economic discourse have been identified and systematised. Particular attention was devoted to the analysis of the semantic nuances and functional characteristics of the identified paronyms, which may contribute to a destabilised understanding of a text's content. The article outlined in detail the significant differences in their lexical meanings, areas of usage, and the specificities of their application in specialised texts. In addition, it explored the various factors that trigger the increased use of paronymic forms in the professional language of economists, thereby contributing to the destabilisation of the terminological system. The results of the study may be effectively applied in the compilation and refinement of various lexicographic works in the field of economics, in the development of modern educational and methodological materials for students of economics, and in targeted efforts to enhance the linguistic competence of professionals in the economic sphere. This, in turn, would support the stabilisation and increased effectiveness of their professional communication

**Keywords:** communicative competence; language culture; similar-sounding words; phonetic similarity; semantics; terminological system; functioning

## Introduction

In modern globalised economic landscape, precision and clarity hold particular significance, as every term carries weight and directly influences decision-making, the drafting of agreements, and the functioning of complex business processes. However, within the lexical arsenal of economists lies a potential source of confusion – paronyms: words with similar phonetic forms that, despite their auditory resemblance, carry different semantic meanings. The incorrect use of such terms may lead to misinterpretation, misunderstandings, and, ultimately, significant economic risks. For this reason, an in-depth analysis of paronyms used in contemporary Ukrainian economic discourse, along with a comprehensive exploration of their potential to destabilise professional

communication, represents a highly relevant and important task for Ukrainian linguists and specialists in economics.

A review of scholarly literature on linguistic confusion – particularly regarding paronyms in economics – revealed considerable academic interest in the impact of this phenomenon on the efficiency of economic processes. As a linguistic phenomenon involving similar-sounding words, paronymy constitutes a critical object of study, as it requires precise differentiation to ensure accurate communication across various contexts, including professional activity. The incorrect use of paronyms can lead to confusion, particularly in registers that demand a high level of precision, such as academic and official-business styles.

This issue has drawn the attention of numerous scholars investigating the nature of paronymy, its functioning, and the challenges it presents in contemporary language. For instance, E. Isaeva (2019) pointed out in her study that in professional contexts – where the effectiveness of communication is crucial – accurate transmission of knowledge is of critical importance. Without appropriate safeguards, this process may involve losses and result in conceptual distortion, highlighting the need to ensure terminological precision, especially in specialised fields. The linguist O. Mykhailenko-Zoto (2019) examined the principles of paronym differentiation in texts of various styles. This study found that the choice between a broad or narrow interpretation of paronymy depends directly on the text's stylistic context. At the same time, the researcher emphasised that a narrow interpretation is most appropriate for academic and official-business styles, where paronyms function as elements of paronymic oppositions. In such contexts, the key principles for avoiding errors are semantic accuracy, conventional appropriateness, and stylistic correctness.

The issue of systematically studying and developing economic terminology in contemporary Ukrainian was also addressed by I. Shelepkova (2021). This study drew attention to the growing relevance of economic terminology, noting its widespread use not only in the professional context but also in everyday communication. The researcher identified the study of economic terminology as a priority task for modern linguistics. The phenomenon of paronymy was examined through the lens of the historical development of economic terminology, as well as the evolution of economic lexicography. According to I. Shelepkova, complexity and multidimensionality are defining features of economic terminology, within which phenomena such as paronymy emerge and function.

At a practical level, the problem of lexical errors in professional communication – particularly in the use of paronyms – is also

studied by other linguists. N. Rymar (2023), for example, classified paronyms as a distinct error-prone group in both spoken and written professional communication. Based on personal observations, such errors stem from confusion between the meanings of phonetically similar words, leading to non-standard usage and a lack of precision in specialised discourse. N. Rymar analysed common lexical mistakes – such as the misuse of paronyms – encountered in professional language, with the aim of characterising these paronyms and providing accurate equivalents.

During the analysis of economists' spoken language, the scholar V. Tovstenko (2021) described the use of paronyms and noted that their phonetic similarity often results in lexical errors and compromises clarity in communication. The researcher provided examples of such confusion in economists' speech, including paronymic pairs such as *liquidator* (ліквідант) – *liquidate* (ліквідат), *license* (ліцензія) – *license* (ліценція), *honorarium* (гонорант) – *honorarium* (гонорат). The author also emphasised that identifying the role of economic terminology in developing professionals' linguistic competence is one of the key challenges in current research.

The issue of developing a culture of professional communication among future economists in higher education institutions – particularly the linguistic training involved – was examined by I. Kharchenko (2020). In this article, the author focused on the methodology of language instruction, which includes studying normative Ukrainian language courses with an emphasis on building professional communication skills and mastering specialised terminology. The researcher pointed out that the language curriculum for future economists involves, among other things, the study of various linguistic units, including paronyms, to ensure their correct usage in professional discourse. This highlights the recognised importance of accurate paronym use in achieving clarity and effectiveness in professional communication among future economic specialists.

From a translation studies perspective, O. Sukhyi & N. Lysa (2025) noted in their study the insufficient exploration of paronyms in economics, particularly in the context of translation between languages. The researchers argued that when translating economic texts, adjectival paronyms may either retain or lose their paronymic relationship, and the degree of similarity between them may shift. In study of interlingual paronymy of verbs in Ukrainian and Polish, O. Stanishchevska (2024) emphasised the limited research into homonyms and paronyms in related languages, particularly from historical-etymological and translation-standpoints. The researcher highlighted the practical importance of understanding these differences to avoid errors in translation and language instruction, which underlines the complexity of interlingual paronymy.

Modern linguistics, in its study of paronymy within economic terminology, consistently identified it as a source of error in professional communication, which has led to its inclusion in educational programmes. The transformation of paronyms during translation is also a subject of ongoing investigation. However, despite growing attention to the issue, the quantitative and qualitative impact of paronymic confusion remains insufficiently addressed.

This study aimed to examine paronymy in contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology and to identify its potential role as a factor destabilising the accuracy of professional communication. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were set: to identify and analyse the semantic and functional features of paronyms; to investigate the causes of their misuse; to assess the impact of incorrect usage on economic communication; and to develop practical recommendations for enhancing linguistic competence among economists and preventing confusion.

## Materials and Methods

To conduct a comprehensive study of the phenomenon of paronymy in contemporary

Ukrainian economic terminology – as a significant factor potentially destabilising the accuracy and clarity of professional communication – a carefully selected, integrated approach was employed, combining complementary qualitative and quantitative methods of analysis. The primary method used in this research was content analysis of Ukrainian economic texts. Its key function lied in the direct identification and qualitative systematisation of specific paronymic pairs and series that are actively used in professional economic discourse. Through this method, the authors were able to examine authentic instances of economic terminology in use, identify potential sources of confusion caused by paronyms, and understand the contexts in which their incorrect usage may have the most detrimental effects on the stability of professional communication. This method is fundamental in establishing the empirical foundation of the study, as it enables the initial identification of the object of analysis – paronyms in economic language.

To objectively assess the prevalence of the identified phenomenon and determine its potential scale as a destabilising factor, the use of quantitative analysis was essential. This method involved the statistical processing of empirical material collected during the content analysis. Its value lied in providing numerical data on the frequency of use of each identified paronymic pair or set across different types of economic texts. The resulting statistical indicators made it possible to identify the most frequently used paronyms, which consequently pose the greatest risk to professional communication due to increased potential for error. Quantitative analysis enabled researchers to measure the intensity of the phenomenon and pinpoint the most problematic areas of economic terminology in terms of paronymic confusion. To gain a deeper understanding of the issue and identify the mechanisms through which paronymy destabilises professional communication, the study also employed a

comparative-contrastive method. This approach was particularly significant in its careful comparison of the semantic characteristics of paronyms. A detailed differentiation of the meanings of similar-sounding words helped clarify the nature of potential errors and assess the degree of semantic proximity that may lead to confusion. Moreover, comparative-contrastive analysis aided in predicting possible communication breakdowns and identifying contexts in which failure to distinguish between paronyms may have especially critical consequences for the accuracy of economic information and the stability of professional interactions. This method was key to understanding the internal mechanisms of destabilisation associated with paronymy.

To ensure broad and representative coverage of economic discourse, the following resources were used: Electronic legislative databases of Ukraine: Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (n.d.), Liga Zakon (n.d.), Normative Acts of Ukraine (NAU) (n.d.). Electronic Ukrainian language dictionaries: Economic Dictionary Online (n.d.), S.M. Ribachok *et al.* (2023), Y.M. Dvorak (2018), S. Honcharov & H.B. Kushnir (2009), D.H. Hrynchyshyn & O.A. Serbenska (1986). The study was carried out in the following stages:

1. Preparatory stage. Definition of the aim, objectives, subject, and object of the research – the phenomenon of paronymy in contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology as a factor destabilising professional communication. Review of existing scholarly literature in linguistics, economic terminology, and interlingual communication, using academic electronic libraries (including the electronic catalogue of the V.I. Vernadskyi National Library of Ukraine, university repositories, Google Scholar, ResearchGate, and Academia.edu). Compilation of a corpus of economic texts through the search and selection of legislative acts of Ukraine (from the aforementioned databases) and economics-related materials (academic articles, professional publications) in digital format.

2. Content analysis stage. Systematic examination of the selected corpus of economic texts to identify potential paronymic pairs and sets within economic terminology. Recording of usage contexts for the identified paronyms for subsequent semantic analysis. Development of a preliminary classification of the identified paronyms based on their application in the field of economics.

3. Quantitative analysis stage. Statistical processing of the identified paronymic units to determine their frequency of use across different types of economic texts. Identification of the most frequently occurring paronyms, which pose a potentially higher risk to the accuracy of professional communication.

4. Comparative-contrastive analysis stage. Detailed semantic comparison of the identified paronyms using electronic Ukrainian language dictionaries (Economic Dictionary Online (n.d.), Y.M. Dvorak (2018), S.M. Ribachok *et al.* (2023), Economic dictionary) to identify differences in meaning. Contextual analysis of paronym usage to detect situations in which confusion may lead to misinterpretation and destabilisation of professional communication. Assessment of potential communicative risks associated with failure to distinguish between paronyms in the professional domain.

5. Generalisation stage. Interpretation of the results of both the quantitative and comparative-contrastive analyses. Formulation of conclusions regarding the role of paronymy as a factor that destabilises accuracy and clarity in professional communication within contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology. Development of practical recommendations to enhance the linguistic competence of economic professionals and to prevent confusion caused by paronymy.

## **Results**

Terminology, as the set of terms specific to a particular field of science, technology, or the arts, constitutes one of the most dynamic and

sensitive subsystems of a language's lexical structure. Economic terminology encapsulates the complex processes and phenomena of economic life, financial relations, management, and international trade. The principal requirements for terms include adherence to the norms of standard language, unambiguity, precision, systematic organisation, and stylistic neutrality. Observance of these criteria is essential for effective professional communication. However, in the actual functioning of terminological systems – particularly those undergoing active development, such as Ukrainian economic terminology – phenomena arise that deviate from ideal standards. One such phenomenon is paronymy.

According to the dictionary by D.H. Hrynchyshyn & O.A. Serbenska (1986), “paronyms” (from the Greek *para* – near, beside and *onyma* – name) are words that are similar in sound and morphemic structure but differ in lexical meaning. They often belong to the same part of speech and share a common root, which causes their external similarity and increases the risk of incorrect usage. In his research, O. Ponomariv (2011) emphasised that paronyms require special attention, as confusing them leads to serious lexical errors, distorting or obscuring the intended meaning. In terminology, paronymy acquires particular relevance. While in general literary language, the misuse of paronyms may result in misunderstanding or even humorous effects, in scientific and professional discourse – where precision is paramount – the consequences may be considerably more serious. The incorrect use of a paronym can result in:

- distortion of meaning in scientific or analytical texts;
- misinterpretation of financial reports, contracts, or regulatory documents;
- errors in calculations and forecasts;
- the adoption of flawed managerial decisions;
- legal disputes.

The sources of paronymy in terminological systems may include both internal linguistic mechanisms (word formation, particularly through suffixation) and external influences (borrowing, calquing). Both factors significantly affect Ukrainian economic terminology. The active generation of new terms from Ukrainian roots using particular term-forming models – for example, suffixes such as *-н(ий)*, *-ов(ий)*, *-ськ(ий)*, *-ичн(ий)* / *-ічн(ий)* – frequently results in the emergence of formally similar units, as noted by A.S. Dyakov *et al.* (2000). Simultaneously, the vigorous process of borrowing from English, along with the influence of Russian (particularly via calques or words that appear similar but differ in meaning between Ukrainian and Russian), also contributes to paronymic errors. Research into paronymy in economic terminology thus necessitates not only the identification of paronymic pairs, but also a thorough analysis of their semantic structures, valency properties (collocational compatibility), stylistic characteristics, and pragmatic function within specific communicative contexts in the economic domain.

The analysis of modern resources – including electronic databases of Ukrainian legislation such as Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine (n.d.), Liga Zakon (n.d.), and Normative Acts of Ukraine (NAU) (n.d.), as well as electronic economic dictionaries such as Economic Dictionary Online (n.d.), S.M. Ribachok *et al.* (2023), Y.M. Dvorak (2018) – revealed a significant number of paronymic pairs that are either actively used or have the potential to be misused in economic discourse. The identified pairs can be categorised according to various criteria. From the perspective of word formation structure, common pairs are those that differ in:

Suffixes: *економіс (економічний)* (relating to economics as a discipline, national economy, or industry) – *економіскал (економний)* (thrifty, requiring minimal expenditure); *credit (кредитний)* (pertaining to credit or loans) – *кредитор (кредиторський)* (relating to a creditor, i.e.,

an individual or institution that provide credit); *financial* (фінансовий) (relating to finance or monetary circulation) – *financier* (фінансистський) (pertaining to a financier, a specialist in finance); *investment* (інвестиційний) (concerning investments or capital expenditure) – *investor* (інвесторський) (pertaining to an investor, i.e., an individual or institution that makes investments); *loss-making* (збитковий) (causing financial losses) – *loss-prone* (збитківний) (likely to cause losses; infrequent in usage, mainly colloquial, and may be mistakenly used in place of “loss-making”); *profitable* (прибутковий) (generating profit) – *profit-driven* (прибутківний) (motivated by profit; not a technical economic term but may be confused due to similarity); *cash* (готівковий) (conducted in cash) – *cash* (готівка) (money in the form of banknotes and coins; although different parts of speech, their shared root may cause confusion in usage); *monetary* (грошовий) (pertaining to money) – *wealthy* (грошовитий) (possessing substantial wealth; not a formal term); *tax-related* (податковий) (relating to taxes) – *pliable* (податливий) (easily influenced; erroneous substitution due to phonetic resemblance).

Prefixes: *expenses* (витрати) (money or material assets spent on something) – *costs* (затрати) (expenses specifically related to production; often treated as synonyms, but “costs” are more narrowly defined); *payment* (оплата) (the act of paying for something) – *disbursement* (виплата) (payment of wages, fees, or reimbursements); *provide* (надати) (to grant access or ownership) – *sell* (продати) (to transfer ownership in exchange for money).

Root similarities (often due to borrowing or historical variation): *company* (компанія) (a commercial or industrial organisation) – *campaign* (кампанія) (a coordinated series of actions, e.g. *marketing campaign* (маркетингова кампанія), *election campaign* (виборча кампанія)); *subscriber* (абонент) (a person using a subscription service) – *subscription* (абонемент) (the right to use a service over a set

period); *effect* (ефект) (the result or consequence of actions; also impression) – *affection* (афект) (a state of intense emotional arousal; not an economic term but may be confused due to foreign origin and similar sound); *addressee* (адресат) (the recipient) – *sender* (адресант) (the one who sends); *diplomat* (дипломат) (an official in diplomacy) – *diploma holder* (дипломант) (a person awarded a diploma, usually for an achievement).

Borrowed terms versus Ukrainian equivalents/pseudo-equivalents: *leasing* (лізинг) (long-term rental of machinery or equipment) – *rental* (оренда) (general property rental; leasing is a specific subtype); *management* (менеджмент) (organisational and production management, a structured set of principles) – *administration* (управління) (the broader activity of organising and coordinating processes). This list is not exhaustive but illustrates the diversity of paronymic pairs that pose potential challenges in economic communication. It is important to note that some of these pairs are classic paronyms (formally similar but semantically distinct), while others represent terms of different degrees of generality (e.g. *leasing* (лізинг) vs. *rental* (оренда)) or belong to different stylistic registers or parts of speech, yet may be confused due to a shared root or phonetic resemblance.

The analysis of the collected material, based on the aforementioned legislative databases, showed that among the identified paronymic pairs, the most frequently occurring ones – those most likely to be used incorrectly in economic communication – are listed and examined below in descending order of frequency. To gain a deeper understanding of the issue, it is necessary to examine these pairs in more detail, with particular attention to their semantic and functional distinctions.

*Company* (компанія) – *campaign* (кампанія). This pair of paronyms, derived from different linguistic roots, are often confused due to their similar pronunciation and orthography. *Company* (компанія) refers to an enterprise,

firm, or organisation engaged in production, trade, finance, or other commercial activities. It can also denote a group of people spending time together. For example: “insurance company (страхова компанія)”, “oil company (нафтова компанія)”, “to establish a company (заснувати компанію)”, “company stocks (акції компанії)”. *Campaign* (кампанія), by contrast, denotes a series of organised activities pursued to achieve a specific goal within a defined timeframe. For instance: “advertising campaign (рекламна кампанія)”, “marketing campaign (маркетингова кампанія)”, “election campaign (виборча кампанія)”, “sowing campaign (посівна кампанія)”, “information campaign (інформаційна кампанія)”. A typical error occurs when *company* (компанія) is incorrectly used in the sense of *campaign*, as in “advertising company (рекламна компанія)” instead of “advertising campaign (рекламна кампанія)”, or vice versa. This indicates a lack of awareness of the distinct semantic roles of the two terms.

*Address* (адрес) – *address* (адреса). This paronymic pair distinguishes between a technical and a general term related to location or identification. *Address* (адрес) (masculine noun) is primarily used in technical contexts in modern Ukrainian, for example: “IP address (ІР-адрес)”, “email address (електронний адрес)”. Historically, it was also used to mean a formal written greeting or congratulatory message, such as (“welcome address (вітальний адрес)”). *Address* (адреса) (feminine noun) refers to a person’s place of residence or the location of an institution; it also denotes the information written on a postal item indicating to whom and where it should be sent. Additionally, it may refer to a sequence of characters used to identify a resource in a computer network (e.g. “web address (веб-адреса)”, “mailing address (поштова адреса)”). Examples include: “legal address (юридична адреса)”, “mailing address (поштова адреса)”, “home address (домашня адреса)”, “web address (веб-адреса)”. The use of *address* (адрес) instead of *address* (адреса) to

mean “location” or “postal label” is non-standard in contemporary Ukrainian, except in certain technical contexts (such as “IP address (ІР-адрес)”). This distinction is important in business correspondence and electronic communication.

*Spectacular* (ефектний) – *effective* (ефективний). This pair of paronyms distinguishes between external impact and actual effectiveness. *Spectacular* (ефектний) is an adjective used to describe something visually impressive, striking, or showy. For example: “spectacular appearance (ефектний вигляд)”, “spectacular presentation (ефектна презентація)”, “spectacular design (ефектний дизайн)”. *Effective* (ефективний) is an adjective that refers to something that produces the desired result, is efficient or achieves an aim with minimal cost or effort. For example: “effective solution (ефективне рішення)”, “effective use of resources (ефективне використання ресурсів)”, “effective management (ефективне управління)”, “effective method (ефективний метод)”. Although both words originate from the Latin *effectus*, their meanings differ significantly. *Spectacular* (ефектний) refers to visual or emotional impact, whereas *effective* (ефективний) relates to results and efficiency. Confusing a *spectacular* (ефектного) decision (one that looks impressive) with an *effective* (ефективним) decision (one that delivers results) is a serious error in economic and managerial terminology.

*Economic* (економічний) – *economical* (економічний). This is one of the most classic and widespread paronymic pairs. *Economic* is an adjective that denotes a connection with the discipline of economics in its various dimensions:

- as a science: “economic theory (економічна теорія)”, “economic analysis (економічний аналіз)”, “economic education (економічна освіта)”;
- as the economy of a country, region, or sector: “economic development (економічний розвиток)”, “economic crisis (економічна криза)”, “economic policy (економічна політика)”, “economic system (економічна система)”;

► as a set of socio-economic relations: “economic formation (економічна формація)”, “economic laws (економічні закони)”.

*Economical (економний)* means that which allows for saving, and preserving resources. Synonyms: *frugal (ощадливий)*, *sparing (заощадливий)*, *thrifty (бережливий)*. It is used in relation to individuals (e.g. “an economical householder (економний господар)”) as well as to processes, technologies, and systems (e.g. “economical use of resources (економне використання ресурсів)”, “economical operating mode (економний режим роботи)”, “economical technology (економна технологія)”). Errors arise when *economical (економний)* is incorrectly substituted with *economic (економічний)* in the sense of “frugal (ощадливий)”, such as in “economic use of fuel (економічне використання палива)” (should be: *economical (економне)* use). While the phrase “economic person (економічна людина)” may theoretically refer to “someone engaged in the field of economics (людина, яка займається економікою)”, it is more frequently misused in contexts where frugality is appropriate – leading to ambiguity regarding whether thriftiness or academic affiliation is implied.

*Credit (кредитний)* – creditor-related (кредиторський). This pair pertains to financial terminology, distinguishing between the concept of credit itself and that relating to the subject of the creditor, i.e. the party extending credit. *Credit* is used as an adjective in the context of loans or credit arrangements, for example: “credit agreement (кредитний договір)”, “credit line (кредитна лінія)”, “credit risk (кредитний ризик)”, “credit history (кредитна історія)”, “credit card (кредитна картка)”, “credit resources (кредитні ресурси)”, “credit union (кредитна спілка)”. *Creditor-related (кредиторський)* refers to the entity that has issued the loan. For example: “creditor debt (кредиторська заборгованість)”, meaning the debt owed by a company to its suppliers, contractors, and other entities; “creditor claims (кредиторські вимоги)”.

Incorrect use of these paronyms constitutes a serious linguistic error that can lead to substantial misunderstandings in financial reporting and legal documentation. For example, the terminological phrase “creditor agreement (кредиторський договір)” instead of “credit agreement (кредитний договір)” is incorrect. Similarly, the phrase “credit debt (кредитна заборгованість)” may be broadly understood as debt related to credit, but the terminologically accurate expression for debt owed to a party is “creditor debt (кредиторська заборгованість)”. Distinguishing these terms is essential for ensuring clarity in the expression of financial obligations.

*Investment (інвестиційний)* – investor (інвесторський). Like the previous pair, these paronyms differentiate between the object (*investment (інвестиція)*) and the subject (*investor (інвестор)*). *Investment (інвестиційний)*, as an adjective, refers to matters pertaining to capital expenditure aimed at generating profit, for example: “investment project (інвестиційний проєкт)”, “investment climate (інвестиційний клімат)”, “investment fund (інвестиційний фонд)”, “investment activity (інвестиційна діяльність)”, “investment attractiveness (інвестиційна привабливість)”, “investment portfolio (інвестиційний портфель)”. *Investor (інвесторський)* is an adjective, denotes attributes linked to the investor – the individual or entity making the investments). Examples include: “investor rights (інвесторські права)”, “investor risks (інвесторські ризики)” (risks borne by the investor), “investor capital (інвесторський капітал)” (capital owned by investors).

Incorrect terminology, such as “investor project (інвесторський проєкт)” in place of “investment project (інвестиційний проєкт)”, distorts meaning. The project concerns investment activity, not ownership by the investor, though the latter may initiate or finance it. Clear terminological differentiation is therefore critical for the accurate description of investment processes and relationships.

*Valuable* (цінний) – *pricey* (ціновий). This paronymic pair is important for distinguishing between the concepts of value or significance and those related to pricing. *Valuable* (цінний) is an adjective that describes something of great worth, importance, or usefulness. For example: “*valuable experience* (цінний досвід)”, “*valuable equipment* (цінне обладнання)”, “*securities* (цінні папери)” (акції, облігації тощо), “*valuable resource* (цінний ресурс)”. *Pricey* (ціновий) is an adjective referring to price or pricing indicators. For example: “*pricing policy* (цінова політика)”, “*price shock* (ціновий шок)”, “*price index* (ціновий індекс)”, “*price regulation* (цінове регулювання)”. Confusion often arises due to the shared root “цін-”. It is essential to distinguish between *valuable* (цінний) (denoting worth, importance, or utility) and *pricey* (ціновий) (pertaining to cost or pricing mechanisms). Phrases such as “*pricey experience* (ціновий досвід)” or “*valuable policy* (цінна політика)” are incorrect. This distinction is especially critical in financial terminology – e.g. “*securities* (цінні папери)” versus “*price index* (ціновий індекс)”.

*Productive* (продуктивний) – *food, grocery* (продуктовий). This pair of paronyms distinguishes between concepts related to work efficiency and those referring to specific goods, especially food products. *Productive* (продуктивний) is an adjective describing something that yields high output, is fruitful, or is capable of generating value. Examples include: “*productive worker* (продуктивний працівник)”, “*labor productivity* (продуктивність праці)”, “*productive period* (продуктивний період)”, “*productive use* (продуктивне використання)”. *Food, grocery* (продуктовий) is an adjective referring specifically to food products or goods, particularly in the context of production or retail. Examples include: “*grocery store* (продуктовий магазин)”, “*grocery basket* (продуктовий кошик)”, “*grocery stocks* (продуктові запаси)”, “*grocery line* (продуктова лінійка)”. *Productive* (продуктивний) relates to efficiency and output in a broad sense, whereas *food, grocery*

(продуктовий) refers specifically to food-stuffs or grocery items. Using “*grocery worker* (продуктовий працівник)” instead of “*productive worker* (продуктивний працівник)”, or “*productive line* (продуктивна лінійка)” instead of “*grocery line* (продуктова лінійка)”, constitutes a misuse of terms. In economic discourse, “*productivity* (продуктивність)” is a key indicator of efficiency, while “*food, grocery* (продуктовий)” is used to describe a type of product.

It may be assumed that the first four pairs represent the most frequently encountered paronyms in contemporary Ukrainian economic terminology in terms of potential confusion. The analysis of these and other pairs indicates that the key semantic distinctions between economic paronyms lie in differentiating: concepts that are formally similar but semantically distinct: *company* (компанія) – *campaign* (кампанія); areas of application or shades of meaning: *address* (адрес) – *address* (адреса), *spectacular* (ефектний) – *effective* (ефективний), *valuable* (цінний) – *pricey* (ціновий), *productive* (продуктивний) – *food, grocery* (продуктовий); a general concept and its specific manifestation or characteristic: *economic* (економічний) – *economical* (економний); attributes related to the object vs those related to the subject: *credit* (кредитний) – *creditor-related* (кредиторський), *investment* (інвестиційний) – *investor* (інвесторський); a process or phenomenon and its defining attribute: *economic* (економіка) – *economistic* (економічний).

Functionally, these paronyms are distinct in their respective domains and collocational behaviour. Deviating from these norms results in communication breakdowns. As for the causes underlying the emergence and spread of paronymic errors in economic discourse, it should be noted that these mistakes arise from a combination of linguistic and extralinguistic factors. Linguistic factors include: formal similarity, where phonetic and graphic resemblance, especially between words sharing a root and differing only by a suffix or prefix (e.g. *credit*

(кредитний) – creditor (кредиторський), expenses (витрати) – costs (затрати), leads to confusion; word-formation activity, whereby intensive generation of new terms using productive morphological patterns – particularly adjective suffixes such as -н(ий), -ов(ий), -ськ(ий), -ичн(ий) / ічн(ий) – produces clusters of formally similar terms with subtle semantic differences; semantic proximity, where some paronyms refer to closely related concepts, as in investment (інвестиційний) – investor (інвесторський), financial (фінансовий) – financier (фінансистський), increasing the risk of misuse; interlingual interference, notably from Russian, which has historically exerted significant influence on Ukrainian economic terminology. Some Ukrainian paronyms have counterparts in Russian, where their distinction may be less well defined or have a different level of specificity, for example, Rus. *Экономический* (економічний) / *экономичный* (економічний). There is also the possibility of calquing Russian structures or inaccurately transferring meanings from Russian words to their Ukrainian equivalents. Additionally, the influence of English – especially the extensive borrowing of English terms such as *management* (менеджмент), *marketing* (маркетинг), *leasing* (лізинг) – and their adaptation into Ukrainian can also give rise to paronymy, particularly in the formation of derived terms, such as *marketing* (маркетинг). Moreover, the similarity between certain English and Ukrainian words (often due to shared Latin roots) may provoke errors (e.g. *company* (компанія) / *campaign* (кампанія)). Another contributing factor is the insufficient lexicographical development of professional resources; the lack of clear definitions, usage examples, and specific markers distinguishing paronyms in some specialised dictionaries complicates accurate acquisition, as noted by L. Lyshychenko (2009).

Extralinguistic factors include: the rapid development of the economic sector, which involves the emergence of new concepts, tools, and technologies. This requires immediate

terminological support, which is not always provided in a systematic or standardised way. The result is terminological variability and inconsistency, leading to frequent errors; an insufficient level of linguistic training among professionals. Training programmes for economists, financiers, and managers often fail to place adequate emphasis on professional language development and terminological competence; haste and inattentiveness. In a fast-paced business environment, specialists often draft documents or speak under time constraints, increasing the likelihood of incorrect word choice; the influence of mass media and the internet. The misuse of economic terminology in media and online platforms can contribute to the entrenchment of erroneous patterns in public and professional discourse; Translation issues, where poor-quality translations of foreign economic literature, documentation, or software also play a role in spreading terminological errors, including paronymic confusion, as observed by V. Koval & L.I. Hladka (2012).

Understanding the aforementioned factors is essential for developing effective strategies to address the problem of paronymy in economic communication. It is equally important to recognise that the incorrect use of paronyms in economic terminology is not merely a formal linguistic error; it has practical negative consequences for professional activity, functioning as a destabilising factor in both communication and decision-making. In particular, it reduces the accuracy and clarity of communication. For example, the incorrect use of terms such as *economis* (економічний) and *economical* (економіний), *credit* (кредитний) and *creditor* (кредиторський), *company* (компанія) and *campaign* (кампанія) introduces ambiguity and semantic imprecision. The listener or reader is forced either to exert additional effort to interpret the message or may misunderstand the information entirely.

Another negative consequence of the incorrect use of paronyms in economic texts is

the potential for misunderstanding and the creation of communication barriers, as imprecision can lead to complete breakdowns in communication between professionals – especially when they represent different departments, organisations, or even countries (in the case of international communication). This hinders collaboration and complicates the coordination of actions. A particularly serious issue arises with errors in data analysis and interpretation, as misunderstanding terms in financial reports, analytical reviews, and statistical data can lead to misleading conclusions about a company's financial position, operational efficiency, market trends, and more. For example, an incorrect or imprecise understanding of the concept of accounts payable could significantly distort the actual picture of financial liabilities.

Another serious consequence of paronym misuse in economic texts is the risk of ineffective or erroneous managerial decision-making. It is important to note that decisions in economics and management are primarily based on information analysis. If this information is distorted due to incorrect terminology (particularly paronyms), the resulting decisions may prove to be suboptimal or even damaging. For instance, an inaccurate assessment of a project's *investment* (*інвестиційної*) attractiveness due to a misunderstanding of key terms could result in missed profitable opportunities or, conversely, investment in an unviable venture.

Within this context, it is also important to highlight the associated legal and financial risks. In official documents – such as contracts, agreements, statutes, and regulations – terminological precision is critically important. The misuse of paronyms in economic texts (e.g. *recipient* (*адресат*) / *sender* (*адресант*), *payment* (*оплата*) / *disbursement* (*виплата*)) can lead to legal disputes, financial claims, and material losses. Moreover, ambiguity in the wording of a *loan agreement* caused by terminological inaccuracy may have serious consequences for both parties. Another notable consequence of

incorrect paronym usage is its detrimental effect on professional credibility. The systematic misuse of specialised terminology reflects a low level of professional culture and linguistic competence, which may negatively affect a specialist's reputation and limit career progression.

Thus, the issue of paronymy in economic terminology extends beyond purely linguistic interest and constitutes a practical challenge that directly influences the quality and effectiveness of economic activity. In her study, L. Symonenko (1991) emphasised that the precision and unambiguity of terms are essential for ensuring effective professional communication and mutual understanding among specialists. Paronymy undermines this clarity and introduces risk at every stage of professional interaction.

Accordingly, addressing the issue of incorrect paronym usage in the economic sphere requires a comprehensive approach, aimed at enhancing the linguistic culture of all participants in professional communication and refining the terminology system itself. Based on the analysis conducted, the following recommendations have been formulated for economic professionals. Based on the findings of the study, several recommendations have been formulated to enhance the linguistic competence of economic professionals: develop individual language awareness and competence through regular reading of specialist literature, use of dictionaries, and consistent self-monitoring. Every professional should recognise the importance of accurate terminology and strive to improve their usage. Select vocabulary for professional texts carefully and attentively, avoiding haste in the preparation of key documents or presentations. Special attention should be paid to terminology in cases where paronymic confusion is possible. Use reference resources when in doubt about the meaning or usage of a term. It is essential to consult authoritative dictionaries and reference materials to ensure precision. Proofread and edit important documents – such as reports, contracts, and

analytical papers – to identify and correct potential linguistic errors, including paronymic ones. This practice reflects a high level of language competence. Establish corporate standards for terminology use where possible. Large companies and institutions may benefit from developing internal glossaries and style guides to promote consistency and accuracy in terminology, thus supporting the ongoing development of staff language skills.

It is important to note that the implementation of the above recommendations requires joint efforts from linguists, lecturers of economic disciplines, and practising professionals. Only a comprehensive approach can minimise the negative impact of paronymy on professional communication in the economic sphere. Such an approach will not only contribute to enhancing the linguistic culture of economic professionals but also have a direct positive effect on the accuracy of economic information and the effectiveness of managerial decisions at all levels. Raising awareness of the importance of precise terminology and actively addressing linguistic inaccuracies is a crucial step towards ensuring the stability and transparency of economic processes in contemporary society.

## **Discussion**

The findings of this study on the phenomenon of paronymy in Ukrainian economic texts confirm both the complexity of the phenomenon and its potential impact on the accuracy of professional communication. The identified paronymic pairs revealed a significant degree of semantic overlap or co-occurrence in similar contexts, which may lead to misunderstandings. For a more in-depth analysis of the observed patterns, it would be appropriate to consider methodological approaches proposed in contemporary linguistics, particularly those based on distributional semantics.

In the context of quantitative properties and aspectual interpretation, M. Andreou & R. Lieber (2020) demonstrated in their research

that these features are not strictly determined by the form of nominalisation, but rather depend significantly on factors such as temporal and quantitative modifiers. This research is particularly relevant as it highlights the decisive role of context in semantic differentiation and the potential confusion caused by paronyms in Ukrainian economic terminology. Notably, as stated in the study of G. Boleda (2020), distributional semantics offers multidimensional, gradable, and empirically induced representations of words that successfully capture different meanings in language. This supports the potential of such an approach for the detailed analysis of semantic nuances between paronyms, which is highly significant for this area of study.

Turning to diachronic analysis, the usage patterns of linguistic units forming paronymic relationships are illustrated in the study by E. Cartier & R. Huyghe (2021). By examining French prefixes that form the superlative degree, the researchers identified the persistence of affixal redundancy and cases of synonymy among competing lexical forms. Although their study focuses on affix competition, similar principles can be applied to understanding the challenges of distinguishing and accurately using paronyms, which often coexist with a high degree of semantic overlap. This underscores the need for a comprehensive approach to the study of paronymy – one that combines both qualitative and quantitative methods and takes into account the dynamic interaction between word form, core meaning, and a wide range of contextual factors.

To address challenges such as distinguishing between formally and semantically similar words, methods of distributional semantics are proving highly effective. The study by K. Denistia *et al.* (2022) demonstrated that vector space models can be used to quantitatively assess subtle semantic differences between closely related linguistic units. Measuring semantic similarity – for instance, through cosine similarity – reveals a lower degree of closeness between

word pairs that differ in formal composition, thus indicating semantic differentiation. These quantitative indicators reflect the existence of semantic specialisation even among superficially similar words, a finding further supported by the high accuracy of automatic classification. This highlights the considerable potential of distributional semantics for in-depth analysis of semantic nuances between paronyms in any type of text, including economic discourse.

In addition, vector representation models of words are effectively used to quantify semantic similarity and differentiation among linguistic units. A valuable contribution in this area was the study of M. Guzmán Naranjo & O. Bonami (2023), whose approach to studying “rivalry in word formation” can be applied analogously to the analysis of the phenomenon of paronymy. In this context, words with similar forms may compete for use in particular situations, sometimes leading to confusion. This methodology would not only allow the identification of paronyms but also help determine the degree of their semantic overlap – an aspect that is critically important for understanding potential communicative risks.

A further analysis of the phenomenon of affix rivalry is presented in detail by R. Huyghe & R. Varvara (2023). This linguistic phenomenon is characterised by its gradient nature and the multiplicity of factors influencing the differentiation of competing forms. The researchers note that distinctions between such forms often emerge as tendencies rather than clear-cut boundaries, thus requiring quantitative assessment to accurately determine degrees of rivalry. The use of similar theoretical and methodological approaches is particularly valuable for analysing Ukrainian paronyms, as it enables the quantitative measurement of their subtle semantic differences.

The concept of affix rivalry developed by A. Nagano (2023) is especially relevant in the context of studying paronymy in Ukrainian economic texts. Her research demonstrates

that competing forms may occupy their own ecological niches, with their distinctions more often appearing as trends rather than precise demarcations. This approach, which emphasises purely semantic differentiation, can be employed to quantitatively assess fine semantic nuances between paronyms in Ukrainian terminology. It helps determine the degree of their semantic overlap and the potential communicative risks – both of which are critically important for understanding factors that may destabilise professional communication.

In terms of practical application, the methodological approach proposed by B. Schirakowski (2020), which focused on the analysis of semantic distinctions and the functional load of word-formation models, may be adapted for the study of the phenomenon of paronymy in Ukrainian economic terminology. An examination of argument structures and the interpretative preferences of paronymic terms can help identify the causes of destabilisation in professional communication, while the use of such linguistic tools may contribute to resolving terminological confusion within the economic domain.

Also relevant is the study by M. Wauquier *et al.* (2020), which confirmed the existence of semantic distinctions between nominalisations based on distributional analysis, partially determined by their degree of technicality. These findings are particularly important as they demonstrate how even subtle semantic differences, when measured using distributional methods, may reflect varying levels of specialisation or technicality – an essential consideration in distinguishing paronyms in highly specialised economic texts.

It is also worth noting that the concept of semantic transparency holds considerable relevance in the analysis of paronymy. Transparency – understood as the extent to which a word’s meaning can be inferred from its constituent parts – is frequently a graduated notion rather than a binary one. R. Varvara *et al.* (2021)

demonstrated how distributional semantic methods – characterising word meanings based on their usage contexts – can empirically measure semantic transparency. Their study highlighted that metrics such as cosine similarity can reveal overall semantic similarity, while distributional inclusion can uncover more nuanced relationships, such as when one word is used within a subset of the contexts of another, indicating semantic specialisation. Moreover, their findings emphasise the interaction between word frequency and semantic transparency, showing how relative frequency may lead to “lexical splitting” or “semantic drift”, reducing a word’s transparency concerning its original meaning. This comprehensive approach to semantic transparency, and its measurement using corpus-based distributional methods, provides a valuable foundation for understanding subtle semantic distinctions and potential confusion among paronyms.

Thus, a comprehensive analysis of contemporary linguistic research – particularly in the fields of distributional semantics, affix rivalry, and semantic transparency – confirms the considerable potential of quantitative methods for gaining a deeper understanding of the fine semantic distinctions between paronyms in Ukrainian economic terminology and for addressing issues related to their incorrect usage.

## **Conclusions**

As a result of the conducted research, it has been established that the phenomenon of paronymy is a significant problem in modern Ukrainian economic terminology. Furthermore, several common paronymic pairs have been identified and analysed (e.g. *economic* (економічний) / *economical* (економний), *credit* (кредитний) / *creditor* (кредиторський), *investment* (інвестиційний) / *investor* (інвесторський), *financial* (фінансовий) / *financier* (фінансистський), *company* (компанія) / *campaign* (кампанія), etc.), which are often misused in professional communication. The classification of these pairs

revealed that they are predominantly formed through processes of suffixation or prefixation, or as a result of borrowing. The analysis of the semantic and functional characteristics of the identified paronyms confirmed the existence of clear differences in their meanings and contexts of usage. The primary distinctions concern the differentiation between concepts related to the object and subject of an action, general concepts and their specific attributes, as well as the distinction between terms denoting different, albeit formally similar, economic phenomena. The emergence and spread of errors in the use of paronyms are facilitated by a combination of linguistic factors (formal and semantic similarity, productive word-formation processes, interlingual interference) and extralinguistic factors (the dynamic development of the industry, insufficient linguistic training of specialists, media influence, translation challenges). The incorrect use of paronyms significantly reduces the effectiveness of professional communication in the economic field, as it leads to semantic inaccuracies, misunderstandings, and errors in data interpretation, and may result in the adoption of inadequate managerial decisions, with potentially serious legal and financial consequences. Such errors act as a destabilising factor in professional interaction. Overcoming the problem of paronymy requires targeted efforts from professionals in the field of economics, namely: enhancing individual linguistic competence, paying close attention to terminological precision, and making active use of reference materials.

Thus, paronymy in contemporary Ukrainian economic texts represents a genuine communicative barrier that must be acknowledged and addressed. Improving the linguistic culture of economists, refining terminological practices, and advancing lexicographical work is essential for ensuring accuracy, clarity, and effectiveness in professional communication within Ukraine’s economic sector. Future research directions include the quantitative analysis

of paronymic error frequency across different genres of economic writing, a deeper investigation of the role of interlingual contact in the emergence of paronymy, and the development of digital tools for the automatic detection and correction of paronymic errors in contemporary Ukrainian economic texts.

### Acknowledgements

The authors express their sincere gratitude to colleagues from the National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Vinnytsia National Agrarian University, and Adam

Mickiewicz University, Poznań, for their valuable discussions and for proofreading the text during the preparation of this article. Any opinions expressed, as well as any remaining errors, are solely the responsibility of the authors.

### Funding

This research was conducted without external funding.

### Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest relevant to this article.

### References

- [1] Andreou, M., & Lieber, R. (2020). Aspectual and quantificational properties of deverbal conversion and -ing nominalizations: The power of context. *English Language and Linguistics*, 24(2), 333-363. doi: [10.1017/S1360674319000108](https://doi.org/10.1017/S1360674319000108).
- [2] Boleda, G. (2020). Distributional semantics and linguistic theory. *Annual Review of Linguistics*, 6, 213-234. doi: [10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030431](https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-linguistics-011619-030431).
- [3] Cartier, E., & Huyghe, R. (2021). Affix competition in diachrony: The case of high-degree prefixes in French. *Linx*, 82, 1-26. doi: [10.4000/linx.8078](https://doi.org/10.4000/linx.8078).
- [4] Denistia, K., Shafaei-Bajestan, E., & Baayen, R.H. (2022). Exploring semantic differences between the Indonesian prefixes PE- and PEN- using a vector space model. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory*, 18(3), 573-598. doi: [10.1515/cllt-2020-0023](https://doi.org/10.1515/cllt-2020-0023).
- [5] Dvorak, Y.M. (2018). *Economic dictionary*. Retrieved from <https://naurok.com.ua/slovník-ekonomichnyy-slovník-15956.html>.
- [6] Dyakov, A.S., Kiyak, T.R., & Kudelko, Z.B. (2000). *Fundamentals of term formation: Semantic and sociolinguistic aspects*. Kyiv: KM Academia.
- [7] Economic Dictionary Online. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://surl.li/okbxjy>.
- [8] Guzmán Naranjo, M., & Bonami, O. (2023). A distributional assessment of rivalry in word formation. *Word Structure*, 16(1), 87-114. doi: [10.3366/word.2023.0222](https://doi.org/10.3366/word.2023.0222).
- [9] Honcharov, S., & Kushnir, H.B. (2009). *Explanatory dictionary of an economist*. Kyiv: Centre for Educational Literature.
- [10] Hrynchyshyn, D.H., & Serbenska, O.A. (1986). *Dictionary of paronyms of the Ukrainian language*. Kyiv: Soviet School.
- [11] Huyghe, R., & Varvara, R. (2023). Affix rivalry: Theoretical and methodological challenges. *Word Structure*, 16(1), 1-23. doi: [10.3366/word.2023.0218](https://doi.org/10.3366/word.2023.0218).
- [12] Isaeva, E. (2019). Metaphor in terminology: Finding tools for efficient professional communication. *Fachsprache*, 41(S1), 65-86. doi: [10.24989/fs.v41iS1.1766](https://doi.org/10.24989/fs.v41iS1.1766).
- [13] Kharchenko, I. (2020). Peculiarities of the methodology of forming the culture of professional communication of future economists in the conditions of the information and educational environment of higher education institutions. *Scientific Bulletin Mykolaiv National University named after V.O. Sukhomlynskyi. Pedagogical Sciences*, 1(68), 287-292. doi: [10.33310/2518-7813-2020-68-1-287-292](https://doi.org/10.33310/2518-7813-2020-68-1-287-292).

- [14] Koval, V.V., & Hladka, L.I. (2012). [Conceptual model of professional training of specialists in economic cybernetics](#). *Bulletin of the East European University of Economics and Management. Series: Economics and Management*, 2(12), 64-75.
- [15] Liga Zakon. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://ips.ligazakon.net/>.
- [16] Lyshychenko, L.A. (2009). [Lexicology of the modern Ukrainian language: Semantic structure of words](#). Kharkiv: Osnova.
- [17] Mykhailenko-Zoto, O.O. (2019). Principles of differentiation of paronyms in texts of different styles. *Mova*, 32, 55-61. [doi: 10.18524/2307-4558.2019.32.187798](#).
- [18] Nagano, A. (2023). Affixal rivalry and its purely semantic resolution among English derived adjectives. *Journal of Linguistics*, 59(3), 499-530. [doi: 10.1017/S0022226722000147](#).
- [19] Normative acts of Ukraine (NAU). (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://nau.ua/>.
- [20] Ponomariv, O.D. (2011). [The Ukrainian word for everyone and for all](#). Kyiv: Lybid.
- [21] Ribachok, S.M., Duda, O.I., & Piatnichka, T.V. (2023). [English-Ukrainian economic glossary](#). Ternopil: Western Ukrainian National University.
- [22] Rymar, N.Yu. (2023). [Lexical errors as a negative phenomenon of a person's language culture](#). In *Agricultural education and science: Achievements, role, growth factors: Innovative psychological, pedagogical, linguistic and legal principles of agricultural science in the context of intercultural agricultural communication: Proceedings of the international scientific and practical conference (BNAU)* (pp. 33-35). Bila Tserkva: Bila Tserkva National University.
- [23] Schirakowski, B. (2020). (No) competition between deverbal nouns and nominalized infinitives in Spanish. *Borealis: An International Journal of Hispanic Linguistics*, 9(2), 257-283. [doi: 10.7557/1.9.2.5215](#).
- [24] Shelepkova, I.M. (2021). [From term to economic terminology of modern Ukrainian language](#). In M.V. Mamych (Ed.), *Modern philological science: Current issues and vectors of development* (pp. 247-276). Lviv-Toruń: Liga-Press.
- [25] Stanishchevska, O. (2024). [Verbal paronyms in Ukrainian and Polish languages in the context of translation studies](#). (Master's thesis, Khmelnytskyi National University, Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine).
- [26] Sukhyi, O., & Lysa, N. (2025). Cognate adjectival paronyms in socio-economic terminological systems of Ukrainian and English. *Current Issues of Linguistics and Translation Studies*, 33, 32-36.
- [27] Symonenko, L.O. (1991). [Formation of Ukrainian biological terminology](#). Kyiv: Scientific Thought.
- [28] Tovstenko, V.R. (2021). [Dynamic processes in the modern Ukrainian economic terminological system](#). *New Philology*, 2(81), 155-163.
- [29] Varvara, R., Lapesa, G., & Padó, S. (2021). Grounding semantic transparency in context: A distributional semantic study on German event nominalizations. *Morphology*, 31, 409-446. [doi: 10.1007/s11525-021-09382-w](#).
- [30] Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine. (n.d.). Retrieved from <https://zakon.rada.gov.ua/laws>.
- [31] Wauquier, M., Hathout, N., & Fabre, C. (2020). Semantic discrimination of technicality in French nominalizations. *Journal of Word Formation*, 4(2), 100-121. [doi: 10.3726/zwjw.2020.02.06](#).

## **Феномен паронімії в сучасній українській економічній термінології як фактор дестабілізації професійного спілкування**

**Надія Резнік**

Доктор економічних наук, професор  
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України  
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9588-5929>

**Олена Юмачікова**

Кандидат філологічних наук, старший викладач  
Вінницький національний аграрний університет  
21008, вул. Сонячна, 3, м. Вінниця, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6909-3175>

**Юлія Гаврилюк**

Кандидат економічних наук, доцент  
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України  
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0774-3494>

**Наталія Шевченко**

Кандидат економічних наук, доцент  
Національний університет біоресурсів і природокористування України  
03041, вул. Героїв Оборони, 15, м. Київ, Україна  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8506-1782>

**Костянтин Мазур**

Доктор філософії з літературознавства, доцент  
Університет імені Адама Міцкевича  
61-712, вул. Венявського, 1, м. Познань, Польща  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3040-3471>

**Анотація.** В умовах динамічного розвитку сучасної економічної термінології, що характеризується активним проникненням іншомовних запозичень, зростає актуальність глибокого й всебічного дослідження мовних явищ, здатних дестабілізувати процеси професійної комунікації. Одним із таких лінгвістичних феноменів є явище паронімії, що може стати причиною використання неточної й неоднозначної фахової термінології у сфері економіки. Метою статті була спроба виявлення, систематизації та лінгвістичного аналізу паронімів, що найчастіше використовуються у сучасній українській економічній термінології. У межах проведеного дослідження здійснено аналіз сучасних ресурсів, що охоплюють електронні бази даних законодавства України, і лексикографічних джерел, зокрема загальномовних тлумачних словників, а також спеціалізованих економічних словників і довідників. На основі проведеного лінгвістичного аналізу було ідентифіковано й систематизовано найбільш поширені паронімічні пари, що активно використовуються в сучасному українському економічному дискурсі. Особливу увагу приділено аналізу семантичних нюансів і функціональних особливостей виявлених паронімів, що можуть призводити до дестабілізації розуміння змісту тексту. Детально окреслено суттєві

відмінності у їхніх лексичних значеннях, сферах уживання та специфіці застосування у фахових текстах. Окрім цього, у статті здійснено спробу дослідити різноманітні чинники, що провокують активізацію паронімічних явищ у фаховій мові економістів, сприяючи дестабілізації термінологічної системи. Результати проведеного наукового дослідження можуть бути ефективно використані у процесі укладання та вдосконалення різноманітних лексикографічних праць економічного спрямування, під час розробки сучасних навчально-методичних матеріалів для студентів економічних спеціальностей, а також для цілеспрямованого підвищення рівня мовної компетентності фахівців зі сфери економіки з метою стабілізації та підвищення ефективності їхньої професійної комунікації

**Ключові слова:** комунікативна компетенція; культура мови; співзвучні слова; явище звукової подібності слів; семантика; терміносистема; функціонування