

**Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication**

Bachelor's thesis

**TERMINOLOGY OF CONTEMPORARY WARFARE
(BASED ON THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE)**

Oleksandr Zhyhalko,

4th-year student of the educational programme

'English Studies and Translation and

Two Western European Languages'

Field of science: 03 "Humanities"

Specialty: 035 "Philology"

Supervised by:

Associate Professor, PhD **Olha O. Havryliuk**

«Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології

та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 12 від 19.05.2026

Зав. кафедри _____ д. філол. н., проф. Алла БЄЛОВА

KYIV - 2026

ABSTRACT

Zhyhalko O. V. “Terminology of Contemporary Warfare (based on the English language)” – Bachelor’s thesis

This study investigates the structural, semantic, and pragmatic peculiarities of contemporary English military terminology within the framework of terminology studies. The **relevance** of the research is predetermined by the rapid evolution of warfare, the growing influence of technological innovation, and the intensified presence of military lexicon in public communication. The study focuses on the interaction between specialized vocabulary and media discourse, where terminological units perform not only nominative but also discursive and pragmatic functions.

The **aim** of the research is to establish the structural and semantic patterns of military terms actively employed in the context of contemporary armed conflicts and to determine the characteristics of their functioning in media communication. The **object** of the study is modern English military terminology, while the **subject** comprises its semantic, morphological, and pragmatic features.

The **methodological framework** combines semantic, morphological, classificatory, comparative, quantitative, and pragmatic methods, whose integrated application ensured a comprehensive and scientifically grounded analysis of the material. The research identifies four principal semantic fields: Cyberwarfare, Informational warfare, Unmanned warfare (UW), and Electronic Warfare (EW). The conducted analysis demonstrates that contemporary military terminology represents a highly dynamic and systematically organized subsystem characterized by intensive word-formation productivity, semantic flexibility, and conceptual convergence between military domains.

Particular attention is devoted to discourse analysis of military terminology in UK & US media outlets, which revealed both similarities and differences in the representation of warfare. The findings confirm that military professional words function not merely as a technical nomenclature but as a multifunctional linguistic

instrument shaping public perception of contemporary conflicts and reflecting the hybrid nature of modern warfare.

Keywords: terminology studies; military terminology; media discourse; UK & US media

АНОТАЦІЯ

Жигалко О. В. «Термінологія сучасної війни (на матеріалі англійської мови)» – Кваліфікаційна робота бакалавра

У цьому дослідженні розглядаються структурні, семантичні та прагматичні особливості сучасної англійської військової термінології з точки зору термінологічних досліджень. **Актуальність** дослідження зумовлена стрімким розвитком військової справи, зростаючим впливом технологічних інновацій та все більшою присутністю військової лексики в суспільній комунікації. Дослідження акцентує увагу на взаємодії спеціалізованої лексики та медійного дискурсу, де термінологічні одиниці виконують не лише номінативні, а й дискурсивні та прагматичні функції.

Метою дослідження є виявлення структурних та семантичних особливостей військових термінів, що активно використовуються в контексті сучасних збройних конфліктів, а також визначення особливостей їхнього функціонування в медіакомунікації. **Об'єктом** дослідження є сучасна англійська військова термінологія, а **предметом** — її семантичні, морфологічні та прагматичні особливості.

Методологічна основа поєднує семантичні, морфологічні, класифікаційні, порівняльні, кількісні та прагматичні методи, комплексне застосування яких забезпечило всебічний та науково обґрунтований аналіз матеріалу. У ході дослідження виокремлено чотири основні семантичні поля: кібервійна, інформаційна війна, безпілотні апарати та радіоелектронна боротьба. Проведений аналіз демонструє, що сучасна військова термінологія є надзвичайно динамічною та систематично організованою підсистемою, яка характеризується інтенсивною продуктивністю словотворення, семантичною гнучкістю та концептуальною суміжністю з іншими військовими сферами.

Особлива увага звернена на дискурсивний аналіз військової термінології у ЗМІ Великої Британії та США. Дослідження виявило як подібні риси, так і відмінності у висвітленні військових дій. Отримані результати підтверджують, що військова термінологія виконує не лише функцію технічної номенклатури, а

й є багатофункціональним мовним інструментом, який формує суспільне сприйняття сучасних конфліктів та відображає гібридний характер сучасних військових дій.

Ключові слова: термінологічні дослідження; військова термінологія; медійний дискурс; британські та американські ЗМІ

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	7
I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF MILITARY TERMINOLOGY.....	10
1.1. Terminology as a branch of linguistics.....	10
1.2. Military terminology in linguistic studies.....	15
1.3. Structural and semantic characteristics of terms.....	17
1.4. The notion of discourse and methods of investigation.....	19
Conclusion to Chapter I.....	26
II. STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC PECULIARITIES OF MODERN CONFLICTS MILITARY TERMS.....	28
2.1. Semantic classification.....	28
2.2. Cyber warfare terminology.....	28
2.3. Unmanned warfare (UW) terminology.....	33
2.4. Electronic warfare (EW) terminology.....	38
2.5. Informational warfare terminology.....	43
Conclusion to Chapter II.....	48
III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF MILITARY TERMS.....	54
3.1. Military terms in modern Media discourse.....	54
3.2. Coverage of modern military terms in the global media.....	54
3.2.1. Cyber and information warfare terminology.....	55
3.2.2. Unmanned and electronic warfare terminology.....	59
3.3. Military terminology in the US and UK media.....	63
Conclusion to Chapter III.....	69
CONCLUSIONS.....	71
REFERENCES.....	76
DATA SOURCES.....	84
APPENDICES.....	87

INTRODUCTION

War has always been an integral part of human existence. This innate belligerence has driven people to devote a considerable amount of time to military activities, which in turn has inevitably had an impact on all aspects of our life, including the way we are speaking everyday.

As language serves both as a tool of representation and a mechanism of conceptualization, the analysis of military terminology always offered critical insight into how conflicts were framed, understood, and communicated across different institutional and cultural contexts, thereby presenting a particular interest to linguistics scientists. Especially relevant and important it became nowadays, when in the light of the present geopolitical environment, marked by heightened international tensions, technological innovation in warfare and sporadically occurring armed conflicts across the globe, the study of modern military terminology, its evolution, and its contemporary characteristics can provide an invaluable insight not only into the professional lexicon of military people but also to the realities it seeks to represent.

Therefore, taking into account all of the above, **the relevance** of this study from an academic perspective lies in the necessity of understanding the patterns of development, structuring, and functional dynamics of modern military terminology. In addition, considering the current challenges facing humanity in the geopolitical arena, precise and systematic knowledge of military terminology is critically important for effective communication, interoperability, and strategic coordination within the military domain. Consequently, the study is of particular importance not only for linguists, but also for the evolving needs of the military sector.

The novelty of this study lies in the fact that there are very few studies in Ukraine devoted to military terminology, particularly those that examine its ongoing evolution under the influence of contemporary geopolitical transformations, hybrid forms of warfare, and the intensification of information and media-driven conflict, as well as its functional, semantic, and pragmatic peculiarities within modern English-language discourse.

The **aim** of work is to establish structural and semantic patterns of the military terminology which became widely employed in the contexts of armed conflicts, which are occurring today. In addition, the aim is to identify and assess the characteristics of the practical employment of the terminology under study in media discourse, which is of paramount importance in the information society.

The objectives of the work are as follows:

- to identify the general characteristics of ‘terminology’ and ‘military terminology’ as subjects of linguistic research;
- to examine the notion of ‘media discourse’ and identify the features and functions significant for the study of terminological units;
- to identify semantic fields into which modern military terms can be classified;
- to create a selection of terminology that has become prevalent in present-day armed conflicts and classify it according to previously identified semantic fields;
- to identify the lexical, morphological and semantic characteristics of the terms in each semantic group and conduct qualitative and quantitative analysis of these patterns;
- to conduct the qualitative and quantitative evaluation of the military terminological units that were identified in the media articles created by the publishers from the United States and Great Britain;
- to compare the pragmatic characteristics of military terms belonging to identified semantic fields in US and UK media discourse and establish similarities and differences in their employment.

The object of the research is military terminology that has become commonly used in the context of contemporary war conflicts.

The subject is semantic and morphological features of military terminology that has become commonly used in the context of contemporary war conflicts along with its pragmatic patterns.

The methods applied in the research include: the data collection; the semantic analysis; the morphological analysis; the classification analysis; the quantitative analysis; the comparison method; the pragmatic evaluation method.

The material covered in this study terms that have attained widespread usage in contemporary military discourse taken from dictionaries, online glossaries, military doctrinal documents, scientific papers, etc. In addition, the study examined articles from British and American media outlets such as The Guardian, BBC, The New York Times and CNN published in the period from 2022 to 2026. The total number of terminological units analysed in the study (including the items identified in the news publications) – **1024**.

The structure of the paper comprises an abstract in English and Ukrainian languages, a table of contents, introduction, three chapters with conclusions, general conclusions, a list of references, data sources and 9 appendices.

I. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND OF MILITARY TERMINOLOGY

1.1. Terminology as a branch of linguistics

The notion of terminology constitutes an integral object of study within linguistics. It is commonly addressed in scientific research as a component of specialised language, examined from linguistic, cognitive, and communicative perspectives.

According to Felber H. '*terminology*' can refer to: **(1)** Inter- and transdisciplinary field of knowledge dealing with concepts and their representations (terms, symbols, etc.); **(2)** Aggregate of terms, which represent the system of concepts of an individual subject field; **(3)** Publication in which the system of concepts of a subject field is represented by terms [Felber 1984, p. 1]. Given the broad range of concepts to which the term may refer to, more than one definition of terminology exists. The most universally accepted is created by Juan C. Sager: "Terminology is the study of and the field of activity concerned with the collection, description, processing and presentation of terms, i.e. lexical items belonging to specialised areas of usage of one or more languages" [Sager 1990, p. 2]. Ukrainian scholars, A. Dyakov, T. Kiyak and Z. Kudelko define '*terminology*' as "an ordered set of terms that adequately express the system of concepts of a theory describing a specific field of human knowledge or activity" [Д'яков 2000, p. 11].

As it is stated by Dr. Mohamed Chtatou terminology is a branch of lexicology and nowadays is often used as a complete synonym to the term '*lexicography*' [Chtatou 2022]. Furthermore, D. Sageder highlights the lack of a unified scholarly position concerning the scientific status of terminology. In particular, the question of whether terminology constitutes an autonomous scientific discipline or should rather be understood as a predominantly theoretical domain remains contested. Within this debate, one group of scholars (Juan Sager, Robert Dubuc, Bruno Besse, Blaise Nkwenti-Azeh) conceptualises terminology as a socially oriented practice, shaped by pragmatic demands and instrumental objectives, including political and economic considerations. An alternative group (Helmut Felber, Christer Laurén and Heribert Picht, Maria Cabré, Kyo Kageura, Johan Myking) frames terminology as a scientific

discipline whose theoretical foundations are largely derived from, and continuously informed by, neighbouring fields of knowledge [Sageder 2010, p. 126].

Despite the ambiguity, scholars are unanimous in stating that terminology as a subject is crucial in every field of our life [Felber 1984, p. 1-2] [Sager 1990, p. 1]. To prove the point, H. Felber lists 6 goals which cannot be achieved without the debatable science:

- the systematic organisation of knowledge;
- the transmission of knowledge, competences, and technologies;
- the conceptual formulation and dissemination of scientific and technical information;
- the interlingual transfer of scientific and technical discourse;
- the analytical abstraction and condensation of subject-specific information;
- the systematic storage, organisation, and retrieval of scientific and technical information [Felber 1984, p. 1].

In his “*Guide to Terminology*” H. Suonuuti states that ‘**concept**’ is the basic unit of the terminology and it can be defined as a unit of thought formed through the mental abstraction and combination of selected characteristics that are perceived as essential for the identification and representation of an object. The whole work of the branch of lexicology is devoted to analyse and structure concepts and relations between them [Suonuuti 2001, p. 12].

Concepts are abstract mental notions therefore their communication requires the use of **definitions** and **terms** as linguistic and semiotic means of expression. **Definition** is a formal statement that describes a concept whereas term is designation which refer to the concept and can be expressed by means of words (e.g., ‘*bullet*’), multi-word expressions (e.g., ‘*anti-aircraft gun*’), or alternative symbolic forms (e.g., ‘*logograms on the military map*’) [Suonuuti 2001, p. 12].

Thus, it is evident that to make a linguistic analysis of military terminology and its various patterns it is crucial to understand the specific characteristics of each of these components, especially of terms, including their processes of formation, standardisation, and management.

A word '*term*' does not possess a single unified definition and is defined diversely by every scholar. For example, M. Kocherhan defines it as “a special word or phrase that serves as a precise designation for concepts in a particular field of science” [Кочерган 2001, p. 220]. Another scholar, O. D. Ponomariv provides the following definition “[term is] a unit of a historically formed terminological system that defines a concept and its place in the system of other concepts. It is expressed by a word or phrase, serves for communication of people connected by the particular specialisation, belongs to the vocabulary of the language and is subject to its laws” [Пономарів 2000, p. 91]. The definition by H. Felber is as follows: “A term is any conventional symbol representing a concept defined in a subject field” [Felber 1984, p. 1]. One more definition by R. Dubuc states that “A term or terminology unit is a word or expression that designates a concept specific to a subject field and the corresponding object in the world” [Dubuc 1997, p. 38].

The main reason for the variety of definitions of the word '*term*' is the fact that similarly to other 'linguistic universals' it lacks clearly defined characteristics, which results in each scholar understanding this phenomenon in his or her own way. Nevertheless the definitions of 'term' are not contradictory. They are often complementary and view the concept from different perspectives [Д'яков 2000, p. 10] [Стацюк 2016, p. 113].

Along with the existence of different definitions of the term, various lists of characteristics that distinguish the term itself from an ordinary word also exist. As noted during the study of theoretical sources, these catalogues consist of a different number of items, which most often duplicate each other [Д'яков 2000, p. 12-13]. The most extensive one that was found was provided by A. Dyakov, T. Kiyak and Z. Kudelko and consisted of the following points:

- A term must comply with the rules and norms of a particular language.
- A term must be systematic.
- A term has the property of definiteness (each term is associated with a clear, separate definition that refers to the corresponding concept.)
- A term is relatively independent of context.

- A term must be accurate.
- A term must be short (the requirement can contradict with the requirement of accuracy.)
- A term must be unambiguous within a single terminological sphere.
- Distinctive terms can not be synonyms, excluding hinders in mutual understanding.
- Terms are expressively neutral.
- The term should be euphonious [Д'яков 2000, p. 12-13] [Кочерган 2001, p. 220] [Dubuc 1997, p. 42] [Gaivenis 2002, p. 30].

Taken together, these characteristics define the term as a linguistically normative, systematic, precise, context-stable, and expressively neutral unit that unambiguously designates a clearly delimited concept within a specific terminological domain, thereby ensuring accuracy, efficiency, and mutual intelligibility in specialised communication.

According to Jaleniauskiene, E. & Čičelytė, V. *'technical terminology'* is the set of specialised lexical units associated with a particular field of knowledge and operates along a continuum of formality. At one end of this continuum are precisely defined *technical terms* that are institutionally recognised and systematically documented, whereas at the other end are more informal designations that emerge through the use of professionals and resemble colloquial or jargon-based usage. The distinction between formally standardised terminology and informal professional slang is ambiguous [Jaleniauskiene 2011, p. 120]. Relying on this definition, we can conclude that, for example, computer terminology, biology terminology and **military terminology** are all technical terminologies.

Additionally Jaleniauskiene, E. & Čičelytė, V. state that the distinction between formally standardised terminology and informal professional slang is ambiguous [Jaleniauskiene 2011, p. 120]. In their work, the scholars exemplify the point on the basis of computer terminology but this also can be easily proved by means of military terms. For instance, the term *'collateral damage'* which now means "Unintentional or incidental injury or damage to persons or objects that would not be lawful military

targets in the circumstances ruling at the time” initially was a military euphemism borrowed from media discourse and used as U.S. armed forces jargonism [Gortney 2010, p. 55]. Only several decades later it appeared in specialised military dictionaries and glossaries [Martin 2023] [Rockel 2009, p. 5-6].

The following definition of **“military term”** is encountered in the literature: *“word, phrase, or abbreviation that denotes an object, phenomenon, or process in the sphere of military (armed forces) activity based on the criteria of nominativity, representativeness, unambiguity, standardization, and semantic-stylistic neutrality.”* And **‘military terminology’** is defined as *“a systematic (organized and structured), standardized (regulated), and harmonized (agreed upon at the interdepartmental or intergovernmental level) set of military terms.”* Military terms can also be organised into military *‘terminological systems’*, i.e. sets of terms and corresponding definitions interconnected through logical and semantic relations [Balabin 2018, p. 11].

‘Military terminology’ should not be confused with **‘terminology of war’** (i.e. military terminology and terminology of other spheres of activity used during war) and with the concept of **‘military vocabulary’** (i.e. incorporates not only official terms but also professionalisms, military slang, jargon, and emotionally-coloured military lexis) [Ivashchenko 2023, p. 48].

Shevchenko L. and Syzenko A. in their analysis define the set of features which is inherent to military terminology and contribute to unambiguous intra-military communication, enhance operational effectiveness, and support the protection of sensitive information. The list of such peculiarities consists of:

1. **Precision and unambiguity** - uniform interpretation by all participants in military operations and command structures (the characteristic reiterates general feature of a term but emphasises the crucial consequences of equivocality in the military sphere.)
2. **International unification** - unification and interoperability among different armed forces and states (especially important in the context of multinational operations.)

3. **Evolution and adaptation** - developing in response to changes in military doctrine, operational strategies, tactical approaches, weaponry, technological innovation, etc [Shevchenko 2024, p. 125].

Therefore, analysis of theoretical sources allows to conclude that military terminology is part of general terminology and that military terms share many features with terms in the general sense.

1.2. Military terminology in linguistic studies

Military terminology and military discourse in the English language have always been a subject of interest for researchers both in independent Ukraine and beyond its borders. Research in this linguistic field has become particularly acute since the beginning of Russian aggression against Ukraine.

The vast majority of studies conducted by Ukrainian researchers concern issues of military translation. The foundations for such research were laid by the following researchers: Balabin V., Lisovskyi V., Chernyshov O., Zatsny Yu.A., Yanchuk S. Ya., etc. Particularly, **Balabin V. V.** addressed modern American slang with particular emphasis on its translation-related challenges [Балабін 2002]; **Yanchuk S. Ya.** focused on the specific features of translating military documentation concerning international peacekeeping missions [Янчук 2011]; **Zatsnyi Yu. A.** examined Anglo–Ukrainian terminological correspondences within the domain of international counter-terrorism [Зацний 1999].

In addition to this, there were general studies of military vocabulary. Examples of such studies include the works of **Vasylenko D. V.**, [Василенко 2008] who investigated the military vocabulary of the English language from the twentieth to the early twenty-first century. It should be noted that the issue of structural semantic features of the creation of military terms (e.g., Babiy I. and Kuchvara L., [Бабій 2023] Lemeshko O. [Лемешко 2020] and military slang (e.g., Balabin V. V., [Балабін 2002] Palchevska, O. et al [Palchevska 2023] has also become one of the frequently studied topics by domestic researchers.

A review of the latest research on military terminology in English conducted outside Ukraine revealed a wide range of scientific works created by authors from various countries. First of all, researchers from NATO member states show particular interest in studies of this kind, since English and its military terminological system form the basis of communication among allied units, thereby assigning the language and its terminology a crucial role in ensuring interoperability [Keagle 2010]. Examples of aforementioned investigators include **Georgieva V.** who conducted general research of the field [Georgieva 2015]. Another group of scholars, **Siegel A., Vance, M., and Nilsson, D.** investigated scientific works about Military English language and teaching over the past three decades [Siegel 2024]. **Chaloupský L.** devoted his work to military slang and vernacular forms and their analysis through sociolinguistic perspective [Chaloupský 2005]. Another scientist, **Dochinoiu E.** examines English military terminology as a form of specialized language by analysing its structural, grammatical, semantic, pragmatic, stylistic, and discourse features [Dochinoiu 2011].

Particular interest in various aspects of the English terminology system has also been noted among researchers from countries that do not belong to NATO. Examples of abovementioned researchers and their most recent works include **Akmedov, O. S.** [Akmedov 2025] and **Musurmanova, S.** [Musurmanova 2022] who investigated lexical-semantic features of English military terms. **Aminova, D.** explored both the phenomenon of polysemy in English military terminology [Aminova 2023b] and significance of the term system as a specialized layer within language. [Aminova 2023a] **Alharahsheh, A. M. M.** studied the translatability of English military terminology into Arabic by evaluating and comparing the accuracy and contextual adequacy of translations produced by civilian and military-trained Arab translators across different military service texts [Alharahsheh 2024].

With the beginning of full-scale military aggression of Russia against Ukraine, some more specialized studies have appeared. Examples include lexicographic investigation of the features of English military dictionaries by **Tsyhanok O. M., Halahan V. Ya., Vynnychuk S. Ya.** [Tsyhanok 2023] or research of functioning of

military terminology in various discourses such as work by **Ivashchenko V.** and **Ivashchenko D.** which addresses Ukrainian military terminology in the context of legislative and media discourses [Ivashchenko 2023].

Predominantly, the works analysed deal with the military terminology that has long been established in dictionaries and glossaries and has been in use for a long time. Research into such terminology, although of great scientific and practical importance, does not fully convey all the innovations of modern warfare, examples of which are constantly being demonstrated by armed conflicts in Ukraine and the Middle East.

This paper will cover military terms and spheres of military terminology that represent inventions and novelties in the fields of warfare and military operations.

1.3. Structural and semantic characteristics of terms

The examination of terms from structural and semantic perspectives forms a distinct area of inquiry within terminology studies and linguistic analysis.

Due to the lack of existence of a unified perspective on the structure of a term, various researchers proposed a number of classifications according to which a terminology unit can be categorised. K. Gaivenis in his work distinguishes between **simple** (created by means of a single word) and **complex** (created by means of more than one word) terms [Gaivenis 2002, p. 134]. R. Dubuc's classification of structure of terminological units consists of **simple terms** (one word), **complex terms** (two or more words with grammatical relationship) and **terminological phrases** (a group of words with higher syntactic relationship) [Dubuc 1997, pp. 38-39]. According to D. Vasylenko military terms can be defined as **single-word**, **two-word** and **multi-word** [Василенко 2008]. During his investigation, O. Lemeshko also divides military terms according to the quantity of constituent parts in it thus dividing them into 7 groups, which include terms consisting of **one** to **seven** components, respectively [Лемешко 2020, pp. 57-58].

Considering all the abovementioned information, it can be concluded that all methods of structural classification of terminological units are similar to each other.

This allows to propose a new classification method for this study which will be based on the previously considered ones. Therefore the terms will be divided into **simple** (consisting of one word) and **complex** (consisting of two and more words) where the ‘complex’ group will be further subdivided according to the number of constituent parts of each of the terminological units analysed.

Furthermore, the systematic analysis of **terminological semantics** is a primary objective for the linguists.

As defined by John I. Saeed, ‘*semantics*’ “is the study of meaning communicated through language” [Saeed 2009, p. 3]. I. K. Nagy in his work observes the concept from two perspectives: as a “*knowledge of meanings*” if it is considered by a speaker and as a “*description of meanings*” if it is considered by a linguist who as a researcher is interested in analysing meaningful units (e.g., words) and meaningful structures (e.g., sentences) [Nagy 2017, p. 43].

Various authors had different perspectives on the analysis of semantic features of terms. To research semantic features of geology terms in English, L. Rohach employed **componential analysis** [Rohach 2019, p. 115]. It is grounded on the assumption that a word is not the smallest unit of meaning. Instead, it can be separated into smaller meaningful units which can be compounded in different ways in order to produce semantically substantive words [Saeed 2009, p. 259]. Taking into consideration the fact that the unanimous term for the smallest lexical unit does not exist, L. Rohach assumes it to be a ‘**seme**’. Scholar defines it as “as a semantic microcomponent which reflects the specific features of the notion represented by the word” which is “revealed and singled out through interrelations of the word with other words on a paradigmatic and syntagmatic level” [Rohach 2019, p. 108].

L. Rohach further divides componential analysis into two types: **minimal** and **full**. **Minimal** componential analysis is aimed at identifying semantic distinctions between lexical units. The procedure is continued until each lexical obtains its own unique selection of semes. It is particularly useful for differentiating between synonyms or sets of semantically related words. In contrast, **full** componential analysis is conducted on the basis of dictionary definitions and involves the entire

lexico-semantic group to which the analysed unit belongs, examining all lexical units within the relevant lexico-semantic group [Rohach 2019, p. 109].

Another approach is demonstrated by M. Bogachyk and D. Bihunov. In their investigation of the semantic features of computer terms scholars suggested and employed analysis by **nominative criterion**. It implies classification of lexical units into paradigmatic semantic groups according to shared content, reflecting conceptual, subjective, and functional similarity in the nomination of domain-specific phenomena. Methodologically, the nominative criterion involves:

1. analysing the semantic structure of terms;
2. establishing paradigmatic relations among them;
3. grouping terms that designate similar concepts, functions, or perspectives;
4. interpreting these groupings as reflections of domain-specific conceptual organisation [Bogachyk 2020, p. 5].

Despite not being stated explicitly, Bevzo et al relied on the **nominative criterion** as well while studying the influence of the russian-Ukrainian war on changes in the English-language terminology system [Бевзо 2022, pp. 123-124].

The analysis of theoretical sources demonstrates that structural and semantic characteristics of terms is a complicated issue with various approaches to it. Thus, a comprehensive investigation will be employed which will combine the views of different scientists, thereby complementing each of them.

1.4. The notion of discourse and methods of investigation

Nowadays, due to the vast number of ongoing war conflicts and unstable socio-political situation, the employment of military terminology spread far beyond the boundaries of professional military use and penetrated many other fields of human interactions [Бабиї 2023, p.7]. To understand this expansion of use, a theoretical reconsideration of **‘discourse’** as a key analytical framework for examining the mechanisms through which specialised terminology is recontextualised, interpreted, and semantically transformed in contemporary communication is needed.

Following Jørgensen, M. and Phillips, L., the term **‘discourse’** has been employed extensively and in an unsystematic way in scientific papers and debates. Thus it became ambiguous and in modern day realities can have a little meaning at all or acquire lots of different meanings depending on the context in which it is used or a person who employs the notion [Jørgensen 2002, p. 1].

According to Fraas C. and Klemm M., two main approaches to the definition of the term ‘discourse’ exist. The first of them is based on English-American tradition and relies mainly on the communication between people. The approach is not merely focused on this kind of analysis, however it makes an emphasis on studying the discourse on an interpersonal level. The second approach is based on French poststructuralist studies and Foucault's theories and focuses its attention on investigating the discourse predominantly on sociocultural level within intertextual relations of various elocutions [Fraas 2005, pp. 2-3].

Summarising the diversity of approaches to ‘discourse’ Fraas C. and Klemm M. provide a following selection of definitions of the notion created by various scholars:

- Discourses are collections of texts that are related in terms of content (Foucault, M.).
- Discourses are ‘amalgamations of themes in texts’ (Sauer, C.).
- Discourses are networks of signs, traces and tracks of knowledge segments (Busse, D.).
- Discourses form reference points for individual texts, because texts do not exist in isolation but are linked to coexisting texts (Warnke, I.).
- Discourses can be understood as ‘conversations’ between texts and are therefore characterised by dialogicity (Wichter, S.).
- Discourses correspond to systems of thought and argumentation that are abstracted from a body of texts (Titzmann, M.).
- Discourses are a form of ‘interaction in society’, because ‘language users actively engage in text and talk not only as speakers, writers, listeners or readers, but also as members of social categories, groups, professions, organisations, communities, societies or cultures’ (van Dijk, T.A.).

- Discourses can be understood as ‘virtual text corpora whose composition is determined by content-related criteria’ (Busse, D. and Teubert, W) [Fraas 2005, pp. 3-4].

Jørgensen, M. and Phillips, L. provide their own definition of ‘discourse’ as well. From their perspective the notion can be defined as is “a particular way of talking about and understanding the world (or an aspect of the world)” [Jørgensen 2002, p. 1].

After analysing 43 independent attempts to define the term ‘discourse’ (including abovementioned), Korolyov, I. formulated the following generalised definition of the phenomenon: “[Discourse is] a complex communicative phenomenon, an oral speech act, which, taking into account the social context, provides information both about the participants in communication and their traits, and the processes of production and perception of the message” [Корольов 2012, pp. 286-290].

Myroshnichenko I. G. in her investigation states that ‘discourse’ is a complex and multi-component notion which in addition to a variety of definitions also has a number of typologies. Her research revealed that scholars propose a range of criteria for differentiating types of discourse, including the degree of communicative formality, the mode of communication, the communicative environment, thematic orientation, the channel of communication, and the spheres of human activity [Мірошніченко 2020, pp. 34-37].

According to the fields of human activity military discourse is usually differentiated. It is the main class of discourse in which military terms function [Корольова 2021, pp. 371-373].

After conducting a detailed analysis of scientific sources Stepan S. B. and Kauza I. B. define ‘**military discourse**’ as “a set of linguistic works created within the military sphere of communication, which is regulated by certain rules, traditions and experience and is reflected in the choice of language means” [Stepan 2024, p. 145].

Additionally, in their work, Korolyova et al determines the set of the most crucial features of military discourse. These include **(1)** its transhistorical relevance

(the language of military personnel has existed in all historical periods); **(2)** its vivid masculinity (military service is traditionally viewed as a manifestation of masculinity); **(3)** it demonstrates a close connection with related types of discourse (e.g., military-political and military-patriotic discourse) as well as with other discourse domains linked to it at the linguistic level through shared metaphorical models and processes of metaphorisation (e.g., sports discourse) [Корольова 2021, pp. 372-373].

Terminology is an integral part of military discourse. Generally, two groups of methods are used to study the terminology of any semantic field: **statistical** and **analytical** [Muxammadkasimovna 2021, pp. 49-50].

The former method may be defined as an empirical approach aimed at establishing the existence and distribution of linguistic facts on the basis of their observable occurrence in language use. Rather than evaluating qualitative characteristics, this method focuses on quantitative and frequentative data by accumulating and systematizing attested information. Therefore it lacks interpretative depth and necessitates integration with interpretative and theoretical approaches in order to produce comprehensive and reliable linguistic insights [Muxammadkasimovna 2021, p. 50].

The latter method may be defined as an approach oriented toward determining “what is right” through critical and methodologically grounded examination of linguistic phenomena. Unlike purely descriptive approaches, it seeks to establish the scientific validity, feasibility, functional adequacy of linguistic units and the operational principles governing linguistic rules. Through systematic reasoning and critical analysis, the method enables researchers to validate or refute hypotheses about language structure and usage. It thus functions as a tool of scientific inquiry, transforming raw linguistic data into theoretically grounded knowledge. However the method may become too dependent on theoretical constructs rather than practical conclusions. Accordingly, a balanced integration with empirical methods, particularly the statistical approach, is essential to ensure that research is both scientifically rigorous and practical at the same time [Muxammadkasimovna 2021, p. 50].

As previously noted, military terminology is no longer restricted solely to the professional discourse in which it originated. The correct employment of military terms is becoming especially important within the boundaries of another type of discourse differentiated according to the field of human activity - **media discourse**. This can be clearly illustrated by the case of the full-scale war of Russia against Ukraine. A significant number of journalists didn't have an experience in covering topics which are connected to war and combat operations, thus had a lot of struggles and questions concerning the way of presenting this kind of information. Especially acute for them was the issue of proper use of military terminology [Комісія з журналістської етики 2022].

Following O'Keeffe A. '*media discourse*' can be defined as "...interactions that take place through a broadcast platform, whether spoken or written, in which the discourse is oriented to a non-present reader, listener or viewer." and thus "[it] is a public, manufactured, on-record, form of interaction." The addresser of the elocution in this kind of discourse often cannot receive an instant feedback from their addressees. Usually media discourse is prepared, planned, public and official [O'Keeffe 2012, p. 441].

Relying on the prior investigations of the media discourse Myroshnichenko I. G. outlines 10 main functions of this kind of discourse. These are **(1) cognitive** (provides an explanation of current affairs); **(2) value-forming** (forms values among the addressers); **(3) constructive** (constructs images and norms of future realities in the minds of recipients); **(4) communicative** (serves as means of communicating ideas and mutual influence between people); **(5) informative** (provides information about various events); **(6) regulatory** (regulates the control over the social opinion and thus is the main tool of rule); **(7) persuasive** (acts as a means of influencing the recipient in order to change the mindset of the last in the interests of the addressor); **(8) integrative** (unifies society, eliminates controversies within it); **(9) cultural** (preserves, develops and disseminates cultural and moral principles and values); **(10) hedonistic** (entertains the audience and satisfies recreational needs) [Мірошніченко 2020, pp. 41-43].

Taking into account the variety of the important functions presented above, it can be concluded that the importance of media discourse, and especially its interaction with military discourse, and the functioning of military terms within it are very important from the point of view of the peculiarities of the functioning of lexical units, and therefore are of great interest for linguistic research.

To conduct this research, it is essential to clearly outline the methods employed during the analysis. Many domestic and foreign researchers have focused their attention on identifying and studying approaches to linguistic research. For example, Sukhorolska S. and Fedorenko O. distinguish comparative, contrastive, oppositional, distributional, immediate constituents, transformational, componential, semantico-syntactic, contextual, performative, frame, discourse, conversation, statistical and corpus-based methods of linguistic analysis [Sukhorolska 2005]. Two foreign investigators - Kurbanova M. and Ataeva G. - determine descriptive, Normative-stylistic, comparative historical, distributional analysis and reverse approaches [Kurbanova 2020, p. 45]. Yefremova N., Boichuk V. and Rys L. also cover the 'case study' method in their work [Yefremova 2025].

Taking into account a brief theoretical analysis of linguistic research methodologies, it can be concluded that a large number of approaches to this problem exist, each of which deserves special attention, as it examines the material under study in its own way. However, during the course of this study the following set of methods was employed: the data collection method; semantic and morphological analysis methods; the comparison and the classification methods, the quantitative analysis and the pragmatic assessment methods. The data collection method ensured the systematic selection of military terms relevant to the research objectives. The semantic analysis method was used to identify the core meanings of the collected terms, while morphological analysis made it possible to examine their structural organisation and word-formation patterns. The comparison method enabled the correlation of terms according to such criteria as offensive versus defensive semantics, linguistic economy, degree of terminological codification, and level of formality. In addition, the classification method was employed to group the analysed

units into semantic categories, which created the basis for both qualitative interpretation and quantitative evaluation of the terminology under investigation. Finally, the pragmatic assessment method made it possible to evaluate the functional and communicative peculiarities of the analysed terms within different contexts of use. This combination ensured both the depth and the systematic character of the analysis.

Quantitative analysis deserves special attention. According to Stefan Th. Gries most of a corpus linguist's work involves statistical investigation. Consequently, in the framework of the study numerical scrutiny can be considered as a constituent part of **corpus linguistics** [Gries 2024, p. 1]. The last is defined as an approach based on the analysis of large collections of machine-readable texts (corpora), which serve as an empirical foundation for investigating specific research questions [McEnery 2011, p. 1-2].

The present study employs a corpus-based approach grounded in descriptive statistical analysis, which usually does not aim to test statistical significance but rather to systematically characterize the distributional properties of terminological units. The primary analytical tool consists of frequency counts, understood as the quantitative identification of how often particular linguistic features occur within the dataset [McEnery 2011, p. 49]. The calculations obtained are further interpreted in relative proportions, allowing for comparison across semantic groups of differing sizes.

Two general types of statistical analysis are also differentiated: **‘token frequencies’** and **‘type frequencies’**. **Token frequency** is interpreted as the relative occurrence of specific characteristics within each dataset (e.g., structural patterns, degrees of formality, or types of codification.) It allows the identification of dominant and entrenched tendencies. **Type frequency** reflects the degree of variation within these categories [Gries 2024, p. 1].

The analysis integrates both of the aforementioned perspectives. This combined approach enables the identification of broader tendencies, such as productivity, semantic generality, and degrees of standardization, thereby linking quantitative

observations with qualitative linguistic interpretation. As a result, the methodology provides a comprehensive framework for examining how terminological systems are shaped by the conceptual complexity, institutionalization, and communicative demands of their respective domains.

Conclusion to Chapter I

The analysis of theoretical sources has demonstrated that the issues of terminology and discourse interpretation remain complex and multidimensional, which explains the absence of universally accepted definitions of such notions as *'terminology'*, *'term'*, and *'discourse'*. The examination of scholarly approaches proposed by Ukrainian and foreign researchers made it possible to identify the principal characteristics of terms distinguishing them from commonly used lexical units, as well as to outline the specific features inherent to military terminology and military terms in particular. Special attention was devoted to the structural, semantic and functional classifications of terminological units. In addition, was conducted a theoretical overview of the interrelation between military and media discourses and their role in the representation of contemporary military realities.

The review of prior studies conducted by scholars from Ukraine, NATO and non-NATO countries has shown that the investigation of military terminology has always been the focal point of attention of linguists and therefore is characterised by a variety of methodological and classificatory approaches. At the same time, the comparative analysis of structural classifications demonstrated their substantial similarity, which enabled the development of a classification framework for the present research based on the division of terminological units into simple and complex terms, with further subdivision of complex units according to the number of their constituent components. Furthermore, the theoretical overview confirmed that the study of semantic characteristics of terms requires a comprehensive approach combining different analytical perspectives, including componential and nominative techniques.

The theoretical foundation examined in this section also substantiated the selection of research methods employed in the practical part of the study. In particular, the application of the data collection method, semantic, morphological and historical analysis methods, along with the comparison, the classification and the quantitative analysis methods, complemented with the pragmatic assessment method, ensures a comprehensive investigation of military terminological units within any framework, including modern media discourse.

II. STRUCTURAL AND SEMANTIC PECULIARITIES OF MODERN CONFLICTS MILITARY TERMS

2.1. Semantic classification

Contemporary military terminology reflects a paradigmatic shift from conventional armed conflict to multi-domain, hybrid warfare, which necessitates the allocation of new semantic fields and the reorganization of existing ones. Thus during the analysis of the selection of terms the following semantic groups were designated according to the nominative criterion:

- Cyber Warfare;
- Unmanned Warfare (UW);
- Electronic Warfare (EW);
- Informational Warfare.

It is important to mention that some of the terms were classified in several semantic fields due to the fact that in their meaning they share some subjective conceptual meanings with professional words from the other group. Thus, for example, such terms as '*Hack-and-Leak Operation*', '*Information Assurance (IA)*', '*Information Environment*' can be included into both 'Cyber Warfare' and 'Informational Warfare' groups.

During the analysis of terminology from all the semantic groups **449** terms were analysed. Their detailed analysis is presented in the subsequent sections. The corpus of professional words was analyzed according to the following criteria: **(1)** Structure; **(2)** Degree of formality; **(3)** Degree of codification; **(4)** Means of linguistic economy and compression; **(5)** Semantic orientation of terms (Offensive / Defensive / Neutral). According to the structural analysis the units were grouped into **simple** and **complex**. Successively, complex terms were subdivided according to the **quantity of their constituent parts** from 2-word to 9-word units.

2.2. Cyber warfare terminology

During the past 3 decades computational technologies have demonstrated great progress. Today we are surrounded by pieces of information technologies of different

shapes and kinds and don't even pay attention to this fact. All of them are interconnected by the Internet and create 'cyberspace' which for a long time now, has been more than just a means of data transmission; it serves as a platform for various cyber operations, which, in essence, can be at least cases of cybercrime or, much more dangerously, collectively form a cyber warfare. Thus, cyberspace was turned into a full-fledged component of war which turned cyberdefence into one of the most crucial fields of national defence of many countries [Kevin 2018] [Singer 2014].

Taking into account all the abovementioned information, cyberdefence and digital warfare terminology possess a crucial importance in terms of linguistic investigation of modern military terminology.

During the investigation, **114** terms were classified as belonging to this semantic group. **Complex terms** constitute the largest share of the dataset (**82.46%**). The most frequent category which was observed during the structural analysis is **3-word complex terms** which comprise **34.21%** of the catalogue. Examples of this kind of terms include '*Computer Network Attack (CNA)*'; '*Defensive Counter-Cyber (DCC)*'; '*Cyber Kill Chain*'. The least frequent category is **7-word complex terms**. A single term from the list was classified into this category. It is '*Cognitive-based Approach to System Security Assessment (CASSA)*' and it comprises **0.88%** of the catalogue. Besides, **17.54% (20 items)** of the analysed material was representative of **simple terms** (e.g., '*phishing*', '*botnet*', '*antispoofing.*')

Structural Characteristics		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Simple	20	17.54%
Complex (2 word)	37	32.46%
Complex (3 word)	39	34.21%
Complex (4 word)	10	8.77%
Complex (5 word)	5	4.39%
Complex (6 word)	2	1.75%

Complex (7 word)	1	0.88%
Complex (in total)	94	82.46%
Total	114	

Table 2.1. Quantitative analysis of Cyber Warfare terminology according to its structure

The data analysis of the degree of formality of the terms in this semantic field reveal a predominance of **formal** terms which comprise **65.79%** of the whole catalogue. Their examples include: ‘*Cyber Collateral Damage*’, ‘*Computer Network Defense (CND)*’; ‘*Advance Force Operations*’. The next group according to the number of terminological units is **semi-formal** words. They represent **29.82%** of the selection with the following examples: ‘*Cyber attack*’, ‘*Cyberspace*’; ‘*Information Environment*’. The minority of the units belong to **informal** terms which comprise **4.39%** of the selected group. For example, ‘*Zoom bombing*’, ‘*Dorking*’; ‘*Backdoor*’.

Degree of Formality		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Formal	75	65.79%
Semi-formal	34	29.82%
Informal	5	4.39%
Total	114	

Table 2.2. Quantitative analysis of Cyber Warfare terminology according to the degree of its formality

According to the degree of codification of units in this semantic group distribution pattern demonstrates a very close number of terms defined by **US and British military documents (50.88%)** (e.g., ‘*Service Cyberspace Component (SCC)*’; ‘*Combat Support Agencies (CSAs)*; *Logical Network Layer*), and those defined by **IT glossaries and computing dictionaries (44.74%)** (e.g., ‘*Cross-Site*

Request Forgery (CSRF); *Intrusion Detection System (IDS)*; *Logic Bomb*). Terms that are more spontaneous and informal in nature and therefore uncoded are in the minority, representing **4.39%** (e.g., *Backdoor*; *Botnet*; *Dorking*) of the selection in the semantic group.

Degree of Codification		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Codified in US and/or UK military doctrine	58	50.88%
Systematised in IT and cybersecurity sources	51	44.74%
Not formally standardised	5	4.39%
Total	114	

Table 2.3. Quantitative analysis of Cyber Warfare terminology according to the degree of its terminological codification

The categorization guided by the means of linguistic economy and compression of terminological units demonstrated that the vast majority of the terms analysed either have either a **clear abbreviation (initialism, acronym)** assigned to them or **do not have any means of conciseness or compression** at all. The percentage of terminological units of this kind in the sample is equal in both cases (**43.86%**). Examples of terms with abbreviations include: *Secure Access Service Edge (SASE)*, *Wired Equivalent Privacy (WEP)*, *Cyber Operational Preparation of the Environment (C-OPE)*, and representatives of words analysed which don't have means of linguistic economy incorporate: *Cyber Defense*, *Weapon Action*, *Data Exfiltration*. The datalist comprises a number of **compound** words as well. They account for **12.28%**. The next set of words can be mentioned as examples of such terms: *Ransomware*, *Rootkit*, *Botnet*.

Means of Linguistic Economy		
Type	Quantity	Percentage

With assigned abbreviations (including acronyms and initialisms)	50	43.86%
Without clearly defined means of conciseness	50	43.86%
With compounds in their structure	14	12.28%
Total	114	

Table 2.4. Quantitative analysis of Cyber Warfare terminology according to the means of its linguistic economy and compression

Ultimately, the investigation has indicated that **offensive** terms comprise **36.84%** (e.g., ‘*Keylogger*’, ‘*Offensive Counter-Cyber (OCC)*’; ‘*Weapon Effect*’) of the whole IT and Cybersecurity dataset and **defensive** - **21.93%** (e.g., ‘*Secure Shell (SSH)*’; ‘*Defensive Counter-Cyber (DCC)*’; ‘*Air-Gap*’). The most widespread terminological units in the classification belong to the ‘**neutral**’ group, which cannot be considered neither as offensive, nor as defensive. They constitute **41.23%** of the catalogue (e.g., ‘*Critical Cyber Asset*’; ‘*Cyber Incident*’; ‘*Information Assurance (IA)*’).

Semantic Orientation (Offensive / Defensive / Neutral)		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Offensive	42	36.84%
Defensive	25	21.93%
Neutral	47	41.23%
Total	114	

Table 2.5. Quantitative analysis of Cyber Warfare terminology according to its offensive, defensive or neutral nature

Thus, in quantitative terms, the dataset is characterised by a strong prevalence of **complex** (mainly comprising 3-words) **formal** terms, most of which are **neither of offensive nor of defensive character**. Most of them are codified either in official

United States/Great Britain military documents or in **specialised cyberdefence and IT dictionaries and glossaries**. Additionally, the statistical analysis reflects the dominance of **abbreviated terms** and terms **without means of linguistic economy** with equal distribution between them.

2.3. Unmanned warfare (UW) terminology

The rapid development of the technologies has drastically changed the ways in which modern war is conducted. One of the most obvious changes is the rapid employment of **Unmanned Vehicles (UV)** and especially aerial ones in order to support and conduct performance of missions. Being initially merely a tool of reconnaissance, now unmanned platforms have transformed into a multipurpose platform which is capable of performing a range of tasks from logistics and EW support to delivering pinpoint strikes [Babayev 2025, p. 28].

The abovementioned statement can be easily illustrated by the example of the Russian-Ukrainian war, where unmanned systems, initially due to their low cost and effectiveness, gained one of the most prominent places in the conduct of military operations. Statistics show that by 2025, the share of targets hit by drones accounted for **80-85%** of the total number of attacks on the battlefield. Another interesting fact is that only in the summer of the same year at least **215,000** strikes were made by autonomous systems [Bilousova 2025, p. 1].

Considering all the facts which argue in favour of using unmanned systems on the battlefield a lot of countries today are trying to implement and develop this highly advanced and efficient technology. Being in the state of war, Ukraine is the leader of the sphere and can share a lot of invaluable insights on the issue with their country-partners [Zaluzhnyi 2024, pp. 5-7]. This underscores the importance and necessity of conducting linguistic research in the **‘Unmanned warfare’** semantic field. This particular title was chosen because the word *‘unmanned’* is widely employed nowadays and, at the same time, its semantic meaning is broad enough to cover all the terminology which is relevant in the context of modern military communication and included into the created catalogue of professional words.

The dataset of the semantic field includes **135** terminological units. With regard to **structural analysis** the relative frequency of **91.11%** amounts to compound terminology units with **3-word structure** constituting the largest part of the catalogue. **29.63%** of the terms belong to the group with the following examples: *‘unmanned ground vehicle (UGV)’*, *‘ground control station (GCS)’*, *‘obstacle avoidance drone’*. The next two items, based on the percentage shares they represent in the list under consideration are **2-word (27.41%)** and **4-word complex (23.70%)** units. Examples of two-component elements include: *‘Autonomous Flight’*, *‘Altitude hold’*, *‘target drone’*; of four-component: *‘unmanned ground combat vehicle (UGCV)’*, *‘remotely piloted aircraft system (RPAS)’*, *‘light detection and ranging (LiDAR)’*. The least represented group is **6-word complex items** which include only one term from the list - *‘medium altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (MAE-UAV)’*. It accounts for **0.74%** of the dataset.

Structural Characteristics		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Simple	12	8.89%
Complex (2 word)	37	27.41%
Complex (3 word)	40	29.63%
Complex (4 word)	32	23.70%
Complex (5 word)	9	6.67%
Complex (6 word)	1	0.74%
Complex (7 word)	2	1.48%
Complex (9 word)	2	1.48%
Complex (in total)	123	91.11%
Total	135	

Table 2.6. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare (UW) terminology according to its structure

In the context of degree of formality which is demonstrated by the terminological units in the sample, **formal** items emerge as the most recurrent category comprising **68.89%** of the catalogue. (e.g., *'medium-range unmanned airborne surveillance and target acquisition system'*, *'telemetry ratio'*, *'medium altitude endurance unmanned aerial vehicle (MAE-UAV).'*.) The share of **semi-formal** terms constitutes **22.22%** (e.g., *'rotorcraft'*, *'multi-mission drone'*, *'one-way attack UAV (OWA UAV).'*.) **Informal items** are the least frequently occurring in the semantic group, comprising **8.89%** of the dataset (e.g., *'swarm of drones'*, *'loiter'*, *'bomber drone.'*)

Degree of Formality		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Formal	93	68.89%
Semi-formal	30	22.22%
Informal	12	8.89%
Total	135	

Table 2.7. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare (UW) terminology according to the degree of its formality

The analysis based on the degree of the terminological codification reveals that the most of the terms from the catalogue are **codified in UV manuals, dictionaries and guides (35.56%)**. As illustrations of the group can serve: *'semi-autonomous drone'*, *'3D Deadband High'*, *'failsafe function'*. The proportion of terminological units that have been **codified in US and UK official military documents** is slightly lower (**28.15%**) with the following items as examples: *'unmanned underwater vehicle (UUV)'*, *'counter-UAS (C-UAS)'*, *'COMINT drone'*. It is noteworthy that **15.56%** of terms in the semantic field are distinguished **both by aviation and UV technical standards**. The group can be exemplified by following professional words: *'Medium Altitude Long Endurance (MALE)'*, *'Flight Envelope'*, *'hybrid vertical*

takeoff and landing (VTOL)'. By contrast, the rate of terminological units which are simultaneously defined in **military statutory documentation and UV technological papers**, remains marginal (**6.67%**). Their examples include '*remotely piloted aircraft system (RPAS)*', '*unmanned combat aerial vehicle (UCAV)*', '*air-controlled interception*'.

Degree of Codification		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Codified in US and/or UK military doctrine	38	28.15%
Defined in aviation and UV standards	21	15.56%
Systematised both in US/UK military regulations and in UV protocols and guidelines	9	6.67%
Standardised in UV technological documentation	48	35.56%
Not formally standardised	19	14.07%
Total	135	

Table 2.8. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare (UW) terminology according to the degree of its terminological codification

The results of classification by offensive/defensive/neutral nature of terminological units of the dataset reflect absolute prevalence of **neutral terms**. They account for **97.78%** and their examples include '*anti-drone net*', '*photoreconnaissance drone*' and '*gyro sensor*'. **Offensive** and **defensive** terms are in the minority. They account for **1.48%** and **0.74%** and represented by '*Swarm attack*', '*air-controlled interception*' and '*counter-UAS (C-UAS)*' correspondingly.

Semantic Orientation (Offensive / Defensive / Neutral)		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Offensive	2	1.48%

Defensive	1	0.74%
Neutral	132	97.78%
Total	135	

Table 2.9. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare (UW) terminology according to its offensive, defensive or neutral nature

The frequency profile demonstrates that the proportions of terms that have **abbreviations (acronyms, initialisms)** (e.g., '*electric vertical takeoff and landing (eVTOL)*', '*Semi-autonomous Hydrographic Reconnaissance vehicle (SAHRV)*', '*Small Unmanned Aerial System (sUAS)*') and of those which **do not have any means of linguistic economy at all** (e.g., '*remotely operated aircraft*', '*inertial navigation system*', '*aerial vehicle carriers*') are almost equal. They account for **40.74%** and **50.37%** per cent of the total list respectively. **Compound terms** (e.g., '*air-launched drone*', '*long-range bomber drone*', '*drone-tracking radar*') represent a minority comprising **8.15%** of the set. The sample also contains one term which incorporates both abbreviation and compounding as its means of linguistic economy. It is a '*fixed-wing vertical takeoff and landing unmanned aerial vehicle (VTOL UAV)*' and it accounts for **0.74%** of all units from the catalogue.

Means of Linguistic Economy		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
With assigned abbreviations (including acronyms and initialisms)	55	40.74%
Without clearly defined means of conciseness	68	50.37%
Containing compound and having a defined abbreviation (acronym/initialism) at the same time	1	0.74%
With compounds in their structure	11	8.15%
Total	135	

Table 2.10. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare (UW) terminology according to the means of its linguistic economy and compression

Taking all into account, the quantitative analysis conducted in this section reveals several salient structural and functional tendencies within the examined terminological corpus. In terms of **structural organisation**, **3-component** terminological units demonstrate the highest frequency in the UV semantic field. With regard to the **degree of formality**, the analysed terms are predominantly characterised by a **formal** register, reflecting their use in professional military and technical contexts. From the perspective of **the level of terminological codification**, the majority of units are **standardised either in official military documentation or in specialized technical sources on unmanned vehicle technologies**. Furthermore, most terms **do not exhibit features of linguistic economy**. However, among those that do, **abbreviations (encompassing both acronyms and initialisms)** constitute the most frequent type. Finally, the distribution according to **functional orientation** shows that the overwhelming majority of terms are **neutral**, as they do not explicitly pertain to either offensive or defensive categories.

2.4. Electronic warfare (EW) terminology

According to Joint Publication 3 - 13.1 *‘Electronic Warfare’* is a “Military action involving the use of electromagnetic and directed energy to control the electromagnetic spectrum (EMS) or to attack the enemy” [Gortney 2012, p. GL-8]. Additionally, the publication states that none of the modern forces can operate without employing EMS for their advantage [Gortney 2012, p. I-1]. Antonino Amoroso in his publication explains further that within the recent years EW received a crucial importance in the field of Electro-Magnetic Spectrum Operation (EMSO) [Amoroso 2021]. Taking into account the fact that with the modern level of technological advancement everything, including armed forces of different kinds, is dependent on fast exchange of current information, scholar concludes that EW performs two roles in modern combat operations. First of them is to develop a

network of services that ensure uninterrupted transmission and delivery of data necessary for successful combat operations, as well as all necessary protection of this network from any interference by the enemy. The second is to prevent the enemy from establishing and operating such a network in every possible way in order to slow down or completely disrupt the exchange of information within the enemy's ranks. In other words, electronic warfare must ensure that command and decision making process is as easy and fast as possible among allied combat units and difficult or impossible at all among enemy units.

On the basis of the preceding analysis, the terminology of electronic warfare emerges as a crucial component of modern military vocabulary due to its close connection with advanced technologies and information dominance.

The terminology system analysed during the study of the semantic group comprises **117** units. The numerical distribution reveals that according to **structure 3- (41.03%)** and **2-word compounds (35.90%)** are the most frequent in the sample. Examples of the first category mentioned are '*electromagnetic spectrum operations (EMSO)*', '*automated jamming station (AJS)*', '*directional infrared countermeasures (DIRCM)*', while of the second are '*Acoustic Intelligence (ACINT)*', '*Navigation Warfare (NAVWAR)*', '*electromagnetic compatibility (EMC)*'. The terms which include the largest number of morphological parts are '*air-dropped mine splash points location radar system*', '*signal-to-interference-plus-noise ratio (SINR)*' and '*digital radio frequency memory (DRFM) decoy system.*' They are the only representatives of **6-word** professional terms and comprise **2.56%** of the whole dataset. The same proportion of the list (**2.56%**) is held by **simple terms** (e.g., '*chaff*', '*EWC4*' and '*spoofing.*'), making these two groups the smallest of all outlined.

Structural Characteristics		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Simple	3	2.56%
Complex (2 word)	42	35.90%

Complex (3 word)	48	41.03%
Complex (4 word)	10	8.55%
Complex (5 word)	11	9.40%
Complex (6 word)	3	2.56%
Complex (in total)	114	97.44%
Total	117	

Table 2.11. Quantitative analysis of Electronic Warfare (EW) terminology according to its structure

Examination of the catalogue from the point of view of **degree of formality** shows a predominance of **formal** units which account for **86.32%** of all units analysed (e.g., *‘Electronic protection (EP)’*, *‘radio-frequency interference (RFI)’* and *‘digital signal processing (DSP).’*) **Semi-formal** and **informal** items are in the minority. They comprise **11.97%** and **1.71%** of the dataset with the next examples of semi-formal: *‘radar signature’*, *‘barrage noise’*, *‘volumetric contamination’* and informal: *‘notching manoeuvres’*, *‘repeater jamming.’*

Degree of Formality		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Formal	101	86.32%
Semi-formal	14	11.97%
Informal	2	1.71%
Total	117	

Table 2.12. Quantitative analysis of Electronic Warfare (EW) terminology according to the degree of its formality

Quantitative analysis of the sample according to **the degree and kind of terminological codification** revealed the prevalence of terminological units that are **defined in US and/or UK military statutory documents (66.67%)**. Examples of these include: *‘electronic attack (EA)’*, *‘emission control (EMCON)’*,

‘electromagnetic interference (EMI).’ The second place by quantity of terms in the catalogue is held by terms which are codified in specialised **electronic and electromagnetic technical manuals (22.22%)**. They could be exemplified by *‘radar cross section (RCS)’*, *‘Inverse Gain’*, *‘angle modulation noise.’* Representatives of professional words which are systematised through **both kinds of the aforementioned sources** are less frequent (**9.40%**). Their illustrative cases are *‘electromagnetic spectrum (EM spectrum, EMS)’*, *‘High-Power Microwave (HPM)’*, *‘active electronically scanned array (AESA).’* **Uncodified terms** are represented by the same units as informal terms (i.e. *‘notching manoeuvres’* and *‘repeater jamming.’*) and account for the same proportion of the total sample (**1.71%**).

Degree of Codification		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Codified in US and/or UK military doctrine	78	66.67%
Defined both in US and/or UK military doctrine and specialised EW technical manuals	11	9.40%
Encoded by specialised EW technical manuals	26	22.22%
Not formally standardised	2	1.71%
Total	117	

Table 2.13. Quantitative analysis of Electronic Warfare (EW) terminology according the degree of its terminological codification

The results of evaluation of the catalogue by **offensive/defensive/neutral kind** reflect a consistent inclination toward terms of **neutral nature**, representatives of which comprise **79.49%** (e.g., *‘advanced design array radar (ADAR)’*, *‘laser warning system’*, *‘Manned-Unmanned Teaming (MUMT)’*). In comparison to them, **offensive** (e.g., *‘directional jamming’*, *‘Electromagnetic/Electronic Counter Counter Measures (ECCM)’*, *‘imitative electronic deception’*) and **defensive** (e.g., *‘electromagnetic counter measures (ECM)’*, *‘electromagnetic shielding’*, *‘adaptive*

radar countermeasures (ARC)’) terms comprise a minority of the datalist and account for **15.38%** and **5.13%** correspondingly.

Semantic Orientation (Offensive / Defensive / Neutral)		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Offensive	18	15.38%
Defensive	6	5.13%
Neutral	93	79.49%
Total	117	

Table 2.14. Quantitative analysis of Electronic Warfare (EW) terminology according to its offensive, defensive or neutral nature

Examination of the **means of linguistic economy** of terminological units revealed that the distribution is heavily inclined toward professional words that have an **abbreviation (acronym/initialism)**. Terms of this kind represent **44.44%** of the dataset and examples of them include ‘*measurement and signature intelligence (MASINT)*’, ‘*battle group interactive jamming system (BGIJS)*’, ‘*electronic warfare tactics range (EWTR)*.’ Terms containing **compounds** are in the minority comprising **5.13%** and can be illustrated by ‘*airborne early-warning radar*’, ‘*electromagnetic shielding*’, ‘*air-dropped mine splash points location radar system*.’ Units which **have both of the abovementioned methods of conciseness** account for **21.37%** in the catalogue of the semantic field. ‘*Cyber-electromagnetic activities (CEMA)*’, ‘*non-nuclear electromagnetic pulse (NNEMP) weapons*’, ‘*directed-energy weapons (DEW / DEWs)*’ provide clear instances of the group. A slightly larger proportion of the list (**21.37%**) consists of units that **do not have clearly defined means of linguistic economy**. Typical instances of them from the sample are: ‘*communication electronic attack*’, ‘*De-interleaving process*’, ‘*advanced radar tracker and server*.’

Means of Linguistic Economy		
Type	Quantity	Percentage

With assigned abbreviations (including acronyms and initialisms)	52	44.44%
Without clearly defined means of conciseness	34	29.06%
Containing compound and having a defined abbreviation (acronym/initialism) at the same time	25	21.37%
With compounds in their structure	6	5.13%
Total	117	

Table 2.15. Quantitative analysis of Electronic Warfare (EW) terminology according to the means of its linguistic economy and compression

To summarise the results of the quantitative analysis of the examined semantic group several key patterns can be highlighted: from a **structural perspective**, **two-** and **three-component** terminological units are the most prevalent. In terms of **register**, the professional words analysed are predominantly **formal**, reflecting their institutionalised use, while their **degree of codification** in most cases is evidenced by their standardisation **in official US and/or UK military doctrine and related documentation**. With regard to **functional orientation**, the overwhelming majority of terms are **neutral**, as they do not explicitly correspond to either offensive or defensive categories. Finally, a significant proportion of the analysed units possess established **abbreviations**, making this the most widespread form of **linguistic economy** within the dataset.

2.5. Informational warfare terminology

One of the most prominent conceptual domains of modern hybrid warfare is **information**. In particular, the one which is manipulated for achieving some purposes and benefits. Such information is often marked as '*weaponised*' and often employed in psychological warfare, hybrid warfare and informational operations. The issue became especially acute with the active development of modern technologies which enriched sources of human informing from the narrow set of '*traditional media*' (e.g.,

magazines, newspapers, radio, and television) to a countless list of information sources which is offered by the Internet (e.g., blogs, videos, vlogs, and live streaming) [Costigan 2024, p. 21-23].

The employment of swiftly-spreading news, messages, and various reports by means of IT technologies made it easier to spread the main means of informational warfare - **fakes**, which recently became a threatening device of public manipulation and psychological influence [Aziz 2025, p. 192].

The importance of information warfare, and especially fake news, in today's media society has become so great that it now allows countries and armies to be defeated without use of force, but purely by manipulating public opinion [Pronoza 2019, pp. 168-169]. Therefore all the countries seek countermeasures against information threats which leads to active employment of terminology connected to the sphere. This provides the study of terms in this semantic field with particular significance in the context of modern military affairs.

The data collected for analysis amounts to **83** terminological units from the semantic field of informational warfare. Their analysis from the **structural frame of reference** revealed that more than half (**51.81%**) of the sample is represented by **2-word complex** terms (e.g., '*Algorithmic manipulation*', '*Cognitive warfare*', '*Synthetic media.*'). Almost a quarter of subjects (**24.10%**) was classified as **simple** (e.g., '*Astroturfing*', '*Deepfake*', '*Polarisation.*') About one-fifth of the list (**20.48%**) structurally belongs to **3-component units** (e.g., '*information overload mechanism*', '*coordinated inauthentic behaviour (CIB)*', '*psychological operation unit.*') **4-part** (e.g., '*Appeal to authority mechanism*', '*Command and Control Warfare (C2W)*') and **5-part** (e.g., '*Foreign Information and Manipulation Interference (FIMI)*') items are relatively marginal in the dataset (**2.41%** and **1.20%** respectively.)

Structural Characteristics		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Simple	20	24.10%
Complex (2 word)	43	51.81%

Complex (3 word)	17	20.48%
Complex (4 word)	2	2.41%
Complex (5 word)	1	1.20%
Complex (in total)	63	75.90%
Total	83	

Table 2.16. Quantitative analysis of Informational Warfare terminology according to its structure

Considering **degree of formality** the data indicate a high incidence of **formal terms** which comprise **62.65%** of the catalogue. Their examples include '*Information alibi mechanism*', '*Misinformation*', '*Military Deception (MILDEC.)*' The number of instances of **semi-formal professional words** in the semantic field is almost halved and comprise **28.92%** of the dataset. '*Data poisoning*', '*Information sandwich tactic*' and '*whataboutery.*' are examples of the abovementioned items. **Informal units** are the smallest in number. They account for **8.43%** of all terminological units analysed and their representatives are '*Clickbaiting*', '*Sock Puppet*' and '*troll farm.*'

Degree of Formality		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Formal	52	62.65%
Semi-formal	24	28.92%
Informal	7	8.43%
Total	83	

Table 2.17. Quantitative analysis of Informational Warfare terminology according to the degree of its formality

The frequency dynamics in the analysis of informational warfare semantic group indicates that regarding **the degree of terminological codification** almost equal

proportions are represented by terminological units that either systematised in **US or/and UK military doctrinal sources** (e.g., '*OpenSource intelligence (OSINT)*', '*Hybrid warfare*', '*Psychological Operations (PSYOPS)*') or items which are **lacking formal codification** (e.g., '*memetic warfare*', '*Smear Campaigns*', '*Public Opinion Warfare.*') These two types of units under study account for **34.94%** and **33.73%** of the sample respectively. **24.10%** of the units analysed are **conceptualised in communication and media studies** (e.g., '*Framing mechanism*', '*False dilemma tactic*', '*Primacy effect.*') The datalist also includes items that systematised in **technical documentation on cybersecurity or IT**. These constitute **7.23%** (e.g., '*Website defacement*', '*Hack-and-Leak Operation*', '*Data poisoning.*')

Degree of Codification		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Codified in US and/or UK military doctrine	29	34.94%
Defined by communication and media frameworks	20	24.10%
Systematised in IT and cybersecurity sources	6	7.23%
Not formally standardised	28	33.73%
Total	83	

Table 2.18. Quantitative analysis of Informational Warfare terminology according to the degree of its terminological codification

Quantitative scrutiny of **offensive, defensive and neutral character of terms** in distribution suggests a systematic preference (**83.13%**) for **neutral** units, examples of which include '*white psychological operation*', '*Baseline audience analysis*', '*Hybrid threat.*' More than a sixth of the sample (**14.46%**) consists of **offensive items**. For instance, '*Algorithmic manipulation*', '*Firehosing*', '*Perception hacking.*' Only 2 terms from the semantic category were classified as **defensive (2.41%)**. Namely, they are '*Data anonymisation*', '*information assurance (IA).*'

Semantic Orientation (Offensive / Defensive / Neutral)

Type	Quantity	Percentage
Offensive	12	14.46%
Defensive	2	2.41%
Neutral	69	83.13%
Total	83	

Table 2.19. Quantitative analysis of Informational Warfare terminology according to its offensive, defensive or neutral nature

During the examination of terminology on the basis of **the means of linguistic economy**, it was found that **66.27%** of the units from the catalogue **do not have any of them**. For example, *'False dilemma tactic'*, *'troll factory'*, *'Doppelganger.'* **Units which include compounds and those with clearly assigned abbreviations** account for two equal shares of the list, which comprise **16.87%**. Instances of the former include *'Imagery Intelligence (IMINT)'*, *'Psychological Operations (PSYOPS)'*, *'Coordinated Inauthentic Behaviour (CIB)'* while of the latter: *'Deepfake'*, *'Clickbaiting'*, *'Disinformation.'*

Means of Linguistic Economy		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
With assigned abbreviations (including acronyms and initialisms)	14	16.87%
Without clearly defined means of conciseness	55	66.27%
With compounds in their structure	14	16.87%
Total	83	

Table 2.20. Quantitative analysis of Informational Warfare terminology according to the means of its linguistic economy and compression

The quantitative analysis of the given semantic group reveals several notable tendencies. **Structurally**, **two-component** terminological units are the most prevalent, indicating a preference for relatively concise multi-word formations. In terms of **register**, the units are predominantly **formal**. However, with regard to **codification**, there is an approximate balance between items standardised in **military documentation** and those **lacking formal codification**. A comparable proportion of terms is defined within **communication and media theoretical frameworks**, which further highlights the interdisciplinary nature of the group. Concerning **functional orientation**, the overwhelming majority of terms are **neutral**, as they do not explicitly correspond to either offensive or defensive categories. Finally, more than half of the analysed units **do not exhibit features of linguistic economy**, whereas the remaining terms are evenly divided between **abbreviations (including acronyms and initialisms)** and items which compound formations.

Conclusion to Chapter II

The comparative linguistic analysis of the four semantic groups has revealed a set of consistent and interrelated trends that reflect the interaction between linguistic form and the conceptual, institutional, and functional characteristics of each domain.

From a **structural** perspective, the overall dominance of **two-component terminological units** demonstrates a general tendency toward maintaining a balance between precision and linguistic economy in specialized discourse. At the same time, a relatively high proportion of **three-component terms** in three of the analyzed groups, as well as the prevalence of **multicomponent units** in the UV semantic field, indicate that structural complexity increases in accordance with conceptual depth. This confirms that more cognitively demanding domains tend to employ more extended terminological constructions in order to ensure semantic clarity and specificity.

In terms of **formality**, **formal** terms constitute the majority across all groups, which is characteristic of professional and scientific communication. However, the distribution is not uniform: the **EW semantic group** demonstrates the **highest level**

of formality, reflecting strong institutional control typical of military and engineering domains, whereas the **informational warfare group** exhibits a significantly larger proportion of **semi-formal** and **informal units**. This variation can be attributed to the rapid evolution and interdisciplinary nature of fields influenced by media, information technologies, and social sciences. Thus, the degree of formality directly correlates with the level of institutionalization and technological maturity of a given domain, as well as with its degree of involvement in media discourse.

The analysis of **codification** further supports this observation. **Terms codified in military statutory documents** prevail overall, particularly within the **UV** and **EW** semantic groups, which can be explained by their longer historical development, broader institutional acceptance, and consequently greater terminological stability. In contrast, the **cyber** and **informational warfare groups** contain a higher proportion of terms **codified within domain-specific documentation**, reflecting their relative novelty and ongoing conceptual formation. This leads to the general conclusion that codification is closely linked to the historical maturity and recognition of a field, while less established domains demonstrate greater variability and lower levels of standardization.

With regard to **semantic orientation**, **neutral** terms predominate across all groups, which aligns with the general tendency of scientific and technical discourse toward objectivity. Nevertheless, a clear correlation emerges between semantic marking and domain type: strategy-oriented domains, such as **cyberwarfare**, contain a higher proportion of offensive and defensive terms, whereas technology-oriented domains, such as **unmanned warfare**, are characterized by a predominance of neutral, function-oriented terminology. This distinction reflects the difference between conceptualizing action and intent versus describing mechanisms and operations.

The investigation of **linguistic economy** shows that terms **without explicit economy markers** constitute the majority in all groups. At the same time, this parameter demonstrates considerable variability, suggesting that it is influenced by a complex interplay of factors rather than a single dominant tendency. Notably, a

higher degree of codification in military sources correlates with the presence of **clear abbreviation patterns** which facilitate efficient communication in operational contexts. Conversely, semantic groups with a greater proportion of **informal** and **semi-formal** units tend to exhibit **simple (one-word)** structures. As a result, the terminology of **UVs** and **EW** appears more structurally extended, whereas **cyberwarfare** and **informational warfare** favor more compact and accessible forms.

Interdisciplinary influence constitutes another key factor shaping terminological systems. **Cyberwarfare** and **informational warfare** groups demonstrate strong connections with **media studies**, **psychology**, and **sociology**, which is reflected linguistically in the use of more abstract, metaphorical, and conceptually fluid terms. In contrast, **EW** and **UVs** fields are rooted in **engineering**, **physics**, and **military science**, resulting in more precise, technical, and standardized nomenclature. This confirms that terminological systems are directly conditioned by the epistemological foundations of their respective domains.

Finally, the analysis highlights the role of **societal relevance and domain maturity**. Semantic groups that are more closely connected to **everyday human experience**, such as **cyber** and **informational domains**, tend to employ simpler and more accessible terminology. In contrast, **more mature domains** exhibit greater terminological stability, higher levels of formality, and stronger codification within military sources.

Structural Characteristics		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Simple	55	12.25%
Complex (2 word)	159	35.41%
Complex (3 word)	144	32.07%
Complex (4 word)	54	12.03%
Complex (5 word)	26	5.79%
Complex (6 word)	6	1.34%

Complex (7 word)	3	0.67%
Complex (8 word)	0	0.00%
Complex (9 word)	2	0.45%
Complex (in total)	394	87.75%
Total	449	

Table 2.21. Quantitative analysis of terms across all semantic groups analysed according to their structure

Degree of Formality		
Type	Quantity	Percentage
Formal	321	71.49%
Semi-formal	102	22.62%
Informal	26	5.79%
Total	449	

Table 2.22. Quantitative analysis of terms across all semantic groups analysed according to the degree of their formality

Degree of Codification		
Nature	Quantity	Percentage
Codified in US and/or UK military doctrine	203	45.21%
Defined in aviation and UV standards	21	4.68%
Systematised both in US/UK military regulations and in UV protocols and guidelines	9	2.00%
Standardised in UV technological documentation	48	10.69%
Encoded by specialised EW technical manuals	26	5.79%

Defined both in US and/or UK military doctrine and specialised EW technical manuals	11	2.45%
Defined by communication and media frameworks	20	4.45%
Systematised in IT and cybersecurity sources	57	12.69%
Not formally standardised	54	12.03%
Total	449	

Table 2.23. Quantitative analysis of terms across all semantic groups analysed according to the degree of their terminological codification

Semantic Orientation (Offensive / Defensive / Neutral)		
Nature	Quantity	Percentage
Offensive	74	16.48%
Defensive	34	7.57%
Neutral	341	75.95%
Total	449	

Table 2.24. Quantitative analysis of terms across all semantic groups analysed according to their offensive, defensive or neutral nature

Means of Linguistic Economy		
Nature	Quantity	Percentage
With assigned abbreviations (including acronyms and initialisms)	171	38.08%
Without clearly defined means of conciseness	207	46.10%
Containing compound and having a defined abbreviation (acronym/initialism) at the same time	26	5.79%

With compounds in their structure	45	10.02%
Total	449	

Table 2.25. Quantitative analysis of terms across all semantic groups analysed according to their offensive, defensive or neutral nature

III. PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF MILITARY TERMS

3.1. Military terms in modern Media discourse

The frequency and severity of current global hostilities has made **the subject of war** one of the most prominent in mass media coverage. Nowadays, military terminology is used not only by specialists, but also by people of many other professions such as public figures or politicians, encouraging the journalists to use terminological systems of armed forces. Consequently, media and military discourses are becoming closer to one another. Due to the fact that modern publishers, being in a highly competitive environment, are constantly seeking for new ways to attract the attention of an even larger audience, professional lexis acquires **metaphorical, persuasive, and ideologically charged** meanings [Поліщук 2023, p. 100]. Not to mention so-called **“rhetorical definitions”** and a number of other deception devices which are used to change the precise nature of terminology for the purpose of reporting on a particular event in someone’s favour [Pavlyuk 2018, p. 211].

Therefore nowadays military terminology serves not only for strict denominating of professional concepts of the domain but also for attracting people's attention and shaping public perception through metaphorical and persuasive usage. In media texts, professional army lexis acquire unexpected forms and meanings; new words and occasionalisms are formed from them, and their use in a figurative sense gives rise to apt images that help to accurately describe a particular event in public life. In addition, the prevalence of military discourse directly influences linguistic patterns and lexical choices within everyday communication [Поліщук 2023, p. 101]. These factors underscore the necessity of investigating military lexis within a media-centric framework to get better insights into all the intricacies of how these linguistic units function in the language.

3.2. Coverage of modern military terms in the global media

This section of the paper examines the peculiarities of the practical employment of military terminology in articles produced by prominent publishers from the United States (i.e. **CNN** and **The New York Times**) and the United Kingdom (i.e. **BBC**

News and **The Guardian**). To ensure that the study is both concise and comprehensive, the semantic groups identified during the analysis in the previous section were grouped in pairs based on their conceptual similarity. Thus, **cyberwarfare** domain lexis was paired with **informational warfare** and **unmanned warfare** unit – with **electronic warfare**. After that, publications from each thematic media outlet were selected. All terms belonging to the semantic groups under investigations were distinguished in the publications. Then, was carried out an analysis of the characteristics of how these items function in the media environment.

All investigations and conclusions were based on both independent assessment of scrutinised items and their comparison with the dataset compiled during the previous section of the research.

3.2.1. Cyber and information warfare terminology

The initial text selected for the discursive analysis of **cyber warfare** is the **BBC** report titled “*What role has cyber warfare played in Iran?*” [Tidy 2026] It contains **48** words from the semantic group analysed. The article demonstrates restrained and analytical discourse in which terminological units are operating. Most of them are employed within **neutral connotation (43.75%)** and have **low evaluative colouring (52.08%)**. Pragmatically most of the terms perform **informative (29.17%)** or **generalising function (18.75%)**. Report does not contain any words under investigation that are **euphemisms** or involve **semantic shifts**. Another peculiarity of the text is the high level of **hybridisation**. Terminology of cyber warfare is often intertwined with intelligence discourse, for example, in the following cases: ‘*cyber-espionage*’, ‘*open source intelligence*’. This frames war in the cyber environment as covert, intelligence-driven and preparatory rather than purely destructive. In contrast, a large proportion of terms, such as ‘*cyber*’, ‘*hacking*’, ‘*hacktivist group*’, are used to make the text easier for the average reader to understand, as they have moved beyond the realm of strictly professional slang and are frequently used by people in everyday speech.

Another corporate text within the analyzed semantic field was published by **The New York Times**, titled “*Russia Uses Cyberattacks in Ukraine to Support Military Strikes, Report Finds*” [Conger 2022]. Within its boundaries were found **34** words which are connected to digital warfare. Similarly to the BBC text which was considered before, this article also does not contain any terms that would illustrate examples of semantic shifts or euphemisation. However, the publication demonstrates strong militarization of cyber discourse. **26.47%** of items are used in **military framing** (e.g., ‘*cyberarsenal*’, ‘*cyberweapons*’, ‘*cyberwar*’.) Furthermore, **41.18%** of the terms in the content piece are focused on **warfare processes**, strategies and operations making the dataset setting a process-oriented tone for the terminology system (e.g., ‘*hacking campaigns*’, ‘*cyberoperations*’, ‘*phishing attempts*’.) The biggest proportions of the words from the semantic field in the text serve for **reinforcement (29.41%)** and **informative (23.53%)** purposes. Although, it is also noteworthy that **82.35%** of all the units convey negative **secondary meaning**.

The next two case studies in the sample shift the analytical focus toward **information warfare**. This sub-field is introduced by a **The Guardian** article entitled “*Iran social media strategy pivots to information war amid US-Israel attack*” [Tait 2026]. The article contains **22** terms which are relevant to the semantic field under scrutiny. The most striking feature of the article is the fact that **81.82%** of the identified units deliver **negative secondary meaning** primarily to frame Iran’s actions as manipulative, coercive, or deceptive. For the same reason, most of the items examined have either **high (45.45%)** or **moderate (40.91%) evaluative load**. By employing charged terms such as ‘*propaganda operators*’ or ‘*troll accounts*’, authors of the article delegitimise actors of the opposing party to the US side, presenting them to their audience as inherently ‘bad’. Two other notable features of the publication are: **(1)** strong amplification technological threats as can be observed on the examples of terms ‘*AI generated footage*’ and ‘*online threats*’; **(2)** militarization of information space by terms like ‘*information war*’, ‘*disinformation weapon*’ which vividly present information as space and means of combat.

The second article included in the analysis was “*China is using the world’s largest known online disinformation operation to harass Americans, a CNN review finds,*” issued by CNN [O’Sullivan 2023]. 40 terms pertaining to informational warfare were identified in it. It is obvious that authors of the article intended for explicit evaluative intensification. This resulted in a high volume of informal words which also had an impact on the dataset where 15% of all words under analysis were of **informal nature**. Besides, analogously to the article by The Guardian, the text presents a high share of terms (82.50%) with **negative connotations** which are aimed at creating a strong moral condemnation. However, the majority of scrutinized units (55%) have **moderate evaluative charge**, are used in **informational framing** (72.50%) and function either for **conceptualization** (32.50%) or **specification** (27.50%). The most frequently used and productive in terms of compound building was the term ‘*Spamouflage*’. In total, there were 7 instances of its sole employment and 6 instances of its employment within compounds (e.g., ‘*operators of spamouflage*’, ‘*spamouflage accounts*’). This repetition serves for cognitive anchoring and discourse consolidation.

Overall, from the perspective of **qualitative analysis**, the findings reveal that 81.82% of terminological units possess **negative connotations** across both semantic groups. This tendency contributes to the construction of a discursive environment marked by threat, hostility, and strategic competition. In terms of **evaluative load**, most terms display **moderate colouring** (47.92%), indicating a balance between technical neutrality and evaluative force. Regarding **contextual framing**, the dominant pattern across the corpus is **informational framing** (29.86%), however, as these texts specifically focused on cyberwarfare, there is a notable share of **military and operational framings** (18,29%). The analysis of **pragmatic functions** shows that **informative** (16.67%) and **conceptualization** (15.97%) functions are the most prominent, with **identification** (13.89%) closely following in frequency.

Quantitatively, the study establishes that the average number of relevant terms per article is 36, with **cyberwarfare texts** demonstrating a higher density (**average of 41 terms**) compared to **informational warfare texts** (**average of 31 terms**).

The corpora also demonstrates high productivity of word formation with distinct patterns across the two domains. In **cyberwarfare discourse**, the most productive stems are ‘*cyber*’ and ‘*hack*’, alongside frequent compounds involving ‘*malware*’ and ‘*network*’ (e.g., ‘*cyberattack*’, ‘*hacker*’, ‘*destructive malware*’, ‘*computer networks*’). In contrast, **informational warfare** does not exhibit a single dominant stem. Instead, compound-creating productivity is distributed across key conceptual units such as ‘*information*’, ‘*disinformation*’, and ‘*spamouflage*’ (e.g., ‘*information environment*’, ‘*disinformation operation*’, ‘*spamouflage network*’).

In terms of **frequency**, the most recurrent terms in **cyberwarfare** texts include ‘*cyberattack*’, ‘*hacker*’, ‘*malware*’, and ‘*cyber operation*’, whereas **informational warfare** discourse is dominated by items such as ‘*asymmetric campaign/warfare*’, ‘*spamouflage*’, ‘*troll accounts*’, and ‘*disinformation*’. Conversely, the least frequent terms across all texts are those that are stylistically marked, metaphorical, or narrative-driven (e.g., ‘*cyber-mischief*’, ‘*to cauterise the digital wound*’, ‘“*tell*” of *spamouflage*’, ‘*media ecosystem*’). Despite the fact that these units are infrequent, they serve expressive and rhetorical functions, which are very important to engage a reader.

A key finding of the study is the systematic fusion of semantic fields. The analysed texts consistently integrate elements from military, technological, and intelligence domains, as illustrated by combinations such as: ‘*cyberwar*’, ‘*cyberweapons*’, ‘*information war*’ (**military**), ‘*malware*’, ‘*networks*’, ‘*AI-generated footage*’ (**technological**), and ‘*cyber-espionage*’, ‘*threat intelligence*’ (**intelligence**). This confirms that both cyberwarfare and informational warfare are inherently hybrid concepts and their terminology operates simultaneously across multiple conceptual domains.

Importantly, the analysis also reveals the interpenetration of the two semantic fields at the textual level. Although the article from **The New York Times** is focused on cyberwarfare, it contains 5 terms associated with informational warfare as well (e.g., ‘*disinformation narratives*’), while the informational warfare articles by **The Guardian** and **CNN** incorporate multiple cyberwarfare-framework terms (25 units in

total). This overlap further substantiates the argument that these domains have their inherent connections within modern conflict discourse.

Another significant pattern is the presence of one of the basic cognitive mechanisms of manipulation. It is known as ‘polarisation’ and consists in the fact that all the actions attributed to **good and blameless “Us”** (i.e. *the USA; NATO countries etc.*) tend to be described using neutral or technical terminology (e.g., ‘*cyber operations*’, ‘*social media strategy*’), whereas those associated with the **bad and vile “Them”** (i.e. *Cyber experts of other countries etc.*) are framed in negative, emotionally charged, or criminalized terms (e.g., ‘*cybercrime*’, ‘*propaganda operators*’). This asymmetry demonstrates the mechanism is used in practice by the media in order to shape people’s mental models and influence their opinions [Van Dijk 2006, p. 370].

3.2.2. Unmanned and electronic warfare terminology

The first article to analyse was concerned with the semantic field of **Unmanned Warfare (UW)** and produced by **The New York Times**. Its heading is “*The Killer Robots Are Coming. The Battlefield Will Never Look the Same*” and contained **51** terms from the sphere of interest [Varenikova 2026]. The text itself presents strong normalisation of military robotic systems. The point is supported by the facts that **78.43%** of the terminology observed in the text bears **neutral connotation** and units with **moderate** and **low evaluative loads** account for **43.14%** and **41.18%** correspondingly. Highly colored negative words appear only in key narrative nodes, such as ‘*Killer Robots*’ in the heading of the article. Prevailing parts of the items from the dataset are used either in **technological (52.94%)** or **operational/military framings (33.33%)**. Dominant functions of the terminological units analysed are: **identification (27.45%)** – for general notion naming; **generalization (27.45%)** – create a certain degree of abstraction; **specification (23.53%)** – ensures technical credibility of the article.

The next article analysed was concerned with the same semantic group. Its headline is “*Killing machines: how Russia and Ukraine’s race to perfect deadly*

pilotless drones could harm us all” and it was published by **The Guardian** [Boffey 2025]. **82** terms from the UV domain were identified in the publication. The text shows strong polarisation between the discourses. When the author describes real employment of drones during warfare or tells about considerations of authorities to prohibit or restrict the employment of unmanned systems, he tends to employ highly evaluative terminology such as *‘killing machines’* or *‘lethal autonomous weapon systems’* to highlight the threat posed by the latest technologies. When the focus shifts to a factual description of UVs and their specifications, the creator of the article switches to technical terminology, for example *‘visual navigation’* or *‘fibre optic drones.’* Thus, the article shapes the reader's attitude toward the problem and retains its professional credibility at the same time. Unlike the news text produced by The New York Times, the publication frequently employs metaphors (e.g., *‘teaching the drone’*, *‘killer offspring’*) making terminology more imaginable and threatening for the audience at the same time. However, two samples are quite similar in terms of **connotative** and **evaluative** colourings where **neutral (73.17%)** secondary meaning and **low (39.02%) / moderate (34.15%)** evaluative loads are prevailing. Dominant framings include **technological (46.34%)**, **threat (14.63%)** and **military (12.20%)** types. Functionally, **identification (28.05%)**, **specification (24.39%)** and **conceptualization (17.07%)** are the most widespread purposes of terms employment. This pragmatic strategy provides stabilization of professional vocabulary, building technical credibility and shaping reader perception.

The third source under investigation was the article by **CNN**. It covered the semantic field of **Electronic Warfare (EW)** and was titled *“GPS jamming is emerging as an increasingly prevalent — and troubling — weapon of war”* [Hunt 2026]. It included **63** terms which are connected to the domain of focus. The article presents the issue of signal interferences in an extremely negative way. **55.56%** of terminology from the dataset possesses **negative secondary meaning**. This is further amplified by the content with **high degree of evaluative marking** which constitutes **49.21%** of the dataset. The context of terms employment is mostly **technological (39.68%)** or **threatening (46.03%)**. Metaphorical framing is limited in the dataset as

we can observe only one term which expresses semantic shift (i.e. *'electronic fog.'*) All these facts create a narrative structure which prompts the reader to assess the threat that GPS signal jamming poses to global shipping from an emotional perspective. The text constantly repeats the terms *'jamming'*, *'spoofing'*, *'interference'* or their compounds (e.g., *'GPS jamming'*, *'spoofing of signals'*, *'electronic interference in navigation systems'*). This preserves the technical credibility of the text, whilst at the same time not impeding the emotion-based perception of the report, which would undoubtedly be affected by the utilisation of a wide range of specialist radio-electronic terminology. The biggest proportions of terms in the article perform either **generalization (36.51%)**, **specification (22.22%)** or **identification (19.05%)** pragmatic functions. This creates a framework which helps the average reader to quickly grasp the essence of the technological processes discussed in the text.

The final sample to analyse addressed the **EW semantic field** as well. The article bore the title *"Ukraine's invisible battle to jam Russian weapons"* and was published by **BBC** [Abdurasulov 2023]. A total of **46** terminological units from the investigated sphere were found in the publication. The main feature of the text is high focus on coverage of operational processes and practical employment of warfare technologies. This has a noticeable impact on the dataset as most of the terms employed in **military (36.96%)** or **technological (34.78%)** framings. **Connotatively**, most of the units analysed are **neutral (56.52%)** and their **evaluative charge** is **moderate** in most cases (**65.22%**). This creates a controlled and realistic atmosphere in the article which supports a sensible perception of EW. Pragmatically, the majority of terms perform either **identification (36.96%)** or **specification (34.78%)** functions, which performs a crucial role in shaping of EW not as a persistent threat but as a professionalized domain of modern warfare centered on control of information and signals.

In conclusion, the analysis reveals both consistent cross-corpus tendencies and outlet-specific discursive strategies. From the perspective of **qualitative parameters**, the majority of terms across all datasets exhibit **neutral connotation (62.81%)**,

confirming the general tendency toward terminological objectivity. However, the CNN article constitutes a notable deviation, displaying a predominance of **negative connotations**, which contributes to a more alarmist and threat-oriented narrative. In terms of **evaluative load**, most terms demonstrate **moderate intensity (37.19%)**, although significant variation is observed at the level of individual publications, reflecting differing editorial approaches. With regard to **contextual framing**, the **technological frame** clearly dominates across all samples, as it is evident in **43.80%** of all cases investigated. This is followed by **operational/military (18.18%)** and **security/threat contexts (19.01%)**, which situate the terminology within active combat and risk-oriented frameworks. In contrast, **spatial** and **metaphorical** framings occur least frequently (**0.41%** and **1.24%** of the dataset correspondingly), indicating a general preference for concrete and technical representation over figurative conceptualization. The analysis of **pragmatic functions** reveals that **specification (27.27%)** and **identification (25.62%)** are the most prevalent, underscoring the informative and classificatory role of military terminology.

Quantitatively, the datasets show a relatively stable distribution of terminology, with an average of **54.5** terms in **Electronic Warfare articles** and **66.5** terms in **Unmanned Warfare articles**, resulting in an overall average of **60.5** terms per text.

The corpora further demonstrates a high degree of **word-formation productivity**, particularly through compounding and derivation. In the **Unmanned Warfare datasets**, the most productive stems include '*drone*', '*robot*', '*system*', and '*autonomous*', while in the **Electronic Warfare datasets**, stems such as '*jam*', '*signal*', and '*electronic warfare*' exhibit the highest productivity. Correspondingly, **the most frequent terms** include '*drone*', '*robot*', and '*unmanned system*' in the former group, and '*jamming*', '*spoofing*', '*interference*', and '*electronic warfare*' in the latter. Conversely, **the least frequent terms** are typically stylistically marked or context-specific, often involving metaphorical or narrative-driven expressions such as '*mother drone*', '*electronic fog*', '*vehicle with rockets*', or '*to teach the drone*'. Despite their low-frequency, these units are still important as discursive intensifiers, attention attractors and interpretation shapers.

An important finding concerns the interdisciplinary overlap of semantic fields. The CNN article on **Electronic Warfare** includes terms associated with **Unmanned Warfare** (e.g., *'GPS-guided drones'*), while the articles on **Unmanned Warfare** incorporate elements of **Electronic Warfare** (e.g., *'jamming systems'*) and **Cyberwarfare** (e.g., *'system that integrates data'*). This confirms the interconnected and hybrid nature of modern military lexicon, reflecting the convergence of technological domains in contemporary conflict.

A further salient pattern is the systematic use of **euphemization**, which operates as a key discursive strategy. Terms such as *'unmanned systems'*, *'suppression'*, *'interference'*, and *'operations function'* to obscure or mitigate the destructive nature of military actions, thereby contributing to depersonalization, institutional alignment, and discursive sanitization. Importantly, this tendency coexists with instances of selective de-euphemization (e.g., *'killer,' 'lethal'*), producing a contrastive effect that heightens rhetorical impact.

3.3. Military terminology in the US and UK media

This section provides a comprehensive comparison of the employment of military terminology by British publishers on one side and by their colleagues from the USA on the other. The material presented in this part focuses on articles, which examine innovations within the Ukrainian armed forces in the field of unmanned systems, as well as their military and political implications.

Of the two articles of **British** origin that were analysed the sample by **The Guardian** was entitled “*‘The frontline is like Terminator’: fighting robots give Ukraine hope in war with Russia*” [Harding 2026]. In it, **48** terminological units belonging to the semantic field of unmanned warfare (UW) were found. The terminology in text is highly narrativised (used in soldiers’ testimonies, battlefield anecdotes) and discursively mobilized to frame war as technologically transformative and future-oriented. The news report constantly builds terminological synonymic chains (e.g., unmanned ground vehicles; UGVs; land robots; land drones; systems; machines). This strategy helps to avoid lexical monotony and make the text more

engaging for a prospective reader. The article tends to frame the deeds of drones in the manner that they seem to be independent actors in the modern warfare and not tools in the hands of soldiers (e.g., “*Since December 2025 the robots have brought provisions to Ukrainian soldiers based around the ruined eastern city of Pokrovsk...*”)

The **BBC** publication was titled “*Armed robots take to the battlefield in Ukraine war*” [Shevchenko 2026]. It contains **49** terms belonging to the field of interest. Compared to The Guardian, the BBC text is less dramatized and more analytically explanatory with stronger military-institutional discourse. The UV terms in it are frequently employed in direct (e.g., “**Robots** can misidentify the wrong person or attack a civilian. That's why the final decision must be made by **an operator**.”) and indirect quotes (e.g., “*Afghan admits there are limits to the **killer robots' autonomy**...*”) of various experts. The core term of the article is ‘UGV’ as well as compounds with it (e.g., ‘*battery-powered kamikaze UGVs*’, ‘*armed UGVs*’, ‘*lethal UGVs*’). Despite of such terminological focus, the text still exhibits synonymic variation across terminological units in order to ensure greater ease of reading and linguistic variety (e.g., ‘*armed uncrewed ground vehicles*’, ‘*armed robots*’, ‘*armed UGVs*’, ‘*killer robots*’). One more fact worth noting is that the abbreviation ‘UGV’ is expanded with the word ‘*uncrewed*’ and not ‘*unmanned*’ which reflects modern institutional norms and signals official discourse [Kallenborn 2025]. In general, the terminology in the article highlights killing in an emotional and opened way (e.g. ‘*killer robots*’, ‘*lethal UGVs*’).

At the same time, the first of the analysed publications of United States origin was published by **The New York Times** and was titled “*Amid Uncertainty About U.S. Support, Ukraine Pins Its Hopes on Innovation*” [Kramer 2025]. The article contained **45** terminological items belonging to the UV semantic field. It constructs uncrewed technologies within a strategic-adaptive framework, where drones and related systems are presented as instruments of military necessity and strategic survival mechanism. The main lexical element of the text is ‘*drone*’. It is often repeated across paragraphs and, in contrast to British samples, rarely replaced with

synonyms. Besides, the frequent occurrence of compound terms in the text (e.g., *'reconnaissance and strike drones'*, *'attack drone squad'*, *'first-person-view drones'*) helps to build taxonomy within a single term. Additionally, compared to British articles, autonomous systems are less anthropomorphised which means that in more contexts they appear as tools in hands of people and not as independent actors (e.g., *"Drones don't replace troops; in fact, each flight of a first-person-view drone can require up to four soldiers."*) Like the BBC report, the publication frequently uses the terminology under study in quotes from experts (e.g., *"The idea is to cover the whole front line with **drones**," he said."*) However, in addition to these, can be observed some instances of the professional vocabulary being used in short military accounts (e.g., *"But the final frame of the video feed showed the drone had zeroed in on him at close range..."*)

The subsequent sample from the USA was produced by CNN. Its headline is *"'Robots don't bleed': Ukraine sends machines into the battlefield in place of human soldiers"* [Kottasová 2026]. 47 terminological units were identified in the text. The central thesis of the article is outlined in the phrase *"Robots don't bleed"* presenting a substitution paradigm in which terminological units serve to present technologies as a means of preservation of soldiers' lives. The vocabulary core in the publication is split between 2 words: *'drones'* and *'robots'* which are frequently employed in pairs (e.g., *'land robots and drones'*, *'ground robots and drones'*, *"...to replace a third of infantry with drones and robots..."*). Analogously to the text by The New York Times, the synonymic variation across the terminology is limited and semantic variability is achieved by means of compound building (e.g., *'ground robotic systems'*, *'robotic strike systems'*, *'aerial drone observation'*, *'battlefield drones'*). Despite the fact that the central idea is the replacement of people with uncrewed vehicles on the battlefield, robots are represented in a balanced way with the emphasis of being tools and not fully independent agents (e.g., *"...the two Russians were submitting to Ukrainian land robots and drones controlled by a pilot from the safety of a position miles away from the front line."*) . Narrative scenes are short and

largely outnumbered by analytical passages such as strategy explanations or expert commentary.

The comparative analysis of military terminology in the semantic field of unmanned warfare between **British** (The Guardian, BBC News) and **American** (The New York Times, CNN) media discourse reveals distinct quantitative and qualitative patterns in their linguistic representation.

From a quantitative perspective, the average number of identified terms in **British** articles is **48.5** and in **American** counterparts is **46**. This demonstrates that the density of military terminology is almost identical across both corpora. In terms of **connotation**, the majority of units under investigation in both datasets are **neutral** (**58.76%** for UK articles and **66.30%** for their US counterparts), reflecting their primarily information transmitting purpose. Similarly, the overall **evaluative load** is generally **low** (**44.33%** for UK and **47.83%** for US). However, the **BBC News article** stands out for its comparatively higher proportion of **evaluatively marked** terms, which comprises **38.78%** of the researched wordlist. In particular, those terminological items highlight the lethal nature of actions performed by unmanned systems (e.g., *'killer robots'*), which introduces a more pronounced ethical and affective dimension.

Regarding **contextual framing**, both British and American sources predominantly situate the UV terminology within **military** (**44.33%** for UK and **42.39%** for US) and **technological** contexts (**24.74%** for UK and **29.35%** for their US), which are subsequently amplified mainly by the **threat frameworks** in the case of UK sources (**11.34%**) and with the **institutional formulations** in the articles by US publishers (**10.87%**).

In terms of **pragmatic functions**, **British** media are characterized by the predominance of **identification** (**42.86%**) role of terminology, with **generalization** (**18.37%**), **specification** (**14.29%**) and **intensification** (**12.24%**) occupying a secondary position according to the quantity of their employment. In contrast, **American** sources prioritize **generalization** (**30.43%**), while units used with **specification** (**22.83%**) and **identification** (**22.83%**) purposes share the second rank

accounting for equal shares in the dataset. This indicates that UK publishers more actively tend to define and categorize emerging phenomena, whereas their US competitors focus on broader conceptual framing supported by clarifying detail.

A key distinction emerges in **terminological organization**. **British** sources employ obvious terminological plurality, synonymic chains and lexical variation (e.g., *'robots'*; *'uncrewed ground vehicles'*; *'drones'*; *'UGVs'*). This results in semantic expansion, which contributes to ease of reading and makes the text more aesthetically appealing. Conversely, **American** publications demonstrate terminological stabilization, relying on a limited set of widely accessible terms (i.e., *'drones'* in **The New York Times**, *'drones'* and *'robots'* in **CNN**). This produces semantic consolidation through repetition, while enhancing clarity and accessibility.

Differences are also evident in **the use of modifiers**. British media frequently employs **evaluatively loaded** (e.g., *'killer robots'*) and sometimes **metaphorical** modifiers (e.g., *'droid-like machine'*), contributing to richer connotative meaning and interpretative depth of terminology. In contrast, American content makers favor **functionally precise, technical modifiers**, (e.g., *'ground-based robotic systems'*, *'small exploding drones'*) which serve classificatory and explanatory purposes of professional words rather than evaluative ones.

The analysis of **agency construction** further highlights divergence. In articles produced by the **UK** publishers, agency is ambiguous and shifting. The **UK** terminology is used to portray uncrewed systems as quasi-autonomous actors which possess some potential risk (e.g., **"The Guardian"**: *"One system – a DevDroid TW 12.7 – defended a position for 45 days."* and **"BBC News"**: *"Robots can misidentify the wrong person or attack a civilian."*) In US discourse, agency is explicitly structured and non-ambiguous, with humans (e.g., *'pilot'*, *'crew'*, *'operator'*) remaining central, and machines consistently framed as tools within a controlled system (e.g., *"For flights last week in northeastern Ukraine, a **drone squad** consisted of a **pilot**, a **navigator**, an **armor**er and a **pilot of a retransmitting drone**."*)

This distinction is reinforced by patterns of **anthropomorphization**. British sources exhibit strong anthropomorphic patterns, utilising military professional words

to attribute human-like roles and actions to machines, thereby positioning them as functional equivalents of soldiers (e.g., “...*claims that one **Ukrainian UGV** armed with a **machine gun** ambushed a Russian personnel carrier, while a **robot defended a Ukrainian position** for weeks.*”) In contrast, American sources systematically alternate between anthropomorphic (e.g., “**Drones** from both sides already **hum** near continuously **over the battlefield.**”) and non-anthropomorphic (e.g., “...*the two Russians were submitting to Ukrainian **land robots and drones controlled by a pilot...***”) expressions, with a tendency to employ military terminology to present drones and robots as instruments operated by humans.

Some distinctions can also be observed at the level of **discursive strategy**, having direct impacts on the terminology employment. **British** media adopt an approach of problematization and rational evaluation, highlighting the novelty of unmanned technologies, exploring their implications, and maintaining a degree of ambivalence (e.g., “*If you shoot a ground robot it doesn’t feel pain. There is a guy looking at a screen who is going to fire back.*”). **American** publishers, by contrast, follow a strategy of rationalization and justification, focusing on functionality, legitimizing technological use, and normalizing its integration into warfare (e.g., “*Land drones are much harder to spot and intercept than larger military vehicles. Compared with their aerial counterparts, they can operate in all weather conditions and carry much larger payloads.*”)

In summary, while British and American media employ a comparable volume of military terminology with largely neutral connotations, the ways in which the investigated terminology is deployed differ substantially, leading to distinct discursive effects. In **British** sources, the use of terminological plurality, synonymic chains, and evaluatively loaded modifiers results in a more semantically expansive and conceptually fluid terminological system, where professional words are continuously reframed and acquire additional connotations, enhancing the interpretative openness. By contrast, in **American** media, the preference for lexical repetition, stable core terms and functionally precise modifiers leads to semantic consolidation and standardization. As a result, military terminology tends to retain a

fixed, instrumental meaning, minimizing ambiguity and reinforcing its role as a tool for clear communication, strategic explanation, and practical justification.

Conclusion to Chapter III

The analysis of the terminology across the examined media outlets demonstrates that contemporary media discourse employs military professional words not merely as technical designations, but as important instruments of discursive representation, ideological framing, and audience orientation. In the investigated articles publishers used the terms to shape perception, construct agency, influence evaluation, and frame the interpretation of contemporary warfare and technologies used on the battlefield. Across all analysed semantic fields, the investigated units predominantly possess **neutral (53.04%)** or **negative (39.13%) connotations** and **moderate (38.08%)** or **low evaluative colouring (36.35%)**, while the dominant **contexts** of usage remain **technological (30.26%)** and **military (25.04%)**. The findings further indicate that **identification (24.35%)**, **generalizing (18.96%)**, **specification (18.43%)**, **conceptualization (9.22%)** and **intensification (9.22%) functions** prevail in the analysed corpora, confirming the central role of terminology in structuring and interpreting military information for a broad audience.

The research also reveals a **high degree of lexical productivity**, **semantic flexibility**, and **hybridization** within contemporary military discourse. Media texts actively combine terminology originating from military, technological, intelligence, and operational domains, which contributes to multi-layered interpretation and conceptual expansion. At the same time, professional and highly specialized terms are frequently simplified or replaced with more accessible lexical units, reflecting the media's orientation toward a non-specialist readership.

The corpora additionally demonstrate notable differences in discursive strategies between **British** and **American media sources**: **UK publications** tend to employ more evaluatively loaded, metaphorical, and terminologically varied language that foregrounds uncertainty created by wide employment of unmanned systems, warfare transformation, and ethical reflection, whereas **US media discourse** is characterized

by greater lexical stability, functional precision, and rationalized representation of military technologies as necessary and efficient operational instruments.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings, derived from a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative analysis, confirm that military terminology constitutes a highly systematized yet dynamically evolving linguistic subsystem, shaped by the interaction of conceptual, institutional, and communicative factors.

First, the analysis of theoretical sources has demonstrated that, despite the absence of a unified definition of '*terminology*', it remains an essential subject of linguistic research due to its crucial role in the systematic organisation, transmission and dissemination of scientific knowledge and technologies, as well as in the storage, retrieval and interlingual transfer of specialised information. The conducted overview also made it possible to determine the principal characteristics of a '*term*', which include systematicity, definiteness, accuracy, relative independence of context, unambiguity within a particular terminological sphere, expressive neutrality and compliance with the norms of a language system. Particular attention was devoted to the concept of '*military terminology*', which can be defined as a systematic, standardised and harmonised set of military terms functioning within professional military communication. The investigation established that military terminology preserves the general linguistic features inherent to terms while simultaneously possessing a number of specific characteristics, namely a heightened degree of precision and unambiguity, international unification aimed at ensuring interoperability between armed forces, as well as constant evolution and adaptation in response to changes in military doctrine, operational strategies and technological development.

Second, the examination of theoretical sources devoted to the notion of '*media discourse*' has made it possible to determine it as a public, planned and institutionally oriented form of interaction realised through written or oral communication and directed towards a non-present audience, where immediate feedback between the addresser and the addressee is often absent. The investigation has also established that '*media discourse*' performs a wide range of interrelated functions, including cognitive, informative, communicative, persuasive, regulatory, constructive,

value-forming, integrative, cultural and hedonistic ones, thereby functioning not only as a means of information transmission but also as an instrument of influence on public opinion, social values and collective perception of reality. In the context of the present research, these characteristics of media discourse are of particular significance, since they create the communicative environment in which military terminological units acquire additional semantic, pragmatic and evaluative features, which are essential for conducting linguistic investigation.

Third, the study identified four relevant semantic fields, namely **cyberwarfare**, **unmanned warfare**, **electronic warfare**, and **informational warfare**. The selected representatives of modern military terminology were subdivided according to them. Such selection has further demonstrated that each domain possesses a distinct yet interrelated terminological profile. These profiles are determined by the cognitive demands of the respective fields, with technology-oriented spheres (e.g. UW; EWs) exhibiting greater structural complexity, precision, and standardization, while media-oriented domains and domains embedded in daily life practices (e.g. Informational warfare) display higher degrees of abstraction, conceptual fluidity, and interdisciplinary influence.

Fourth, the structural and linguistic analysis has revealed systematic regularities across all semantic groups. The predominance of **two-component** terminological units indicates a general tendency toward balancing semantic precision with linguistic economy. At the same time, the investigation highlighted increased frequency of multicomponent constructions in more complex domains, particularly **3-component units** in **cyberwarfare**, **UVs** and **EW** semantic fields. The fact confirms the direct relationship between **conceptual density** and **structural expansion**. In addition the variations in levels of codification and formality were observed. More **institutionalized** and **historically established** domains (e.g. EW) tend to develop stable, formalized, and highly standardized terminological systems. Conversely, domains characterized by **ongoing conceptual development** and **active interdisciplinary interaction** (e.g. Informational warfare) exhibit greater variability,

lower levels of codification, and a higher proportion of semi-formal and informal units.

Fifth, the analysis of military terminology in media discourse has shown that the professional lexicon extends beyond its purely nominative function and operates as an essential mechanism of discourse construction. Although **neutral connotations** (53.04% of all terms identified in the articles analysed) along with **moderate** (38.09%) and **low** (36.35%) **evaluative loads** are predominant overall, a significant number of investigated units across media outlets reveals the influence of editorial strategies on terminological usage. The dominance of **technological framing** (30.26%), combined with frequent **military** (25.04%) and **threat-oriented** (12.34%) contexts, indicates a preference for a disconcerting, but, nevertheless, concrete, critical and detail-focused representations of warfare. At the same time, **pragmatic functions** such as **specification** (18.43%), **identification** (24.34%) and **conceptualization** (9.22%) reflect the need of any news article to transfer the information, or, particularly in the investigated case, to classify and precisely describe emerging technologies. Meanwhile, the relatively high presence of **intensification** (9.22%), and **generalization** (18.96%) **functions** indicates that modern military terminology is also mobilized to amplify significance and construct broader conceptual narratives.

Another prominent feature which is inherent to all the datasets analysed except from the **informational warfare** domain, is a **high degree of word-formation productivity**, particularly through compounding and derivation. The most productive stems and words, such as *'cyber'*; *'hack'*; *'drone'*; *'robot'*; *'system'*; *'autonomous'*; *'jam'*; and *'signal'*, form the structural core of the lexicon, and, at the same time, reflect the dominant technological and operational concerns of each semantic domain. On the contrary, low-frequency items (e.g., *'burrow deeper into networks'*, *'mother drone'*, *'electronic fog'*, *"'tell" of Spamouflage'*) tend to be stylistically marked, context-bound, and often metaphorical. They usually function as context-specific means of discursive emphasis.

Concurrently, **informational warfare** discourse does not display a single dominant derivational stem or word, instead relying on a **cluster of frequently recurring conceptual units** (e.g., *'information'*, *'disinformation'*). It is most probably caused by the facts that the sphere is the newest out of all differentiated and it has the closest connection to the mundane people's lives therefore drawing a huge number of words from general public lexicon.

In addition, the results of the conducted analysis indicate that the media representation of terminology from all military domains analysed demonstrates a high degree of **conceptual and linguistic convergence** (e.g., articles on the topic of Electronic Warfare contain some terms that belong to Unmanned Warfare semantic field). This pattern is especially observable between **Cyber and Informational** warfares along with **UVs and EW** domains which justifies their pairing and further consideration within a unified analytical framework. Overall, the above-mentioned feature confirms the hybrid and convergent nature of modern military terminology from all the semantic fields analysed and reflects the integrated character of contemporary warfare in the context of their coverage in the media discourse.

Sixth, the comparative analysis of **British and American media sources** has identified both similarities and differences in the employment of military terminology. While both discourses maintain a broadly similar quantitative distribution of selected units according to connotation, evaluative charges, contextual framings and pragmatic functions, they differ in their discursive realization.

In **British media**, the reliance on terminological plurality, synonymic chains, and evaluatively marked modifiers, which sporadically involve metaphorization, transforms military terms into flexible semantic units, capable of expanding their meaning and accommodating multiple interpretative layers. As a result, terminology becomes a medium through which the discourse not only describes but also warns and problematizes the evolving nature of warfare. It helps to blend technological, ethical, and disconcerting cognitive dimensions of the reader's minds.

By contrast, **American media** discourse creates a more fixed and operationally oriented semantic framework of terms functioning. This is achieved through its

preference for lexical stability, repetition of core terms (e.g., '*drone*'; '*robot*'), and functionally precise adverbs and adjectives (e.g., '*attack drone squad*'; '*remotely controlled vehicles*'). By means of that, terms are predominantly used to portray UVs as instruments in the hands of people. Professional words serve to structure, clarify, and rationalize the use of uncrewed systems and consequently, they normalize these technologies as integral components of contemporary military practice.

Taken together, these findings substantiate the central hypothesis that modern military terminology is not merely a neutral system of technical designations but a complex and multifunctional linguistic phenomenon. Its structural organization reflects the conceptual architecture of military knowledge, while its semantic and pragmatic flexibility enables it to adapt to diverse communicative environments, particularly within media discourse where it plays a pivotal role in shaping public perception of conflict.

From a **practical perspective**, the results of this study may be applied in several domains. In **media studies and journalism**, a more critical awareness of terminological choices can contribute to more vivid, transparent and responsible reporting. In **translation and intercultural communication**, understanding the structural and semantic variability of military terms can enhance interpretive accuracy and reduce misinterpretation. Finally, in **linguistic and terminological research**, the identified patterns provide a foundation for further investigation into the evolution of specialized vocabularies under the influence of rapidly changing technological and geopolitical conditions.

Overall, the study demonstrates that the analysis of military terminology offers valuable insights not only into language structure but also into the ways in which contemporary warfare is conceptualized, communicated, and interpreted in the information society.

REFERENCES

1. Бабій І. В., Кучвара Л. Б. Структурний аналіз військових термінів в англійській та українській мовах. Львівський філологічний часопис. 2023. No 13. URL: http://philologyjournal.lviv.ua/archives/13_2023/1.pdf.
2. Балабін В. В. Сучасний американський військовий сленг як проблема перекладу: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук. 2002. URL: <https://uacademic.info/ua/document/0402U002726>.
3. Бевзо Г. А., Алиєва А. Д., Поліщук О. С. Лексико-семантичні особливості англійської військової термінології. Академічні студії. Серія «Гуманітарні науки». 2022. No 1. Р. 120–125. DOI: 10.52726/as.humanities/2022.1.18. URL: <http://www.academstudies.volyn.ua/index.php/humanities/article/view/260/247>.
4. Василенко Д. В. Розвиток словникового складу англійської мови військової сфери XX – початку XXI століття: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук. 2008. URL: <http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/aref/2009050500190920090505001909>.
5. Д'яков А. С., Кияк Т. Р., Куделько З. Б. Основи термінотворення: семантичні та соціолінгвістичні аспекти. Київ: KM Academia. 2000. URL: http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/cgi-bin/ua/elib.exe?Z21ID=&I21DBN=UKRLIB&P21DBN=UKRLIB&S21STN=1&S21REF=10&S21FMT=online_book&C21COM=S&S21CNR=20&S21P01=0&S21P02=0&S21P03=FF=&S21STR=ukr000404.
6. Зацний Ю. А. Розвиток словникового складу англійської мови в 80-ті – 90-ті роки XX століття: автореф. дис. ... д-ра філол. наук. 1999. URL: <http://search.nbuv.gov.ua/publ/REF-0000255702>.
7. Комісія з журналістської етики. Рекомендації Комісії з журналістської етики щодо словника воєнного часу (оновлено). 2022. URL: <https://cje.org.ua/statements/rekomendatsii-komisii-z-zhurnalistiskoi-etyky-shchodo-slovnyka-voiennoho-chasu/>.

8. Корольов Р. Поняття дискурсу в сучасному мовознавстві: визначення, структура, типологія. *Studia Linguistica*. Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка. 2012. URL: <https://studia-linguistica.knu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2018/11/2012-6-2-285-305-%D0%9A%D0%BE%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%BB%D1%8C%D0%BE%D0%B2-%D0%86.%D0%A0..pdf>.
9. Корольова Т., Соріч Р., Александрова О. Військовий дискурс та особливості його перекладу. Науковий вісник ПНПУ ім. К. Д. Ушинського. 2021. URL: <https://www.lingstud.od.ua/archive/2021/33/26.pdf>.
10. Кочерган М. П. Вступ до мовознавства. Видавничий центр «Академія». 2001. URL: https://shron1.chtyvo.org.ua/Kocherhan_Mykhailo/Vstup_do_movoznavsta.pdf.
11. Лемешко О. Структурні характеристики англomовних військових термінів. Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук. 2020. Vol. 27. Р. 56. URL: https://aphn-journal.in.ua/archive/27_2020/part_3/11.pdf.
12. Мірошніченко І. Г. Стислий текст в українському масмедійному дискурсі. Дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Дніпро. 2020. URL: https://www.dnu.dp.ua/docs/ndc/dissertations/K08.051.05/dissertation_5f47fa5e219da.pdf.
13. Поліщук Н. О. Військова термінологіка в мові сучасних масмедіа. Термінологічний вісник. 2023. Вип. 7. Р. 100–110. URL: <https://termvisnyk.iul-nasu.org.ua/wp-content/uploads/sites/11/2023/06/12.pdf>.
14. Пономарів О. Д. Стилiстика сучасної української мови. Тернопіль: Навчальна книга. 2000. URL: <http://irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/ulib/item/UKR0001854>.
15. Стацюк Р. В. Основні підходи до визначення поняття «термін» у сучасній лінгвістичній науці. 2016. URL: http://ddpu-filolvisnyk.com.ua/uploads/arkhiv-nomerov/2016/NV_2016_5-2/29.pdf.

16. Янчук С. Я. Особливості перекладу військової документації миротворчих місій ООН та НАТО: автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук. 2011. URL: <http://www.irbis-nbuv.gov.ua/publ/REF-0000494059>.
17. Akmedov O. S. Lexical-Semantic Features of English Military Terms. Ethiopian International Multidisciplinary Research Conferences. 2025. С. 16–21. URL: <https://eijmr.org/conferences/index.php/eimrc/article/view/409>.
18. Alharahsheh A. M. M. A Comparative Study "Translatability of English Military Terms into Arabic Language by Translators with Military Backgrounds and Civilian Translators". Forum for Linguistic Studies. 2024. Vol. 6, No 6. P. 310–315. DOI: 10.30564/fls.v6i6.6715. URL: <https://journals.bilpubgroup.com/index.php/fls/article/view/6715>.
19. Aminova D. Military Terminology as a Special Layer of the Lexical System of Language. Western European Journal of Historical Events and Social Science. 2023. Vol. 1, No 3. P. 23–25. URL: <https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/4/article/view/61>.
20. Aminova D. Polysemy in Military Terminology. Western European Journal of Historical Events and Social Science. 2023. Vol. 1, No 3. P. 20–22. URL: <https://westerneuropeanstudies.com/index.php/4/article/view/60>.
21. Amoroso A. Electronic Warfare AKA Electromagnetic Warfare - EMSOPEDIA. 2021. URL: <https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/electronic-warfare-aka-electromagnetic-warfare/>.
22. Aziz A. E. Information Warfare in the Modern World. Baltic Journal of Legal and Social Sciences. 2025. No 4. P. 191–197. DOI: 10.30525/2592-8813-2025-4-23. URL: <http://www.baltijapublishing.lv/index.php/bjlss/article/view/3189/3156>.
23. Babayev S., Hashimov E., Akhundov R. The Impact of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles on the Strategy and Tactics of Modern Warfare. 2025. URL: <https://previous.scientia.report/index.php/archive/article/view/3067>.

24. Balabin V. V. et al. Лінгвістичне забезпечення військ (сил). Основні положення. Військовий стандарт 01.003.001. 2018. URL: https://milstand.knu.ua/uploads/p_573_19168698.pdf.
25. Bilousova O., Olkhovyk K. O., Risinger L. From the Battlefield to the Future of Warfare: Harnessing Ukraine's Drone Innovations to Advance U.S. Military Capabilities. KSE Institute. 2025. URL: https://kse.ua/wp-content/uploads/2025/11/KSE_Institute_Report_Harnessing_Ukraines_Drone_Innovations_to_Advance.pdf.
26. Bogachyk M., Bihunov D. The Structural-Semantic Features of Computer Terms in English. Cognitive Studies | Études cognitives. 2020. No 20. Article 2262. DOI: 10.11649/cs.2262.
27. Chaloupský L. A. Sociolinguistic Interpretation of Military Slang and Vernacular Expressions. Brno. 2005. URL: https://is.muni.cz/th/56285/ff_d/Final-jirsa-opr1Av2.pdf.
28. Chtatou M. Introduction to the Science of Terminology – Analysis. Eurasia Review. 2022. URL: <https://www.eurasiareview.com/08012022-introduction-to-the-science-of-terminology-analysis/>.
29. Costigan S. S., Hennessy M. A. Hybrid Threats and Hybrid Warfare Reference Curriculum. NATO Headquarters Brussels. 2024. URL: <https://www.nato.int/content/dam/nato/webready/documents/deep/Hybrid-threats-and-hybrid-warfare-ENGLISH.pdf>.
30. Dochinoiu E. English Military Terminology as an Essential Dimension of The Specialized Language. 2011. URL: https://doctorat.ubbcluj.ro/sustinerea_publica/rezumat/2011/filologie/dochinoiu_fuiorea_elena_en.pdf.
31. Dubuc R. Terminology: A practical Approach. Quebec: Canada National Library. 1997. P. 196

32. Felber H. Terminology manual. International Information Centre for Terminology (Austria). 1984. URL: <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000062033>.
33. Fraas C., Klemm M. Diskurse – Medien – Mediendiskurse. Begriffsklärungen und Ausgangsfragen. Frankfurt/Berlin/Bern/New York/Paris/Wien. 2005. URL: https://michaelklemm.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/fraas_klemm_mediendiskurse_vorwort.pdf.
34. Gaivenis K. Lietuvių terminologija: teorijos ir tvarkybos metmenys. Vilnius: Lietuvių kalbos institutas. 2002.
35. Georgieva V. Military English: from Theory to Practice. 2015. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363582336_MILITARY_ENGLISH_FROM_THEORY_TO_PRACTICE.
36. Gortney W. E. Collateral damage. Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. 2010. P. 55.
37. Gries S. TH. Corpus Linguistics: Quantitative methods. 2024. DOI: 10.1002/9781405198431.wbeal20003. URL: https://stgries.info/research/ToApp_STG_CorpLingQuantMeth_EncApplLing2.pdf.
38. Ivashchenko V., Ivashchenko D. Ukrainian Military Terminology in the Conditions of Armed Aggression: Legislative And Media Discourses. Terminology Science & Research. 2023. No 26. P. 45–67. URL: https://elibrary.kubg.edu.ua/id/eprint/45544/1/Ivashchenko_V_Ivashchenko_D_TSR_2023_26_45-67.pdf.
39. Jaleniauskiene E., Čičelytė V. Insight into the Latest Computer and Internet Terminology. Studies About Languages. 2011. DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.0.19.955. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/265032595_Insight_into_the_Latest_Computer_and_Internet_Terminology.

40. Kevin D. S. Joint Publication 3-12 Cyberspace Operations. 2018. URL: <https://www.onlinelibrary.iihl.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/2018-JP-3-12-Cyberspace-Operations.pdf>.
41. Jørgensen M. W., Phillips L. J. Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method. SAGE Publications Limited. 2002. URL: https://moodle.znu.edu.ua/pluginfile.php/697206/mod_resource/content/1/Discourse%20analysis%20as%20Theory%20and%20Method.pdf.
42. Kallenborn Z. Stop Saying “Uncrewed” Vehicles. Modern War Institute. 2025. URL: <https://mwi.westpoint.edu/stop-saying-uncrewed-vehicles/>.
43. Keagle J. M., Petros T. G. Building Partner Capacity through Education: NATO Engagement with the Partnership for Peace. The Quarterly Journal. 2010. URL: https://connections-qj.org/system/files/download-count/10.1.03_keagle_petros.pdf.
44. Kurbanova M., Ataeva G. Linguistic Methods for Investigating Concepts in Use. Middle European Scientific Bulletin. 2020. No 4. P. 44–47. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/348749714_Linguistic_methods_for_investigating_concepts_in_use.
45. Martin G. Collateral Damage - Meaning & Origin of the Phrase. Phrase Finder. 2023. URL: <https://www.phrases.org.uk/meanings/97000.html>.
46. McEnery T., Hardie A. Corpus Linguistics: Method, Theory and Practice. Cambridge University Press. 2011. URL: <https://nlp.csie.org/~sound/Corpus%20Linguistics%20Method%20Theory%20and%20Practice.pdf>.
47. Musurmanova S. Functional and Semantic Analyses of Military Terms. European Journal of Humanities and Educational Advancements (EJHEA). 2022. P. 132–134. URL: <https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejhea/article/view/2562>.
48. Muxammadkasimovna P. N. Basic Approaches and Methods of Term and Terminology. European Journal of Research Development and Sustainability

- (EJRDS). 2021. P. 49–50. URL:
<https://scholarzest.com/index.php/ejrds/article/download/356/304/816>.
49. Nagy I. K. An Introduction to Lexical Semantics for Students of Translation Studies. Cluj-Napoca: Scientia. 2017. URL:
<https://files.core.ac.uk/download/pdf/335374448.pdf>.
50. O’Keeffe A. Media and Discourse analysis. The Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Routledge Oxon/New York. 2012. P. 441–454. URL:
<https://circulosemiotico.wordpress.com/wp-content/uploads/2020/05/routledge-handbook-of-discourse-analysis.pdf>.
51. Palchevska O., Aleksandruk I., Tyshchenko O., Labenko O., Sydorenko O. Military Slang: Origin, Structure and Semantics. Amazonia Investiga. 2023. Vol. 12, No 69. P. 42–50. DOI: 10.34069/AI/2023.69.09.3. URL:
<https://amazoniainvestiga.info/check/69/3-42-50.pdf>.
52. Pavlyuk L. Terminology in the Media Analysis of War: Naming Conflict, Strategies and Solutions. 2018. DOI: 10.30970/vjo.2018.44.9370. URL:
<https://publications.lnu.edu.ua/bulletins/index.php/journalism/article/viewFile/9370/9371>.
53. Pronoza I. I. Fundamentals of the Theory of Information War. Development Trends of Scholarly Knowledge in Philosophy, Sociology and Political Sciences. 2019. P. 168–186. DOI: 10.36059/978-966-397-125-4/168-186. URL:
<http://catalog.liha-pres.eu/index.php/liha-pres/catalog/download/30/348/757-1?inline=1>.
54. Rockel S. J., Halpern R. Inventing Collateral Damage: Civilian Casualties, War, and Empire. Between the Lines (CA). 2009. URL:
https://archive.org/details/isbn_9781897071120.
55. Rohach L. V. Lexical and Semantic Features of Geology Terms in English. 2019. URL:
<http://catalog.liha-pres.eu/index.php/liha-pres/catalog/view/65/744/1621-1>.

56. Saeed J. I. Semantics. Wiley-Blackwell. 2009. URL: https://www.academia.edu/25250981/Saeed_john_i_semantics.
57. Sageder D. Terminology today: A Science, an Art or a Practice? Some Aspects on Terminology and Its Development. 2010. URL: https://www.academia.edu/25351271/terminology_today_a_science_an_art_or_a_practice_some_aspects_on_terminology_and_its_development.
58. Sager J. C. A Practical Course in Terminology Processing. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1990. URL: https://api.pageplace.de/preview/DT0400.9789027274342_A24758665/preview-9789027274342_A24758665.pdf.
59. Shevchenko L., Syzenko A. Comparative Analysis of Military Terminology. Current Issues of Linguistics and Translation Studies. 2024. No 30. P. 123–127. DOI: 10.31891/2415-7929-2024-30-22.
60. Siegel A., Vance M., Nilsson D. Military English Language Education: A Scoping Review of 30 Years of Research. Innovation in Language Learning and Teaching. 2024. Vol. 19, No 5. P. 433–451. DOI: 10.1080/17501229.2024.2370986. URL: <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17501229.2024.2370986>.
61. Singer P. W., Friedman A. Cybersecurity and Cyberwar: What Everyone Needs to Know. Oxford University Press. 2014.
62. Stepan S., Kauza I. Suggestion as a Domain of Military Discourse (Based on Materials from the Speeches of World Leaders). Transcarpathian Philological Studies. 2024. No 38. P. 144–148. DOI: 10.32782/tps2663-4880/2024.38.27. URL: <http://zfs-journal.uzhnu.uz.ua/archive/38/29.pdf>.
63. Sukhorolska S. M., Fedorenko O. I. Methods of Linguistic Analysis for Students and Researchers. БІБ ЛІТУ ім. Івана Франка. 2005. URL: <https://files.znu.edu.ua/files/Bibliobooks/Inshi65/0048176.pdf>.
64. Suonuuti H. Guide to Terminology. Tekniikan Sanastokeskus ry. 2001. URL: http://www.nordterm.net/filer/publikationer/guider/Guide_to_Terminology.pdf.

65. Tsyhanok O., Halahan V., Vynnychuk S. Some Features of English Military Dictionaries. *Transcarpathian Philological Studies*. 2023. Vol. 2, No 32. P. 77–81. DOI: 10.32782/tps2663-4880/2023.32.2.14.
66. Van Dijk T. A. Discourse and Manipulation. *Discourse & Society*. 2006. Vol. 17, No 3. P. 359–383. DOI: 10.1177/0957926506060250.
67. Gortney W. E. Joint Publication 3-13.1. 2012. URL: <https://info.publicintelligence.net/JCS-EW.pdf>.
68. Yefremova N., Boichuk V., Rys L. Methodology and Methods of Linguistics: Case Study. *Humanities Science Current Issues*. 2025. Vol. 1, No 89. P. 260–265. DOI: 10.24919/2308-4863/89-1-37. URL: https://evnuir.vnu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/28733/1/Yefremova_Boichuk_Rys.pdf.
69. Zaluzhnyi V., Hryshchuk R., Solomytskyi O., Hrachov I. The Armed Forces of Ukraine Unmanned Systems Future Development. *Military Science*. 2024. Vol. 2, No 1. P. 5–16. DOI: 10.62524/msj.2024.2.1.01. URL: <https://themilitaryscience.com/index.php/journal/article/download/31/36/>.

DATA SOURCES

British outlets

BBC

1. Abdurasulov A. Ukraine's Invisible Battle to Jam Russian Weapons. 2023. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-66279650>
2. Shevchenko V. Armed Robots Take to the Battlefield in Ukraine War. 2026. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c62662gzlp8o>
3. Tidy J. Iran war: What Role has Cyber Warfare Played in Iran? 2026. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c5yr0576ygvo>

The Guardian

4. Boffey D. Killing Machines: How Russia and Ukraine's Race to Perfect Deadly Pilotless Drones Could Harm Us all. *The Guardian*. 2025. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/jun/25/ukraine-russia-autonomous-d>

rones-ai

5. Harding L., Mamo A. 'The Frontline Is Like Terminator': Fighting Robots Give Ukraine Hope in War with Russia. The Guardian. 2026. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/apr/04/fighting-robots-give-ukraine-hope-in-war-with-russia>
6. Tait R. Iran Social Media Strategy Pivots to Information War amid US-Israel Attack. The Guardian. 2026. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/mar/22/iran-social-media-strategy-in-information-war-us-israel-attack>.

American outlets

CNN

7. Hunt K. GPS Jamming Is Emerging as an Increasingly Prevalent — and Troubling — Weapon of War. 2026. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2026/03/06/science/gps-jamming-ships-planes-iran-war>
8. Kottasová I., Tarasova-Markina D., Butenko V. 'Robots Don't Bleed': Ukraine Sends Machines into the Battlefield in Place of Human Soldiers. 2026. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2026/04/20/europe/robots-ukraine-battlefield-drones-in-tl-cmd>
9. O'Sullivan D., Devine C., Gordon A. China Is Using the World's Largest Known Online Disinformation Operation to Harass Americans, a CNN Review Finds. 2023. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2023/11/13/us/china-online-disinformation-invs>

The New York Times

10. Conger K., Sanger D. E. Russia Uses Cyberattacks in Ukraine to Support Military Strikes, Report Finds. 2022. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/27/us/politics/russia-cyberattacks-ukraine.html>.
11. Kramer A. E. Amid Uncertainty About U.S. Support, Ukraine Pins Its Hopes on Innovation. 2025. URL:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/28/world/europe/ukraine-russia-war-drones.html>

12. Varenikova M. The Killer Robots Are Coming. The Battlefield Will Never Look the Same. 2026. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2026/04/20/world/europe/ukraine-russia-war-robots-drones.html>

APPENDICES

Appendix 1

Corpus of terms in the cyber warfare domain

1. Al-Kadhim M. et al. Network Reconnaissance Investigation: A Memory Forensics Approach. 2019. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335360870_Network_Reconnaissance_Investigation_A_Memory_Forensics_Approach.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 1.1. Network Reconnaissance

2. Barker W. C. et al Guideline for Identifying an Information System as a National Security System. National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2003. P. 21. URL: <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/Legacy/SP/nistspecialpublication800-59.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 2.1. Command and Control (C2)

3. Butterfield A., Ngondi G. E., Kerr A. A Dictionary of Computer Science. Oxford University Press. 2016. p. 628

Terminology identified in the source:

- 3.1. Adware
- 3.2. Cloud Computing
- 3.3. Distributed Denial of Service (DDoS)
- 3.4. Dynamic Host Configuration Protocol (DHCP)
- 3.5. Extensible Hyper Text Markup Language (XHTML)
- 3.6. Extensible Markup Language (XML)
- 3.7. Firewall
- 3.8. HyperText Transfer Protocol (HTTP)
- 3.9. Internet Connection Firewall
- 3.10. Media Access Control Address (MAC Address)

- 3.11. Microservice
- 3.12. Open Firmware
- 3.13. Open Source
- 3.14. Password Management as a Service (PMaaS)
- 3.15. Phishing
- 3.16. Remote Access Trojan (RAT)
- 3.17. Rootkit
- 3.18. Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP)
- 3.19. Spoofing
- 3.20. Spyware
- 3.21. Uniform Resource Locator (URL)
- 3.22. Universal (Uniform) Resource Identifier (URI)
- 3.23. Vulnerability Management as a Service (VMaaS)
- 3.24. Wired Equivalent Privacy (WEP)

- 4. Cartwright J. Joint Terminology for Cyberspace Operations. 2008. URL: <https://info.publicintelligence.net/DoD-JointCyberTerms.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 4.1. Advance Force Operations
- 4.2. Aim Point
- 4.3. Computer Network Attack (CNA)
- 4.4. Computer Network Exploitation (CNE)
- 4.5. Counter-cyber (CC)
- 4.6. Critical Cyber Asset
- 4.7. Critical Cyber Function
- 4.8. Critical Cyber System
- 4.9. Critical Infrastructure
- 4.10. Cyber attack (Cyberattack)
- 4.11. Cyber Defense
- 4.12. Cyber Incident

- 4.13. Cyber Operational Preparation of the Environment (C-OPE)
 - 4.14. Cyber Warfare (CW)
 - 4.15. Cyber-Security
 - 4.16. Cyberspace
 - 4.17. Cyberspace Operations (CO)
 - 4.18. Cyberspace Superiority
 - 4.19. Defensive Counter-Cyber (DCC)
 - 4.20. Information Assurance (IA)
 - 4.21. Interdiction
 - 4.22. Network Operations (NetOps)
 - 4.23. Offensive Counter-Cyber (OCC)
 - 4.24. Offensive Cyberspace Operations (OCO)
 - 4.25. Weapon action
 - 4.26. Weapon effect
 - 4.27. Weapon system
5. Chauhan S., Panda N. K. Hacking Web Intelligence: Open Source Intelligence and Web Reconnaissance Concepts and Techniques. Syngress. 2015.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 5.1. OpenSource intelligence (OSINT)
6. Contributors of the NICCS community. NICCS Glossary. 2025. URL: <https://niccs.cisa.gov/resources/glossary>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 6.1. Advanced persistent threat
 - 6.2. Air-Gap
 - 6.3. All source intelligence
 - 6.4. Anti-CSRF
 - 6.5. Antispoofing
 - 6.6. Cross-site request forgery (CSRF)

- 6.7. Threat Actor
- 6.8. Weaponneering
- 6.9. Weaponization

7. Exploring Information Security. Hack-and-leak operations. 2022. URL: <https://www.exploressec.com/hack-and-leak-operations>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 7.1. Hack-and-Leak Operation

8. FOLDOC. Computing Dictionary. 2025. URL: <https://foldoc.org/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 8.1. Backdoor
- 8.2. Botnet
- 8.3. HTTPS (Hypertext Transfer Protocol Secure)
- 8.4. Keylogger
- 8.5. Logic bomb
- 8.6. PPPoE (Point-to-Point Protocol over Ethernet)
- 8.7. Ransomware
- 8.8. Service Set Identifier (SSID)
- 8.9. Transport Layer Security (TLS)
- 8.10. Uniform Resource Name (URN)
- 8.11. WPA1/2/3

9. Heller K. J. Low-Intensity Cyber Operations and State Sovereignty in Cyberspace. Centre for Military Studies, University of Copenhagen. 2022. URL: https://cms.polsci.ku.dk/publikationer/low-intensity-cyber-operations-and-state-sovereignty-in-cyberspace/download-cms-rapport/CMS_Report_2022__5_-_Low-intensity_cyber_operations_and_state_sovereignty_in_cyberspace.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

9.1. Low-Intensity Cyber Operation

10. Feldman L., Witte G., G2 Inc. NIST/ITL Cybersecurity Program Annual Report 2017. National Institute of Standards and Technology. 2018. URL: <https://nvlpubs.nist.gov/nistpubs/SpecialPublications/NIST.SP.800-203.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 10.1. Cognitive-based Approach to System Security Assessment (CASSA)

11. Ostler R. T. Defensive Cyber Battle Damage Assessment through Attack Methodology Modeling. Air Force Institute of Technology. 2011. URL: <https://files01.core.ac.uk/download/pdf/277524462.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 11.1. Defensive Cyber Battle Damage Assessment (DCBDA)

12. Researchers of NIST Computer Security Resource Center. Glossary | CSRC. 2026. URL: <https://csrc.nist.gov/glossary>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 12.1. Advanced Malware Protection (AMP)
- 12.2. Attack Surface
- 12.3. Blue Team
- 12.4. Cyber Resiliency Concept
- 12.5. Information Assurance (IA)
- 12.6. Intrusion Detection System (IDS)
- 12.7. Multi-factor authentication (MFA)
- 12.8. Red Team
- 12.9. Secure Access Service Edge (SASE)
- 12.10. Secure Shell (SSH)
- 12.11. Supply-Chain Attack
- 12.12. Two-factor Authentication (2FA)

13. Romanosky S., Goldman Z. Cyber Collateral Damage. Procedia Computer Science. 2016. Vol. 95. P. 10–17. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2016.09.287. URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1877050916324590?via%3Dihub>

Terminology identified in the source:

- 13.1. Cyber Collateral Damage

14. Sessa M. G. Disinformation Glossary: 150+ Terms to Understand the Information Disorder. EU DisinfoLab. 2023. URL: https://www.disinfo.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/EUDL_Disinformation_Glossary.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 14.1. Crawler
14.2. Website defacement
14.3. Zoom bombing

15. Skopik F., Pahi T. Under False Flag: Using Technical Artifacts for Cyber Attack Attribution. Cybersecurity. 2020. Vol. 3. DOI: 10.1186/s42400-020-00048-4. URL: <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1186/s42400-020-00048-4>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 15.1. Attribution
15.2. Cyber Kill Chain

16. Social Links. OSINT Glossary. 2026. URL: <https://sociallinks.io/osint-glossary>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 16.1. Dorking
16.2. Honeypots
16.3. Operations Security (OPSEC)

16.4. Sock Puppet Account

16.5. Thermal Attack

17. Ukrop Austria. English-Ukrainian Military Dictionary. 2026. URL: <https://english-military-dictionary.org.ua/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

17.1. Information Warfare (IW)

18. Ullah F. et al. Data Exfiltration: A Review of External Attack Vectors and Countermeasures. Journal of Network and Computer Applications. 2017. Vol. 101. P. 18–54. DOI: 10.1016/j.jnca.2017.10.016. URL: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/320803746_Data_Exfiltration_A_Review_of_External_Attack_Vectors_and_Countermeasures.

Terminology identified in the source:

18.1. Data Exfiltration

19. United States Department of the Army. Joint Publication 3-13 Information Operations. 2012. URL: https://informationsecurity.info/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/jp3_13.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

19.1. Blue Cyberspace

19.2. Combat Support Agencies (CSAs)

19.3. Computer Network Attack (CNA)

19.4. Computer Network Defense (CND)

19.5. Computer Network Exploitation (CNE)

19.6. Cyber-Persona Layer

19.7. Gray Cyberspace

19.8. Information Environment

19.9. Logical Network Layer

19.10. Red Cyberspace

19.11. Service Cyberspace Component (SCC)

Corpus of terms in the unmanned warfare (UW) domain

1. Ascent AeroSystems. UAV Glossary. 2025. URL:
<https://ascentaerosystems.com/glossary/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 1.1. Autonomous Flight

2. Canadian Advanced Air Mobility. Drone Dictionary: A Glossary of Unmanned Aviation Terms. 2020. URL:
<https://canadianaam.com/wp-content/uploads/2021/05/Drone-Dictionary.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 2.1. Counter-UAS (C-UAS)
- 2.2. Electric Vertical Takeoff and Landing (eVTOL)
- 2.3. Electronic Speed Controller (ESC)
- 2.4. Failsafe Function
- 2.5. First Person View (FPV)
- 2.6. Flyaway
- 2.7. FPV mode
- 2.8. Headless Mode Flight
- 2.9. Hexacopter
- 2.10. Hybrid Vertical Takeoff and Landing (VTOL)
- 2.11. Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR)
- 2.12. Multi-copter
- 2.13. Multi-rotor
- 2.14. Octocopter
- 2.15. Permanent Areas
- 2.16. Quadcopter
- 2.17. Remotely Operated Aircraft
- 2.18. Remotely Piloted Aircraft
- 2.19. Remotely Piloted Aircraft System (RPAS)

- 2.20. Rotary-Wing Aircraft
 - 2.21. Rotor Drone
 - 2.22. Rotorcraft
 - 2.23. Small Unmanned Aircraft (UA)
 - 2.24. Small Unmanned Surveillance Aircraft (SUSA)
 - 2.25. Tricopter
 - 2.26. Unmanned Aircraft System Traffic Management (UTM)
3. Drone Warfare editorial team. Drone Warfare Terminology. 2025. URL:
<https://drone-warfare.com/drone-warfare-terminology/>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 3.1. Swarm attack
 - 3.2. Swarm intelligence
4. EagleNXT. Drone Dictionary: Essential Terms Every Pilot Should Know. 2019. URL:
<https://eaglenxt.com/blog/drone-dictionary-essential-terms-every-pilot-should-know/>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 4.1. Ground Control Station (GCS)
5. ENG For UARMY: Армійська Англійська. Unmanned Systems. Безпілотні системи англійською. Урок 72. 2024. URL:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Fb45k5dVPqo>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 5.1. Aerial Vehicle Carriers
 - 5.2. Inertial Navigation System
 - 5.3. Launch And Recovery Subsystems (LARS)
 - 5.4. Mission Planning And Control Systems (MPCS)
 - 5.5. Override

- 5.6. Preprogrammed Navigation System
- 5.7. Radio Navigation System
- 5.8. Remotely Piloted Vehicle (RPV)
- 5.9. System of command and control data link
- 5.10. Target Drone

6. Kansas State University Libraries. Abbreviations and Acronyms. Nichols project. 2020. URL: <https://kstatelibraries.pressbooks.pub/nicholsproject/front-matter/abbreviations-and-acronyms/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 6.1. Detect, Sense And Avoid (DSA)
- 6.2. “Follow-me” technology
- 6.3. High Altitude Long Endurance (HALE)
- 6.4. Medium Altitude Long Endurance (MALE)
- 6.5. Semi-autonomous Hydrographic Reconnaissance vehicle (SAHRV)
- 6.6. Small Unmanned Aerial System (sUAS)
- 6.7. Unmanned Aerial System (UAS)
- 6.8. Unmanned Surface Vessel (USV)

7. Milrem Robotics. THeMIS Unmanned Ground Vehicle Family. 2026. URL: <https://milremrobotics.com/themis-family/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 7.1. Tracked Hybrid Modular Infantry System (THeMIS)

8. Researchers of NIST Computer Security Resource Center. Glossary | CSRC. 2026. URL: <https://csrc.nist.gov/glossary>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 8.1. Hazard Avoidance
- 8.2. Unmanned Combat Aerial Vehicle (UCAV)

9. The Unmanned Company. Counter-UAS Glossary. 2026. URL: <https://www.theunmannedcompany.com/counter-uas-glossary>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 9.1. Flight Envelope
- 9.2. Go/No-Go Analysis
- 9.3. Ground Risk Assessment (GRA)
- 9.4. Ground Risk Class (GRC)
- 9.5. Hazard Identification (HAZID)
- 9.6. Non-Cooperative Drones
- 9.7. Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)

10. Ukrop Austria. Drone. English-Ukrainian Military Dictionary. 2026. URL: <https://english-military-dictionary.org.ua/search/drone>

Terminology identified in the source:

- 10.1. 3D Deadband High
- 10.2. 3D Deadband Low
- 10.3. Above The Takeoff Altitude (AToA)
- 10.4. Active Electromagnetic/Electronic Counter Measures (ECM) Drone
- 10.5. Air-Controlled Interception
- 10.6. Air-Launched Drone
- 10.7. Air(borne) Surveillance Drone
- 10.8. Altitude hold
- 10.9. Anti-drone gunner
- 10.10. Anti-drone means
- 10.11. Anti-drone net
- 10.12. Anti-drone systems
- 10.13. Anti-drone warfare
- 10.14. Anti-drone weapons
- 10.15. Anti-emitter drone

- 10.16. Automatic Ground Control Station (AGCS)
- 10.17. Autonomous (unmanned) system
- 10.18. Autonomous Collision Avoidance System (ACAS)
- 10.19. Bomber Drone
- 10.20. Close-Range Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.21. Collision Avoidance Drone
- 10.22. COMINT drone
- 10.23. Demag compensation
- 10.24. Drone Visual Photogrammetry
- 10.25. Drone-tracking radar
- 10.26. Electronic Warfare Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.27. Express Long-range Radio System (ExpressLRS, ELRS)
- 10.28. Fast Long Range Communication (FLRC)
- 10.29. Fixed-wing drone
- 10.30. Fixed-wing Vertical Takeoff and Landing (VTOL) Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.31. Gyro sensor
- 10.32. Hand-launched (tossed) drone
- 10.33. Harassment Drone
- 10.34. Heavy Bomber Drone
- 10.35. Hypersonic Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.36. Intelligence Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.37. Jamming Unmanned Aircraft System
- 10.38. Light Bomber Drone
- 10.39. Loiter
- 10.40. Loitering Munition
- 10.41. Long-range bomber drone
- 10.42. Low-altitude drone
- 10.43. Low-altitude Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.44. Medium Altitude Endurance Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (MAE-UAV)

- 10.45. Medium-Range Unmanned Airborne Surveillance And Target Acquisition System
- 10.46. Micro Unmanned Aerial Vehicle
- 10.47. Microdrone
- 10.48. Miniature Unmanned aerial/air Vehicle (MUAV)
- 10.49. Multi-mission drone
- 10.50. Multi-mission unmanned aircraft system
- 10.51. Multiple Drone Control
- 10.52. Multiple Unmanned Simulation Environment
- 10.53. Nano-Unmanned Aerial System (nUAS)
- 10.54. Near real-time (NRT) data transmission
- 10.55. Obstacle avoidance
- 10.56. Obstacle avoidance drone
- 10.57. One-way attack UAV (OWA UAV)
- 10.58. One-way UAV
- 10.59. Personal Reconnaissance System (PRS)
- 10.60. Photoreconnaissance drone
- 10.61. Semi-autonomous drone
- 10.62. Sine Mode Power
- 10.63. Sine Mode Range
- 10.64. SRD band (Short-Range Device)
- 10.65. Strategic Unmanned Aerial/Air Vehicle (UAV)
- 10.66. Swarm
- 10.67. Swarm of drones
- 10.68. Tactical Unmanned Aerial/Air Vehicle (TUAV)
- 10.69. Tactical Unmanned Ground Vehicle (TUGV)
- 10.70. Telemetry Protocol
- 10.71. Telemetry Ratio
- 10.72. Tethered drone
- 10.73. Torpedo Bomber Drone

- 10.74. Unmanned Airborne Surveillance And Target Acquisition System
- 10.75. Unmanned Ground Combat Vehicle (UGCV)
- 10.76. Unmanned Ground Vehicle (UGV)
- 10.77. Unmanned Underwater Vehicle (UUV)

Corpus of terms in the electronic warfare (EW) domain

1. Butterfield A., Ngondi G. E., Kerr A. A. Dictionary of Computer Science. Oxford University Press. 2016. p. 628

Terminology identified in the source:

- 1.1. Spoofing

2. EMSOPEDIA. Electronic Warfare (also Known as Electromagnetic Warfare). 2020. URL: <https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/electronic-warfare-aka-electromagnetic-warfare/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 2.1. Cyber-Electromagnetic Activities (CEMA)
- 2.2. Electromagnetic/Electronic Counter Counter Measures (ECCM)
- 2.3. Electromagnetic/Electronic Counter Measures (ECM)
- 2.4. Electronic Attack (EA)
- 2.5. Electronic protection (EP)
- 2.6. Electronic Support (ES)
- 2.7. Electronic Support Measures (ESM)

3. EMSOPEDIA. Glossary Index. 2020. URL: <https://www.emsopedia.org/glossary-index/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 3.1. Acoustic Intelligence (ACINT)
- 3.2. Barrage Noise
- 3.3. Communication Electronic Attack
- 3.4. Communication Electronic Support Measures (CESM)
- 3.5. Communication intelligence (COMINT)
- 3.6. De-interleaving process
- 3.7. Defensive Electronic Attack

- 3.8. Electronic intelligence (ELINT)
- 3.9. EW Command & Control (EWC2)
- 3.10. EWC4
- 3.11. Expendable Active Decoys (EAD)
- 3.12. Information Operation (IO)
- 3.13. Target Sensing System (TSS)

4. EMSOPEDIA. Image Intelligence (IMINT). 2020. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/image-intelligence-imint/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 4.1. Image Intelligence (IMINT)
- 4.2. Synthetic Aperture Radars (SAR)

5. EMSOPEDIA. Manned–Unmanned Teaming. 2020. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/manned-unmanned-teaming/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 5.1. Manned-Unmanned Teaming (MUMT)

6. EMSOPEDIA. Radar Warning System. 2020. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/radar-warning-system/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 6.1. Radar Warning Receiver (RWR)
- 6.2. Radar Warning System (RWS)

7. EMSOPEDIA. Laser Warning System. 2021. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/laser-warning-system/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 7.1. Laser Beam Rider (LBR)
- 7.2. Laser Range Finder (LRF)
- 7.3. Laser Target Designator (LTD)

7.4. Laser Warning System

8. EMSOPEDIA. Missile Warning System. 2021. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/missile-warning-system/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 8.1. Counter Measure Dispensing System (CMDs)
- 8.2. Missile Warning System (MWS)

9. EMSOPEDIA. Self Protection Suite. 2021. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/self-protection-suite/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 9.1. Electronic Warfare Manager (EWM)

10. EMSOPEDIA. High Energy Laser (HEL). 2024. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/high-energy-laser-hel/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 10.1. High Energy Laser (HEL)

11. EMSOPEDIA. High-Power Microwave (HPM). 2024. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/high-power-microwave-hpm/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 11.1. High-Power Electro Magnetic (HPEM)
- 11.2. Lightning Electromagnetic Pulse (LEMP)
- 11.3. Nuclear Electromagnetic Pulse (NEMP)

12. EMSOPEDIA. Inverse Gain. 2024. URL:
<https://www.emsopedia.org/entries/inverse-gain/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 12.1. Inverse Gain

13. Joint Chiefs of Staff. Electronic Warfare (Joint Publication 3-13.1). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense. 2012. URL: <https://info.publicintelligence.net/JCS-EW.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 13.1. Chaff
 - 13.2. Combined Arms
 - 13.3. Directed-Energy Warfare (DEW)
 - 13.4. Directed-Energy Weapons (DEW / DEWs)
 - 13.5. Electro-optical-infrared countermeasure (EO-IR CM)
 - 13.6. Electromagnetic Battle Management (EMBM)
 - 13.7. Electromagnetic Compatibility (EMC)
 - 13.8. Electromagnetic Environment (EME)
 - 13.9. Electromagnetic Environmental Effects (E3)
 - 13.10. Electromagnetic Interference (EMI)
 - 13.11. Electromagnetic Pulse (EMP)
 - 13.12. Electromagnetic Vulnerability (EMV)
 - 13.13. Electronic Masking
 - 13.14. Electronic Warfare (EW) System
 - 13.15. Emission Control (EMCON)
 - 13.16. High-Power Microwave (HPM)
 - 13.17. Navigation Warfare (NAVWAR)
 - 13.18. Precipitation Static (P-STATIC)
14. Kania J., Grenda B. Electronic Warfare in Cyberspace. Security and Defence Quarterly. 2019. Vol. 24, No 2. P. 8–21. URL: <https://securityanddefence.pl/pdf-103299-36215>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 14.1. Measurement and Signature Intelligence (MASINT)
- 14.2. Signals Intelligence (SIGINT)
- 14.3. Spectrum Management Operations

15. The Unmanned Company. Counter-UAS glossary. 2026. URL:
<https://www.theunmannedcompany.com/counter-uas-glossary>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 15.1. Active jamming
- 15.2. Barrage jamming
- 15.3. Directional jamming
- 15.4. Noise jamming
- 15.5. Spot jamming

16. Ukrop Austria. Electronic Warfare. English-Ukrainian military dictionary. 2026. URL:
[https://english-military-dictionary.org.ua/search/\(%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%80\)](https://english-military-dictionary.org.ua/search/(%D1%80%D0%B5%D1%80))

Terminology identified in the source:

- 16.1. Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA)
- 16.2. Active Electronically Scanned Array (AESA) radar
- 16.3. Active Radar Homing (ARH)
- 16.4. Active Sweep Frequency Interferometer Radar
- 16.5. Adaptive Clutter Attenuator (ACA)
- 16.6. Adaptive Radar Countermeasures (ARC)
- 16.7. Address Selective Secondary Surveillance Radar
- 16.8. Advanced Design Array Radar (ADAR)
- 16.9. Advanced Radar Tracker And Server
- 16.10. Air Electronic Guidance Information System (AEGIS)
- 16.11. Air Guard Radar
- 16.12. Air Search Radar
- 16.13. Air-Dropped Mine Splash Points Location Radar System
- 16.14. Airborne Early-Warning Radar
- 16.15. Airborne Guidance Radar

- 16.16. Aircraft Intercept Radar
- 16.17. Angle Modulation Noise
- 16.18. Anti-Radiation Missile (ARM)
- 16.19. Automated Jamming Station (AJS)
- 16.20. Battle Group Interactive Jamming System (BGIJS)
- 16.21. Battlefield Surveillance Radar (BFSR)
- 16.22. Constant False Alarm Rate (CFAR) detection
- 16.23. Decoy Flare
- 16.24. Digital Radio Frequency Memory (DRFM) decoy system
- 16.25. Digital Radio Frequency Memory Jamming (DRFM jamming)
- 16.26. Digital Signal Processing (DSP)
- 16.27. Directed energy (DE)
- 16.28. Directional Infrared Countermeasures (DIRCM)
- 16.29. Distance Measuring Equipment (DME)
- 16.30. Electromagnetic Electronic Warfare (EW)
- 16.31. Electromagnetic Shielding
- 16.32. Electromagnetic Signature
- 16.33. Electromagnetic Spectrum (EM spectrum, EMS)
- 16.34. Electromagnetic Spectrum Operations (EMSO)
- 16.35. Electronic Warfare Tactics Range (EWTR)
- 16.36. Imitative Deception
- 16.37. Imitative Electronic Deception
- 16.38. Line-of-Sight radar
- 16.39. Low-Probability-Of-Intercept Radar (LPIR)
- 16.40. Non-nuclear Electromagnetic Pulse (NNEMP) weapons
- 16.41. Notching Manoeuvres
- 16.42. Power Density Spectrum (PDS)
- 16.43. Radar Cross-Section / Radar Cross Section (RCS)
- 16.44. Radar Crossover
- 16.45. Radar Signature

- 16.46. Radio-Frequency Interference (RFI)
- 16.47. Repeater Jamming
- 16.48. Signal-To-Interference-Plus-Noise Ratio (SINR)
- 16.49. Simulative Deception
- 16.50. Simulative Electronic Deception
- 16.51. Time Of Arrival (TOA)
- 16.52. Visible Areas Of Irradiated Object
- 16.53. Volumetric Contamination

Corpus of terms in the informational warfare domain

1. Brangetto P., Veenendaal M. Influence Cyber Operations: The Use of Cyberattacks in Support of Influence Operations. 2018. URL: <https://ccdcoe.org/uploads/2018/10/Art-08-Influence-Cyber-Operations-The-Use-of-Cyberattacks-in-Support-of-Influence-Operations.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 1.1. Influence operations

2. Center for Countering Disinformation (Ukraine). Handbook: Weapons of Information Warfare. Kyiv: Center for Countering Disinformation. 2022. URL: <https://cpd.gov.ua/en/manuals/handbook-weapons-of-information-warfare/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 2.1. Anonymous authority mechanism
- 2.2. Appeal to authority mechanism
- 2.3. Clickbaiting
- 2.4. Contextomy
- 2.5. Demonisation
- 2.6. Doublespeak tactic
- 2.7. False analogy tactic
- 2.8. False dilemma tactic
- 2.9. Framing mechanism
- 2.10. Information overload mechanism
- 2.11. Information sandwich tactic
- 2.12. Mundanisation
- 2.13. Polarisation
- 2.14. Primacy effect
- 2.15. Stereotyping tactic
- 2.16. Trolling tactic

3. Chauhan S., Panda N. K. Hacking Web Intelligence: Open Source Intelligence and Web Reconnaissance Concepts and Techniques. Syngress Media Incorporated. 2015. p. 281

Terminology identified in the source:

- 3.1. OpenSource intelligence (OSINT)

4. Civil Affairs Association. Narrative Warfare. 2019. URL: <https://www.civilaffairsassociation.com/post/narrative-warfare>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 4.1. Narrative warfare

5. Command and control warfare. Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms. 2005. URL: <https://en.thefreedictionary.com/command+and+control+warfare>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 5.1. Command and Control Warfare (C2W)

6. Costigan S. S., Hennessy M. A. Hybrid Threats and Hybrid Warfare Reference Curriculum. NATO Headquarters Brussels. 2024. URL: <https://www.nato.int/content/dam/nato/webready/documents/deep/Hybrid-threats-and-hybrid-warfare-ENGLISH.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 6.1. False narrative
- 6.2. Psychological warfare
- 6.3. Weaponized information

7. Derleth J. W. A New Generation of Warfare: The Role of Information and Influence. Military Review. U.S. Army Combined Arms Center. 2020. URL: <https://www.armyupress.army.mil/Portals/7/military-review/Archives/English/SO-20/Derleth-New-Generation-War-1.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

7.1. New Generation Warfare (NGW)

7.2. Unrestricted warfare

8. Encyclopaedia Britannica. Whataboutism. 2024. URL:
<https://www.britannica.com/topic/whataboutism>.

Terminology identified in the source:

8.1. Whataboutery

8.2. Whataboutism

9. EU DisinfoLab. Disinformation Glossary: 150+ Terms to Understand the Information Disorder. Brussels: EU DisinfoLab. 2023. URL:
https://www.disinfo.eu/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/EUDL_Disinformation_Glossary.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

9.1. ABCDE framework

9.2. Astroturfing

9.3. Coordinated Inauthentic Behaviour (CIB)

9.4. Cyborg

9.5. Data anonymisation

9.6. Deepfake

9.7. Doppelganger

9.8. Firehosing

9.9. Perception hacking

9.10. Post-truth

9.11. Synthetic media

9.12. Website defacement

9.13. Zoom bombing

10. European External Action Service. Information Integrity and Countering Foreign Information Manipulation and Interference (FIMI). 2026. URL:

https://www.eeas.europa.eu/eeas/information-integrity-and-counteracting-foreign-information-manipulation-interference-fimi_en.

Terminology identified in the source:

10.1. Foreign Information and Manipulation Interference (FIMI)

11. Exploring Information Security. Hack-and-leak Operations. 2022. URL: <https://www.exploressec.com/hack-and-leak-operations>.

Terminology identified in the source:

11.1. Hack-and-Leak Operation

12. First Draft. Understanding Information Disorder. 2017. URL: <https://firstdraftnews.org/long-form-article/understanding-information-disorder/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

12.1. Disinformation

12.2. Information disorder

12.3. Malinformation

12.4. Misinformation

13. First Draft. Information Disorder Glossary. 2018. URL: https://firstdraftnews.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/07/infoDisorder_glossary.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

13.1. Sock Puppet

13.2. Troll Army

13.3. Troll Factory

13.4. Troll Farm

14. FOLDOC. Computing Dictionary. 2025. URL: <https://foldoc.org/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 14.1. Bot
- 14.2. Botnet

15. Gershaneck K. K. Media Warfare: How Taiwan Can Win the Battle for the Cognitive Domain. PROSPECT & EXPLORATION. 2021. URL: https://www.mjib.gov.tw/FileUploads/eBooks/ef1b42ce04b74fb48e0f552d38bb7d1f/Section_file/6ce9317e12764cf08ffdc7c6357f692d.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 15.1. Media Warfare
- 15.2. Public Opinion Warfare

16. Gisea J. Weaponizing Social Media: How Foreign Actors Exploit Online Platforms. NATO Strategic Communications Centre of Excellence. 2017. URL: https://stratcomcoe.org/cuploads/pfiles/jeff_gisea.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 16.1. Memetic Warfare

17. Global Rights Compliance. Manufacturing Impunity: Information Manipulation and International Crimes. 2025. URL: <https://globalrightscompliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/05/Manufacturing-Impunity.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 17.1. Information alibi mechanism

18. Joint Chiefs of Staff. Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms (JP 1-02). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense. 2011. URL: https://www.ieee.es/Galerias/fichero/OtrasPublicaciones/Internacional/JP_1-02._DictionaryofMilitaryandAssociatedTerms_15nov11.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

18.1. Military Deception (MILDEC)

19. Joint Chiefs of Staff. Information Operations (Joint Publication 3-13). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Defense. 2012. URL: https://informationsecurity.info/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/jp3_13.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

19.1. Information Operations (IO)

20. Lanoszka A. Russian Hybrid Warfare and Extended Deterrence in Eastern Europe. Zurich: Center for Security Studies, ETH Zurich. 2016. URL: https://www.files.ethz.ch/isn/194544/Brief_32_Hybrid_warfare.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

20.1. Hybrid warfare

21. Mugg D. E. Satan vs. Satan: The Use of Black PSYOP to Regain the Tactical Initiative in The Counterinsurgency Fight. Naval Postgraduate School. 2007. URL: <https://files01.core.ac.uk/download/pdf/36697166.pdf>.

Terminology identified in the source:

21.1. Black psychological operation

21.2. Gray psychological operation

21.3. White psychological operation

22. NATO Allied Command Transformation. Cognitive Warfare. 2025. URL: <https://www.act.nato.int/activities/cognitive-warfare/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

22.1. Cognitive warfare

23. North Atlantic Treaty Organization. Allied Joint Doctrine for Operations (AJP-3, Edition D). Brussels: NATO Standardization Office. 2016. URL:

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/6964e72799fbdc498faecce2/AJP_3_Ed_D_V1-O.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

23.1. Information Activities

24. Office of the Government of Finland. Overview of Information Influence Activities. 2025. URL: <https://valtioneuvosto.fi/en/government-communications/overview-of-information-influence-activities>.

Terminology identified in the source:

24.1. Influence Activities

25. RAND Corporation, Data & Society Research Institute. Deepfakes and Cheap Fakes. 2019. URL: <https://datasociety.net/library/deepfakes-and-cheap-fakes/>.

Terminology identified in the source:

25.1. Cheapfake

26. Researchers of NIST Computer Security Resource Center. Glossary | CSRC. 2026. URL: <https://csrc.nist.gov/glossary>.

Terminology identified in the source:

26.1. Data poisoning

26.2. Information Assurance (IA)

27. Sigoulakis D. Allied Joint Doctrine for Information Operations (Edition A Version 1). North Atlantic Treaty Organization. 2023. URL: https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/media/650c03bf52e73c000d9425bb/AJP_10_1_Info_Ops_UK_web.pdf.

Terminology identified in the source:

27.1. Information Environment (IE)

27.2. Media Operations

- 27.3. Target audience analysis
 - 27.4. Mission audience analysis
 - 27.5. Baseline audience analysis
28. Social Links. OSINT Glossary. 2026. URL:
<https://sociallinks.io/osint-glossary>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 28.1. Imagery Intelligence (IMINT)
 - 28.2. Smear Campaigns
 - 28.3. Web Intelligence (WEBINT)
29. Sustainability Directory. Algorithmic Manipulation. 2025. URL:
<https://pollution.sustainability-directory.com/term/algorithmic-manipulation/>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 29.1. Algorithmic manipulation
30. Sustainability Directory. Public Sentiment Shaping. 2025. URL:
<https://lifestyle.sustainability-directory.com/area/public-sentiment-shaping/>.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 30.1. Sentiment shaping
31. U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command. Hybrid Threat (TC 7-100). Fort Eustis, VA: TRADOC. 2023. URL:
https://odin.tradoc.army.mil/TC/TC_7-100_Hybrid_Threat.
- Terminology identified in the source:**
- 31.1. Hybrid threat
32. Ukrop Austria. English-Ukrainian Military Dictionary. 2026. URL:
<https://english-military-dictionary.org.ua/>
<https://english-military-dictionary.org.ua/>

Terminology identified in the source:

- 32.1. Psychological Operations (PSYOPS)
- 32.2. Psychological operation unit
- 32.3. Information Warfare (IW)

- 33. United Nations, World Health Organization. Infodemic. 2023. URL:
<https://www.who.int/health-topics/infodemic>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 33.1. Infodemic

Results of the quantitative analysis of terms which were identified in the media sources

Table E.1. Quantitative analysis of Cyber and Information Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to its connotation

Nature	Quantity	Percentage
Positive	11	7.64%
Neutral	35	24.31%
Negative	98	68.06%
Total	144	

Table E.2. Quantitative analysis of Cyber and Information Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to its evaluative load

Degree	Quantity	Percentage
High	39	27.08%
Moderate	69	47.92%
Low	36	25.00%
Total	144	

Table E.3. Quantitative analysis of Cyber and Information Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to the contextual framing in which it is used

Type	Quantity	Percentage
Technological	17	11.81%
War/military	18	12.50%
Crisis	13	9.03%
Institutional	4	2.78%

Offense	15	10.42%
Geopolitical	7	4.86%
Intelligence	4	2.78%
Conceptual	5	3.47%
Informative	43	29.86%
Spatial	7	4.86%
Security/Threat	11	7.64%
Total	144	

Table E.4. Quantitative analysis of Cyber and Information Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to the pragmatic purpose which it performs in the text

Purpose	Quantity	Percentage
Conceptualization	23	15.97%
Informative	24	16.67%
Intensification	12	8.33%
Identification	20	13.89%
Specification	9	6.25%
Generalisation	11	7.64%
Reinforcement	16	11.11%
Evaluation	11	7.64%
Technical detailing	12	8.33%
Framing	5	3.47%
Legitimization	1	0.69%
Total	144	

Table E.5. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned and Electronic Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to its connotation

Nature	Quantity	Percentage
Positive	3	1.24%
Neutral	152	62.81%
Negative	87	35.95%
Total	242	

Table E.6. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned and Electronic Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to its evaluative load

Degree	Quantity	Percentage
High	66	27.27%
Moderate	90	37.19%
Low	86	35.54%
Total	242	

Table E.7. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned and Electronic Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to the contextual framing in which it is used

Type	Quantity	Percentage
Technological	106	43.80%
War/military	44	18.18%
Security/Threat	46	19.01%
Crisis	14	5.79%
Geopolitical	0	0.00%

Institutional	14	5.79%
Legal/Normative	8	3.31%
Informational/Intelligence	6	2.48%
Spatial	1	0.41%
Metaphorical	3	1.24%
Total	242	

Table E.8. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned and Electronic Warfare terminology from all articles analysed according to the pragmatic purpose which it performs in the text

Purpose	Quantity	Percentage
Conceptualization	20	8.26%
Specification	62	25.62%
Identification	66	27.27%
Evaluation	6	2.48%
Intensification	29	11.98%
Generalization	44	18.18%
Framing	15	6.20%
Total	242	

Results of the quantitative analysis of terms which were identified in the media sources

Table F.1. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the UK articles analysed according to its connotation

Nature	Quantity	Percentage
Positive	12	12.37%
Neutral	57	58.76%
Negative	28	28.87%
Total	97	

Table F.2. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the US articles analysed according to its connotation

Nature	Quantity	Percentage
Positive	19	20.65%
Neutral	61	66.30%
Negative	12	13.04%
Total	92	

Table F.3. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the UK articles analysed according to its evaluative load

Degree	Quantity	Percentage
High	26	26.80%
Moderate	28	28.87%
Low	43	44.33%
Total	97	

Table F.4. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the US articles analysed according to its evaluative load

Degree	Quantity	Percentage
High	16	17.39%
Moderate	32	34.78%
Low	44	47.83%
Total	92	

Table F.5. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the UK articles analysed according to the contextual framing in which it is used

Type	Quantity	Percentage
Technological	24	24.74%
War/Military	43	44.33%
Security/Threat	11	11.34%
Crisis	2	2.06%
Geopolitical	1	1.03%
Institutional	9	9.28%
Legal	1	1.03%
Conceptual	3	3.09%
Metaphorical	3	3.09%
Total	97	

Table F.6. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the US articles analysed according to the contextual framing in which it is used

Type	Quantity	Percentage
Technological	27	29.35%

War/Military	39	42.39%
Security/Threat	3	3.26%
Crisis	1	1.09%
Geopolitical	6	6.52%
Institutional	10	10.87%
Conceptual	4	4.35%
Metaphorical	2	2.17%
Total	92	

Table F.7. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the UK articles analysed according to the pragmatic purpose which it performs in the text

Purpose	Quantity	Percentage
Conceptualization	2	2.06%
Specification	14	14.43%
Identification	33	34.02%
Evaluation	7	7.22%
Intensification	10	10.31%
Generalization	26	26.80%
Framing	4	4.12%
Legitimization	1	1.03%
Total	97	

Table F.8. Quantitative analysis of Unmanned Warfare terminology identified in the US articles analysed according to the pragmatic purpose which it performs in the text

Purpose	Quantity	Percentage
Conceptualization	8	8.70%
Specification	21	22.83%
Identification	21	22.83%
Evaluation	7	7.61%
Intensification	2	2.17%
Generalization	28	30.43%
Framing	3	3.26%
Legitimization	2	2.17%
Total	92	

Cyber and information warfare terminology identified in media articles

1. Conger K., Sanger D. E. Russia Uses Cyberattacks in Ukraine to Support Military Strikes, Report Finds. 2022. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2022/04/27/us/politics/russia-cyberattacks-ukraine.html>.
 - 1.1. A-team
 - 1.2. A-team of hackers
 - 1.3. computer systems
 - 1.4. cyberarsenal
 - 1.5. cyberattack (7 times)
 - 1.6. cybercapability
 - 1.7. cyberoperation
 - 1.8. cyberwar
 - 1.9. cyberweapons
 - 1.10. destructive malware
 - 1.11. hacked into
 - 1.12. hacker (4 times)
 - 1.13. hacking attempts
 - 1.14. hacking campaigns (3 times)
 - 1.15. malware (3 times)
 - 1.16. malware aimed at destroying computer systems and stealing information
 - 1.17. nation-state hacking groups
 - 1.18. online accounts
 - 1.19. phishing attacks
 - 1.20. phishing attempts
 - 1.21. the online attacks
2. O'Sullivan D., Devine C., Gordon A. China Is Using the World's Largest Known Online Disinformation Operation to Harass Americans, a CNN Review

Finds.

2023.

URL:

<https://edition.cnn.com/2023/11/13/us/china-online-disinformation-invs>.

- 2.1. “tell” of Spamouflage
- 2.2. disinformation (4 times)
- 2.3. disinformation campaign
- 2.4. disinformation operation (2 times)
- 2.5. fake accounts
- 2.6. flooding
- 2.7. information environment
- 2.8. legitimate messages
- 2.9. manipulate public perceptions
- 2.10. misattributed social media accounts
- 2.11. negative content
- 2.12. online disinformation operation
- 2.13. online influence campaigns
- 2.14. online smears
- 2.15. operators of Spamouflage
- 2.16. public opinion
- 2.17. social media platform
- 2.18. spamouflage (7 times)
- 2.19. spamouflage accounts
- 2.20. spamouflage network (2 times)
- 2.21. spamouflage stress
- 2.22. spamouflage’s
- 2.23. tech and social media companies
- 2.24. threat intelligence (2 times)
- 2.25. trolling
- 2.26. troll (2 times)
- 2.27. weaponizing of the global information space

3. Tait R. Iran Social Media Strategy Pivots to Information War amid US-Israel Attack. The Guardian. 2026. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/mar/22/iran-social-media-strategy-information-war-us-israel-attack>.
 - 3.1. asymmetric campaign (2 times)
 - 3.2. AI generated footage
 - 3.3. asymmetric warfare
 - 3.4. disinformation weapon
 - 3.5. faked
 - 3.6. flooding platforms
 - 3.7. foreign influence campaigns
 - 3.8. influence operations
 - 3.9. information model
 - 3.10. information war
 - 3.11. internet blackout
 - 3.12. media ecosystem
 - 3.13. moral pressure (2 times)
 - 3.14. online threats
 - 3.15. propaganda operators
 - 3.16. social media strategy
 - 3.17. state media
 - 3.18. targeted postings
 - 3.19. troll account (2 times)
4. Tidy J. Iran war: What Role has Cyber Warfare Played in Iran? 2026. URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c5yr0576ygvo>.
 - 4.1. app
 - 4.2. Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools
 - 4.3. company's employee login defaced
 - 4.4. Computer network

- 4.5. cyber (7 times)
- 4.6. cyber attacks
- 4.7. cyber domain
- 4.8. cyber forces
- 4.9. cyber operations (2 times)
- 4.10. cyber power
- 4.11. cyber warfare
- 4.12. cyber-attack (2 times)
- 4.13. cyber-defence
- 4.14. cyber-espionage (2 times)
- 4.15. cyber-security (2 times)
- 4.16. cyber-space (2 times)
- 4.17. cybersecurity
- 4.18. hack
- 4.19. hacked
- 4.20. hackers
- 4.21. hacker group
- 4.22. hacker persona
- 4.23. hacking (3 times)
- 4.24. hacking group
- 4.25. hacktivist activity
- 4.26. hacktivist group
- 4.27. information environment
- 4.28. Internet-connected
- 4.29. open source intelligence
- 4.30. push notification
- 4.31. threat intelligence expert
- 4.32. wiper attacks (2 times)
- 4.33. wiper malware
- 4.34. wiper malware attack

Unmanned and electronic warfare terminology identified in media articles

1. Abdurasulov A. Ukraine's Invisible Battle to Jam Russian Weapons. 2023.
URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/world-europe-66279650>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 1.1. antenna
- 1.2. break down radar
- 1.3. cellular and internet communications
- 1.4. cellular and radio communications jammer
- 1.5. counter-measures against jamming
- 1.6. detect electronic signals
- 1.7. electronic and cyber warfare department
- 1.8. electronic intelligence officers
- 1.9. electronic warfare (3 times)
- 1.10. electronic warfare systems (5 times)
- 1.11. electronic warfare troop
- 1.12. electronic warfare unit (2 times)
- 1.13. GPS jammer
- 1.14. GPS receiver
- 1.15. infrared
- 1.16. intercept [signals]
- 1.17. intercepted radio communications
- 1.18. jam (2 times)
- 1.19. jam GPS
- 1.20. jammer
- 1.21. jamming signal
- 1.22. jamming technology
- 1.23. microwaves
- 1.24. military satellite networks
- 1.25. mobile electronic warfare unit

- 1.26. other frequencies
- 1.27. penetrate air defence systems
- 1.28. radio stations
- 1.29. radio waves
- 1.30. shut down communications
- 1.31. signal
- 1.32. suppress signal
- 1.33. suppression
- 1.34. suppress satellite signal
- 1.35. system that suppress radar
- 1.36. airborne and air defence radars
- 1.37. the jammer
- 1.38. vulnerable to such jamming

- 2. Boffey D. Killing Machines: How Russia and Ukraine's Race to Perfect Deadly Pilotless Drones Could Harm Us all. The Guardian. 2025. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2025/jun/25/ukraine-russia-autonomous-drones-ai>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 2.1. 100km range
- 2.2. 20-foot wingspan
- 2.3. all-domain autonomous systems
- 2.4. attack drone
- 2.5. automatic mode
- 2.6. autonomous and swarming technology
- 2.7. autonomous drone (4 times)
- 2.8. autonomous system
- 2.9. autonomous terminal guidance system
- 2.10. autonomous thinking (2 times)
- 2.11. autonomous weaponry (2 times)

- 2.12. autonomous weapons (2 times)
- 2.13. autonomous weapons system
- 2.14. drone (17 times)
- 2.15. drone attack
- 2.16. drone manufacturer
- 2.17. drone manufacturing company
- 2.18. drone pilot
- 2.19. fibre optic drone
- 2.20. fixed-wing aerial drone
- 2.21. fly autonomously
- 2.22. flying at a low altitude
- 2.23. fully autonomous
- 2.24. ground-based robotic system
- 2.25. killer robot
- 2.26. killing machine
- 2.27. lethal autonomous weapon (4 times)
- 2.28. lethal autonomous weapon systems
- 2.29. level of autonomy
- 2.30. level of human intervention
- 2.31. mother drone
- 2.32. mothership (2 times)
- 2.33. mothership drone
- 2.34. operators
- 2.35. pilot [a drone]
- 2.36. pilotless drone
- 2.37. range
- 2.38. remote weaponised station
- 2.39. remotely controlled weapon station
- 2.40. robot (3 times)
- 2.41. robot dog

- 2.42. smaller drone
- 2.43. suicidal attack drone
- 2.44. swarm technology
- 2.45. swarming
- 2.46. swarm
- 2.47. system operator
- 2.48. to teach the drone
- 2.49. unmanned aerial vehicle
- 2.50. unmanned ground vehicle
- 2.51. unmanned land vehicle
- 2.52. visual navigation
- 2.53. weapon system
- 2.54. weapon-wielding machine

3. Hunt K. GPS Jamming Is Emerging as an Increasingly Prevalent — and Troubling — Weapon of War. 2026. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2026/03/06/science/gps-jamming-ships-planes-iran-war>

Terminology identified in the source:

- 3.1. antenna
- 3.2. anti-spoofing features
- 3.3. easy to overpower
- 3.4. electronic fog
- 3.5. electronic interference (2 times)
- 3.6. electronic interference in navigation systems
- 3.7. emergency broadcast position information
- 3.8. encryption
- 3.9. frequency bands
- 3.10. global navigation satellite systems (GNSS) (4 times)
- 3.11. global positioning satellite systems

- 3.12. Global Positioning System (GPS)
- 3.13. global positioning system signal
- 3.14. GNSS interference
- 3.15. GNSS signal
- 3.16. GPS data
- 3.17. GPS interference (3 times)
- 3.18. GPS interference events
- 3.19. GPS jamming
- 3.20. GPS manipulation
- 3.21. GPS navigation jamming
- 3.22. GPS signal
- 3.23. high-intensity radio signal
- 3.24. interference (2 times)
- 3.25. jammed
- 3.26. jamming (9 times)
- 3.27. military GNSS signal
- 3.28. navigation system (6 times)
- 3.29. radar
- 3.30. radio signal
- 3.31. signal
- 3.32. to have signals diverted
- 3.33. spoofing (5 times)
- 3.34. spoofing navigational signal
- 3.35. spoofing of signal (2 times)
- 3.36. spoofing region
- 3.37. spoofing source
- 3.38. vehicle's satellite-based positioning

4. Varenikova M. The Killer Robots Are Coming. The Battlefield Will Never
Look the Same. 2026. URL:

<https://www.nytimes.com/2026/04/20/world/europe/ukraine-russia-war-robots-drones.html>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 4.1. aerial drone (3 times)
- 4.2. aerial exploding drone
- 4.3. assault with robotic vehicles
- 4.4. automated assault
- 4.5. automated attack
- 4.6. automated weapon
- 4.7. drone attack team
- 4.8. drone manufacturer
- 4.9. drone (2 times)
- 4.10. exploding drone
- 4.11. flying drone
- 4.12. ground robot (4 times)
- 4.13. ground vehicle
- 4.14. killer robots
- 4.15. operator
- 4.16. pilot
- 4.17. remote system
- 4.18. remotely controlled vehicle
- 4.19. robot (9 times)
- 4.20. robotic assault
- 4.21. small aerial drone
- 4.22. small quadcopter drone
- 4.23. tactics for robots' use
- 4.24. the most advanced drone
- 4.25. unmanned ground system
- 4.26. unmanned ground vehicle (6 times)
- 4.27. unmanned operation

- 4.28. unmanned systems (4 times)
- 4.29. vehicle with rockets

Terminology identified in US and UK media discourse

1. Harding L., Mamo A. 'The Frontline Is Like Terminator': Fighting Robots Give Ukraine Hope in War with Russia. The Guardian. 2026. URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2026/apr/04/fighting-robots-give-ukraine-hope-in-war-with-russia>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 1.1. aerial attack
- 1.2. aerial drone
- 1.3. anti-Shahed interceptor
- 1.4. armed ground robot
- 1.5. battery-powered land robot
- 1.6. droid-like machine
- 1.7. drone (2 times)
- 1.8. drone expertise
- 1.9. drone operator
- 1.10. electric vehicle
- 1.11. fighting robot
- 1.12. first-person-view drone
- 1.13. ground robot
- 1.14. ground robot technology
- 1.15. ground robotic system
- 1.16. ground system
- 1.17. ground vehicle (2 times)
- 1.18. ground-based robotic system
- 1.19. kamikaze robot
- 1.20. land drone
- 1.21. land robot
- 1.22. land robot
- 1.23. long-range kamikaze Shahed drone

- 1.24. interceptor
- 1.25. modern unmanned weapon
- 1.26. pioneering sea drone
- 1.27. remote console
- 1.28. remote control machine gun
- 1.29. robot (7 times)
- 1.30. robotic system
- 1.31. robotise
- 1.32. spy drone
- 1.33. system (2 times)
- 1.34. UGV pilots
- 1.35. UGV (2 times)
- 1.36. unmanned ground systems
- 1.37. unmanned ground vehicle (2 times)

- 2. Kottasová I., Tarasova-Markina D., Butenko V. ‘Robots Don’t Bleed’: Ukraine Sends Machines into the Battlefield in Place of Human Soldiers. 2026. URL: <https://edition.cnn.com/2026/04/20/europe/robots-ukraine-battlefield-drones-in-tl-cmd>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 2.1. aerial [drones]
- 2.2. aerial drone observation
- 2.3. AI in land drones
- 2.4. battery life
- 2.5. battery recharge
- 2.6. battlefield drone
- 2.7. controlled by a pilot
- 2.8. drone (7 times)
- 2.9. drone superiority
- 2.10. drone warfare (2 times)

- 2.11. drone-based battlefield
- 2.12. drones and robots (3 times)
- 2.13. fully autonomous technologies
- 2.14. ground drone (2 times)
- 2.15. ground robotic system
- 2.16. ground robot
- 2.17. ground-based
- 2.18. ground-based robotic system
- 2.19. ground-based robotics commander
- 2.20. land drone (3 times)
- 2.21. land robot (2 times)
- 2.22. light maintenance
- 2.23. payload
- 2.24. remotely controlled vehicle
- 2.25. robot (6 times)
- 2.26. robotic ground system
- 2.27. robotic strike system
- 2.28. robotic system
- 2.29. these systems

3. Kramer A. E. Amid Uncertainty About U.S. Support, Ukraine Pins Its Hopes on Innovation. 2025. URL: <https://www.nytimes.com/2025/04/28/world/europe/ukraine-russia-war-drones.html>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 3.1. armorer
- 3.2. attack drone squad
- 3.3. drone (10 times)
- 3.4. drone battalions
- 3.5. drone crews (2 times)

- 3.6. drone deployment
- 3.7. drone program (3 times)
- 3.8. drone regiment
- 3.9. drone pilot
- 3.10. drone squad
- 3.11. drone strategy
- 3.12. drone war
- 3.13. exploding speedboat
- 3.14. explosive drones' range
- 3.15. fiber-optic thread
- 3.16. first-person-view drone (4 times)
- 3.17. flying re-transmitter drone
- 3.18. guiding drone
- 3.19. navigator
- 3.20. pilot (3 times)
- 3.21. reconnaissance and strike drone
- 3.22. remote-controlled
- 3.23. remote-controlled vehicles
- 3.24. retransmitting drone
- 3.25. small exploding drone
- 3.26. unmanned ground system
- 3.27. unmanned system
- 3.28. unmanned weapon

- 4. Shevchenko V. Armed Robots Take to the Battlefield in Ukraine War. 2026.
URL: <https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/c62662gzlp8o>.

Terminology identified in the source:

- 4.1. aerial drone
- 4.2. armed robot
- 4.3. armed UGV (2 times)

- 4.4. armed uncrewed ground vehicle
- 4.5. battery-powered kamikaze UGV
- 4.6. be supported by UGV
- 4.7. combat UGV
- 4.8. communication
- 4.9. drone (2 times)
- 4.10. ground drone
- 4.11. ground robot system
- 4.12. kamikaze vehicle
- 4.13. killer robot (2 times)
- 4.14. lethal UGV
- 4.15. machine
- 4.16. manufacturer of UGVs
- 4.17. operator (3 times)
- 4.18. part-autonomous
- 4.19. remote-controlled
- 4.20. robot war
- 4.21. robots (5 times)
- 4.22. run autonomously
- 4.23. “strike droid”
- 4.24. Strike drone [UGV]
- 4.25. strike UGV (3 times)
- 4.26. swarms of drones
- 4.27. swarms of spy and killer drones
- 4.28. the killer robots' autonomy
- 4.29. UGV (5 times)
- 4.30. UGV battalion
- 4.31. uncrewed boats
- 4.32. uncrewed ground vehicles (UGVs)
- 4.33. uncrewed vehicles