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Abstract

This paper aims to thoroughly analyze terminological studies as a particular modality of domain analysis (DA). To this end, we establish the following methodological sequence: i) a broad description of the field of terminology, with emphasis on a general characterization of the theoretical currents and the two traditional types of research: systematic research and punctual research; ii) review of the background information on the theoretical and methodological intersection between terminology and knowledge organization (KO); iii) the problematization of terminological studies seen as DA, based on the study of background information and a series of trigger questions. The answers to these questions will allow us to progress in their understanding. The results show the need to further define the profile of terminological studies to use them in KO better. They also suggest considering terminological studies as a separate DA category, specifically in relation to language for special purposes (LSP) and discourse analysis. Finally, the preliminary conclusions will guide future research in the field. In particular, we stress that terminological research methods seem not to be sufficiently recognized as suitable for application in KO.
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1. Introduction

In the almost thirty years of development of the domain analysis (from now on DA) concept, at least three milestones – not necessarily successive – define its history. The first is related to its proposal and coinage, through the pioneering contributions of Hanne Albrechtsen and especially the Danish researcher Birger Hjørland (Albrechtsen 1993; Hjørland and Albrechtsen...

The third corresponds to the gradual emergence of explorations, revisions, and applications of the concept (Beghtol 1995; Robinson 2009; Guimarães 2014; Hjørland 2017), as well as various critical and propositional texts (Tennis 2003; Smiraglia 2012, 2015; Guimarães and Tognoli 2015), which make up its basic body of literature.

Smiraglia (2015) explored the nature of DA with greater detail by considering the concept as a paradigm, a metatheory, or a methodological paradigm within Knowledge Organization (KO). However, he had already stated in a previous study that the enumeration of the eleven types of DA formulated by Hjørland (2002), in his first systematic field study, constituted a “panoply of methodologies” (Smiraglia 2012 p. 114).

Guimarães (2014) also supported this position. He reaffirmed that beyond the theoretical aspects involved, the interaction between central concepts for understanding DA (such as domain and discourse communities) essentially constitute methodological expressions that allow identify “as categorias fundamentais do campo (a partir das questões e tópicos que os pesquisadores da área consideram relevantes para estudo)” (Guimarães 2014 p. 16).

Along the same line of thought, in this paper, DA is the generic name given in KO to a set of methodologies or methodological approaches aimed at designing a map or a conceptual representation of a knowledge domain’s structure. The purpose of traditional Library and Information Science (LIS) is the subject representation for information retrieval. On the other hand, for different purposes unrelated to LIS, it identifies research trends or the analysis of support structures for the management and production of knowledge in specialized areas.

The number of proposed modalities of DA is still an open discussion. Hjørland (2002) identified and established an initial list of eleven different types. It was partly contested and extended by Smiraglia (2015) and Guimarães and Tognoli (2015).

Table 1 shows the state-of-the-art consensus and dissension on the DA typology established so far in the literature.
As shown in table 1, terminological studies correspond to the ninth type of DA. Hjørland (2002) grouped them with two other fields: languages for special purposes or LSP and discourse analysis. The table also shows that terminological studies are smoothly accepted as a specific type of DA since they have not caused dissension.

This exploratory work aims to delimit and analyze the terminological situation as a modality of DA. To this end, the following methodological sequence is established: (1) a broad description of the field of terminology, with emphasis on a general characterization of the theoretical currents and the two traditional types of research: systematic research and punctual...
research, (2) a review of background information on the theoretical and methodological intersection between terminology and KO, (3) the problematization of terminological studies seen as DA, based on the background information. The answers to these questions will allow progress in their understanding.

2 Terminology as a domain

The expression ‘terminology’ has two meanings: “1. the aggregate of terms representing a system of concepts of a particular subject field, and, 2. an interdisciplinary field comprising linguistics, logic, information sciences, and individual subject fields” (Felber 1974 p. 89).

It is an interdisciplinary field, integrating knowledge not only from the areas mentioned by Felber, but also from communication, translation (Cabré 1993), semantics, lexicology and lexicography (Krieger and Finatto 2004), among others. Thus, the terminology has evolved based on the successive development of different theoretical and methodological schools.

Among the classical conceptions, we find the General Theory of Terminology (GTT), advocated by Wüster in his doctoral thesis defended in 1931 and published many years later (Wüster 1970). This theory has been supported up to the present by authors such as Felber and Picht. As for more recent developments, there is a widespread reference to the Communicative Theory of Terminology – CTT- (Cabré 1993), Socioterminology (Gaudin 1993), and the Sociocognitive Terminology Theory (Temmerman 2000).

To a greater or lesser degree, many authors outline the main characteristics of these currents of thought (Cabré 2003; Krieger and Finatto 2004; Benítez 2009; Senftleben 2020). In the context of this paper, we will only say that the GTT responds to a normative vision of terminology. It does not recognize variety and believes it is instrumental to different processes of normalization and standardization of designations and meanings in specialized fields that in Wüster’s original vision seem to be limited to sciences and technologies.

The CTT identifies, primarily through Cabré, the inadequacies of the classical theory personalized in Wüster, although it involves other schools such as those of Prague and Russia.
The CTT proposes to relaunch the discipline based on communicative principles and a descriptive vision based on recognizing terms as expressions of natural language, which follow the grammatical and syntactic rules of the languages they belong to. Furthermore, they are identified by the possibility of being used as specialized units in sciences, technologies, and specialties considered in a broad sense.

Gaudin (1993) introduces variation as a central concept for understanding the flow of dialogues between specialists and users of terminologies.

Temmerman (2000) constructs her thought in opposition to the classical theory. Instead, she offers five alternative principles. First, she enhances the historical or diachronic analysis of terminology and the need to incorporate cognitive models to frame the creation, use, and understanding of the concepts represented by the terms.

All these theories are of interest to KO. Both the classical standardization criteria and the concern for variants are present in the development of vocabulary control types. They are formalized in the standards for creating controlled vocabularies (British Standard Institution 2005; National Information Standards Organization 2005; International Organization for Standardization 2011).

On the other hand, the communicative conception of terminology and the sociocognitive aspects introduced by Temmerman reinforce the attention on the mediating processes of knowledge organization systems (from now on KOS) and natural language indexing between classifiers or indexers and users.

From the perspective of the development of methods and techniques for research, terminology has followed a more homogeneous path, traditionally running along two tracks: systematic research (Corbeil 1973; Sager 1990; Bevilacqua 2017) and punctual research (Célestin et al. 1984; L'Homme 2004).

Systematic research deals with the identification, systematization and presentation of the terminology of a knowledge area following to a certain extent the methods of compilation, definition, and organization of data used in lexicography.
The typical product of this type of research has been the preparation of specialized dictionaries and glossaries, and more recently, the implementation of terminological data banks (Krieger and Finatto 2004). Cabré and Tebé emphasize that systematic research “sigue unas pautas metodológicas bien establecidas”, las que “están bien descriptas en las normas ISO del TC37 [https://www.iso.org/committee/48104.html], puesto que es el tipo de trabajo que responde históricamente a la necesidad de ingenieros y técnicos de representar, estructurar y denominar de forma sistemática sus ámbitos de conocimiento” (Cabré and Tebé 2005 p. 20).

In systematic terminological research, the study and compilation of terminology cannot be separated from the analysis of the epistemological and theoretical foundations that sustain the existence, validity, and use of terms with more or less shared meanings within a given discourse community. There are often divergences even in the relevance of using or not certain terms to represent the entities or phenomena under study.

Within a discourse community, there are often different currents of thought, sometimes with contradictory or opposing approaches and interpretations of the scope and particularities of their objects of study.

Punctual terminological research consists of “une technique d’investigation d’un terme ou d’un groupe restreint de termes appartenant à n’importe quel domaine de l’activité humaine, en vue de satisfaire un besoin immédiat exprimé par un usager” (Célestin et al. 1984 p. 17). These authors also establish a typology of punctual research, which includes the analysis of the meaning of a term, the most appropriate term to represent a new concept, the certification or validation of the use of a term, or the search for an exact or approximate equivalence in another language.

Dubuc points out that there are those who underestimate punctual research by considering that "un trabajo ‘por pedazos’ [a ‘piecemeal’ work] no aporta realmente soluciones de conjunto a las necesidades terminológicas” (Dubuc 1999 p. 65). However, he finds at least the following advantages in getting involved in this work: (1) the solution to urgent problems in translation and writing, (2) the opportunity to use this type of research as a training school by putting the future terminologist in direct contact with users and their needs, and (3) the possibility of studying in-depth the existing documentation in a certain domain (Dubuc 1999).
To these advantages, we should add the possibility of quickly solving problems of designation, conceptualization, translation, and historical or etymological precedence, continually presented by neologisms.

As Cabré and Tebé point out, the first methodological descriptions of punctual research refer to Quebec, in particular to the contributions of the Consultation Service of the Office de la Langue Française in a context of terminological work targeted at linguistic planning, and without a standardized international regulation (Cabré and Tebé 2005).

Nevertheless, the demands and urgencies posed by the avalanche of neologisms to translators, communicators, journalists, and information professionals make punctual research a helpful tool for selecting terms in target languages, or descriptors or indexing terms for the retrieval of information in native languages.

In short, we can establish that terminology research offers two types of approach: a microstructural one (that of punctual terminology), which refers to the study of a term or a restricted set of generally related terms, in questions concerning the etymology, coinage, conceptualization, definition, and identification of synonyms of each term, as well as its grammatical, syntactic and orthographic aspects.

The second type of approach, corresponding to systematic research, is macrostructural. It seeks to obtain the mapping of a domain, as generic or specific, as primary or exhaustive as necessary for the research objectives. This overall approach to a specialized area also allows visualizing the links with other domains, facilitating the insertion of a notional system in the preexisting knowledge maps.

3 Terminology and knowledge organization

The intersection points between linguistics and LIS are mainly centered on terminology and KO. This can be documented in different ways. For example, when in 1993, Dahlberg argues for changing the name of the journal *International Classification to Knowledge Organization Journal* (KOJ), she points out that:

The new title, denoting a superordinate concept to ‘Classification’, clearly indicates that we do not wish to confine ourselves to the problems falling under the ‘Classification’ concept, but rather are interested - as in fact we always have been, although many a one did not notice it - in all questions of knowledge organization such as they are now alluded to in the subtitle of our journal: hence in Conceptology, Classification (including Thesaurus Problems), Indexing, and Knowledge Representation (including the relevant Linguistic Problems and Terminology. (Dahlberg 1993 p. 1)

The reference to terminology already appears in the first issue of the KOJ in 1993, in the introductory pages: in the Scope section, when mentioning the willingness to accept, among others, contributions "concerning themselves with the problems of terminology in general and with respect to special fields"; and under the title Aims, when referring to the research area and its purposes "with special attention being given to the problems of terminology".

Previously, this author had explored the philosophical and linguistic foundations that Terminology and KO could share (Dahlberg 1992). Dahlberg also added division 77 - Problems of Terminology, within class 7 – Knowledge Representation by Language and Terminology in her Classification System for Knowledge Organization Literature (CSKOL), used to classify the literature in the field (Dahlberg 1999).

With these signs, there is no further doubt about Dahlberg’s willingness to introduce terminology as one of the essential areas in constructing the semantic universe of KO. The regular publication of articles and papers specifically on intersection issues between terminology and KO (Espelt 1995; Campos 2001; Alexiev 2006; Mayr and Petras 2008; Alexiev and Marksbury 2010; Woźniak-Kasperek 2014; Braz 2020) reaffirm the validity of the interdependence of both fields.

As if we needed further evidence, in volume 17 of the Advances in Knowledge Organization series, corresponding to the proceedings of the Sixteenth International ISKO Conference 2020, the word terminology appears 584 times in the 583 pages of the volume (International Society for Knowledge Organization 2020).

According to the consulted authors, the flow of the influences (from terminology to KO, from KO to terminology, or the bidirectional communication) is a matter that we will describe here, in the absolute certainty that it requires a more precise systematization.
The analysis of the links between terminology and KO cannot avoid the reference to the theoretical and methodological profiles of both domains to clearly determine the nature of the intersections that have occurred and can occur.

From the theoretical perspective, Espelt (1995), concerned with determining the bases that support KO subjects' theoretical/practical teaching focuses mainly on the contributions of documentation, the faceted classification theory, and terminology. Along the same line, Campos considers terminology as one of the three principal theoretical substrata, along with Ranganathan’s faceted classification theory and the concept theory formulated by Dahlberg (Campos 2001).

Both authors focus mainly on describing terminology as a domain without delving deeper into the concrete links with KO. However, both make progress in analyzing the principles common to the theories on which they focus.

From a methodological perspective, recent research provides brief and rather general approaches. Alexiev and Marksbury (2010) point out that almost all KO methods (empirical, rationalist, historicist or pragmatic) are applicable in the modern terminographic practice. Although these authors do not explore the peculiarities of terminology research thoroughly, they conclude that “there is a clear tendency in both KO and terminology to move toward a domain-specific approach that presupposes organizing the knowledge in general (e.g., for classification) and for specific terminographic purposes” (Alexiev and Marksbury 2010 p. 369).

Woźniak-Kasperek (2014), on the other hand, situates the main contributions of terminology to the development of KOSs and takes the risk of saying that one of the most interesting conceptions to optimize the quality of KOSs is termontography, an approach advocated by the sociocognitive theory.

The contributions of terminology can also be found in three other areas: first, in everything related to the processes of classification and indexing, because in these practices the most accurate and appropriate names to represent the subject content of documents are discussed daily.

Second, the explicit use of terminology-based criteria by those responsible for the standards that guide the construction and revision of KOSs (British Standard Institution 2005; National Information Standards Organization 2005; International Organization for Standardization 2011),
allows offering consistent solutions in the selection or exclusion of terms and their relationships, as well as in the standardization of their orthographic, syntactic and morphological aspects.

The potential that may exist in the accumulated development in KO on warrants (literary, cultural, user, academic) becomes visible in the processes of selection or exclusion of terms, for example, in the selection of terms for a dictionary or specialized glossary. This implies a real contribution from KO to terminology in the reciprocal use of theories and methods.

Finally, the creation of domain trees (necessary in the process of organizing a domain and made in any systematic terminological research) has recently been valued as a particularly suitable tool in any process of mapping an area of knowledge, as in the case of the development of thesauri, subject headings lists, and other KOSs (Barité 2017 p. 97).

4 Terminological studies

As already said, Hjørland (2002) joined terminological studies with LSP (languages for special purposes) and discourse analysis as expressions of DA. This starting point opens the way to a series of questions, the answers to which are necessary to make progress in their problematization and scope.

What are terminological studies in general and in KO in particular? What do authors understand as terminological studies considered as modalities of DA? What concrete examples of terminological studies as modalities of DA have been identified? How do terminological studies as modalities of DA relate to usual research lines in the field of terminology? With what other forms of DA is it possible to combine terminological studies to establish the characteristics of a field of knowledge? Finally, does it make sense to group terminological studies with LSP and discourse analysis in the same category?

Given the characteristics of this paper, we can only aim at an initial treatment of these issues, with the possibility of expanding it in future contributions.

What are terminological studies in general and in particular in KO? It is not easy to determine the precise scope of the word ‘study’ in this context. In English, the Merriam-Webster
online dictionary, in its fifth meaning, states that studies are “a branch or department of learning” and adds that in this sense, it is often used in the plural, for example: “American studies” (Encyclopedia Britannica 2021).

On the other hand, in Spanish, Moliner establishes as the third meaning of the word: "(pl.) Conjunto de cosas que se estudian de cierta manera: Los estudios filosóficos” (Moliner 2016 p. 1114).

The expression ‘terminological’ has equally generic meanings. For Moliner (2016 p. 2494), this adjective deals with “De [o del] término o de [la] terminología”, in English “Of [or of] the term or of [the] terminology”, a general formula that is further opened up by the possibilities provided by square brackets, to incorporate any sense, relation or link to aspects of terminology or especially of terms.

Although at first studies could be assimilated to research literature, it seems more appropriate to consider that they refer to a more general conception of the work in an area. Thus, they reflect both the state-of-the-art (such as handbooks, dictionaries, or specialized teaching texts) and the possibilities for experimentation, innovation, or invention within a field of knowledge (the research literature itself).

Establishing the precise meaning of what can be considered a priori terminological studies seems as arduous a task as seizing Proteus and holding him forever.

Provisionally, and just to venture a basic agreement, we can say that terminological studies comprise a set of works of different nature (descriptive, analytical, speculative). This work seeks to explain general or particular aspects of terminologies or specialty languages concerning their foundations, theories, methods, applications, or products.

It is possible to add three ideas: the first is that by their nature, terminological studies may need contributions to or from other knowledge areas (lexicography, semantics and logic, for example).

The second is that not all terminological studies are directly relevant to KO. The third is that even when the presence or influence of terminological studies in KO is identified, this does not imply an automatic reference to any of the modalities of DA.
Indeed, the close links with the selection, use, and organization of terminology, both in terms of processes (classification, indexing, abstracting) and systems (thesauri, lists, taxonomies, subject ontologies, and others), it is possible to accept the existence of studies that do not intend to analyze a domain. On this basis, it is possible to ask the following question: Which are the terminological studies that authors consider as modalities of DA? Hjørland (2002) and Almeida (2021) place terminological studies in the broad areas of intersection between IS and linguistics. Hjørland warns about the relative lack of communication between both domains until now, despite having so many common issues to explore. He attributes this situation to theoretical problems that linguistics itself has. In particular, its structure with related subdisciplines affects the holistic view of linguistic phenomena. Furthermore, he mentions a certain resistance to considering sublanguages (and terminologies are ultimately sublanguages) as objects of study (Hjørland 2002).

Guimarães shows the way when he assures that terminological studies, together with LSP and discourse analysis “prestam-se para a análise de como, nesse domínio, se nomeiam conceitos, e se organizam palavras, textos e enunciados, segundo critérios semânticos e pragmáticos” (Guimarães 2014 p. 18). Following this line of thinking, terminological studies would include the set of analyses of specialized designations and their organization or conceptual structuring, based on their meanings or other useful alternative criteria.

Almeida and Dias propose a list of possibilities related to terminological studies, LSP, database semantics and discourse analysis (without making further distinctions between these fields). They summarize them as follows: terminological studies, specialized lexicography, semantics, specialized languages, relations with gender studies, construction of thesauri, and, as an important note, problems related to the efficiency of controlled or natural language retrieval (Almeida and Dias 2019 p. 30).

In the three preceding references, there remain at least two problems to solve: i) the impossibility of identifying what in particular is attributable to terminological studies, and ii) the lack of a specific and definitive list of situations in which one we can say ‘here there is a concrete application of terminological studies as a modality of DA while in this other situation there is not’.

Which are the identified specific examples of terminological studies as modalities of DA? Smiraglia (2015) has been the most exhaustive in this regard. He gathered almost a hundred
research reports on DA and classified them under the general label of ‘Terminological studies, language for special purpose, database semantics, and discourse studies’. He broke down nineteen papers published between 2002 and 2014 as follows: eleven papers published in the Proceedings of the international conferences of the International Society for Knowledge Organization (ISKO), five articles published in the Knowledge Organization Journal, and three additional papers published in LIS journals.

Without prejudice to accepting that Smiraglia’s compilation (2015) corresponds to a partial and targeted sample, which may be further conditioned by the author’s particular interpretation, the fact is that having resorted to the international conferences and ISKO’s reference journal, he provided a consistent view of the selected documents.

Based on the consultation of the original documents and the stipulations of the authors themselves, Table 2 below was drawn up with the nineteen documents mentioned by Smiraglia.

It includes the authors, the publication year, the modality of DA, the methods used, the domain on which the analysis was performed, and the final product. The modality of DA is established according to Smiraglia’s opinion when it is explicit; otherwise, the type is assigned based on the technical reading of each document. Finally, data that raise doubts are presented with a question mark.
Table 2 – Terminological studies, discourse analysis and LSP according to Smiraglia (2015)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Paper</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Domain</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Ørom 2003</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>KOS Comparison</td>
<td>Visual arts and exhibitions</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>López-Huertas, Barité &amp; Torres 2004</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>KOS Comparison</td>
<td>Gender studies</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Miller et al. 2006</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Critical reading of texts. KOS Comparison</td>
<td>KO education</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lin et al. 2006</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>Terminology extraction by users</td>
<td>Influenza virus</td>
<td>Prototype testing: concept map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Christensen 2008</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>Comparison of KO terms</td>
<td>Homosexuality</td>
<td>KOS evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ibekwe-San Juan 2008</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Research discourse analysis</td>
<td>Astronomy</td>
<td>Area terminology according to geographic areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Mustafa El Hadi 2008</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Political discourse analysis</td>
<td>Darfur conflict</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Barros &amp; Moraes 2010</td>
<td>Discourse analysis</td>
<td>Comparison of two terms in handbooks</td>
<td>Archival science</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zherebchevsk &amp; 2010</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>Term extraction from ISKO proceedings</td>
<td>Formalism in KO</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Kwaśnik &amp; Flaherty 2010</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>Term comparison in KOS</td>
<td>Autism</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Jeong &amp; Kimn 2010</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>Co-ocurrence analysis. Term comparison in KOS</td>
<td>Biomedical information</td>
<td>KOS evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Dutta et al., 2011</td>
<td>Terminological study</td>
<td>Cluster analysis</td>
<td>String theory</td>
<td>Results and conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data in Table 2 show that of the nineteen documents surveyed by Smiraglia, six correspond to research using discourse analysis. The other twelve can be classified, with doubts in some cases, within terminological studies. The remaining work presented the possibility of classification in both categories. None of the nineteen papers could easily be categorized as an example of LSP. It is possible that given the relative indeterminacy of the boundaries between LSP, terminological studies, and discourse analysis persisting in the DA literature, some of these papers could admit a different or mixed categorization.

Most of the works identified are close to the systematic terminology research modality (more or less comprehensive approach to a domain). At the same time, at least one fits in the category of studies of punctual terminology (Barros and Moraes 2010).

Comparative analyses of the terminology of an area as presented in various KOSs prevail among the former group (López-Huertas 2004; Christensen 2008; Kwaśnik and Flaherty 2010; Jeong and Kim 2010; Scaturro 2013).
Also noteworthy are several studies based on the extraction of terminology to establish different forms of knowledge representation in a domain (Lin et al. 2006; Zherebchevsky 2010; Dutta et al. 2011; Guimarães et al. 2014).

Other terminological studies propose the analysis of preexisting classifications or information organizations to extract the basis of the conceptual structure of a domain (Pattuelli and Rubinov 2013; Campbell 2014).

The methods used to develop terminological studies include facet analysis, content analysis, conceptual analysis, comparison, clustering, and the critical appraisal of terminology extracted from different corpora.

The spectrum of domains studied is comprehensive (theories, arts, natural sciences, health sciences, political science, and social phenomena). This fact confirms the applicability of DA and, in particular, of terminological studies to any area of knowledge, by the power of conceptual representation and communication available to scientific, technical, and specialized terms in general.

In most cases, the product is a set of results described from which conclusions are drawn. For example, in some studies, a prototype is tested, while in others, the graphic visualizations of the domain studied are proposed.

Looking through the collection of the Knowledge Organization journal and the Advances in Knowledge Organization series, we get the feeling that Smiraglia could have included many other papers in his compilation. Nevertheless, the list of examples provides an approach to the scope and possibilities of terminological studies. In KO, systematic and punctual research tasks are processed through methods and techniques that have their tradition, such as facet analysis or content analysis.

How do terminological studies as modalities of DA relate to the usual research lines in terminology? Interestingly, in the IS, KO or DA literature on terminology or terminological studies, it is quite common to find reviews of their main theoretical currents (GTT, CTT, Socioterminology or Sociocognitive Theory). However, they tend to provide a summary and general explanation and establish possible connections with some of the aspects linked to KO.
However, in these papers, there is almost no mention either to the two classic aspects of terminological research (systematic and punctual) or to the techniques or methods usually attached to them, and how they could be applied or adapted to solve specific problems of KO.

The lack of studies on these specific points constitutes, for now, an obstacle to systematically insert terminological studies in the area of KO and everything related to DA. However, as was said, many of the cases studied by Smiraglia (2015) fit as a matter of fact in particular types of systematic and punctual research.

Let’s consider the following two approaches to terminological research (microstructural for punctual terminology and macrostructural for systematic research). The first finding is that macrostructural approaches are naturally associated with the comprehensive mappings that aim to construct DA and can, therefore, be considered as an area of methodological exploration.

Systematic research in terminology requires a prior delimitation of the domain boundaries, the determination of a specific hardcore, and the decision on what to do with the terminology coming from other areas into the domain under study.

On the other hand, the microstructural approach proposed by terminology can also be considered as a support for the construction of a domain map through its significant units: the terms. Their particular treatment, one by one, also requires the definition of warrant criteria to validate or exclude terms and definitions (selection of a corpus, expert consultation, studies of use, and frequency of use of the language, among others).

In each of these activities associated with systematic or punctual research, it is possible to find points of support, intersection, or possible reciprocal contributions between terminology and DA.

Can other modalities of DA be combined with terminological studies to establish the characteristics of a knowledge field? It is an established opinion that each type of DA can be used autonomously or in combination with others if this contributes to the better design or mapping of a specialized knowledge area. For example, Hjørland mentions that “terminology as an approach to domain studies in IS [information science] should be combined with bibliometrical studies; historical studies; and epistemological and critical studies” (Hjørland 2002 p. 446). This is a
possibility that has to be assessed in each situation, particularly if we want to promote quantitative, qualitative, or mixed approaches in research.

For instance, in systematic terminological research, and perhaps as a derivation of traditional lexicographic methods, qualitative criteria are often considered for selecting lemmas. In this sense, bibliometric studies can provide terminology with different ways of measuring or validating this selection process based on quantitative data from the documentation.

Does it make sense to group terminological studies with LSP studies and discourse analysis in the same category? This association may be controversial since it is arguable that the three fields have a common epistemological background in their theories, methodologies, and applications. However, Hjørland provides two arguments for bringing these areas together: all three have experience in analyzing their respective relations to IS, and all three are related to language (Hjørland 2002 p. 441).

The characteristics of the article itself limit the development that this author makes of his argument. Thus, although he establishes a necessary starting point, we still lack a serious contribution that can refute or confirm with sufficient epistemological foundations.

Within the terminology discourse community, there are different opinions regarding the nature of the domain: some think it is a branch of applied linguistics, while others postulate its independence either as an autonomous discipline or as an interdisciplinary or transdisciplinary activity.

In the intersection of terminology and other fields, the links with LSP or discourse analysis have not been studied from a different perspective than, for example, the links between terminology and translation.

Therefore, as a first working hypothesis, we suggest that terminological studies have their own knowledge profile, without prejudice to recognize possible exchange levels and interoperability with LSP or discourse analysis studies.

The autonomy of terminological studies as a type of DA would allow clarifying and going deeply into the different aspects mentioned in this paper as critical or insufficiently developed points.
5 Conclusions

The history of domain analysis in KO is summarized in a growing body of original studies published over almost thirty years. During this period, the foundations of its theoretical construction and methodological potential have been laid. The latter starts with the typology proposed in 2002 by Hjørland, which has been partially discussed and extended.

As the advances are still tentative, it is possible that the general discussion on DA will continue to be open for an extended time, although on the common basis of considering the different types of DA as methodological approaches.

It is possible to insert terminological studies within the interlocution between linguistics and IS, specifically between terminology and KO. As to the visibility of this interlocution, we have to acknowledge Ingetraut Dahlberg’s leadership. Since the early nineties and on a recurring basis Dahlberg brought to the table the number of possibilities that the theories and tools of terminology could offer to KO (and vice versa), through the common work they carry out around subject representation in specialized areas.

KO has focused on systematizing the processes of knowledge representation for information retrieval, and providing the rules for the construction of a wide variety of knowledge organization systems.

On the other hand, terminology has traditionally focused on criteria and methods (many of them taken from lexicology and lexicography) for the elaboration of specialized dictionaries and glossaries, and the creation of terminological databases, as well as for the development of punctual studies on a term or families of terms. Terminology and KO have served all knowledge domains from their respective scopes of action. They have had to resort, for operational issues, to disciplines such as translation, specialized communication, and technical writing, as well as linguistics and LIS.

As a particular manifestation of DA, terminological studies have received little attention in the literature to date. For this reason, in this paper, we have sought to problematize different issues whose resolution will allow to better define their conceptualization and operationalization.
Progress has been made in determining the very concept of terminological study as a particular form of DA.

On the other hand, an approximation was made to the nineteen cases explicitly recognized by Smiraglia (2015) as terminological studies of DA, in order to offer a systematic picture of the methods applied, the domains studied, and the results obtained.

From these data also emerges, as was expected, a clear predominance of systematic terminological studies over those that can be assimilated to punctual terminology research. We have hypothesized that terminological studies should be considered a completely autonomous form of DA, separating them from the established association with LSP and discourse analysis.

As this is exploratory research, the conclusions should be considered preliminary, possibly guiding future research on the subject. For example, one of the possible lines of research development is related to the question of consensus and dissension within a discourse community and how it directly impacts the orientation and outcome of the mappings.

In most scientific, social, technological, and human disciplines, we find different trends or currents of thought. Consequently, they may restrict the possibility of constructing neutral and objective languages.

The prevalence of comparative analysis in the cases studied has points of connection with this circumstance. In this way, terminological studies demonstrate the need for reliable methods and forms of interpretation to assess consensus and dissension, both in contemporary studies and analyses of the historical evolution of terminologies.
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