

# Characteristic Features of Modern Discourse in English and Uzbek Educational and Print Media

**Tursunov Mirzo Makhmudovich\*<sup>1</sup>, Chullieva Malika Kholmurod kizi<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> BSU, dotsent at English linguistics department

<sup>2</sup> 2nd-year master student

\*E-mail: [mirzobek.tursunov81@gmail.com](mailto:mirzobek.tursunov81@gmail.com)

## Abstract:

Modern discourse is a dynamic phenomenon shaped by digital technologies, globalization, and cultural diversity. It extends beyond traditional textual communication to include multimodal elements such as visuals and interactivity. This study investigates the characteristic features of modern discourse in English and Uzbek educational and print media. The research adopts a theoretical-conceptual approach, drawing on critical discourse analysis (CDA), multimodal discourse analysis (MDA), and sociolinguistics. No primary empirical data were collected. The analysis is supported by the authors' autoethnographic reflections as bilingual participants in English and Uzbek media environments. The study identifies five key features of modern media discourse observed across both languages: (1) multimodality, (2) fragmentation and hybridity, (3) identity construction, (4) tension between globalization and localization, and (5) ephemerality and speed. English discourse tends to lead in adopting fast-paced, multimedia forms, while Uzbek discourse reflects efforts to preserve cultural identity while adapting to global trends. These discourse features reveal changing norms in education and journalism. Educators and media practitioners must adapt to evolving expectations, using diverse communicative modes and addressing multilingual audiences. The findings underscore the need for critical awareness in designing content that is culturally responsive and communicatively effective.

**Keywords:** Modern Discourse, Multimodality, Hybridity, Identity, Performance, English-Uzbek Media, Globalization, Education, Digital Media Discourse, Algorithmic Personalization, Code-Switching

## Introduction

Discourse is commonly understood as language use in context – not just isolated words or sentences, but meaningful communication shaped by social forces. In Fairclough’s terms, discourses are “ways of representing aspects of the world”, while Foucault emphasizes that discourse defines “what can be seen and known” and thus delimits reality. Modern discourse, in turn, refers to contemporary modes of communication that extend beyond traditional text to include images, sound, and digital interactivity[1]. In an era of global connectivity and information overload, discourse has arguably become more influential than ever in constructing social reality and knowledge.

This article focuses on the characteristic features of modern discourse as observed in English and Uzbek contexts, specifically within educational settings and print media. English discourse, often considered a global lingua franca, dominates international academia and journalism, whereas Uzbek discourse provides insights into a multilingual, post-Soviet society negotiating its. By examining both, we gain a comparative perspective on how global trends and local cultures interact in discourse[2]. The originality of this study lies in synthesizing diverse theoretical frameworks – from the critical analysis of power in text to multimodal and sociolinguistic analyses – and applying them to a bilingual context. Through this lens, and informed by personal reflections as a bilingual educator, the paper aims to elucidate how modern discourse is evolving and why these changes matter for linguistics and education.

This study is a theoretical-conceptual analysis supplemented by personal reflection; no new empirical data were collected. The methodology aligns with an *integrative literature review* and *autoethnographic* insight[3]. We draw on published scholarship and the author’s firsthand observations as a bilingual participant in English and Uzbek media spheres. The conceptual framework combines elements of CDA, MDA, and sociolinguistics as outlined above. CDA provides the critical lens to ask: How do educational and print media discourses maintain or challenge power and ideology in each language? MDA ensures we consider not just linguistic features but also images, typography, and interactive elements (for example, the layout of a newspaper page or the design of an educational website). Sociolinguistic and new media frameworks guide our attention to language choice (e.g. code-switching between Uzbek, Russian, and English), audience interaction (such as comment threads or letter-to-editor culture), and the impact of media technologies (like algorithms and social media dissemination)[4].

The contexts selected are (1) *educational discourse*, meaning text and communication in educational media (e.g. school textbooks, university websites, scholarly journals or educational TV programs), and (2) *print media discourse*, meaning newspapers and magazines (including their online versions). These contexts were chosen because they are influential in knowledge construction and public opinion respectively, and they also exhibit interesting contrasts: educational discourse tends to aim for authority and clarity, while news media often balance information with persuasion or entertainment[5]. Examining both domains allows us to see whether modern discourse features are pervasive across domains or vary by communicative purpose.

## Methods

This study employs a theoretical-conceptual approach rather than empirical fieldwork. It is grounded in an integrative literature review and autoethnographic reflection, allowing the authors to synthesize and interpret existing research while incorporating personal insights as bilingual participants in English and Uzbek media environments.

Three main analytical frameworks guide the study:

1. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) – Used to examine how power relations, ideology, and institutional influence are embedded in educational and media texts. CDA helps explore how discourse either maintains or challenges existing social structures in both English and Uzbek

contexts.

2. Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA) – Applied to analyze not only verbal text but also visual and interactive elements in print and digital media. This includes the layout of educational websites, use of images in textbooks, typography, color schemes, and hyperlink structures.
3. Sociolinguistic and Media Discourse Analysis – Focused on language choice (e.g., code-switching among Uzbek, Russian, and English), audience engagement practices (such as comment sections, feedback loops), and the influence of digital algorithms and platforms on content visibility and personalization.

The selected data sources include:

1. Educational media: school textbooks, university websites, academic journals, and e-learning platforms in both English and Uzbek.
2. Print and digital press: newspapers and magazines (and their online editions), with attention to headlines, article structure, visuals, and language styles[6].

The methodology is comparative in nature, analyzing parallel features across both linguistic-cultural contexts[7]. The use of autoethnography enriches the analysis by connecting academic interpretation with lived experience, particularly in navigating bilingual educational and media spaces.

## Results and Discussion

In focusing on English and Uzbek, the framework takes a comparative approach. English educational and media discourse is well-documented and often sets global trends, whereas Uzbek discourse provides a less-studied example of a national context under global influences[8]. The researcher's bilingual competence and familiarity with Uzbek culture strengthen the comparative analysis by enabling nuanced reflection on examples (for instance, recalling how an Uzbek science textbook presents content versus an American one). Throughout the analysis, attention is given to linguistic features (vocabulary, code choices, style), visual/graphic features (use of photos, charts, emoji, etc.), and interactive features (hyperlinks, comment sections, reader engagement). This multi-dimensional approach allows a rich understanding of modern discourse characteristics[9-10].

Modern discourse is characterized by several core features that emerge repeatedly across English and Uzbek educational and print media. These include multimodality; fragmentation and hybridity; identity performance; globalization vs. localization dynamics; and ephemerality/speed. Each is discussed below with comparative commentary and reflective insights.

### a. Multimodality in communication

One of the clearest shifts in modern discourse is its multimodal nature. Unlike the dense, text-only pages of the past, contemporary media routinely blend words with images, audio, and interactive elements[11]. In English print journalism, a news article on a website might include embedded videos, infographics, and social media feeds alongside text. Educational content, too, is often presented via multimedia slides or e-learning platforms rather than solely chalk-and-talk or black-and-white textbooks. Kress and van Leeuwen's theory of multimodality holds that all these modes (visual, verbal, etc.) are integrated parts of meaning-making – for example, a photograph in a magazine not only illustrates but can frame the narrative, and its interpretation works like a sentence in context[12].

In English educational media, multimodality is advanced: think of Khan Academy videos or interactive e-textbooks that allow annotations. Uzbek educational media, while also incorporating images and charts, historically relied more on text, but this is changing. Current Uzbek textbooks and academic journals include color diagrams, and universities provide video lectures in Uzbek. In print news, major Uzbek newspapers (e.g. *Xalq So'zi*) now have online editions with images and sometimes bilingual captions[13]. There is also a visible interplay of scripts in Uzbek visual discourse – a single poster or

infographic might use Latin and Cyrillic alphabets together as the country transitions its writing system, which is itself a visual aspect of discourse.

From a personal reflection standpoint, as an Uzbek reader of English news, one notices the *density* of multimodal cues in Western media – bold headlines, subheadings, pull quotes, graphs – making the content visually engaging. Uzbek print media is catching up, recognizing that a compelling visual design can shape how information is perceived (what Kress calls the semiotic weight of design). The implications of multimodality are significant for education: literacy now means not only reading words but also “reading” images and layouts. In both languages, educators and communicators need to ensure that visuals and text work together coherently to avoid misinterpretation. As one scholar put it, modern discourse is “semiotically exuberant”, crossing boundaries between modes in pursuit of effective communication.

To sum we can state that modern discourse in educational and print media is defined by being multimodal, fast-changing, and culturally hybrid. English and Uzbek examples illustrate how these broader trends manifest in specific ways. English discourse, embedded in a dominant global language, often leads in adopting new modalities and rapid dialogic forms, whereas Uzbek discourse navigates maintaining cultural identity (through language purity, tradition) while integrating global influences (through loans, new genres). Despite these differences, both contexts show a move toward richly multimodal texts, a fragmentation of audiences into niche communities, a deliberate use of language to perform and project identities, and an unprecedented pace of communication[14].

These characteristics carry significant implications. Culturally, the norms of communication are in flux – what might be seen as informal or hybrid in one generation (e.g., mixing Uzbek and English in a lesson) could become the accepted norm for the next. Educators and writers need to be aware that effective communication today requires versatility: the ability to shift registers, combine modes, and address diverse audiences. For example, a teacher in Uzbekistan might need to create bilingual, multimedia lesson content to engage students who consume knowledge via YouTube as much as textbooks[15]. Similarly, an English journalist must consider that their article could be algorithmically filtered to certain readers, and thus might strive for clarity and inclusivity to avoid deepening echo chambers.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the analysis of modern discourse in English and Uzbek educational and print media reveals a profound transformation in how information is communicated, shaped by the forces of digitalization, globalization, and increasing cultural hybridity. Modern discourse is no longer confined to traditional, linear text but instead incorporates a wide range of multimodal elements—visuals, interactive features, and algorithm-driven personalization—that influence both the form and perception of content. English media discourse, driven by global standards and digital advancements, tends to be more rapid, interactive, and visually rich, often setting trends that are later adapted in other linguistic and cultural contexts. Uzbek media discourse, meanwhile, demonstrates an active negotiation between preserving cultural-linguistic identity and embracing modern communicative forms. This duality is particularly evident in educational discourse, where the shift toward multimedia and bilingual content reflects changing expectations in teaching and learning. Print media in both contexts also illustrates the fragmentation of audiences and the performance of social identity through language use. The implications are significant: educators, content creators, and media practitioners must now possess a high degree of communicative flexibility, technological literacy, and cultural sensitivity. Effective modern discourse requires not just linguistic accuracy, but the ability to navigate diverse modes, address multilingual audiences, and critically assess the sociopolitical impact of how information is framed. Ultimately, understanding the evolving nature of discourse in different media and cultural settings is essential for fostering more inclusive, effective, and responsive communication practices in both local and global arenas.

## References

- [1] S. B. Abdusattarova, “Theoretical foundation of the study of neologisms in English and Uzbek newspaper discourse,” *Eurasian Journal of Academic Research*, 2021.
- [2] A. Bell, *The Language of News Media*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1991.
- [3] J. Blommaert, *The Sociolinguistics of Globalization*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [4] N. Fairclough, *Media Discourse*, London: Edward Arnold, 1995.
- [5] N. Fairclough, *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research*, London: Routledge, 2003.
- [6] S. Usmonova, “Newspaper discourse: Features of speech influence in Uzbek and American newspapers,” *Excellencia: International Multi-Disciplinary Journal of Education*, vol. 2, no. 10, pp. 517–522, 2024.
- [7] T. A. van Dijk, “Critical discourse analysis,” in *Handbook of Discourse Analysis*, vol. 1, T. D. Thu, Ed., Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2015, pp. 466–485.
- [8] S. Vertovec, “Super-diversity and its implications,” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, vol. 30, no. 6, pp. 1024–1054, 2007.
- [9] R. Wodak and M. Meyer, Eds., *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis*, London: SAGE Publications, 2001.
- [10] G. Kress and T. van Leeuwen, *Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary Communication*, London: Arnold, 2001.
- [11] D. Machin and A. Mayr, *How to Do Critical Discourse Analysis: A Multimodal Introduction*, London: SAGE Publications, 2012.
- [12] B. Bhatia and B. Ritchie, *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2004.
- [13] T. Scollon and S. Scollon, *Intercultural Communication: A Discourse Approach*, 2nd ed., Oxford: Blackwell, 2001.
- [14] J. Martin and D. Rose, *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause*, London: Continuum, 2003.
- [15] D. Crystal, *English as a Global Language*, 2nd ed., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.