

MEDIA DISCOURSE IN THE LIGHT OF ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM

Usmonova Dilnoza Umarovna

Tashkent state university of Uzbek language and Literature named after
Alisher Navoi

Teacher of English

Annotation: *This article explores the role of media discourse in shaping public perception, political ideologies, and communication practices in contemporary society. It delves into the interdisciplinary field of media linguistics, examining how language in mass media influences and constructs political narratives, societal values, and national identities. Drawing on various theoretical frameworks, including cognitive linguistics, sociolinguistics, and discourse analysis, the article highlights the complexities of language use in media texts and the dynamic relationship between language, culture, and communication. It discusses key characteristics of media discourse, such as its collective nature, its orientation toward a broad audience, and its dependence on various media channels (print, radio, television, internet). Additionally, the article emphasizes the importance of the human factor in shaping media messages and their communicative impact, aligning with the anthropocentric paradigm in modern linguistics. The article concludes by asserting the significance of media discourse as both a tool for information dissemination and a powerful means of influence in the digital age. It contributes to the ongoing study of language and media, offering insights into the evolving nature of communication and its impact on society.*

Key words: *Media Discourse, media linguistics, political ideologies, mass communication, cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, sociolinguistics, communication strategies, media influence, cultural identity, national mentality*

In today's interconnected world, media plays a pivotal role not only in informing the public but also in shaping political ideologies and influencing decision-making processes. Media discourse—the way language is used in news reports, opinion pieces, and social media platforms—has a profound impact on how we understand and interpret political events. Through subtle linguistic choices, media outlets have the power to construct, promote, or challenge political narratives, thus serving as influential political actors in their own right.

Modern human life unfolds in a constant, unceasing flow of information. The emergence and development of communication tools (radio, television, the Internet) have led to the rise of a new type of discourse—media discourse. It is important to note that there is still no unified definition of this concept. For instance, Russian scholars use the following terms: media discourse [Dobrosklonskaya, 2012; Kozhemyakin, 2010], language of mass media [Volodina, 2011], mass media discourse [Plotnikova, 2002], network discourse [Karasik, 2021], discourse of mass communication [Graudina, 2000], media discourse [Kibrik, 2011], mass-media discourse [Zheltukhina, 2004], and others. Foreign researchers use terms such as mass media [Bell, 1991], media discourse [Fairclough, 1989], mass media discourse [Van Dijk, 1995], language in the news [Fowler, 1991], the media [Montgomery, 1996], and others.

On the basis of the above mentioned investigations new terms that define media discourse appeared and different scientists applied different viewpoints to explain these terms. Relatively new term media linguistics was also introduced in the scientific works by T. Dobrosklonskaya as a subject that studies language in mass media. The foundations for the emergence of media linguistics were established in the 1970s, when publications focusing on the role of language in mass communication began to appear regularly in Russia and Europe. Scholars analyzed media texts through various academic lenses, including sociolinguistics, functional stylistics, pragmatics, discourse theory, content analysis, cognitive linguistics, and rhetorical criticism. Their research addressed a broad range of topics, such as defining the status of media language within functional stylistics, exploring methods for describing different types of media texts, and examining the influence of socio-cultural factors and linguistic techniques on mass and individual consciousness.

Such a significant number of terminological definitions serves as undeniable evidence that the phenomenon of media discourse attracts the attention of researchers worldwide, representing a relevant phenomenon in modern linguistics. It is described as “a complex communicative phenomenon, the analysis of which requires consideration of both linguistic and extralinguistic factors that characterize it” [1].

In this study, we adhere to the terminology proposed by T. G. Dobrosklonskaya, who defines media discourse as “a set of processes and products of speech activity in the field of mass communication in all their richness and complexity of interaction” [2].

The main characteristics of media discourse are “the collective, collegial nature of text production and its orientation toward a vast, spatially dispersed audience” [3, p.21], as well as a special connecting mechanism—a media channel through which information is delivered to the recipient (press, radio, television, Internet) [3].

Mass media is inherently communicative, as it is designed for an audience being intended to communicate with passive audience without direct feedback or interaction. Beyond its primary informative function, mass media fulfills numerous additional roles, with influence and persuasion being among the most significant. Effective influence and persuasion rely fundamentally on a communicative foundation. Thus, it is essential to first analyze the nature and components of communication in this context.

A key element of media linguistics theory is the development of a set of parameters designed to enable a detailed and systematic description of all types of media texts. The central concept of the media text is grounded in a stable framework of parameters, which facilitate the analysis and classification of texts in mass media based on their production, distribution, and verbal and media characteristics. These parameters include:

1. Authorship: Media texts may be created by either an individual or a collective.
2. Type of Production: Texts can be either oral or written.

3. Type of Presentation: The presentation of the text may be oral or written.
4. Media Channel: The medium used for transmission, such as print media, electronic media, or the Internet.
5. Functional Type or Genre: The classification of texts into genres like news, commentary and analysis, features, or advertisements.
6. Topical Affiliation: The thematic focus of the text, such as politics, business, culture, education, sports, or other universal media topics that shape the content structure of daily information flow.

Based on the above, we can conclude that media discourse “is dialogic in its structure, as it involves the participation of both the source of information (websites on the Internet, mass media) and the recipient of information (any recipient of the given content)” [4, p. 173].

From this, three types of media discourse can be identified based on the channels used to implement communicative influence on the recipient:

1. television discourse;
2. radio discourse;
3. internet or computer discourse.

These types of discourse, in turn, can be classified as autonomous, interactive, or interactive-autonomous, depending on the method of communicative interaction. Media discursive communicative interaction is carried out through audio (radio), visual, and audiovisual channels (television discourse, internet discourse). It should be noted that the autonomous type of media discourse is a public, non-spontaneous form of interaction between communication participants (articles, internet-blog, internet-website), while the interactive type of media discourse, determined by the mode of communication, is carried out through audio, visual, and audiovisual channels in real-time. Participants in the communicative situation can engage in communication by exchanging content.

Media linguistics, as an interdisciplinary field, has successfully incorporated fundamental terms and methods from the humanities, including those essential to any academic discipline, such as methodology and terminology. The methodology for studying media texts encompasses a wide array of techniques used in textual analysis, ranging from traditional systematic and content analysis to stylistic, discursive, linguocultural, pragmatic, ideological, and sociolinguistic approaches.

Nearly every academic school of language and media studies has contributed to shaping the methodology of media linguistics. Currently, media texts are analyzed using techniques derived from cognitive linguistics, discourse analysis, critical linguistics, functional stylistics, pragmatics, rhetorical criticism, and linguoculturology. This multidisciplinary methodological framework defines the innovative approach of media linguistics to analyzing speech practices in mass communication. By integrating existing methods, it offers a systematic and multidimensional foundation for studying media texts.

The human factor has emerged as a pivotal focus in recent research, emphasizing the role of individuals in constructing messages, transforming them into meaningful utterances, and shaping them to achieve specific communicative intentions. This field has already adopted the anthropocentric paradigm, and

research conducted in this direction highlights the importance of studying language through new approaches and perspectives. One of this directions, the cognitive approach to mass media discourse, involves examining the issue of diverse worldviews, which influence language use across various types of discourse, particularly the distinctive features of mass media texts. Language is often described as a mirror of culture, reflecting not only the external reality and conditions surrounding individuals but also the collective mentality of a national community. This includes elements such as national character, lifestyle, traditions, moral and evaluative principles, emotional responses to the external world, and overarching worldviews [5].

Each nation employs its own language as a means of communication and a tool for naming and categorizing the world, thereby reflecting its unique national identity. Among different peoples, words and phrases are used and interpreted in ways that align with their cultural traditions and collective mentality. These variations depend on the context, purpose, and state of communication, often diverging from conventional patterns. Additionally, it is essential to consider the audience in relation to specific countries or geographic regions, as cultural and regional factors influence communication strategies. When interacting with individuals from different nationalities, distinct approaches to reasoning, proof, and persuasion come into play, shaped by their cultural norms and communicative orientations.

The linguistic behavior of an ethnos serves as a mirror of the nation's mentality, reflecting its cultural and historical traditions, as well as its collective national experience. A journalist's ability to process, interpret, and convey information is a vital component of both the nation's cultural identity and the broader framework of universal information culture.

In conclusion, media discourse plays an indispensable role in shaping public understanding and political ideologies in today's interconnected world. As an evolving field of study, media linguistics has emerged as a crucial area of research, providing valuable insights into how language in mass media influences perceptions and behavior. By examining media texts through diverse theoretical lenses—such as sociolinguistics, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis—we can better understand how media shapes narratives, constructs identities, and reflects cultural and national mentalities.

The analysis of media discourse highlights the dynamic interaction between language, culture, and communication, where linguistic choices are not just reflections of external realities but also of deeply ingrained cultural values, traditions, and worldviews. Understanding these processes is key to recognizing the power media holds in influencing public opinion and shaping political discourse. Moreover, as media continues to evolve through new technologies and platforms, further research into the interaction between language, media, and society will be essential for understanding the impact of communication in the digital age.

In essence, media discourse is not only a tool for information dissemination but also a powerful medium for persuasion and influence, driving social change

and reflecting the collective identity of nations. As the field of media linguistics continues to grow, it will undoubtedly offer further insights into the complex relationship between language and society, contributing to our understanding of the role media plays in the modern world.

The list of used literature

1. Бабаян В. Н., Тюкина Л. А. К вопросу о единице диалогического дискурса // Лингводидактика в неязыковом вузе: традиционные и инновационные подходы: сб. научных статей по материалам II Международной научно-практической конференции, г. Ярославль, 14–16 мая 2020 года. Ярославль : Изд-во ЯГТУ, 2020. С. 20–23.
2. Добросклонская Т. Г. Медиалингвистика: теория, методы, направления. Москва : «КДУ», «Добросвет», 2020. 178 с
3. Добросклонская Т. Г. Язык средств массовой информации. Москва : КДУ, 2012. 116 с.
4. Мельникова К. А., Бабаян В. Н. Политкорректный медиадискурс как способ достижения коммуникативной свободы общения // Язык и межкультурная коммуникация: современные векторы развития : сборник научных статей по материалам II Международной научно-практической конференции, Пинск, 26 марта 2021 года. Пинск : Полесский государственный университет, 2021. С. 169–175.
5. Ter-Minasova, Svetlana G. (2000): Language and the Intercultural Communication. Moscow.
6. Желтухина М. Р. Тропологическая суггестивность массмедиального дискурса: о проблеме речевого воздействия тропов в языке СМИ : монография Москва : Ин-т языкознания РАН; Волгоград : Изд-во ВФ МУПК, 2004. 656 с.
7. Карасик В. И. Сетевая языковая личность // Лингвокультурные аспекты глобализационных процессов: социокультурный контекст и динамика речевых практик : Тезисы докладов II Международной конференции, Москва, 25–26 февраля 2021 года. Москва : Московский государственный лингвистический университет, 2021. С. 58–59.
8. Кибрик А. А. Дискурсивная таксономия и медийный дискурс // Язык и дискурс средств массовой информации в XXI веке / под ред. М. Н. Володиной. Москва : Академический проспект, 2011. С. 79–85.
9. Кожемякин Е. А. Массовая коммуникация и медиадискурс: к методологии исследования // Научные ведомости Белгородского государственного университета. Серия: Гуманитарные науки. № 2 (73). 2010. Вып. 11. С. 13–21.
10. Плотникова С. Н. Корпоративность при выражении мнения в массмедийных текстах. Политический дискурс в России – 6 : Материалы постоянно действующего семинара (Москва, 7 ноября

- 2002 года) / Под ред. В. Н. Базылева, В. Г. Краси́льниковой. Москва : МАКС Пресс, 2002. С. 70–72.
11. Bell A. The Language of News Media. Oxford : Blackwell, 1991. p. 296
12. Dijk T. A. van. Power in the media // In D. Paletz (Ed.), Political Communication and Action. Cresskill. New York : Hampton Press, 1995. p. 9–36.
13. Fairclough N. Language and Power. Longman Group UK Limited, 1989. p. 253
- Fowler R. Language in the News. Discourse and Ideology in the Press. London : Routledge, 1991. 224 p
14. Володина М. Н. Язык массовой коммуникации – особый язык социального взаимодействия: учеб. пособие / под ред. М. Н. Володиной // Язык средств массовой информации. Москва : Академический проспект; Альма Матер, 2008. С. 27–48
15. Граудина Л. К. Средства массовой информации и культура речи: учеб. пособ. / под ред. Л. К. Граудиной, Е. Н. Ширяева // Культура русской речи. Москва : Норма, 2000. 560 с
16. Yuldashev A. G. Metaphtonymy as the main cognitive mechanism in the formation of idiomatic compound words // ANGLISTICUM. Journal of the Association-Institute for English Language and American Studies. – 2016. – Т. 5. – №. 7. – С. 30-35.
17. Юлдашев А. Г. Идиоматичность узбекской языковой картины мира // Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. – 2020. – №. 1. – С. 130.
18. ЮЛДАШЕВ А. Г. The role of cognitive mechanisms in the words with transferred meanings // Иностранные языки в Узбекистане. – 2019. – №. 3. – С. 49-54.
19. Юлдашев А. Г. Культурная коннотация в семантике идиоматичных сложных слов в разнотелственных языках // Вестник Московского государственного лингвистического университета. Гуманитарные науки. – 2015. – №. 25 (736). – С. 76-84.
20. Kayumov K. N. THEORETICAL APPROACHES TO THE ANALYSIS OF SOCIAL ORPHAN HOOD // Theoretical & Applied Science. – 2019. – №. 10. – С. 11-18.
21. Nozimjonovich K. K., Ogli A. K. A. The role of state and civil society institutions in the management and development of social infrastructure in small towns // ACADEMICIA: AN INTERNATIONAL MULTIDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH JOURNAL. – 2021. – Т. 11. – №. 2. – С. 763-768.