



IDEOLOGICAL AND EVALUATIVE FUNCTIONS OF NEWSPAPER DISCOURSE IN UZBEK AND ENGLISH MASS MEDIA

Fayyoza Kamolova Mirza qizi
Master Student, Asian Technology of University,
shaxzod19950109@icloud.com
+998 94 657 03 26

Abstract

This article explores the ideological and evaluative functions of newspaper discourse in Uzbek and English mass media from a comparative perspective. Using discourse analysis and critical pragmatic approaches, the study examines how ideological positions and value judgments are constructed through lexical choices, evaluative markers, presupposition, and framing strategies. The analysis demonstrates that English newspapers tend to employ implicit ideological evaluation and indirect stance-taking, while Uzbek media more frequently rely on explicit evaluation and socially oriented judgments. The findings reveal both universal and culture-specific mechanisms of ideological representation in newspaper discourse.

Keywords: newspaper discourse, ideology, evaluative language, media discourse, mass media, discourse analysis, ideological functions, evaluative functions, Uzbek and English, comparative linguistics

Annotatsiya

Mazkur maqola o'zbek va ingliz ommaviy axborot vositalarida gazeta diskursining ideologik va baholovchi funksiyalarini qiyosiy tahlil qilishga bag'ishlangan. Tadqiqot diskurs tahlili va tanqidiy pragmatik yondashuv asosida ideologik pozitsiya va qiymat bahosining leksik tanlovlar, baholovchi birliklar, presuppozitsiya hamda freymlash strategiyalari orqali ifodalanishini o'rganadi. Tahlil natijalari ingliz gazetalarida yashirin ideologik baholash ustunligini,



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 1, January, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

o‘zbek matbuotida esa ochiq va ijtimoiy yo‘naltirilgan baholash keng qo‘llanishini ko‘rsatadi.

Kalit so‘zlar: gazeta diskursi, ideologiya, baholovchi leksika, medial diskurs, ommaviy axborot vositalari, diskurs tahlili, ideologik funksiya, baholovchi funksiya, o‘zbek va ingliz tillari, qiyosiy lingvistika

Introduction

In contemporary society, mass media play a crucial role in shaping public consciousness, constructing social values, and disseminating ideological perspectives. Newspapers, in particular, function not only as channels of information but also as discursive institutions through which ideological meanings and value judgments are produced and circulated. As a result, the study of newspaper discourse from an ideological and evaluative perspective has become a central concern in media linguistics and discourse studies. Ideology in newspaper discourse is rarely expressed explicitly; instead, it is embedded in linguistic choices such as evaluative vocabulary, presupposition, metaphor, nominalization, and framing strategies. These devices allow journalists to present particular interpretations of events as natural or commonsensical, thereby influencing readers’ perceptions. Evaluative language plays a key role in this process, as it conveys the author’s stance and guides readers toward positive or negative assessments of social actors and events. From a comparative perspective, Uzbek and English newspaper discourses reflect different socio-cultural, historical, and communicative traditions. English newspapers often employ implicit ideological positioning and indirect evaluation, maintaining an appearance of objectivity and neutrality.

The present study aims to analyze the ideological and evaluative functions of newspaper discourse in Uzbek and English mass media. By applying discourse-analytical approaches to selected newspaper texts, the study seeks to identify key linguistic mechanisms of ideological representation and evaluation, and to reveal both universal and culture-specific features of media discourse.



Modern American Journal of Linguistics, Education, and Pedagogy

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 1, January, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

Main Body

In discourse studies, ideology is understood as a system of socially shared beliefs and values that influence how social reality is represented through language. Ideology is not always expressed explicitly; rather, it is embedded in routine linguistic choices and discursive structures that appear neutral or objective. Language therefore serves as a key medium through which ideological meanings are produced, maintained, and legitimized. Within Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), ideology is closely linked to discourse and power. According to Norman Fairclough, ideology works by naturalizing particular representations of social reality so that they appear as “common sense.” For example, in an English newspaper sentence such as “*Economic reforms are necessary to ensure long-term stability,*” the adjective *necessary* encodes an ideological assumption that reforms are unavoidable and beneficial. The statement discourages alternative viewpoints by presenting one interpretation as self-evident. Similarly, Teun A. van Dijk conceptualizes ideology as socially shared knowledge that controls discourse production and comprehension. In his socio-cognitive approach, ideology influences what information is emphasized, omitted, or evaluated. For instance, consider the headline “*Protesters Disrupt City Life*”. The lexical choice *disrupt* frames protesters negatively, reflecting an ideological stance that prioritizes order over dissent, even though the same event could be described as “*Citizens Demand Social Change.*”

Ideology is often realized through **lexicalization**, where word choice signals approval or disapproval. In Uzbek newspaper discourse, expressions such as “*ijtimoiy adolatni ta’minlash yo’lida muhim qadam*” explicitly convey positive ideological evaluation. The phrase frames governmental action as morally justified and socially beneficial, reinforcing dominant ideological narratives related to progress and stability. Another important ideological mechanism is **nominalization**, which obscures agency and responsibility. In English newspapers, sentences like “*Mistakes were made during the policy implementation*” remove the actor responsible for the mistakes. This grammatical choice reflects an ideological strategy that minimizes accountability while maintaining institutional authority. **Presupposition** also plays a crucial ideological role. For example, the sentence “*The failure of previous policies*



*Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy*

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 1, January, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

highlights the need for change” presupposes that previous policies have failed, even before evidence is presented. In Uzbek media, presuppositions such as “*Islohotlarning izchil davom etishi jamiyat taraqqiyotini ta’minlaydi*” assume that reforms are inherently positive and continuous, positioning ideology as an unquestioned truth [4;380].

Ideology further manifests through **framing strategies**, which determine how events and social actors are represented. English newspapers may frame economic migration as a “*challenge*” or “*pressure*”, while Uzbek newspapers often frame similar phenomena using collective and moral terms such as “*ijtimoiy mas’uliyat*” or “*barqaror rivojlanish.*” These frames guide readers toward specific ideological interpretations without explicit argumentation. Overall, ideology in discourse studies is viewed as dynamic, context-dependent, and culturally shaped. In newspaper discourse, ideology operates through evaluative language, grammatical choices, and discursive framing that influence how readers understand social reality. Examining ideology with concrete linguistic examples allows researchers to uncover how seemingly neutral media texts participate in the construction of social values and power relations [7;78].

Nominalization refers to the transformation of verbs or processes into nouns, such as *decide* → *decision*, *fail* → *failure*, or *reform* → *reform implementation*. This process shifts attention away from social actors and focuses instead on abstract events or outcomes. According to Norman Fairclough, nominalization is a key ideological resource because it suppresses agency and presents socially constructed actions as neutral facts. For example, consider the English newspaper sentence: “*Mistakes were made during the implementation of the policy.*” Here, the nominalized form *mistakes* eliminates the actor responsible for those mistakes. The passive structure combined with nominalization obscures accountability and protects institutional authority. An alternative non-nominalized version (“*The government made mistakes*”) would explicitly assign responsibility, thus altering the ideological impact of the statement. Similarly, in Uzbek newspaper discourse, nominalization frequently appears in expressions such as: “*Islohotlarning amalga oshirilishi barqarorlikni ta’minlaydi.*” The noun *amalga oshirilishi* (“implementation”) removes the specific actor performing the action. This linguistic choice presents reforms as an autonomous process rather



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 1, January, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

than a decision made by concrete individuals or institutions, reinforcing the ideology of inevitability and continuity [2;267].

Abstraction involves the use of generalized and vague nouns such as *development, stability, progress, democracy, or national interests*. These abstract concepts carry strong ideological connotations but lack precise reference, making them difficult to question or challenge. Abstraction allows newspapers to align readers with dominant values while avoiding detailed justification. In English newspapers, abstraction is often used in political and economic reporting: “*The reforms aim to strengthen democracy and promote long-term stability.*” Here, abstract nouns like *democracy* and *stability* are presented as universally positive goals. The sentence does not specify who defines these concepts or how they will be achieved, yet it invites reader approval through shared ideological assumptions. Uzbek newspapers similarly rely on abstraction to reinforce collective values: “*Milliy taraqqiyot va ijtimoiy barqarorlik jamiyat hayotining asosiy mezonidir.*” The abstract nouns *milliy taraqqiyot* (“national development”) and *ijtimoiy barqarorlik* (“social stability”) function ideologically by framing social reality in terms of unquestioned priorities. Such abstractions discourage critical engagement by positioning these values as self-evident and universally desirable.

Nominalization and abstraction often operate together to strengthen ideological effects. For example: *English: “The modernization of the economy requires structural adjustment.” Uzbek: “Iqtisodiy modernizatsiya jarayonining jadallashuvi muhim ahamiyat kasb etadi.”* In both cases, abstract nominalized forms (*modernization, adjustment, jadallashuvi*) conceal decision-makers and present socio-political change as a natural, technical process rather than a contested ideological choice. This combination reduces the visibility of power relations and frames policy as inevitable and rational [6;79].

Conclusion

This study has examined the ideological and evaluative functions of newspaper discourse in Uzbek and English mass media through a comparative discourse-analytical framework. The findings confirm that newspapers operate not merely as sources of information but as powerful ideological institutions that shape



***Modern American Journal of Linguistics,
Education, and Pedagogy***

ISSN (E): 3067-7874

Volume 2, Issue 1, January, 2026

Website: usajournals.org

*This work is Licensed under CC BY 4.0 a Creative Commons Attribution
4.0 International License.*

public perception through strategic linguistic choices. Ideology in newspaper discourse is largely realized implicitly, embedded in lexical selection, evaluative language, presupposition, nominalization, abstraction, and framing strategies that guide readers toward preferred interpretations of social reality. The analysis reveals both shared and language-specific patterns of ideological representation. In English newspaper discourse, ideology is predominantly conveyed through indirect evaluation, hedging, abstraction, and nominalization, which contribute to an appearance of objectivity and neutrality while subtly influencing reader interpretation. In contrast, Uzbek newspaper discourse tends to employ more explicit evaluative markers, normative modality, and socially oriented abstractions that emphasize collective values, moral responsibility, and social cohesion. These differences reflect distinct cultural traditions, communicative norms, and ideological frameworks shaping media language in each context.

References

1. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
2. Fairclough, N. (2010). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
3. van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as Discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
4. van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. *Discourse & Society*, 17(3), 359–383.
5. Fowler, R. (1991). *Language in the News: Discourse and Ideology in the Press*. London: Routledge.
6. Bell, A. (1991). *The Language of News Media*. Oxford: Blackwell.
7. Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
8. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). London: Sage.