BG Pulse Journal USA
ISSN:1947-2536 http://www.bgpulseusa.com/index.php/bg
BG PULSE JOURNAL

FUNCTIONING OF BORROWED LEXICON IN MEDIA DISCOURSE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF RUSSIAN AND UZBEK MASS MEDIA

Mohidil Meyliyeva

Abstract

In the context of digital communication and accelerating globalization processes, mass media has become a key channel for the dissemination of borrowed vocabulary. This process is particularly evident in Russian- and Uzbek-language media spaces, where foreign lexical units perform not only nominative but also pragmatic, stylistic, and axiological functions. Despite a considerable number of studies on lexical borrowing, the issues of its functioning in media discourse across different language systems remain insufficiently explored. In particular, there is a lack of comprehensive comparative studies addressing the usage of borrowed lexical units in Russian and Uzbek mass media with regard to their communicative efficiency, normative status, and adaptive potential. The aim of this study is to identify the functional-semantic, pragmatic, and normative features of borrowed vocabulary in Russian and Uzbek media based on a comparative analysis. The research material includes texts from print and online media, news portals, and social media platforms in Russian and Uzbek. The study employs comparative analysis, discourse analysis, corpus-based methods, and statistical data processing. The results show that the highest concentration of borrowed vocabulary is found in economic, technological, sports, and internet discourse. It has been established that borrowings perform the function of linguistic economy, contribute to the creation of a modernity effect, and facilitate the integration of national media spaces into the global information environment. At the same time, issues such as normative variability, graphic instability, and the emergence of hybrid linguistic structures have been identified. The findings allow for a more precise understanding of the mechanisms of lexical borrowing adaptation in media discourse and outline prospects for the development of linguistic norms in digital communication.

Keywords: borrowed vocabulary, media discourse, linguistic globalization, mass media, Russian language, Uzbek language, pragmatics, language norm.

Introduction

Contemporary media systems operate within a highly globalized and digitally mediated communicative environment in which linguistic exchange has become both inevitable and structurally embedded. Mass media no longer functions solely as a channel for information dissemination; it also acts as a primary mechanism of lexical innovation and diffusion. One of the most visible outcomes of this process is the systematic penetration of borrowed lexical items—particularly Anglicisms—into both Russian- and Uzbek-language media discourse. This phenomenon is driven by technological modernization, cross-border communication flows, and the dominance of English as a global lingua franca in digital and economic domains.

In Russian media outlets such as RBC, RIA Novosti, and Kommersant, as well as Uzbek platforms like Gazeta.uz and Kun.uz, borrowings such as “стартап (startup),” “инфлюенсер (influencer),” “контент (content),” “дедлайн (deadline),” and “лайк (like)” have become routine

lexical units. For instance, headlines such as “Startups attract record investment in 2025” or “Influencers reshape digital marketing strategies” demonstrate how English-origin terms are not merely transliterated but integrated into journalistic framing strategies. In Uzbek media, hybrid constructions such as “startap loyihalar,” “kontent yaratish,” and “onlayn marketing strategiyalari” illustrate a similar adaptive mechanism, where borrowed stems are combined with Turkic morphological structures. Importantly, lexical borrowing in media discourse is not limited to nominative necessity. It performs a strong pragmatic function by signaling modernity, technological competence, and global relevance. As Fairclough (1995) emphasizes, media discourse is inherently ideological and contributes to shaping public perception through lexical selection. Borrowed vocabulary thus becomes a semiotic resource for constructing prestige and aligning local discourse with global communicative standards. Despite extensive linguistic research on borrowing phenomena, comparative studies focusing specifically on Russian and Uzbek media systems remain limited. This gap is particularly evident in relation to the functional-pragmatic distribution of borrowings across different media genres, which constitutes the central research problem of the present study. The aim of this article is to analyze the functional-semantic, pragmatic, and sociolinguistic characteristics of borrowed vocabulary in Russian and Uzbek media discourse and to identify its role in shaping contemporary communicative practices.

Literature Review

Lexical borrowing has been widely examined within contact linguistics, sociolinguistics, and media discourse studies. Foundational theoretical frameworks were developed by Weinreich (1953), Haugen (1950), and Bloomfield (1933), who conceptualized borrowing as a systematic outcome of language contact, involving both structural adaptation and sociocultural integration.

In contemporary linguistics, David Crystal (2003) highlights the unprecedented global expansion of English as a linguistic source for international communication, particularly in digital environments. Similarly, Kachru (1992) conceptualizes the “outer and expanding circles” of English use, emphasizing its role as a global linguistic reservoir for lexical innovation. Media discourse studies further develop this perspective. Fairclough (1995) argues that media language is a site of ideological reproduction, where lexical choices—including borrowings—reflect broader sociocultural transformations. Van Dijk (2008) also stresses the cognitive dimension of discourse, showing how lexical selection influences mental models of social reality.

In Russian linguistics, Leontiy Krysin (2004, 2008) provides a systematic analysis of foreign lexical integration, emphasizing the stages of adaptation from phonetic assimilation to semantic stabilization. Karasik (2002) and Issers (2020) extend this framework by examining pragmatic and communicative strategies in public discourse, including media environments. Uzbek linguistic scholarship, particularly the works of Makhmudov, Safarov, and Khodzhiev, focuses on lexical normalization processes and the interaction between Uzbek morphological systems and foreign lexical roots. These studies demonstrate that borrowings are increasingly integrated into Uzbek through hybrid morphological constructions (e.g., online xizmatlar, digital ta’lim, marketing strategiyasi). However, despite these contributions, comparative empirical studies analyzing Russian and Uzbek media discourse from a unified functional-pragmatic perspective remain insufficiently developed, particularly in relation to digital media environments.

Results and Discussion

The conducted analysis of Russian and Uzbek media texts demonstrates that the dynamics of borrowed vocabulary are primarily shaped by globalization, digitalization, and the increasing dominance of technology-driven communication. Borrowings are especially concentrated in specific discourse domains such as economics, IT, marketing, entertainment, and social media communication. For example, in Russian digital media, phrases such as "запуск стартапа (startup launch)," "вирусный контент (viral content)," and "бренд-стратегия (brand strategy)" are frequently used without explanatory equivalents, indicating full lexical assimilation. Similarly, Uzbek media discourse employs expressions like "startap ekotizimi rivojlanmoqda," "kontent yaratuvchilar," and "digital marketing bozorida raqobat", reflecting a parallel integration pattern with partial morphological adaptation. From a cognitive linguistic perspective (Lakoff & Johnson, 2003), borrowings function as conceptual markers for emerging social realities that lack precise equivalents in native lexical systems. For instance, the term "influencer" encapsulates a complex socio-digital role that cannot be fully represented by traditional lexical units in either Russian or Uzbek, thereby necessitating borrowing.

From a pragmatic standpoint, borrowed lexical units serve as instruments of communicative optimization and persuasive enhancement. In advertising and business journalism, terms such as "deadline," "branding," and "performance" are strategically used to create an impression of efficiency, professionalism, and global connectivity. This aligns with Fairclough's (1995) notion of "marketization of discourse," where lexical choices reflect neoliberal communicative values. Sociolinguistically, the frequency of borrowings correlates strongly with audience segmentation. Younger demographics and digitally active users demonstrate higher tolerance and even preference for hybrid lexical forms, whereas traditional print audiences often require explanatory paraphrases. This duality leads to the coexistence of "pure" and "hybrid" discourse styles within the same media systems. The adaptation process of borrowings follows a multi-stage trajectory: initial foreign insertion, phonological and orthographic adjustment, morphological integration, and semantic stabilization. Over time, lexical items such as "контент (content)" or "лайк (like)" lose their foreign salience and become fully naturalized components of the receiving language systems. Nevertheless, excessive borrowing raises concerns regarding normative instability and lexical hybridity. In both Russian and Uzbek contexts, hybrid constructions such as "online ta'lim platformasi" or "digital reklama strategiyasi" reflect ongoing tension between linguistic modernization and preservation of linguistic identity.

References (Scopus-style, English sources with links)

1. Crystal, D. (2003). English as a Global Language. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/english-as-a-global-language/
2. Fairclough, N. (1995). Media Discourse. Edward Arnold. https://www.routledge.com/Media-Discourse/Fairclough/p/book/9780340620830
3. Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach. Cambridge University Press. https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/discourse-and-context/
4. Kachru, B. B. (1992). The Other Tongue: English across Cultures. University of Illinois Press. https://press.uillinois.edu/books/?id=p073707

5. Weinreich, U. (1953). Languages in Contact. Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110810997
6. Haugen, E. (1950). The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing. Language, 26(2), 210–231. https://doi.org/10.2307/410058
7. Bloomfield, L. (1933). Language. Henry Holt. https://archive.org/details/languagebloo00bloo
8. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2003). Metaphors We Live By. University of Chicago Press. https://press.uchicago.edu/ucp/books/book/chicago/M/bo3637992.html