

SCIENCE
PROBLEMS.UZ

ISSN 2181-1342

Actual problems of social and humanitarian sciences
Актуальные проблемы социальных и гуманитарных наук

**Ijtimoiy-gumanitar
fanlarning dolzarb
muammolari**

10/S-son (4-jild)

2024

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

ИЖТИМОЙ-ГУМАНИТАР ФАНЛАРНИНГ ДОЛЗАРБ МУАММОЛАРИ

№ S/10 (4) - 2024

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО- ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

ТОШКЕНТ-2024

БОШ МУҲАРРИР:

Исанова Феруза Тулқиновна

ТАҲРИР ҲАЙЪАТИ:

07.00.00-ТАРИХ ФАНЛАРИ:

Юлдашев Анвар Эргашевич – тарих фанлари доктори, сиёсий фанлар номзоди, профессор, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси;

Мавланов Уктам Махмасабирович – тарих фанлари доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси;

Хазраткулов Абдор – тарих фанлари доктори, доцент, Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети.

Турсунов Равшан Нормуратович – тарих фанлари доктори, Ўзбекистон Миллий Университети;

Холикулов Ахмаджон Боймаҳамматович – тарих фанлари доктори, Ўзбекистон Миллий Университети;

Габриэльян Софья Ивановна – тарих фанлари доктори, доцент, Ўзбекистон Миллий Университети.

Саидов Сарвар Атабулло ўғли – катта илмий ходим, Имом Термизий халқаро илмий-тадқиқот маркази, илмий тадқиқотлар бўлими.

08.00.00-ИҚТИСОДИЁТ ФАНЛАРИ:

Карлибаева Рая Хожабаевна – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат иқтисодиёт университети;

Насирходжаева Дилафруз Сабитхановна – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат иқтисодиёт университети;

Остонокулов Азамат Абдукаримович – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент молия институти;

Арабов Нурали Уралович – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, профессор, Самарқанд давлат университети;

Худойқулов Садирдин Каримович – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, доцент, Тошкент давлат иқтисодиёт университети;

Азизов Шерзод Ўктамович – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, доцент, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Божхона институти;

Хожаев Азизхон Саидалоҳонович – иқтисодиёт фанлари доктори, доцент, Фарғона политехника институти

Холов Актам Хатамович – иқтисодиёт фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD), доцент, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси;

Шадиева Дилдора Хамидовна – иқтисодиёт фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD), доцент в.б, Тошкент молия институти;

Шакарров Қулмат Аширович – иқтисодиёт фанлари номзоди, доцент, Тошкент ахборот технологиялари университети

09.00.00-ФАЛСАФА ФАНЛАРИ:

Ҳакимов Назар Ҳакимович – фалсафа фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат иқтисодиёт университети;

Яхшиликков Жўрабой – фалсафа фанлари доктори, профессор, Самарқанд давлат университети;

Ғайбуллаев Отабек Мухаммадиевич – фалсафа фанлари доктори, профессор, Самарқанд давлат чет тиллар институти;

Саидова Камола Усканбаевна – фалсафа фанлари доктори, “Tashkent International University of Education” халқаро университети;

Ҳошимхонов Мўмин – фалсафа фанлари доктори, доцент, Жиззах педагогика институти;

Ўроқова Ойсулув Жамолиддиновна – фалсафа фанлари доктори, доцент, Андижон давлат тиббиёт институти, Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанлар кафедраси мудири;

Носирходжаева Гулнора Абдукаҳхаровна – фалсафа фанлари номзоди, доцент, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Турдиев Бехруз Собирович – фалсафа фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD), доцент, Бухоро давлат университети.

10.00.00-ФИЛОЛОГИЯ ФАНЛАРИ:

Ахмедов Ойбек Сапорбаевич – филология фанлари доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети;

Кўчимов Шухрат Норқизилович – филология фанлари доктори, доцент, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Ҳасанов Шавкат Аҳадович – филология фанлари доктори, профессор, Самарқанд давлат университети;

Бахронова Дилрабо Келдиёровна – филология фанлари доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети;

Мирсанов Ғайбулло Қулмуродович – филология фанлари доктори, профессор, Самарқанд давлат чет тиллар институти;

Салахутдинова Мушарраф Исамутдиновна – филология фанлари номзоди, доцент, Самарқанд давлат университети;

Кучкаров Раҳман Урманович – филология фанлари номзоди, доцент в/б, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Юнусов Мансур Абдуллаевич – филология фанлари номзоди, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси;

Саидов Улугбек Арипович – филология фанлари номзоди, доцент, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси.

12.00.00-ЮРИДИК ФАНЛАР:

Аҳмедшаева Мавлюда Ахатовна – юридик фанлар доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Мухитдинова Фирюза Абдурашидовна – юридик фанлар доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Эсанова Замира Нормуратовна – юридик фанлар доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон Республикасида хизмат кўрсатган юрист, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Ҳамроқулов Баҳодир Мамашарифович – юридик фанлар доктори, профессор в.б., Жаҳон иқтисодиёти ва дипломатия университети;

Зулфиқоров Шерзод Хуррамович – юридик фанлар доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Жамоат хавфсизлиги университети;

Хайитов Хушвақт Сапарбаевич – юридик фанлар доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси;

Асадов Шавкат Ғайбуллаевич – юридик фанлар доктори, доцент, Ўзбекистон Республикаси Президенти ҳузуридаги Давлат бошқаруви академияси;

Эргашев Икром Абдурасулович – юридик фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Утемуратов Махмут Ажимуратович – юридик фанлар номзоди, профессор, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Сайдуллаев Шахзод Алиханович – юридик фанлар номзоди, профессор, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Ҳақимов Комил Бахтиярович – юридик фанлар доктори, доцент, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Юсупов Сардорбек Баходирович – юридик фанлар доктори, доцент, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Амиров Зафар Актамович – юридик фанлар бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD), Ўзбекистон Республикаси Судьялар олий кенгаши ҳузуридаги Судьялар олий мактаби;

Жўраев Шерзод Юлдашевич – юридик фанлар номзоди, доцент, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Бабаджанов Атабек Давронбекович – юридик фанлар номзоди, доцент, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Раҳматов Элёр Жумабоевич – юридик фанлар номзоди, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Норматов Бекзод Акром ўғли – юридик фанлар бўйича фалсафа доктори, Тошкент давлат юридик университети.

13.00.00-ПЕДАГОГИКА ФАНЛАРИ:

Ҳашимова Дильдархон Уринбоевна – педагогика фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат юридик университети;

Ибрагимова Гулнора Хавазматовна – педагогика фанлари доктори, профессор, Тошкент давлат иқтисодиёт университети;

Закирова Феруза Махмудовна – педагогика фанлари доктори, Тошкент ахборот технологиялари университети ҳузуридаги педагогик кадрларни қайта тайёрлаш ва уларнинг малакасини ошириш тармоқ маркази;

Каюмова Насиба Ашуровна – педагогика фанлари доктори, профессор, Қарши давлат университети;

Тайланова Шоҳида Зайниевна – педагогика фанлари доктори, доцент;

Жуманиёзова Муҳайё Тожиевна – педагогика фанлари доктори, доцент, Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари университети;

Ибрахимов Санжар Урунбаевич – педагогика фанлари доктори, Иқтисодиёт ва педагогика университети;

Жавлиева Шахноза Баходировна – педагогика фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD), Самарқанд давлат университети;

Бобомуротова Латофат Элмуродовна – педагогика фанлари бўйича фалсафа доктори (PhD), Самарқанд давлат университети.

19.00.00-ПСИХОЛОГИЯ ФАНЛАРИ:

Каримова Василя Маманосировна – психология фанлари доктори, профессор, Низомий номидаги Тошкент давлат педагогика университети;

Ҳайитов Ойбек Эшбоевич – Жисмоний тарбия ва спорт бўйича мутахассисларни қайта тайёрлаш ва малакасини ошириш институти, психология фанлари доктори, профессор

Умарова Навбахор Шокировна – психология фанлари доктори, доцент, Низомий номидаги

Тошкент давлат педагогика университети,
Амалий психологияси кафедраси мудир;

Атабаева Наргис Батировна – психология
фанлари доктори, доцент, Низомий номидаги
Тошкент давлат педагогика университети;

Шамшетова Анжим Караматдиновна –
психология фанлари доктори, доцент,
Ўзбекистон давлат жаҳон тиллари
университети;

Қодиров Обид Сафарович – психология фанлари
доктори (PhD), Самарканд вилоят ИИБ Тиббиёт
бўлими психологик хизмат бошлиғи.

22.00.00-СОЦИОЛОГИЯ ФАНЛАРИ:

Латипова Нодира Мухтаржановна – социология
фанлари доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон
миллий университети кафедра мудир;

Сеитов Азамат Пўлатович – социология фанлари
доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон миллий
университети;

Содиқова Шоҳида Мархабоевна – социология
фанлари доктори, профессор, Ўзбекистон
халқаро ислом академияси.

23.00.00-СИЁСИЙ ФАНЛАР

Назаров Насриддин Атақулович – сиёсий фанлар
доктори, фалсафа фанлари доктори, профессор,
Тошкент архитектура қурилиш институти;

Бўтаев Усмонжон Хайруллаевич – сиёсий фанлар
доктори, доцент, Ўзбекистон миллий
университети кафедра мудир.

ОАК Рўйхати

Мазкур журнал Вазирлар Маҳкамаси ҳузуридаги Олий аттестация комиссияси Раёсатининг 2022 йил 30 ноябрдаги 327/5-сон қарори билан тарих, иқтисодиёт, фалсафа, филология, юридик ва педагогика фанлари бўйича илмий даражалар бўйича диссертациялар асосий натижаларини чоп этиш тавсия этилган илмий нашрлар рўйхатига киритилган.

**Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг
долзарб муаммолари”** электрон
журнали 2020 йил 6 август куни 1368-
сонли гувоҳнома билан давлат
рўйхатига олинган.

Муассис: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM”
масъулияти чекланган жамияти

Таҳририят манзили:

100070. Тошкент шаҳри, Яккасарой
тумани, Кичик Бешёғоч кўчаси, 70/10-
уй. Электрон манзил:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Боғланиш учун телефонлар:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).

07.00.00 – TARIX FANLARI

<i>Norbekov Ahmadjon Norbekovich</i> XX-ASRNING BIRINCHI YARMIDA O‘ZBEKISTONNING SIYOSIY -IJTIMOIY VA IQTISODIY HOLATI	11-18
<i>Eliboyev Ozodjon Po‘lat o‘g‘li</i> BAQTRIYANING KUSHONIYLAR DAVRI SHAHARSOZLIGI VA ME‘MORCHILIGI.....	19-23
<i>Нуритдинова Нодира Сирожовна</i> XX-АСР БОШЛАРИДА ТУРКИСТОН ЎЛКАСИДА ТАЪЛИМ ТИЗИМИ (СЕНАТОР К.К. ПАЛЕН ТАФТИШ МАТЕРИАЛЛАРИ АСОСИДА).....	24-28
<i>Чориев Шоҳрух Холтура ўғли</i> ЎРТА ОСИЁ ТЕМУРИЙЛАР ДАВРИДА САРОЙ АРХИТЕКТУРАСИ ИЖТИМОИЙ СТРАТИФИКАЦИЯНИ ЎРГАНИШ МАНБАСИ СИФАТИДА	29-38
<i>Жумаева Шоира Бердияровна</i> МАРКАЗИЙ ОСИЁ МИНТАҚАСИДА ЗИЁРАТ ТУРИЗМИНИ РИВОЖЛАНТИРИШДА МУҚАДДАС ҚАДАМЖО ВА ЗИЁРАТГОҲЛАРНИНГ ЎРНИ	39-43
<i>Jo‘rayev Muxriddin Xasanovich</i> MOVAROUNNAHRLIK MUHADDISLARNING ILMIY SAFARLARI VA SAFAR YO‘LLARI GEOGRAFIYASI.....	44-51
<i>Муқимова Рисолат Рустамжон қизи</i> ЗИЁРАТ МАРОСИМЛАРИДА ТАБИАТ КУЛЬТИ БИЛАН БОҒЛИҚ УРФ-ОДАТЛАР	52-56

08.00.00 – IQTISODIYOT FANLARI

<i>Абдуллаев Алтинбек Янгибаевич</i> ДОННИ ҚАЙТА ИШЛАШ КОРХОНАЛАРИДА ТЎЛОВ ҚОБИЛИЯТИ БОШҚАРУВ ҲИСОБИНИНГ ИЛМИЙ – МЕТОДОЛОГИК ЁНДОШУВИ	57-69
<i>Baxriddinova Yulduz Baxriddinovna</i> MINTAQALARDA FARMATSEVTIKA SANOATINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING ZARURIYATI	70-75
<i>Matkarimov Inomjon Baxtiyorovich</i> QISHLOQ XO‘JALIK MAHSULOTLARINI YETISHTIRISHDA AGROBIOKIMYO XIZMATLARINI TAKOMILLASHTIRISHNING OBYEKTIV ZARURATI	76-86
<i>Ибадуллаев Дилшад Ибрагимович</i> ИНВЕСТИЦИЯ САЛОҲИЯТИНИ МИНТАҚА ИҚТИСОДИЁТИГА ТАЪСИРИНИ ЭКОНОМЕТРИК БАҲОЛАШ АСОСЛАРИ	87-92
<i>Исламтдинова Дина Файзрахмановна</i> АНАЛИЗ СОСТОЯНИЯ АГРОПРОМЫШЛЕННОГО КОМПЛЕКСА РЕСПУБЛИКИ УЗБЕКИСТАН	93-102
<i>Qobiljon Isaev</i> O‘ZBEKISTONNING JAHON SAVDO TASHKILOTIGA (JST) A‘ZO BO‘LISHINI IQTISODIY VAHOLASH	103-110

09.00.00 – FALSAFA FANLARI

<i>Xaitov Elmurod Bekmurodovich</i> O‘ZBEKISTONDA “AHOLI HAYOT SIFATI”GA ASOSIY YONDOSHUVLAR: MUAMMO VA YECHIMLAR (IJTIMOIY-FALSAFIY TAHLIL)	111-116
<i>Расулов Зоҳиддин Усарович</i> СПОРТ ЭСТЕТИКАСИ: РИТМ, ҲАРАКАТ ВА МАДАНИЯТНИНГ УЙҒУНЛИГИ	117-122
<i>Тавмурадов Жамшид Элмурадович</i> АБДУЛҚОДИР БЕДИЛНИНГ ҲАЁТ ЙЎЛИ: ФАЛСАФА ВА АДАБИЙ МЕРОС	123-128
<i>Davronov Otabek Ulug‘bek o‘g‘li</i> YUSUF QORABOG‘IY SHAXSIYATI VA FALSAFIY-ILMIY MEROSI	129-132
<i>Muxtorova To‘tixon Solijonovna</i> FALSAFA FANINI O‘QITISHDA ZAMONAVIY YONDASHUVLAR: METODLAR VA AMALIYOTLAR	133-137
<i>Akramov G‘iyosiddin Najmiddinovich</i> MARGINALLASHUV TUSHUNCHASINING IJTIMOY-FALSAFIY TAHLILI	138-142
<i>Ahmedova Dilrabo</i> DINIY BAG‘RIKENGLIKNING YOSHLAR IJTIMOY, MA‘NAVIY QIYOFASI SHAKLLANISHIDAGI IJTIMOIY POTENSIALI	143-150
11.00.00 – FILOLOGIYA FANLARI	
<i>Abdunabiyev Sunnat Botirovich</i> IBN BATTUTANING «SAYOHATNOMA» ASARIDA TARIXIY SHAXSLAR NOMINING TARJIMADA BERILISHI	151-159
<i>Seytnazarova Injayim</i> ADABIYOTSHUNOSLIK SOHASIDA RAQAMLI TEXNOLOGIYALARDAN FOYDALANISH TAHLILI	160-168
<i>Tukhtakhodjaeva Zulfiya</i> PHRASEOLOGY AS A SUBSYSTEM OF THE ENGLISH VOCABULARY	169-174
<i>Abdusalomov Doniyor Togayali ogli</i> REFLECTION OF THE CONCEPT OF «POLITENESS» IN THE PHRASEOLOGICAL AND PAREMIOLOGICAL RESERVOIRS OF THE COMPARED LANGUAGES	175-179
<i>Axmedov Anvar Botirovich</i> TILNING NOMINATSIYA TIZIMIDA O‘ZLASHMA SO‘ZLAR	180-184
<i>Aminov Farrukh Komiljon Ugli</i> THE EVOLUTION OF MEDIA DISCOURSE: FROM TRADITIONAL FORMS TO MULTIMODAL REPRESENTATIONS IN DIGITAL SPACES	185-193
<i>Sharipov Bobur Salimovich</i> RETSIPROKLI SEMANTIK DERIVATSIYA	194-201
<i>Abduganiyeva Zebuniso Abduhafizovna</i> ILMIY DISKURSNING O‘ZIGA XOS XUSUSIYATLARI	202-205

<i>Samatov Farxod Muminovich</i> O‘ZBEK VA INGLIZ TILIDA “TV” SEMANTIK MAYDONI LEKSIK BIRIKLARINING SO‘Z YASALISH XUSUSIYATLARI (ABBREVIATURALAR MISOLIDA)	206-210
<i>Kendjayeva Zemfira</i> METAFORIK POLISEMIYANING LINGVISTIK YUMORI.....	211-216
<i>Abdullayeva Nilufar Ramazonovna, Uzoqova Durdona Baxtiyor qizi</i> INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA «HID», « IS» KONSEPTINING SEMANTIK TAHLILI	217-221
<i>Saydullayeva Dilrabo Ilxom qizi</i> ALISHER NAVOIYNING “NASOYIM UL-MUHABBAT” TAZKIRASI VA SULAMIYNING “TABAQOT US-SUFIYA” ASARLARI O‘RTASIDAGI MUSHTARAKLIKLAR	222-226
<i>Шарапова Лола Станиславовна</i> ИЛЛЮЗИЯ И РЕАЛЬНОСТЬ В КОНТЕКСТЕ МАГИЧЕСКОГО РЕАЛИЗМА.....	227-232
<i>Ҳакимова Мастура Файзиллаевна</i> ИНГЛИЗ ВА ЎЗБЕК МАҚОЛЛАРИНИНГ МИЛЛИЙ ДУНЁ ТАСВИРИНИ АКС ЭТИШДАГИ АҲАМИЯТИ ВА ЛЕКСИК МАЪНОНИНГ РИВОЖЛАНИШИ (КЕНГАЙИШИ)	233-239
<i>Mo‘soyeva Hayitgul O‘roqovna</i> “HEART” – “YURAK” SO‘ZLI METAFORALARNING INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDAGI KOGNITIV TAHLILI	240-245
<i>Mamataliyeva Navbahor Hujamberdiyevna</i> INGLIZ VA O‘ZBEK TILLARIDA TEZ AYTISHLARNING STRUKTURAVIY TAHLILI	246-250
<i>Багаутдинова Ильмира Салаватовна</i> ВЛИЯНИЕ РОДНОГО ЯЗЫКА НА ПРОИЗНОШЕНИЕ В ИЗУЧЕНИИ ИНОСТРАННЫХ ЯЗЫКОВ	251-255
12.00.00 – YURIDIK FANLAR	
<i>Nuraliyev Oyatillo Abduvaliyevich</i> EFFECTIVE PRACTICES FOR DRAWING YOUNG TALENT TO UZBEKISTAN’S PUBLIC CIVIL SERVICE	256-268
<i>Алиев Асилбек Кадиорович</i> ВОПРОСЫ ОТГРАНИЧЕНИЯ МАССОВЫХ БЕСПОРЯДКОВ И ГРУППОВОГО ХУЛИГАНСТВА	269-275
<i>Hong Weixing</i> INTERNATIONAL LAW AS THE FOUNDATION FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF TRADE AND ECONOMIC RELATIONS BETWEEN UZBEKISTAN AND CHINA	276-284
<i>Султанова Сабохат Алишеровна</i> ПЕРСПЕКТИВЫ ДАЛЬНЕЙШЕГО РАЗВИТИЯ ОЦЕНКИ РЕГУЛЯТОРНОГО ВОЗДЕЙСТВИЯ В РЕСПУБЛИКЕ УЗБЕКИСТАН	285-290
<i>Jonuzoqova Yulduz Izzatulla qizi</i> O‘ZBEKISTONNING AXBOROT TEXNOLOGIYALARI SOHASIDAGI TRANSMILLIY JINOYATLARGA QARSHI KURASH MASALALARI	291-298
<i>Абдусамиева Дилрабо Абдувахоб кизи</i> ПРЕВЕНТИВНАЯ ФУНКЦИЯ ПОСТПЕНИТЕНЦИАРНОЙ РЕСОЦИАЛИЗАЦИИ	299-304
<i>Khalikov Khayot</i> THE ROLE OF MODEL UNITED NATIONS IN SHAPING GLOBAL LEADERS AND LAWYERS: A CASE STUDY ON UZBEKISTAN’S YOUTH	305-311

Даулетова Динара Даулетовна

ПРИЧИНЫ И УСЛОВИЯ, СПОСОБСТВУЮЩИЕ ХИЩЕНИЮ ЧУЖОГО ИМУЩЕСТВА .. 312-317

13.00.00 – PEDAGOGIKA FANLARI

Толипов Бахтиёр Хамитович

БЎЛАЖАК ИҚТИСОДЧИЛАРДА АНАЛИТИК ТАФАККУРНИ РИВОЖЛАНТИРИШ
САМАРАДОРЛИГИНИ ТАЪМИНЛАШНИНГ ПЕДАГОГИК ВОСИТАЛАРИ 318-324

Собирова Гулибарно Зайнитдин қизи

ТЕХНОЛОГИИ РАЗВИТИЯ НАВЫКОВ КРИТИЧЕСКОГО МЫШЛЕНИЯ НА УРОКАХ
РУССКОГО ЯЗЫКА 325-335

Xolmatova Ziroatxon Anvarovna

BO'LAJAK O'QITUVCHILARNING TASHXISLASH KOMPETENSIYALARINI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA
INNOVATSION-METODOLOGIK YONDASHUVLAR 336-339

Abduxoliqov Sardor Safarovich

YOSH DZYUDOCHILARNI JISMONIY SIFATLARINI RIVOJLANTIRISHDA HARAKATLI
O'YINLARNING O'RNI 340-344

Usmonova Mohizoda Avazjon qizi

GLOBOL TA'LIM MUHITIDA TALABALARNING MULOQOT MADANIYATINI INTEGRATIV
YONDASHUV ASOSIDA RIVOJLANTIRISH TIZIMI 345-348

Xodjiyeva Zumrad

MEZONLARGA ASOSLANGAN BAHOLANISHNING CHEKLANGAN DOIRASI 349-352

Turdiyev Ismoil Allayorovich

OLIV TA'LIM HAYOTIDA MA'NAVIY-MA'RIFIY ISHLARNING ILMIY-NAZARIY ASOSLARI
HAQIDA 353-358

Ibadullaev G'ayrat Akmuradovich

BO'LAJAK FIZIKA-ASTRONOMIYA O'QITUVCHILARINING KOMPETENTLIGINI
RIVOJLANTIRISH METODLARI 359-364

Ishonkulov Sherali Sharifovich

TALABALARNING IJODIY QOBILİYATLARINI RIVOJLANTIRISH VOSITASI SIFATIDA RAQAMLI
DASTURLARDAN FOYDALANISH 365-372

Raxmatov Rafik G'ayratovich

IMKONIYATI CHEKLANGAN O'QUVCHILAR RIVOJLANISHIDA TURMUSH TARZINI
SOG'LOMLASHTIRISH KO'NIKMALARINI RIVOJLANTIRISHNING PEDAGOGIK
IMKONIYATLARI 373-378

Xalmuratova Shaxnoza Bekmurzaevna

BO'LAJAK BOSHLANG'ICH SINFI O'QITUVCHILARINING RISKOLOGIK MADANIYATINI
SHAKLLANTIRISH TAMOYILLARI 379-383

Meliboyeva Nodira Qaxramanjanovna

MIRSODIQ TOJIYEV MEROSI (CHANG UCHUN YARATGAN ASARLARI MISOLIDA) 384-387

Qodirov Mirjalol Tolmasovich

TA'LIMDA GIPERMATNLI AXBOROT MODELLARINI QURISHNING ZAMONAVIY
TEKNOLOGIYALARI VA ASPEKTLARI 388-392

Karimova Aziza

BO'LAJAK O'QITUVCHILARNI SCAMPER TEXNIKASI ORQALI BOLALARNING KREATIV
TAFAKKURINI RIVOJLANTIRISHGA O'RGATISH METODIKASI 393-399

Nishonov Nodir Alimjanovich

BO`LAJAK O`QITUVCHILARDA FUTUROLOGIK TAHLIL QILISH KO`NIKMALARINI
RIVOJLANTIRISHNING MUHIM ASPEKTLARI 400-404

Xidirova Durdona Muxtorovna

SINERGETIK YONDASHUV ASOSIDA O`QUVCHI QIZLARNI IJTIMOIMADANIY
MUNOSABATLARGA TAYYORLASH MEKANIZMLARI 405-408

Received: 10 December 2024
Accepted: 15 December 2024
Published: 25 December 2024

Article / Original Paper

THE EVOLUTION OF MEDIA DISCOURSE: FROM TRADITIONAL FORMS TO MULTIMODAL REPRESENTATIONS IN DIGITAL SPACES

Aminov Farrukh Komiljon Ugli

Karshi State University, PhD student

Abstract. The shift from traditional to digital media has transformed how discourse is created, consumed, and analyzed. This paper examines media discourse through the lenses of power, representation, and participation in both traditional and new media environments. The findings suggest that although the modes of communication have evolved, power dynamics and issues of representation remain persistent.

Keywords: Media discourse, traditional media, digital media, multimodality, power dynamics, critical discourse analysis, multimodal analysis, digital communication.

MEDIA DISKURS EVOLUTSIYASI: RAQAMLI MAKONDA AN'ANAVIY SHAKLLARDAN MULTIMODAL NAMUNALARGACHA

Aminov Farrux Komiljon Ugli

Qarshi davlat universiteti, Tayanch doktorant

Annotatsiya. An'anaviy mediadan raqamli mediaga o'tish nutqni yaratish, iste'mol qilish va tahlil qilish usullarini o'zgartirdi. Ushbu maqola an'anaviy va yangi media muhitida kuch, vakillik va ishtirok etish linzalari orqali media nutqini ko'rib chiqadi. Topilmalar shuni ko'rsatadiki, aloqa usullari rivojlangan bo'lsa-da, kuch dinamikasi va vakillik muammolari saqlanib qolmoqda.

Kalit so'zlar: Media nutqi, an'anaviy media, raqamli media, multimodallik, kuch dinamikasi, tanqidiy nutq tahlili, multimodal tahlil, raqamli aloqa.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V4SI10Y2024N22>

Dramatic changes that have taken place in the media world with the introduction of new online platforms can be attributed to media discourse or traditional communication, that is most often associated with the press, radio and television. And this change is not just technical, but it radically changes the very principles of the creation, reception and understanding of communication. In the context of mass media, power relations and ideology are embedded in the content of the media, serving to construct narratives and shape societal perceptions [3; P.47]. Such media are often organized and operated within a systemic structure in which ownership and other editorial matters determine the content which is more likely to advance the owners view and less likely to advance other views [11; P.132].

The emergence of digital media, known for its multimodal and participatory qualities, has challenged these traditional frameworks. Platforms such as Instagram, YouTube, and

TikTok enable users to produce and share content, promoting a more decentralized media environment [1; P.59]. However, this democratization is offset by emerging forms of control, like algorithmic gatekeeping, in which content visibility is determined by engagement metrics rather than editorial supervision [2; P.98]. This prompts vital inquiries regarding the genuineness and variety of discussions in these environments.

In addition, digital platforms enable multimodal communication by combining text, images, sound, and interactive components, allowing for deeper and more instant expressions of meaning. This change has significant ramifications for discourse analysis, since the interaction of various semiotic modes generates nuanced meanings that rely on context [4; P.74]. Nonetheless, the advantages of digital media also present difficulties, including context collapse, wherein various audiences understand the same message in different ways because of the lack of situational indicators [9; P.121].

These changes signify not merely a shift in format but a transformation of discourse authority. Conventional media held a top-down authority, allowing minimal audience participation. Conversely, digital media merges these limits, offering chances for grassroots voices to confront prevailing narratives. Nevertheless, this empowerment comes with its own set of challenges. Algorithmic biases, strategies for monetizing platforms, and the dissemination of misinformation indicate that power inequities continue to exist, though in varied forms. These issues highlight the necessity of thoughtfully examining how digital platforms influence public discussion while preserving—or enhancing—current inequalities.

This paper aims to explore the evolution of media discourse from its conventional origins to its digital forms. In particular, it examines the development of media conversation in reaction to digital platforms, consistencies in power relations and portrayal in both conventional and digital media, the function of multimodality in forming and understanding communication in the digital era.

By tackling these inquiries, this research adds to a deeper comprehension of media discourse in a highly connected world. It underscores the intricacies of digital interactions, where user engagement and technological capabilities intersect with enduring societal norms and power dynamics. With the advent of new technologies such as artificial intelligence and virtual reality, their impact on media dialogue requires careful scrutiny to guarantee fair and inclusive depictions in a constantly changing environment [5; P.89; 10; P.63].

As we move through this swiftly evolving communicative environment, it is clear that traditional and digital media are not distinct entities but rather intertwined components of a larger discursive system. Although digital platforms present fresh chances for representation and engagement, they also perpetuate numerous ideological frameworks and power relations of their forerunners. This duality underscores the necessity for an in-depth examination of how media discourse develops and the effects it has on influencing societal beliefs, norms, and behaviors.

Methods. This research utilizes a mixed-method strategy, combining Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA), and a limited corpus linguistic analysis to investigate the development of media discourse on both traditional and digital platforms. Each methodological approach was selected to tackle particular research inquiries and enhance each other, providing a comprehensive view of the data.

CDA acts as the core framework for examining the power relationships and ideological frameworks present in both traditional and digital media texts. It emphasizes how language can sustain or contest social [3; P.47]; [11; P.132]. This assessment involved reviewing news articles, opinion pieces, and broadcast news segments from major established media sources. Special focus was given to word selections, thematic frameworks, and rhetorical techniques utilized to present topics like immigration, gender, and economic disparity. CDA was utilized to examine the quotation of expert sources and the representation of marginalized groups in narratives, uncovering patterns that uphold prevailing societal ideologies. The study additionally featured an intertextual review of how conventional media dialogue aligns with or diverges from new digital stories, providing understanding into the persistence and transformation among media types.

Acknowledging the fundamentally multimodal characteristics of digital media, this research utilized MDA to examine content on social media sites like Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube. MDA highlights the interplay of different semiotic modes—text, visuals, sound, video, and interactive components—during a unified communicative occurrence [4; P.32].

The dataset contained user-created content (UGC), memes, GIFs, and graphic advertisements. These were examined to comprehend how visual and textual components collaborate in constructing meaning and affecting audience understanding. For example, the incorporation of emotive images, hashtags, and emojis in Instagram posts was examined to understand how multimodal elements improve or complicate the communicated message. The investigation also assessed platform-specific features, like Twitter's character restriction and Instagram's emphasis on visuals, to comprehend their influence on shaping conversations.

To enhance the qualitative findings from CDA and MDA, a limited corpus analysis was performed utilizing computational tools. The corpus consisted of around 100,000 words sourced from traditional media formats (like news articles and opinion pieces) and digital media materials (such as social media posts and blogs).

The analysis of the corpus centered on analyzing word frequency and collocation trends to recognize persistent themes and perspectives, analyzing keywords to identify prominent terms utilized in conversations about power and representation, comparative examination of word selections in conventional and digital environments to uncover changes in language application and framing techniques.

For example, phrases concerning immigration were examined in both datasets to see how traditional media may use formal, institutional terminology, while digital media frequently includes emotionally expressive or informal language.

Data for this research was gathered over a six-month period, guaranteeing a varied and representative sample from both traditional and digital media. Conventional media outlets comprised prominent newspapers and broadcast news shows, whereas digital media information was collected from popular platforms such as Instagram, Twitter, and YouTube. Data from social media was chosen by analyzing engagement metrics like likes, shares, and comments to guarantee its relevance to public conversations.

Ethical aspects were taken into account during data gathering, especially in relation to privacy and content created by users. Data that is publicly accessible was prioritized, and individual users' anonymity was preserved where relevant.

To improve reliability, triangulation was used by integrating qualitative and quantitative approaches. CDA revealed ideological frameworks in detail, MDA highlighted the intricacies of multimodality, and corpus analysis supplied quantitative data to back qualitative insights [10; P.63]. The combination of these approaches secured a thorough grasp of the changing dynamics of media discourse.

Results. The results of this study illustrate the transformative and lasting nature of media discourse, emphasizing both continuities and shifts from traditional to digital platforms. Through the examination of data via Critical Discourse Analysis, Multimodal Discourse Analysis, and corpus linguistic approaches, several prominent themes surfaced: the enduring nature of power structures, the changing significance of representation, and the challenges brought about by multimodal communication in digital environments.

The CDA of conventional media showed that power relations are firmly established in the discourse, illustrating the impact of leading societal figures like political authorities, businesses, and influential organizations. For instance, news articles and TV reports often portrayed marginalized groups—like immigrants or low-income communities—through perspectives of deficiency or abnormality. This perspective frequently corresponds with the ideological goals of prevailing societal factions, sustaining systemic disparities [3; P.89]; [11; P.134].

A significant trend was the dependence on institutional sources, including government representatives and expert commentators, which restricted the variety of viewpoints in traditional media stories. Even when other perspectives were integrated, they were commonly presented within the limits of institutional norms, reducing their possible influence on public discourse.

In digital media, these power dynamics continued but appeared in different forms. Algorithmic gatekeeping, an essential aspect of digital platforms, frequently enhanced popular content while diminishing the visibility of less engaging or less prominent stories. Platforms such as YouTube and Instagram, for example, appeared to prioritize creators with significant followings, reflecting the editorial structures of conventional media [2; P.72]. This occurrence strengthens the concentration of power, even within seemingly democratized online spaces.

Representation continues to be a crucial topic in both traditional and digital media, although its expressions vary between these areas. In conventional media, stories frequently mirrored societal prejudices, depicting marginalized communities in stereotypical or unfavorable manners. For instance, topics concerning gender or immigration were often presented in manners that upheld current stereotypes, sustaining limited views of these communities.

In comparison, digital media platforms created a more engaging atmosphere, enabling users to contest prevailing narratives and build alternative representations. The examination of user-generated content (UGC) showed that online platforms allowed grassroots movements to gain attention, like the #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter initiatives, which contested conventional representations of gender and race. Nonetheless, the success of these movements was frequently constrained by the disunity of digital conversations and the presence of algorithmic prejudices.

The varied nature of digital media brought about notable challenges in creating and understanding discourse. Social media platforms like Instagram and Twitter combine text,

images, videos, and emojis, producing complex yet vibrant communicative settings. The MDA indicated that these various features frequently improved emotional connection and involvement. For example, utilizing memes and visual narratives enabled users to convey intricate concepts in a visually striking and approachable way [4; P.53].

Nevertheless, the absence of situational and cultural context in online communications frequently resulted in misunderstandings or “context collapse,” whereby messages meant for a specific audience were misconstrued by a different one [9; P.47]. This phenomenon was especially noticeable in cross-cultural exchanges, where variations in cultural norms and semiotic resources resulted in differing interpretations of identical content.

The linguistic analysis of the corpus uncovered unique language patterns in both traditional and digital media. Conventional media texts featured formal and institutional language, often employing terms that highlighted authority, expertise, and impartiality (“expert assessment,” “official directive”). Conversely, digital media displayed language that was more conversational and emotionally engaging, frequently mirroring the participatory and personal aspects of user-generated content [1; P.116].

For instance, the examination of collocations tied to immigration revealed that conventional media often employed phrases such as “border security” and “illegal entry,” positioning the topic within a security-focused narrative. Conversely, digital media frequently used phrases such as “human rights” and “family separation,” indicating a more compassionate perspective.

Although digital media provides chances for greater involvement and varied representation, it also brings distinctive challenges. The algorithmic promotion of sensational or emotionally engaging material frequently skews public discussions, emphasizing popularity rather than informational quality. This phenomenon was particularly noticeable on platforms such as Twitter, where contentious content often overshadowed conversations, deepening social rifts.

Moreover, the visual focus of digital media, while facilitating creative expression, occasionally resulted in the oversimplification of intricate issues. For instance, social media campaigns typically depended on eye-catching visuals or hashtags to achieve visibility, which, although successful in increasing awareness, occasionally fell short of providing the depth needed for a nuanced comprehension.

The results demonstrate that the evolution of media discourse is characterized by both continuity and change. While digital media has democratized content creation and enabled multimodal expression, many of the ideological structures and power dynamics of traditional media persist in these new environments. The interplay between user agency and algorithmic control highlights the complexities of digital discourse and underscores the need for critical engagement with emerging media technologies.

Discussions. The results of this research emphasize the active interaction between continuity and change in media discourse as it transitions from conventional formats to the multimodal, participatory settings of digital platforms. This section integrates insights from the introduction, methods, and results, emphasizing important implications for comprehending power, representation, and multimodality in media discourse.

The findings indicate that power dynamics are a constant element in both traditional and digital media, although they appear in different forms. In conventional media, editorial

authority is centralized, with influential societal entities like governments, corporations, and leading institutions directing the storyline. This supports Fairclough's (1995) claim that media discourse is intricately tied to social power dynamics, reinforcing inequalities via selective representation and framing. For example, depending on institutional sources restricts the variety of perspectives, strengthening dominant ideologies and preserving current social structures [3; P.121].

Digital media, frequently praised for its ability to democratize, reveals a contradictory persistence in power dynamics via algorithmic gatekeeping. Services such as YouTube and Facebook employ algorithms that emphasize engagement metrics, frequently elevating content from prominent creators or sensational stories rather than varied or complex discussions [2; P.78]. This reflects traditional media's editorial prejudices but in a different manner, emphasizing the ongoing influence of control systems in influencing public dialogue.

Media representation has experienced a notable change with the emergence of digital platforms. The introduction highlighted how digital media can oppose conventional representations of marginalized communities, a conclusion backed by the findings. Movements such as #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter illustrate how user-generated content (UGC) can challenge dominant narratives and amplify the voices of marginalized communities.

Nonetheless, the disjointed and intensely visual characteristics of digital media pose difficulties. The multimodal characteristics of digital platforms—blending text, images, and video—allow for more nuanced expressions of identity and resistance but may also result in oversimplified portrayals. For instance, social media updates typically depend on eye-catching images or hashtags to attract attention, potentially overlooking the intricacies of the topics being discussed [5; P.102]. This dualism highlights the conflict between accessibility and profundity in online discussions.

Additionally, the algorithmic prejudices of digital platforms may restrict the visibility of minority voices, prioritizing content that matches prevalent engagement trends. As indicated by the findings, this reflects the editorial structures of traditional media, though filtered through computational systems.

Multimodality has transformed the way meaning is created and understood in media communication. The emergence of digital tools that merge text, visuals, audio, and interactive features has enhanced the communicative capabilities of media. The methods and results sections demonstrate that social media platforms such as Instagram and Twitter employ multimodal resources to express meaning, elicit emotion, and promote engagement.

Nevertheless, this transition has also brought forth new difficulties, especially in understanding meaning. The occurrence of “context collapse,” in which varied audiences perceive the same message in different ways due to an absence of situational cues, complicates communication within digital environments [6; P.59]. This matter highlights the necessity for innovative analytical models that consider the intricacies of multimodal communication and its risk of being misunderstood.

The results show that although digital media promotes increased engagement, it also intensifies division and polarization. The focus on emotionally intense material in algorithm-based platforms frequently skews public discussion, favoring sensationalism instead of meaningful conversation. This dynamic questions the democratic potential of digital media,

prompting important inquiries about technology's influence on the formation of societal norms and beliefs.

Moreover, the ongoing presence of conventional power structures in digital environments emphasizes the significance of thoughtfully interacting with media technologies. With the advent of new tools such as artificial intelligence and virtual reality, these developments are expected to add further complexity to media discussions, requiring continuous analysis of their influence on representation and authority.

The combination of CDA, MDA, and corpus linguistic analysis in this study provides a holistic method for exploring the development of media discourse. Through the analysis of both linguistic and multimodal elements, it reveals the subtle dynamics of how power, representation, and engagement are navigated across conventional and digital platforms.

The conversation highlights the necessity for ongoing interdisciplinary research that connects linguistics, media studies, and technology. As emphasized in the introduction, grasping the relationship between traditional and new media necessitates acknowledging both patterns and changes in discourse practices. The results indicate that although digital media offers fresh chances for representation and involvement, it remains affected by the structural disparities that have historically defined media systems.

In the end, the development of media discourse showcases a complicated interaction between established power dynamics and new modes of digital engagement. Although the multimodal aspect of digital media has enhanced communication methods, it has also brought forth new challenges that need to be examined critically. Leveraging the findings of this study, subsequent research can delve deeper into how emerging technologies influence discourse creation and representation, enhancing our comprehension of media's impact on societal dynamics.

Conclusion. The development of media discourse from conventional formats to the multimodal and interactive domains of digital platforms showcases a terrain characterized by both transformation and persistence. This research has investigated the evolution of media discourse using a comprehensive approach that combines Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), Multimodal Discourse Analysis (MDA), and corpus linguistic techniques. The results illuminate how power dynamics, representation, and multimodal communication interconnect through various media forms, presenting both opportunities and obstacles for public discourse.

Although new media platforms offer a more engaging and interactive setting for content creation, the power dynamics found in traditional media continue to exist in digital spaces, albeit in different forms. Algorithmic gatekeeping and content prioritization driven by engagement metrics have supplanted conventional editorial oversight while still influencing discourse in manners that favor specific voices over others [4; P.117]. These power dynamics show that digital media, even though it seems to promote democratization, continues to enhance centralization and hierarchy.

Representation, a fundamental theme examined throughout this research, reveals both advancement and decline. Although digital media provides avenues for various and frequently marginalized voices to confront prevailing narratives—seen in movements such as #MeToo and #BlackLivesMatter—obstacles to widespread representation still exist. The division of digital conversations, the focus on eye-catching or sensational material, and algorithmic biases frequently restrict in-depth discussions and perpetuate stereotypes [8; P.125].

Multimodality has been a revolutionary element of this change, enhancing the ways meaning is communicated and understood. The capability to merge text, images, videos, and interactive components has enabled richer and more emotionally impactful communication. Nonetheless, as indicated in the results and discussion, this complexity also brings about challenges like context collapse and possible misinterpretation owing to insufficient situational cues [7; P.97]. The results highlight the importance of creating innovative analytical frameworks capable of addressing these multimodal complexities and their consequences for discourse analysis.

The enduring nature of conventional power frameworks and the new difficulties introduced by algorithmic governance emphasize the necessity for ongoing critical interaction with digital media. The research highlights that, although new media settings provide greater chances for participatory dialogue, they do not automatically ensure fairness or equity in representation. The ways in which digital platforms function—prioritizing content that attracts engagement over content of genuine value—can skew public conversation, fostering polarization and shallow insights instead of thorough discussions.

The multifaceted aspect of digital communication introduces additional complexity, suggesting that even though technology has broadened the communicative resources, it has also altered the ways audiences engage with and understand media content. This transformation requires refreshed analytical and theoretical models that can tackle the joint impact of text, visual components, and interaction on discourse creation and understanding.

The research highlights that although media discussions have changed considerably due to the emergence of digital technologies, numerous fundamental power dynamics and representation challenges have persisted, though in altered manifestations. The results indicate that new digital media platforms are not impartial; they are influenced environments where algorithms, platform features, and user interaction affect what is viewed, shared, and highlighted. This understanding necessitates a continuous critical review of how media technologies influence public perception, either fortifying or contesting power dynamics, and affect social norms.

The findings of this research highlight the necessity of creating more inclusive and fair digital environments that extend beyond simple engagement to guarantee a variety of perspectives and richer, more significant dialogue. Future studies ought to concentrate on how new technologies like artificial intelligence and augmented reality could further impact media discourse, advocating for an understanding that embraces both the intricacies of new media and the ongoing issues inherent in traditional methods.

In summary, as media discourse keeps evolving, a comprehensive approach that connects linguistic, technological, and sociocultural viewpoints will be essential for grasping its effects on power, representation, and communication in the digital era. By grappling with these complexities, researchers and practitioners can strive for a media environment that more accurately mirrors the varied realities of modern society and promotes more knowledgeable and inclusive public discussions.

Адабиётлар/Литература/References:

1. Boyd, D. (2014). *It is Complicated: The Social Lives of Networked Teens*. Yale University Press.

2. Castells, M. (2009). *Communication Power*. Oxford University Press.
3. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. Edward Arnold.
4. Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2006). *Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
5. McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man*. McGraw-Hill.
6. Mammadov, A., & Lewandowska-Tomaszczyk, B. (2020). *Analysing Media Discourse: Traditional and New*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
7. O'Keeffe, A. (2006). *Investigating Media Discourse*. Routledge.
8. Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2003). *Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World*. Routledge.
9. Tannen, D., & Trester, A. M. (Eds.). (2013). *Discourse 2.0: Language and new media*. Georgetown University Press.
10. Talbot, M. (2007). *Media Discourse: Representation and Interaction*. Edinburgh University Press.
11. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A Multidisciplinary Approach*. Sage Publications.

SCIENCEPROBLEMS.UZ

ИЖТИМОЙ-ГУМАНИТАР ФАНЛАРНИНГ ДОЛЗАРБ МУАММОЛАРИ

№ S/10 (4) – 2024

АКТУАЛЬНЫЕ ПРОБЛЕМЫ СОЦИАЛЬНО- ГУМАНИТАРНЫХ НАУК

ACTUAL PROBLEMS OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

Ижтимоий-гуманитар фанларнинг долзарб муаммолари” электрон журнали 2020 йил 6 август куни 1368-сонли гувоҳнома билан давлат рўйхатига олинган.

Муассис: “SCIENCEPROBLEMS TEAM” масъулияти чекланган жамияти

Таҳририят манзили:

100070. Тошкент шаҳри, Яккасарой тумани, Кичик Бешёғоч кўчаси, 70/10-уй. Электрон манзил:

scienceproblems.uz@gmail.com

Боғланиш учун телефонлар:

(99) 602-09-84 (telegram).