HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN TEACHING ENGLISH TO JOURNALISM STUDENTS BASED ON THE CONTRASTIVE TYPOLOGY OF ENGLISH AND RUSSIAN MEDIA DISCOURSE

Igamberdieva Saida Abdusamatovna
Teacher, Department of Foreign Languages,
University of Journalism and Mass Communications of Uzbekistan
https://orcid.org/0009-0002-3845-625X
doi:**https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24271078**

Abstract. This article proposes an AI-assisted approach to teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) to journalism students through a contrastive analysis of English- and Russian-language media discourse. The approach uses pairs of news reports on the same event to guide students in comparing headline structure, the organization of news leads, source attribution, and evaluative language. Students use generative artificial intelligence to suggest possible contrasts and produce alternative headlines and leads for a specified readership. They then check the AI-generated observations against the original reports, evaluate the proposed revisions for factual accuracy and preservation of attribution, and explain their editorial decisions.

Keywords: journalism education, contrastive typology, English-language media discourse, Russian-language media discourse, news writing.

Introduction:

Journalism students who report in English need to make editorial decisions about which facts to foreground, how to identify sources, and how to convey uncertainty. These decisions are especially important when students work with reporting in another language. For example, when writing an English-language lead from a Russian-language report, a student must decide which detail is most relevant to the intended readership and preserve the distinction between a verified fact and a claim attributed to a source. Such tasks connect English for Specific Purposes (ESP) instruction with the practical work of news writing and editing.

A contrastive approach to English- and Russian-language media discourse gives students a way to examine these decisions. By comparing reports on the same event, students can observe how headlines foreground different aspects of the story, how leads sequence information, and how reporters attribute claims or signal uncertainty. The comparison also helps students distinguish recurring features of a news genre from choices made by a particular outlet. Differences between two reports may reflect editorial policy, audience, or publication format, so a single pair of texts offers a starting point for analysis. Comparing several pairs allows students to test whether an observed pattern recurs.

Generative artificial intelligence can support this work by suggesting points of comparison and producing alternative headlines and leads for a specified readership. These outputs give students material for editorial review. For instance, an AI-generated lead may turn a statement attributed to local officials into an assertion presented as fact. Students can compare the revision with the original report, restore the attribution, and explain how the change affects the reader's understanding of the

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

claim. The exercise links language choices to journalistic responsibilities and gives students a concrete basis for evaluating AI-generated text.

This article proposes an AI-assisted approach to teaching English to journalism students through the contrastive analysis of English- and Russian-language news reports. It focuses on four features of media discourse: headline structure, lead organization, source attribution, and evaluative language. The proposed sequence moves from comparing authentic reports to reviewing AI-generated alternatives and producing a revised English-language text. Students justify their editorial decisions with evidence from the source reports, with particular attention to factual accuracy, clarity of attribution, and suitability for the intended audience.

Materials and Methods:

This article proposes a teaching methodology for integrating generative artificial intelligence into English for Specific Purposes (ESP) instruction for journalism students. The methodology combines contrastive discourse analysis with practical tasks in English-language news writing and editing. The unit of comparison is a pair of English- and Russian-language news reports on the same event. The teaching sequence uses these paired reports to help students identify editorial choices, verify AI-generated observations, and apply their analysis to a new headline and lead. The methodology is presented as an instructional proposal for classroom implementation.

The proposed materials comprise pairs of publicly accessible straight-news reports from English- and Russian-language media outlets. Each pair should cover the same event at a comparable stage of reporting. To make the comparison meaningful, the teacher selects reports published within a similar time frame and records the outlet, publication date, and any visible update time. The headline, lead, and relevant body paragraphs are retained so that students can check whether condensed information accurately reflects the report and whether claims are attributed to the appropriate sources.

Several pairs from different outlets are used to examine whether a feature recurs across texts. For example, if one headline foregrounds a government decision and its counterpart foregrounds the people affected, students compare additional pairs before treating the difference as a broader pattern. Their interpretation considers the language of publication alongside the outlet, intended readership, and information available at the time of reporting.

The contrastive analysis uses four categories shared by both sets of reports.

Category	Features examined
Headline structure	The foregrounded actor, action, or outcome, as well as the use of verbs, quotations, and omitted information
Lead organization	The order of key facts and the amount of background supplied in the opening paragraph
Source attribution	The identification and placement of sources, reporting verbs, and distinctions between reported claims and established facts
Evaluative language	Word choices that express judgement, signal uncertainty, or frame the significance of an event

First, students annotate the paired reports independently and record examples in a comparison table. They identify the main information in each headline and lead, underline attribution markers, and explain how selected words convey evaluation or uncertainty. They then compare their observations in pairs or small groups and support each interpretation with a passage from the reports.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Next, students provide the same excerpts to a generative AI tool and ask it to compare the texts using the four categories. They also ask the tool to produce an alternative English-language headline and lead for a specified readership, using only the information supplied. Students keep the prompt and output alongside their annotations so that each AI-generated observation or editorial choice can be traced to the relevant passage.

Finally, students check the AI output against the source texts and produce their own revised headline and lead. They verify names, dates, figures, and attributions. They also check whether a claim presented as uncertain or provisional in a source retains that status in the revision. For example, if the AI turns a preliminary estimate attributed to local officials into an unqualified statement, students restore the attribution and explain how the revision changes what the reader can reasonably infer.

The proposed assessment draws on three student products: the annotated comparison, the revised English-language headline and lead, and a short editorial rationale. The comparison is assessed for accuracy and use of textual evidence. The headline and lead are evaluated for factual fidelity, clear attribution, appropriate information order, and suitability for the intended readership. In the rationale, students explain at least one significant decision about what to foreground and one decision about which AI suggestion to accept, revise, or discard. Together, these products provide a basis for assessing how students apply contrastive analysis to English-language reporting and verify AI-generated text against their sources.

Results and discussion:

The proposed methodology identifies three types of evidence that instructors can use to assess students' work: annotated comparisons of English- and Russian-language news reports, revised English-language headlines and leads, and editorial rationales. The discussion below uses illustrative examples to show what these materials can reveal about students' contrastive analysis, news writing, and evaluation of AI-generated text. Classroom implementation would be needed to determine whether the approach improves these skills over time.

Comparing news reports on the same event gives students a basis for examining how editors organize shared information for different readers. For example, one headline about a transport policy may foreground the authority that approved it, while another may foreground the passengers affected by the change. The corresponding leads may also differ in the order in which they introduce the decision, its expected consequences, and the date of implementation. A well-supported comparison identifies the textual choices that produce these differences and explains what each version makes salient to its readership.

For a contrastive typology, a distinction observed in one pair of reports can serve as a hypothesis to examine across additional pairs. Headline length, information order, and the placement of attribution may vary with outlet conventions, audience, or the stage of reporting. Students can therefore record where a feature recurs and where it varies. An annotation that identifies which information each lead foregrounds and supports the interpretation with passages from both reports gives the instructor evidence of contrastive reasoning.

The AI-assisted stage makes source attribution and certainty concrete subjects of editorial review. Consider an illustrative Russian-language report in which municipal officials estimate that a new bus route could serve up to 10,000 passengers a day. An AI-generated English lead might state that the route will carry 10,000 passengers daily. This revision changes the status of the figure in three ways. It

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

removes the source of the estimate, presents a possibility as a certainty, and turns an upper limit into a fixed figure. A student could revise the sentence to read, "Municipal officials estimate that the new bus route could serve up to 10,000 passengers a day." The editorial rationale can then identify which words preserve the meaning and evidential status of the original claim.

A similar task can address evaluative language. If the source report attributes the description an ambitious plan to a city official, an AI-generated headline may reproduce the phrase in the publication's own voice. Students can consider whether the evaluation should be explicitly attributed or whether a more specific description of the plan would better serve the reader. The exercise connects lexical choices and reporting verbs with the journalist's responsibility to distinguish a source's judgement from the outlet's account.

The three student products provide evidence of different skills. The annotated comparison shows whether students can explain how a headline or lead organizes information. The revised English text shows whether they can apply that analysis while preserving factual accuracy, attribution, and uncertainty. The editorial rationale shows whether they can trace an AI suggestion to the relevant passage and explain why they accepted, revised, or discarded it. For example, a student may choose to foreground changes to bus services for a local readership while retaining the attribution of a ridership estimate. That decision demonstrates how audience adaptation and factual fidelity can be assessed within the same writing task.

For journalism-focused ESP instruction, the approach places English-language choices within a recognizable editorial workflow. Students read across languages, select and verify information, and explain how their wording affects what a reader can infer. A classroom study could evaluate the methodology by comparing students' independent headlines and leads before and after a series of paired-text tasks, using the same criteria for information order, factual fidelity, attribution, and treatment of uncertainty.

Conclusion:

This article proposes an AI-assisted approach to teaching English for Specific Purposes (ESP) to journalism students through the comparison of English- and Russian-language news reports on the same event. By examining headline structure, lead organization, source attribution, and evaluative language, students practice identifying how news outlets present information to their readers. Comparing several pairs of reports allows them to determine whether an observed feature recurs and to consider how editorial practice, audience, and the stage of reporting may account for differences.

Generative AI provides draft headlines and leads for editorial review. Students check these drafts against the source texts, revise wording that changes the meaning or degree of certainty of a claim, and explain their editorial decisions. The annotated comparison, revised news text, and editorial rationale give instructors a basis for assessing whether students can adapt their English-language reporting to a target readership while preserving factual accuracy and clear attribution.

The methodology is presented as an instructional proposal supported by illustrative tasks. Its effectiveness could be evaluated by comparing students' independently written headlines and leads before and after a series of paired-text exercises, using the same criteria for factual fidelity, information order, source attribution, and treatment of uncertainty.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

References

1. Bell, A. (1991). The language of news media. Blackwell.
2. Dudley-Evans, T., & St John, M. J. (1998). Developments in English for specific purposes: A multi-disciplinary approach. Cambridge University Press.
3. Miao, F., & Holmes, W. (2023). Guidance for generative AI in education and research. UNESCO. https://doi.org/10.54675/EWZM9535 doi.org
4. Satibaldiyev, E. K. (2026). Agency and evidentiality under English dominance in Russian and Uzbek news translation. The Lingua Spectrum, 4(1), 357–361. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20810713
5. Subbotina, M. V., Yakovleva, G. G., Gilazova, G. S., & Gubanov, A. R. (2023). Kontaktoustanavlivayushchie sredstva v zagolovkakh mediatekstov (na materiale russkogo, angliyskogo i chuvashskogo yazykov) [Phatic means in media text headlines (based on the material of the Russian, English and Chuvash languages)]. Philology. Theory & Practice, 16(10), 3486–3490. https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20230536 Philology. Theory & Practice
6. Abdusamatovna, I. S. (2023). PROCESS AND CRITERIA OF TEACHING LISTENING. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ADVANCED RESEARCH IN EDUCATION, TECHNOLOGY AND MANAGEMENT, 2(3).
7. Igamberdieva Saida Abdusamatovna. (2025). THE ROLE OF PHRASEOLOGICAL UNITS IN DEVELOPING STUDENTS' INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE. IQRO INDEXING, 18(01), 233-236. https://worldlyjournals.com/index.php/IFX/article/view/15573
8. Igamberdieva Saida Abdusamatovna. THE ROLE OF PROVERBS IN DEVELOPING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING. (2025). Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations, 4(9), 376-379. https://doi.org/10.55640/