SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

INTERNATIONAL SCIENTIFIC JOURNAL OF

2026 / No. 1(2)

Contemporary Pedagogical and Philological Research

LANGUAGE, CULTURAL IDENTITY AND SOCIETY IN THE DIGITAL AGE: RECONCEPTUALISING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNICATION

Tamane Jelena

Assistent to the Rector, Daugavpils University

Daugavpils, Latvia

Suyunov Bobur

Head of department of Narpay “General subjects”, SamSIFL

Samarkand, Uzbekistan

Abstract. This article investigates the relationship between language, cultural identity and social interaction in digitally networked environments. It argues that global platforms expand opportunities for intercultural contact while simultaneously creating pressures towards linguistic homogenisation, cultural simplification and unequal visibility. The discussion draws on sociolinguistic and intercultural communication perspectives to examine how identities are negotiated through multilingual practices, digital self-presentation, algorithmic recommendation and AI-mediated communication. Particular attention is paid to the position of national languages and culturally embedded meanings in a global digital environment. The article proposes that intercultural competence should be understood not merely as knowledge of cultural differences but as the ability to interpret context, recognise asymmetries of power, negotiate meaning and communicate ethically across linguistic boundaries. The findings underline the importance of multilingual digital resources, culturally responsive technologies and education that develops critical intercultural literacy.

Keywords: language and culture; cultural identity; intercultural communication; multilingualism; digital globalisation; linguistic diversity; cultural representation

Introduction

Language is both a medium of communication and a principal resource through which individuals and communities articulate identity, belonging, memory and social values. In a globalised world, digital platforms have intensified contact among speakers with different linguistic and cultural backgrounds. Communication that once required geographical proximity can now take place across borders in real time. This expansion creates significant opportunities for education, research, cultural exchange and international cooperation. At the same time, it raises questions about whose languages and cultural perspectives are most visible, whose communicative conventions are treated as normative and how local identities are represented in global digital spaces.

The relationship between language, culture and society is therefore undergoing a complex reconfiguration. Digital communication does not simply dissolve cultural boundaries; it can make them more visible, contested and commercially mediated. The growing use of generative AI adds another layer because automated systems may reproduce dominant cultural assumptions or fail to interpret meanings that depend on local histories, social relationships and pragmatic conventions.

Language as a resource of cultural identity

Language carries culturally specific ways of categorising experience, expressing respect, organising social relationships and transmitting collective memory. Forms of address, idioms, proverbs, humour, metaphor and politeness conventions are not interchangeable labels; they are embedded in social practices. When communication moves across languages, speakers must interpret not only lexical meanings but also the values and expectations that accompany them.

Cultural identity should not be treated as fixed or internally uniform. Individuals draw on multiple identities according to context, audience and communicative purpose. Digital spaces make this fluidity particularly visible: users may alternate languages, adopt hybrid styles, use transliteration, quote popular cultural references or adapt their

self-presentation to different communities. Such practices can be understood through translanguaging and other approaches that view multilingual speakers as drawing on an integrated repertoire rather than operating with sealed linguistic systems.

For Uzbek-speaking communities, digital communication offers opportunities to expand the presence of the national language in science, education, media and public discussion. However, this requires more than increasing the quantity of Uzbek-language content. It also requires terminological development, reliable digital resources, support for dialectal and stylistic diversity, and technologies capable of processing the language accurately.

Global platforms and cultural asymmetries

Digital platforms connect users across borders, but the conditions of visibility are not equally distributed. Languages with extensive digital corpora, commercial investment and established technical infrastructure are more likely to receive high-quality tools and broad platform support. Languages with fewer digitised resources may experience weaker speech recognition, machine translation, search performance and content moderation. These disparities can affect educational access and the ability of communities to participate fully in digital public life.

Algorithmic recommendation systems also influence cultural circulation. Content that generates engagement may be amplified, while less widely understood cultural forms may remain marginal. This does not mean that global platforms inevitably erase local cultures. Rather, the outcome depends on the interaction between platform design, user agency, institutional policy, cultural production and media literacy. Communities can use digital tools to revitalise language, document heritage and create transnational networks, but these possibilities require supportive conditions.

Generative AI introduces a further concern: cultural meaning may be flattened when systems produce fluent but contextually inappropriate explanations, translations or examples. A culturally responsive system should be evaluated not only for

grammatical accuracy but also for its treatment of social hierarchy, historical references, humour, gendered language, politeness and culturally specific knowledge.

Reconceptualising intercultural communicative competence

Intercultural competence is sometimes reduced to memorising facts about other societies. Such knowledge is useful but insufficient. Effective intercultural communication requires the ability to interpret unfamiliar practices without immediate stereotyping, recognise one's own assumptions, negotiate ambiguity, repair misunderstanding and reflect on unequal power relations. It also involves an ethical dimension: speakers should be prepared to listen, clarify and revise their interpretations rather than assume that their own communicative norms are universal.

In digital settings, intercultural competence must include platform literacy. Users need to understand how context collapses when messages circulate beyond their intended audience, how irony and humour may be misinterpreted, how images and symbols vary across communities and how automated translation may conceal ambiguity. Educational programmes should therefore combine language learning with critical media literacy, pragmatic awareness and guided engagement with authentic multilingual materials.

Universities can contribute by developing collaborative online projects, multilingual research teams, virtual exchange programmes and comparative analysis of public discourse. Such initiatives should avoid treating culture as a checklist of national characteristics. Instead, they should invite students to examine variation within communities and the historical, institutional and situational factors that shape communication.

Cultural representation and the question of visibility

Digital visibility is not simply a matter of whether a language can be typed or displayed on a screen. It also concerns whether that language is searchable, recommended, accurately translated, supported by speech technologies and represented

in the knowledge resources used by automated systems. A language may be widely spoken yet remain technologically disadvantaged if its digital content is fragmented, poorly indexed or absent from high-quality training datasets. This creates a form of representational inequality: speakers may participate online, but the tools through which they access information and produce content may not fully recognise their linguistic and cultural resources.

Cultural representation is similarly shaped by selection and framing. Search results, recommendation systems and automated summaries can privilege particular narratives, genres and sources. Cultural practices that are complex, contested or locally specific may be simplified into easily recognisable categories. Such simplification can reinforce stereotypes even when the system's language appears neutral. Critical intercultural communication should therefore examine not only what is represented but also what is omitted, whose perspective is treated as authoritative and how cultural knowledge is transformed when it is made computationally legible.

For Uzbekistan, strengthening the digital presence of Uzbek should involve a broad cultural and institutional strategy. High-quality digital collections should include contemporary communication, scholarly writing, historical documents, literature, oral heritage and regional language practices. The purpose should not be to freeze the language into a single standard form, but to represent its diversity while supporting clear and consistent tools for education and public communication. A rich digital environment can help younger generations engage with cultural heritage while also enabling Uzbek-language knowledge to circulate internationally.

Intercultural communication as negotiation

Intercultural communication is best understood as an ongoing process of negotiation rather than the application of fixed rules about national character. Participants may share a language but differ in professional background, age, educational experience, regional identity or expectations about formality. Conversely,

speakers from different societies may develop effective communication through shared professional practices and mutual accommodation. The relevant unit of analysis is therefore the communicative encounter and the resources participants use to interpret one another, not an assumed set of uniform cultural traits.

Digital interaction makes negotiation more demanding because contextual cues may be reduced. Tone of voice, gesture, timing and physical setting can be absent or transformed into textual conventions such as punctuation, emoji and response delay. A short message may be interpreted as abrupt, while a detailed explanation may be perceived as excessive. Automated translation can further obscure pragmatic distinctions by rendering several forms of address or politeness through one target-language equivalent. Users need strategies for clarification, paraphrase, checking assumptions and repairing misunderstanding.

Educational institutions can develop these capacities through structured intercultural tasks. Students may compare alternative translations of the same message, analyse how humour travels across languages, examine the interpretation of disagreement in professional correspondence or collaborate with peers from other linguistic backgrounds. Such tasks should invite reflection on uncertainty and interpretation rather than reward memorisation of cultural generalisations. Assessment can focus on the ability to explain choices, adapt language to audience and respond constructively to ambiguity.

Policy and educational implications

Language policy in the digital age should connect education, cultural development and technological infrastructure. Supporting a national language requires investment in terminology, digital publishing, accessible archives, speech resources and language-aware software. It also requires collaboration between universities, public institutions, publishers, technology developers and communities. Without such

coordination, isolated projects may produce valuable resources that remain difficult to discover, maintain or integrate into educational practice.

Institutions should also promote critical AI literacy. Users need to recognise that an automated translation or cultural explanation is a constructed output rather than a neutral account. They should be able to question sources, identify missing context and seek human expertise when a misunderstanding could have serious consequences. These competencies are relevant not only to language students but also to professionals working in education, public administration, media, tourism and international cooperation.

Ultimately, the objective is not to resist global communication but to participate in it on equitable terms. Cultural identity is strengthened when communities can represent themselves, interpret external influences critically and contribute their knowledge to wider conversations. A multilingual digital environment should enable reciprocal exchange rather than one-directional adaptation to dominant languages and platforms.

Conclusion

Digital globalisation has expanded intercultural contact but has not removed linguistic or cultural inequalities. Language remains a central resource for identity and social participation, while platform infrastructures and AI systems increasingly influence which meanings become visible and how they are interpreted. A sustainable approach should strengthen multilingual digital resources, promote culturally responsive technology design and develop critical intercultural competence. For Uzbekistan, the strategic task is to participate actively in global digital communication while ensuring that Uzbek language, cultural knowledge and locally grounded forms of expression are represented accurately and creatively. Intercultural communication should therefore be approached as a process of reciprocal interpretation, ethical negotiation and respect for linguistic diversity.

SCIENCE CONNECTS PEOPLE

References

1. Byram, M. (1997). Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. Multilingual Matters.

2. Kramsch, C. (1993). Context and Culture in Language Teaching. Oxford University Press.

3. Piller, I. (2017). Intercultural Communication: A Critical Introduction (2nd ed.). Edinburgh University Press.

4. UNESCO. (2003). Education in a Multilingual World. UNESCO Education Position Paper.

5. UNESCO. (2022). Re|Shaping Policies for Creativity: Addressing Culture as a Global Public Good. UNESCO.