



**Feruza ISOKOVA,**  
PhD student, Termez State University  
E-mail: [fur.isokova@gmail.com](mailto:fur.isokova@gmail.com)

TerSU, under review of PhD, Associate Professor A.Khudaykulov

## COMMUNICATIVE ASPECT OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF UZBEK AND ENGLISH POLITICAL DISCOURSES

Annotation

This study provides a comparative investigation of the communicative dimensions of political discourse in Uzbek and English-speaking cultures. This study examines the rhetorical and linguistic methods employed in the speeches of the presidents of the United States and Uzbekistan to engage, influence, and shape public opinion. speech analysis indicates that Uzbek speech prioritises collectivism, tradition, and cultural heritage, whereas English discourse underscores individualism and direct communication. The research utilises Austin's (1962) theory of performative utterances and Searle's (1969) speech act theory to illustrate that language delivers information while simultaneously fulfilling political roles.

**Key words:** Political discourse, Uzbek political rhetoric, English political rhetoric, comparative analysis, performative utterances, speech acts, strategies for communication.

## SIYOSIY DISKURSNING KOMMUNIKATIV ASPEKTI: O'ZBEK VA INGLIZ SIYOSIY DISKURSINING QIYOSIY TAHLILI

Annotatsiya

Ushbu tadqiqot o'zbek va ingliz tilida so'zlashuvchi madaniyatlarda siyosiy diskursning kommunikativ jihatlarini qiyosiy tadqiq qilishni ko'zda tutadi. Ushbu maqola AQSH va O'zbekiston prezidentlarining nutqlarida jamoatchilik fikrini jalb qilish, ta'sir qilish va shakllantirish uchun qo'llaniladigan ritorik va lingvistik usullarni o'rganadi. Diskurs tahlili shuni ko'rsatadiki, o'zbek nutqida kollektivizm, an'ana va madaniy meros ustuvorlik qiladi, ingliz nutqida esa individuallik va bevosita muloqotga urg'u beriladi. Tadqiqot Ostinning (1962) ijro etuvchi gaplar nazariyasidan va Searlning (1969) nutq akti nazariyasidan til bir vaqtning o'zida siyosiy rollarni bajarish bilan birga ma'lumot yetkazib berishini ko'rsatish uchun foydalanadi.

**Kalit so'zlar:** Siyosiy diskurs, o'zbek siyosiy ritorikasi, ingliz siyosiy ritorikasi, qiyosiy tahlil, performativ gaplar, nutqiy harakatlar, muloqot strategiyalari.

## КОММУНИКАТИВНЫЙ АСПЕКТ ПОЛИТИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ УЗБЕКСКОГО И АНГЛИЙСКОГО ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИХ ДИСКУРСОВ

Аннотация

В этом исследовании проводится сравнительное исследование коммуникативных измерений политического дискурса в узбекской и англоязычной культурах. В этом исследовании изучаются риторические и лингвистические методы, используемые в речах президентов США и Узбекистана для вовлечения, влияния и формирования общественного мнения. Анализ речи показывает, что узбекская речь отдает приоритет коллективизму, традициям и культурному наследию, тогда как английский дискурс подчеркивает индивидуализм и прямое общение. Исследование использует теорию перформативных высказываний Остина (1962) и теорию речевых актов Серла (1969), чтобы проиллюстрировать, что язык передает информацию, одновременно выполняя политические роли.

**Ключевые слова:** Политический дискурс, узбекская политическая риторика, английская политическая риторика, сравнительный анализ, перформативные высказывания, речевые акты, стратегии коммуникации.

**Introduction.** Politicians utilise speech to influence public perception, construct ideological narratives, and consolidate authority. Political discourse employs rhetorical methods, persuasive strategies, and symbolic language to communicate explicit themes while implicitly asserting power. This study examines how leaders utilise language to exercise power—making promises, legitimising policies, and creating ideologies—drawing on Austin's (1962) performative utterances and Searle's (1969) speech act theory. Fairclough's (2001) critical discourse analysis emphasises discourse as a mechanism of authority and influence. This paper analyses President Shavkat Mirziyoyev's "New Uzbekistan Strategy," highlighting how his rhetoric fosters national unity, economic modernisation, and institutional reforms, indicative of broader transformations in political communication in Uzbekistan and global leadership narratives.

**Literature review.** Political discourse has been thoroughly examined within linguistic and political science fields, with researchers highlighting its significance in forming ideological frameworks and public narratives [1]. Critical discourse analysis (CDA) serves as a valuable methodological framework, elucidating the utilisation of language in political

contexts to perpetuate power dynamics and shape public consciousness.

Uzbek political speech frequently embodies collectivist traditions, highlighting national identity, cultural legacy, and state cohesion. Political leaders purposefully utilise formal speech and rhetorical techniques that correspond with Uzbekistan's historical and socio-political values. Conversely, Western political discourse, especially in English-speaking nations, emphasises individual agency, transparency, and popular engagement, with direct communication strategies and emotive appeals as predominant techniques[3].

**Recent research** [5] underscores the influence of globalisation and the use of English lexicon in Uzbek political discourse, indicating that contemporary political rhetoric increasingly integrates international vocabulary to convey modernisation and global interconnectedness. Comparative studies reveal that Uzbek discourse upholds a hierarchical and state-centric narrative, whereas Western political communication frequently incorporates interactive and media-driven discourses that emphasise direct audience interaction[6].

**Research methodology.** The research employs a qualitative design under the IMRAD (introduction, methodology,

findings, and discussion) framework. We gathered data from various political speeches, interviews, and debates conducted by prominent Uzbek and English-speaking politicians. We utilised discourse analysis methods to examine the gathered data, concentrating on elements such as audience participation, persuasive strategies, rhetorical devices, and the sociocultural setting. We performed a comparative analysis to discern similarities and differences in linguistic and communicative methods. The findings indicate that, whereas Uzbek and English political discourse employ analogous rhetorical devices such as analogies, emotive appeals, and repetition, these devices are utilised in markedly distinct manners across various contexts. Uzbek political discourse frequently embodies the societal collective ideals, highlighting togetherness, cultural identity, and reverence for tradition. In contrast, English political rhetoric often emphasises individualism, active engagement, and personal integrity. The research revealed disparities in language formality, indicating that Uzbek politicians utilise more formal structures than their English counterparts, who frequently adopt a conversational tone to engage a wider audience.

**Analysis and results.** In order to reveal the main content of our research, we analyzed the speeches of the presidents of Uzbekistan [10] and the USA [8]. Through comparative analysis, we examined the political discourses of both distinct cultures, expressing their identities.

In the analysis of the speech «Remarks of President Donald J. Trump—as prepared for delivery of the inaugural address Friday, January 20, 2017 in Washington, D.C.» it is evident that the speaker employs inclusive pronouns like «we», «our», and «together» to foster a sense of unity and collective purpose. Phrases like «We, the citizens of America, are now joined in a great national effort» and «Together, we will determine the course of America and the world for years to come» emphasize collective effort and shared responsibility. According to Austin's (1962) theory of performative utterances, these phrases do more than convey information—they actively create a sense of community and commitment among the audience [9]. The speaker is binding the people to a shared cause, therefore uniting them. Motivating the audience and bringing them behind the speaker's vision depends mostly on this approach.

The speaker then juxtaposes this quiet transfer with the assertion made by «we are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the American People.» This denotes a major shift—positioning the speaker as a defender of the people against an establishment that is not receptive. Here the wording is antithetic, contrasting «the establishment» with «the people,» so stressing the speaker's position as a reformer seeking to give the general people power back-off.

A commissive speech act [10] is the dedication of the speaker to a future course of action by means of the power transfer to the people. In political debate, this is crucial to create credibility and project responsibility. The speech is full of vivid language meant to arouse national pride and passion. Notions like «This is your day. This is your party. And this, the United States of America, is your country. We will bring back our employment. We shall restore our boundaries. We shall return our riches. And we shall bring back our dreams» are used to produce a strong rhythm and underline the message of emancipation and healing.

With references to «We share one heart, one home, and one glorious destiny,» the speaker underlines emotional oneness. Common in political speeches, this kind of emotional appeal—pathos—is meant to create a closer emotional relationship with the listener [7].

The phrase «We are one nation—and their pain is our pain» resonates deeply. Their dreams are our dreams, and their success will be our success,» emphasizes collectivism and national solidarity. While in this speech the collectivism is portrayed in the framework of shared progress and overcoming common issues, in Uzbek political speeches it is typically founded in traditional values and cultural identity.

In order to lay out commitments and promises for future activities, the speaker regularly employs declarative statements: «We will build new roads, highways, and bridges, and airports, and tunnels, and railways all across our wonderful nation.» A

sense of urgency and resolve to better the nation's future is communicated by the focus on certain initiatives and infrastructure reconstruction. «But that is the past,» the speaker says, drawing a comparison between previous failures and future goals. We are now solely focused on the future. This change highlights a departure from the norm, a common tactic in political debate meant to present oneself as a transforming leader [1].

Promises like «We will bring back our jobs» and «We will build new roads» serve as per for roads and commissive speech acts [9]. They are meant to inspire trust and present the speaker as aggressively serving the good of the people. This effective use of language helps the audience to be motivated and to develop belief in a fresh idea.

The speaker uses populist rhetoric to position «the establishment» as the adversary of «the people». Declarations like «For people,», a small group in our nation's capital has reaped the rewards of government while the people have borne the cost» use aggressive language to set apart the elites from the general population. This posture helps to create a story of recovering authority and making the institution answerable [6].

Statements such as «We will be protected by the great men and women of our military and law enforcement, and, most importantly, we are protected by God» convey a promise of security. The speaker employs religious references to appeal to faith-based sentiments, which enhances the perceived moral legitimacy of the message [4].

«Birinci navbatda... Ikkinchidan... Uchinchidan... To'rtinchidan... Beshinchidan...» (First of all... Second... Third... Fourth... Fifth...)

When talking about changes to the way government works, the speech uses an organized listing method. This way of doing things makes it easy to understand and follow the information. The audience can better understand the government's priorities and trust its methodical approach when the goals are broken down into separate parts that show a logical development and thorough planning.

«Men bir fikrni takrorlashdan charchamayman: xalqimiz hamma narsadan ustun qo'yadigan adolatni hayotimizda tom ma'noda qaror toptirish eng asosiy vazifamizga aylanishi shart». I will never tire of repeating this: ensuring justice, which our people value above all else, must become our primary mission.

The repetition of the commitment to justice underscores its importance and conveys a sense of urgency. By emphasizing justice as a core value, the President aims to align the audience's focus with the same high standards and priorities.

Both of the leaders promote togetherness by using inclusive pronouns like «we» and «our» rather regularly. Often using pronouns like «we», «our» and «together» Trump's speech helps to create a common goal. Declarations like, «We, the people of America, are now joined in a great national effort,» stress group accountability. This indicates an effort to organize the American people around a common aim of change and national resurrection. Similarly, Shavkat Mirziyoyev's speech employs phrases like «biz» (we) and addresses the audience as «muhtaram deputat va senatorlar» (respected deputies and senators), reflecting inclusion and shared responsibility, so engaging citizens directly in national growth.

Leaders from both countries cite their past to inspire pride. With lines like «We are transferring power from Washington, D.C., and giving it back to you, the American People», Donald Trump stresses American exceptionalism and creates a populist narrative against the establishment, so establishing himself as the people's champion. Shavkat Mirziyoyev, on the other hand, stresses Uzbekistan's outstanding intellectuals and rich cultural and historical legacy, including «qadimiy madaniyat va sivilizatsiyalar chorrhasi» (crossroads of ancient civilizations and languages). This is meant to inspire national pride and bring people together over a common legacy.

Both speeches make frequent use of the rhetorical tactic of repetition. Trump says things like «We will bring back our jobs.» We shall bring back our borders to underline the main idea of rehabilitation and motivate hope in his audience. Mirziyoyev also frequently emphasizes the need for justice, «xalqimiz hamma narsadan ustun qo'yadigan adolatni hayotimizda tom ma'noda

qaror toptirish eng asosiy vazifamiziga aylanishi shart,» therefore ensuring that justice must become our first concern.

Mirziyoyev uses a structured and systematic approach, explicitly stating priorities in an orderly manner with phrases like "Birinchi navbatda... Ikkinchidan... Uchinchidan..." First, Second, and Third provide clarity and logical flow to his message, making it more accessible. Despite being organized, Trump's speech emphasizes a fresh beginning by contrasting the past with the future and departing from the status quo: «But that is the past. And now we are looking only to the future,» says the transformative leader.

Both speeches contain performative speech acts[9] that seek to effectuate action beyond mere words. Donald Trump articulates specific commitments, such as the construction of new roads, highways, and bridges, which position him as a leader advocating for change. Shavkat Mirziyoyev similarly commits to judicial reforms through practical measures, including the establishment of the Sud hokimiyati mustaqilligini ta'minlashga ko'maklashish komissiyasi (Commission to Ensure the Independence of the Judiciary), thus creating a framework for tangible reform and accountability.

Trump's speech makes use of religious references, "We are protected by God," which appeals to faith-based sentiments and adds moral legitimacy to his message. Shavkat Mirziyoyev, on the other hand, emphasizes cultural and moral qualities to appeal to his audience by making fewer religious references but rather appeals to traditional values like «bag'rikeng xalqimiz,» our kind people.

The results fit Austin's theory of performative utterances by showing how Uzbek political leaders unite using formal and culturally relevant language. In contrast, English political leaders often use performative acts that emphasize individualism and credibility, which is consistent with Searle's notions of how speech acts can establish authority and trust. By using

performative speech acts, both Uzbek and English political leaders perform specific social functions – such as promising economic reforms or calling for unity – that help in shaping public perception and legitimizing their authority. This shows how naturally linked to the socio-cultural expectations of every culture the communicative tactics applied in political discourse are.

Cross-cultural communication, international diplomacy, and political linguistic research all depend on an awareness of these differences. It emphasizes the requirement of context in the efficacy of political communication and the need of political leaders to modify their techniques to fit cultural standards and audience expectations. These insights can also be valuable for political analysts, linguists, and communication specialists interested in the dynamics of power, language, and audience interaction in political discourse.

**Conclusion.** This comparative analysis underscores the substantial influence of cultural context on political discourse. Although both Donald J. Trump and Shavkat Mirziyoyev employ inclusive language, emotive appeals, and repetition to promote unity, their rhetorical methods embody different cultural norms. Mirziyoyev's address underscores collectivism and tradition, bolstering national identity, while Trump's discourse is straightforward, populist, and focused on change.

Both leaders utilise performative and commissive speech acts to develop credibility and unify their audience; yet, their methodologies diverge—Uzbek political discourse emphasises formality and cultural references, whilst English-speaking politicians favour a conversational manner to foster trust.

These findings highlight the significance of cultural sensitivity in political communication, especially in international relations and cross-cultural diplomacy. Modifying rhetorical methods to conform to cultural norms improves the efficacy of political communication and promotes greater audience involvement.

## REFERENCES

1. Fairclough, N. (2001). *Language and Power* (2nd ed.). Pearson Education.
2. Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as Structure and Process*. SAGE Publications.
3. Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (2009). *Methods of Critical Discourse Analysis* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications.
4. Chilton, P. A., & Schäffner, C. (2002). *Politics as Text and Talk: Analytic Approaches to Political Discourse*. John Benjamins Publishing.
5. Khudaykulov, A. E., & Isoqova, F. S. (2024). Functioning of Borrowed Words of English Origin in Uzbek Political Texts. *Mental Enlightenment Scientific-Methodological Journal*, 5(08), 113-125.
6. Lakoff, G. (2004). *Don't Think of an Elephant!: Know Your Values and Frame the Debate*. Chelsea Green Publishing.
7. Charteris-Black, J. (2011). *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
8. White House Archives. (2017). Inaugural Address by President Donald J. Trump. Retrieved from <https://trumpwhitehouse.archives.gov/briefings-statements/the-inaugural-address/>
9. Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
10. Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.