COMMUNICATIVE CHARACTERISATION OF POLITICAL DISCOURSE IN A SOCIAL CONTEXT

Abdiyev Mavlonbek Xolmurot o'g'li
Faculty of English Philology
Department of English Language Teaching methodology and educational technologies
Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent
Email: mavlon9792@gmail.com
DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22916970

Abstract. This study explores the communicative tactics used in political discourse, with an emphasis on current world leaders' addresses. The study investigates how linguistic aspects such as metaphors, evaluative lexicon, and framing influence public perception and political legitimacy in the context of social interaction. The findings emphasize the function of language in shaping political realities and legitimizing authority.

Keywords: Political discourse, communicative strategies, metaphors, evaluative lexicon, framing, social context

Introduction

Political discourse is an important instrument for leaders to express their policies, ideas, and ideologies to the general public. Leaders use speeches, news conferences, and interviews to convey their policies, share their ideals, and persuade or influence the public. Discourse can be used to shape perceptions, mobilize support, and legitimise authority in addition to communicating facts. Understanding the communicative methods embedded in these discourses is critical for analyzing how political messages are constructed and received. In political speech, leaders employ certain methods to make their statements more persuasive and effective. Metaphors, rhetorical questions, repetition, framing, and emotional or value appeals are all examples of such methods. Understanding how communications are received entails investigating the impact of discourse on the audience. This entails examining how different social groups, individuals, or media interpret and respond to the message. The purpose of this study is to investigate the language elements found in presidential addresses and examine how they shape political narratives within a social environment.

Methodology and Analysis

This study takes a Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) method, concentrating on recent presidents' speeches. CDA allows for the investigation of how language reflects and reinforces power relations and ideologies in society. CDA is used in political discourse to investigate how leaders' statements reinforce or challenge political ideas, power structures, and societal norms. It identifies how leaders use language to match their viewpoints with specific ideals, advocate specific policies, and justify their actions. Political leaders' speeches frequently reinforce prevalent ideas or attempt to persuade their audiences to embrace specific worldviews or ways of thinking. Metaphor analysis is the study of the metaphors employed by political leaders in their speeches and how they influence the public's comprehension of political issues. A metaphor is a rhetorical tactic that helps people understand complex or abstract subjects by relating them to something more familiar or concrete.

Mualliflik huquqi egasi tomonidan ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

Metaphors frequently shape how individuals see political events, concerns, and identities. Metaphors such as "the war on terror" and "fighting for freedom" are prominent in political discourse. These metaphors define political issues in terms of conflict, urgency, and moral struggle, influencing how the public perceives the situation. CDA's metaphor analysis reveals how these metaphors represent underlying ideologies such as militarism, nationalism, or a moral need to protect the nation. The Evaluative Lexicon refers to specific terms or phrases used by political actors to indicate judgment, approval, or disapproval. These are words with an evaluative charge, reflecting a positive or negative attitude toward a specific subject, organization, or individual. In political speeches, evaluative language is frequently used to position policies, acts, or organizations according to their perceived value. This can include using adjectives (e.g., "just," "brutal," "unfair"), nouns (e.g., "freedom," "tyranny"), or verbs (e.g., "defend," "oppress"). These evaluative phrases impact the audience's perception of political topics and personalities, influencing their attitudes and opinions. For example, in political speeches, a leader may use evaluative language such as "courageous" to commend a military action or "dangerous" to describe an opposing political doctrine. This evaluative language shapes the discourse by matching it with certain moral or ethical judgments, altering how others see the activity or policy under consideration. When performing CDA, speaker selection is a crucial part of the study. Speeches are chosen based on their relevance to current political events, as they provide a rich framework for comprehending the language employed by politicians to address current issues. Relevance to Political Events: Examining speeches related to contemporary political concerns, such as economic crises, foreign policy, or social movements, provides for an assessment of how leaders respond to or affect public debate on these matters. Speeches delivered in response to national tragedies or political scandals, for example, reveal how leaders employ language to manipulate public opinion, maintain authority, or push specific ideas. For example, Franklin D. Roosevelt's "Day of Infamy" address, which he gave on December 8, 1941, in the wake of the Pearl Harbor assault, is a fantastic illustration of this concept in action. This speech demonstrates how a leader can respond to a national disaster and influence public opinion using language in a way that upholds power and advances a particular goal.
The speech connects to the statement in the following ways:
National Tragedy: The Pearl Harbor attack was a terrible national catastrophe. Roosevelt's speech was crucial in defining the public's response because it was given during a period of extreme shock and terror. The use of the phrase "a date which will live in infamy" by Roosevelt was a rhetorical device intended to elicit a strong emotional response from the American audience. Establishing that such behavior could not be tolerated, he named Japan as the aggressor and presented the attack as a direct assault on American principles. Roosevelt did this in an effort to increase public support for joining World War II.

Discussion

The communicative methods found in the investigation demonstrate how political leaders use language to generate realities that promote their agendas. Metaphors simplify difficult situations, making them more approachable and emotionally appealing. The evaluative lexicon matches the audience's values to the speaker's message, generating a sense of shared philosophy. Framing focuses attention on key parts of an issue, altering public perception and legitimizing political activities. These methods are more than just linguistic choices; they reflect and reinforce power systems and ideologies. Understanding these methods is vital for critically engaging in political debate and seeing how language impacts political realities.

Mualliflik huquqi egasi tomonidan ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.

Conclusion

Finally, studying political discourse is essential for understanding how language, ideology, and power interact to shape public perception. Analyzing political leaders' communicative techniques helps us understand how discourse creates and disseminates political ideologies, ultimately impacting social beliefs and values. We are more equipped to critically examine political messaging, detect the influence of framing, and comprehend the ideological dynamics that dominate current political discourse after using CDA. This understanding is necessary not only for academic research, but also for developing an informed and engaged populace capable of critically interacting with political narratives and actively participating in democratic processes.

References:

1. Charteris-Black, J. (2005). Politicians and rhetoric: The persuasive power of metaphor. Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Chilton, P. (2004). Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice. Routledge.
3. Fairclough, N. (1989). Language and power. Longman.
4. Hart, C. (2010). Critical discourse analysis and cognitive science: New perspectives on immigration discourse. Palgrave Macmillan.
5. Lakoff, G. (2004). Don't think of an elephant! Know your values and frame the debate. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Mualliflik huquqi egasi tomonidan ushbu material Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 (CC BY 4.0) litsenziyasi asosida tarqatiladi.