



## COMMUNICATIVE DISCOURSE AND COMMUNICATIVE STRATEGY

*Teshaboyev Izzatjon Islomjon o'g'li*  
*Kenjaboev Sanjarbek Adhamjon o'g'li*  
*Orifova Yulduzxon Qurbonjon qizi*

*Teachers at Polytechnic N. 1, Fergana region, Dangara district*

### ABSTRACT

This article describes the political discourse and its specific features, associated types of analysis. Participants of political discourse and their delimitation during the communication were also studied.

Keywords: political discourse, delimitation, conceptual imagery, extralinguistics, politician, communicative phenomena, manipulation, audience, language imagery, semiotic analysis.

### ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqolada siyosiy diskurs va uning o'ziga xos xususiyatlari, unga bog'liq bo'lgan tahlil turlari yoritilgan. Shuningdek, siyosiy diskurs ishtirokchilari va muloqot jarayonida ularning delimitatsiyaga olinishi ham o'rganilgan.

Nowadays the notion of discourse is widely used in a variety of academic fields including political science, linguistics, philosophy, psychology, cultural studies and many other. This notion is attributed to become a certain paradigm as well. Thus, there is a variety of approaches to define this notion depending on a certain academic field. The paper aims to provide an overview of discourse as a notion and discuss its peculiar characteristics from the point of view of linguistics. When giving the definition of discourse, N. D. Arutyunova provides three perspectives to discuss. The first one would be when discourse is regarded a coherent text together with a set of extralinguistic aspects including pragmatic, sociocultural, psychological ones and other. Discourse can also be viewed as a text within a specific context. The last would be when discourse is regarded as speech



viewed as intended social action, a component of human interaction and cognition. It is worthwhile mentioning that N. D. Arutyunova sees discourse as speech imbedded in context. As E. S. Kubryakova points out, from the point of view of cognitive linguistics the distinction between the two notions (text and discourse) is quite natural since it correlates with the contrast between cognition and its outcome. According to E. S. Kubryakova, discourse can be assumed as a cognitive process related to speech production while a text is the outcome of speech. Thus, researchers distinguish discourse and text according to a number of criteria, such as functionality and structure, dynamics and statics, process and outcome, topicality and virtuality. In Russian linguistics, V. Z. Demyankov provided the most comprehensive definition of this notion. V. Z. Demyankov claimed that discourse is ‘an arbitral part of text consisting of more than one sentence or an independent part of sentence; which is usually wrapped around some basic concept, creates the overall context, describing people, objects, circumstances, time, actions and etc.’

Before thinking about the specific features of political discourse, we need to define the term political discourse. Despite the fact that such definitions are given in different forms in different areas of society, the most complete and perfect definitions are always given by linguists. When analyzing political speech, first of all, it is necessary to be able to correctly define the object of its study.

What exactly is “political speech”? In this regard, the easiest and most general idea comes to everyone’s imagination. Political discourse is performed by authors, that is, politicians, or their speeches are defined as political discourse. In fact, a large part of political or politicians studies involves the texts of professional politicians, relying on the discourse patterns of Presidents and Prime Ministers and other members of government, parliament or political parties, and governing bodies at both local, national and international levels. In many developed countries of the world, in particular, in the United States, a lot of scientific research is being



conducted based on the analytical discourse approach to study presidential rhetoric. (eg. Campbell and Jamieson 1990; Hart 1984; Snyder and Higgins 1990; Thompson 1987; Windt 1983; 1990) At this point, the group of political, who are the players in the center of the political field, also become the target of research on political discourse analysis. This method of identifying political discourse is not much different from identifying medical, legal, or educational. However, in political science and other political practices, while politicians are crucial as actors and authors of the field, they are not the only participants in political discourse analysis. Therefore, when we conduct speech analysis from the point of view of interaction, we should include political communicative phenomena such as public, people, citizens, “mass” and other groups or categories as listeners and receivers of political speech.

Obviously, the same applies to the definition of media discourse, which must also focus on its audience. And also, when we mean medical, legal or educational discourse, we need to think not only part of participants such as doctors, lawyers, teachers, but also patients, students as participants in this discourse process. Political discourse can be defined as a communicative act in which speakers attempt to convey a specific meaning with the aim of influencing or persuading others. In other words, political speech can be defined as a linguistic strategy manipulation that serves ideological goals. Political discourse can include formal discussions or informal discourse discussions about politics among listeners and family members.

Political speech is essentially an expression of the whole complex of relation between the individual and society and therefore this phenomenon is essentially functionally aimed at forming a certain part of the worldview or world image among the receivers. Using political discourse as a cornerstone, understand how cultural values are modeled in different language communities, how social order is promoted, and which elements of the linguistic representation of the world remain



outside the conscious discourse strategies of speakers. Political speech not only has a meaning related to reality, but also has an important “connection” subjectively associated with a certain group or groups of people. Different subject of communication appear in speech in different ways: communicative forms create their content.

Analysis of important date of political speech is communicative-nominative analysis: who communicates and how he communicates. Political discourse is presented in faces. The face merges with the text, but, at the same time it is the text itself. Mixing this “layer” or content creates new content. As a result, the author concludes that the same text spoken by different people “separetes” into different texts: they are decodes, structured, classified and ordered differently by the audience. They provide a different picture of social interaction.

According to F. Uxfanova, semantic-basic researches of political speech can provide important material about modern speech in general and about political speech in particular. At this stage of society’s development, it ios necessary to determine the characteristics of political speech, as well as, to determine the historical and nationalspecific features of political speech, the continuity or discontinuity of certain styles, types, forms. A political text is a product of the conflict of different interests and strategies, resulting ideas, voluntary actions and discourses of the political subject. A political text is verbalized political activity in all its forms: both signified/symbolic (normative and accumulative activities) and insigned (performative texts). This concept covers the subject scope and style features of political activity carried out in language and through language.

According to Sheygal the most characteristic of all types of communicative actions for “political” speech is the intarnational actions of “persuasion” manifested in various entho-specific methods. These ethno- cultural styles are created as a result of a complex interaction of two types of sterotypes; linguistics related to the semantic adventages of the language and related to behavioral norms



and value criteria established in society. Persuasion is effective if it is implemented on the basis of principles that reflect established behaviours and attitudes in the community.

Therefore, when interpreting the political speech as a whole, one should not be limited to purely linguistic moments, otherwise the essence and purpose of the political speech will be overlooked. Understanding political discourse involves knowing the background, the expectation of the author and the audience, the hidden intentions, the plot patterns, and the favorite logical transitions that exist in a given period. Thus, political discourse comprises all types of interaction of an individual and society, creating worldview. Political discourse reveals the way cultural values and social order are imposed in different societies. This type of discourse includes a variety of political discussions in the society, including ones with the politicians and officials and public rhetoric.

#### REFERENCES:

1. Ухванова И.Ф. План содержания текста: от анализа к синтезу, от структуры к системе. И.Ф.Ухвановаю Философская и социологическая мысль. Киев,1993-№3
2. Ухванова И.Ф. Смысловые и сущностные параметры политического дискурса в фокусе внимания исследователя
3. И.Ф.Ухванова. Язык и социум: материалы II междунар. конф. - Минск, 1998. Киев.
4. What is Political Discourse Analysis? Teun A. van Dijk. Universiteit van Amsterdam
5. van Dijk, T. A., ed. 1985. Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Vol. 3. Discourse and Dialogue. London: Academic Press.
6. Verba, S., Schlozman, K. L., Brady, H., & Nie, N. H. 1993. Citizen Activity: Who Participates: What Do They Say. *American Political Science Review* 87(2): 303-318.