

# The Discursive Features of Speech Acts in Uzbek Media

Axmadjonov Nurbek Zokirjon o'g'li

Fergana state university, Faculty of foreign languages, Associate professor of the Department of German and French languages, PhD in Philosophical Sciences, Uzbekistan

Anvarova Ominaxon Sherzod qizi

Fergana state university, Faculty of foreign languages, 3rd year Student, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 23 February 2025; **Accepted:** 12 March 2025; **Published:** 22 April 2025

**Abstract:** Understanding the discursive nature of these speech acts requires peeling back layers of intention, form, and effect. From a casual morning news report to a fiery political debate, from a government press release to a social media post—every utterance performs an act. This article delves into these performative structures, drawing from foundational theories and applying them to authentic Uzbek media texts to illuminate how speech acts operate discursively and powerfully in public discourse.

**Keywords:** Ideologies, contextual embeddedness, intertextuality, audience-directed, audience-directed pragmatics, media discourse, performative nationalism, genre sensitivity and intertextuality.

**Introduction:** If words were shadows, speech acts would be the light behind them — unseen yet illuminating, fleeting yet powerful. Now, imagine a space where these shadows dance daily across millions of minds — the media. It is not merely a transmitter of information; it is a living, breathing organism — shaping, persuading, masking, and revealing. And in this vast echo chamber of utterances, the Uzbek media discourse becomes a particularly intriguing case. Furthermore, every sentence uttered on air, every line published on paper, and every quote captured in interviews holds more than its literal meaning. Beneath the surface of statements like “Bu xalq bilan biz birgamiz” (“We are united with this nation”) or “Kelajak yoshlar qo'lida” (“The future is in the hands of the young people”) lies a complex network of intentions, power dynamics, politeness strategies, ideologies, and cultural undercurrents. These are not just words — they are acts. Acts of requesting, promising, asserting, questioning, warning, manipulating, and motivating. But what makes these acts truly fascinating in the Uzbek media context is their discursive embeddedness — how they are not just shaped by grammar, but by culture, hierarchy, norms, genre, and context. A presidential address and a street interview might use

similar linguistic forms but carry entirely different perlocutionary effects, as J.L. Austin (1962) would say. Uzbek society, with its rich oral traditions, honorific expressions, and collectivist underpinnings, makes every speech act an encoded reflection of identity, politeness, and power. This article aims to delve deep into those layers — exploring how discursive features such as contextual embeddedness, politeness strategies, intertextuality, genre-awareness, and performativity manifest within speech acts in contemporary Uzbek media. Grounded in Speech Act Theory (Austin, Searle) and enriched through insights from discourse analysis frameworks (Fairclough, Hymes, Mey), it sheds light on how speech functions not merely as communication — but as cultural performance, political negotiation, and social choreography. In a world where every media utterance can ignite debates, mold public opinion, or restore faith, understanding these discursive features becomes not only relevant — but urgent. And perhaps, just perhaps, in decoding these patterns, we get closer to understanding how power truly speaks in our society — and how we, knowingly or unknowingly, listen.

## Literature Review

Language, as we encounter it in everyday life and media, is far more than a vehicle for conveying information—it is an instrument of action, power, and intent. This conceptual pivot was famously introduced by J.L. Austin (1962) in his seminal work *How to Do Things with Words*, where he unfolded the performative nature of language, dividing speech into three functional layers: locutionary (the act of saying something), illocutionary (the intended meaning), and perlocutionary (the effect it has on the listener). These categories reframed the understanding of spoken or written statements as acts in themselves—capable of transforming social realities. Building upon Austin’s foundation, John Searle (1969) extended the theory with a precise taxonomy of speech acts: Assertives (statements of belief), Directives (requests, commands), Commissives (promises, threats), Expressives (emotions and attitudes), and Declarations (statements that enact change, like verdicts or resignations). When filtered through the lens of media discourse, this theoretical framework illuminates the intricate power language holds in shaping public perception and behavior. Example from Uzbek Media: “Iltimos, hushyor bo’ling – O’zgidromet kuchli shamollar haqida ogohlantiradi.” (“Please, stay alert – Uzhydromet warns about strong winds.”) (— Source: O’zbekiston 24 TV channel, January 12, 2024, 20:00 broadcast.)

At a surface level, this utterance performs a locutionary act—it states a fact. However, the embedded illocutionary force is more nuanced: the phrase “Iltimos, hushyor bo’ling” functions as a directive urging the public to take caution. The perlocutionary effect aims to instigate behavioral change, prompting citizens to secure their homes or adjust travel plans. What makes this example particularly compelling is the softened imperative form. Instead of a blunt command (“Bo’ling hushyor!”), the use of “iltimos” (please) signals politeness, aligning with Searle’s concept of indirect speech acts—where a speaker achieves a goal (warning or advising) without overtly demanding action, thus respecting the autonomy of the audience. It reflects the discursive feature of indirectness common in public service announcements to maintain trust and mitigate resistance. Such examples show that speech act theory is not an abstract concept, but a living framework for analyzing how Uzbek media balances clarity, authority, and sociocultural politeness in its messaging.

Language does not merely reflect reality—it shapes it. It constructs social identities, reinforces ideologies, and either legitimizes or challenges existing power structures. This profound realization forms the backbone of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA),

pioneered by Norman Fairclough in his influential work *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language* (1995). Fairclough asserts that discourse is inherently political and social—it is a site of struggle where power is produced, negotiated, and sometimes resisted. CDA is not just about analyzing words; it is about uncovering the power relations embedded within texts and speech, particularly in institutional and media contexts. Media discourse, especially state-affiliated media, plays a pivotal role in manufacturing consent, constructing national identity, and legitimizing political authority. This is vividly seen in the Uzbek media. Example from Uzbek Media: “Biz xalq uchun xizmat qilamiz.” (“We serve the people.”) (— Televised statement by a state official during a press conference on UzReport TV, April 2023.) At first glance, the statement seems purely declarative and informative—a public servant stating their purpose. But through the lens of discursive analysis, it carries a heavier ideological weight. The utterance functions as a rhetorical strategy to assert political legitimacy and project moral authority. The phrase “xalq uchun” (for the people) evokes solidarity, trust, and inclusiveness, aligning the speaker with the masses. From Fairclough’s perspective, this is a clear instance of ideological language that reinforces the hegemonic narrative—that the government is altruistic, morally upright, and aligned with public interest. The repetition of such phrases across televised interviews, banners, and news scrolls constructs a discursive field where the legitimacy of political figures is naturalized and rarely questioned.

In discursive terms, this example showcases the intertextuality often found in political discourse—drawing from established ideological motifs such as serving the people, unity, or progress. Over time, these motifs form a discursive hegemony, where alternative narratives may be excluded or marginalized, especially in state-controlled media environments. Furthermore, the power asymmetry between speaker (state official) and audience (citizens) is masked through inclusive pronouns like “biz” (we), which subtly positions the government and people on equal footing. This linguistic move creates the illusion of unity and shared goals, while maintaining institutional authority. Thus, CDA allows us to peel back the layers of what appears to be a neutral statement, revealing how language is weaponized to uphold political narratives and social control in Uzbek media.

If language is a battlefield, then argumentation is its most disciplined combat. Where everyday conversations flow loosely, argumentative discourse—especially in public arenas like media—is governed by logic, rules, and rhetorical maneuvers. This is the

domain of Pragma-Dialectics, a theory meticulously developed by Franz van Ameren and Rob Grootendorst in their seminal work *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discussions* (1984). They proposed that argumentation is not random persuasion but a systematic exchange of speech acts aimed at resolving differences of opinion in a reasonable, structured way. The theory views argumentation as a critical discussion comprising specific stages: confrontation, opening, argumentation, and conclusion. In this model, each speech act plays a strategic role, whether it's challenging a position, defending a standpoint, or closing a disagreement. Example from Uzbek Media: "Siz ilgari bunday va'da bergandingiz. Endi nima uchun buning aksi bo'lyapti?" ("You previously made this promise. Why is the opposite happening now?") (—Host of "Munozara" talk show (Sevimli TV), questioning a local official, October 2023.) This seemingly confrontational question embodies the confrontation stage of pragma-dialectical discourse. The host's question isn't just a query—it functions as a directive speech act intended to challenge the consistency and credibility of the politician's actions. This push often elicits a commissive or declarative response, such as: "Biz bu borada aniq choralar ko'rayapmiz va xalqimizga javob beramiz." ("We are taking concrete measures in this regard and will answer to our people.") Such responses represent a strategic maneuver: a commissive to promise action, wrapped in a declarative to restore authority and assure the public. From a pragma-dialectical lens, this exchange showcases how Uzbek media—particularly politically charged talk shows—become arenas of rational confrontation. Hosts are not merely moderators; they act as institutional protagonists demanding logical consistency and transparency. This aligns with van Ameren and Grootendorst's vision of reasonable argumentation, where discourse follows rules of critical engagement even when power dynamics are asymmetrical. Furthermore, these speech acts are not isolated—they are embedded in a broader discursive culture where public trust is shaped through visibility, rhetoric, and accountability. In the Uzbek context, where political transparency has historically been opaque, such televised confrontations signal a subtle shift toward dialogic engagement, even if within controlled parameters. Pragma-dialectics thus helps decode the invisible architecture behind what appears to be emotionally charged dialogue. It unveils how reasoned speech acts are orchestrated to defend reputations, clarify stances, or shift blame—all while maintaining an illusion of open debate.

Behind every "breaking news" headline lies a calculated blend of language and visuals—an orchestrated

performance designed to evoke curiosity, concern, or outrage. This powerful phenomenon is expertly unpacked in Bednarek and Caple's (2017) influential work *The Discourse of News Values*, where they argue that newsworthiness is not inherently present in events, but constructed through discursive and semiotic choices. News, then, is not merely reported—it is crafted. DNVA introduces the idea that news values such as negativity, proximity, eliteness, impact, and timeliness are not just editorial standards but are actively realized through language and visual resources. What Bednarek and Caple describe is a discursive toolkit that shapes what audiences pay attention to—and how they feel about it. Example from Uzbek Media: "Farg'onada dahshatli YTH: 3 kishi halok bo'ldi, yana 5 nafari og'ir tan jarohati oldi." ("Terrible accident in Fergana: 3 dead, 5 seriously injured.") (—Kun.uz, February 2024 headline.) This headline is a textbook example of how negativity and proximity are linguistically encoded. The use of "dahshatli" (terrible) amplifies the emotional weight of the event, boosting its negativity value, while the explicit reference to Farg'ona appeals to cultural and geographic proximity, particularly for Uzbek readers. The sentence is structured to foreground human loss—"3 kishi halok bo'ldi"—an appeal to impact, another central news value. What Bednarek and Caple (2017, p. 41) explain is that these values are not discovered, but discursively produced. In the above example, the adjective choice ("dahshatli"), the numerical precision (listing casualties), and the local reference are not merely descriptive—they are discursive moves to elevate the story's perceived importance. Further, visual elements (e.g., a blurred image of the crash site with emergency lights) contribute to the semiotic orchestration of urgency and tragedy. This multimodal packaging turns an accident into a "must-read" moment, reinforcing the constructed hierarchy of significance in the media ecosystem. From a speech act perspective (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969), the headline performs an assertive act—reporting a fact. But it also harbors expressive undertones: it signals societal sorrow, urgency, and a subtle call for action or awareness. Such headlines often trigger perlocutionary effects—shock, fear, sympathy—which are crucial in shaping public discourse. In the broader context of Uzbek media discourse, this technique reflects an evolving trend: emotionally engaging, linguistically dramatized, yet politically cautious reporting. The emotional pull maintains audience engagement, while the structural language of reporting adheres to conventional norms, ensuring safety in expression.

In every spoken word, there is more than just meaning—there is a silent architecture, a hidden

framework that tells us how to interpret what is being said. This is what Dell Hymes (1974) beautifully captured in his SPEAKING model, an ethnographic lens through which language is not only what we say, but also how, where, why, and to whom we say it. Hymes shifted the paradigm of linguistic analysis from focusing solely on structure to appreciating the rich tapestry of context surrounding every speech act. His model—Setting, Participants, Ends, Act sequence, Key, Instrumentalities, Norms, and Genre—offers a comprehensive tool for dissecting real-life communicative events. Especially in media discourse, where audience perception hinges on framing, tone, and purpose, Hymes' insights shine like a lighthouse guiding interpretive clarity. Example from Uzbek Media: "Aziz yurtdoshlar, bugungi kunda hukumatimiz barcha kuchlarini xalqimiz farovonligi yo'lida safarbar qilmoqda." ("Dear compatriots, today our government is mobilizing all resources for the well-being of our people.") (— Government press briefing, O'zbekiston24, January 2024.) This is analysis through Hymes' SPEAKING model:

**S – Setting and Scene:** A formal government press briefing, broadcast on national TV, sets a serious, institutional tone. The setting reinforces the power dynamic—authority addressing the public.

**P – Participants:** The speaker is a high-ranking government official, and the listeners are millions of Uzbek citizens. This dynamic creates an implicit hierarchy, where assertive and commissive speech acts carry weight.

**E – Ends (Purposes):** The overt goal is to reassure the public and display institutional competence. The speech act seeks to calm, inform, and establish trust—what Searle would classify as commissives (promises of action) and assertives (statements of belief/fact).

**A – Act Sequence:** The act begins with emotional solidarity ("Aziz yurtdoshlar"), transitions into the action phase ("barcha kuchlarini safarbar qilmoqda"), and closes with hope or unity appeals. Each stage serves a rhetorical function.

**K – Key (Tone, Manner):** The speech is delivered in a measured, confident tone, reinforcing reliability. The key frames the discourse as serious but under control.

**I – Instrumentalities:** Spoken Uzbek via mass media (TV and social media), employing formal register and state-approved linguistic norms.

**N – Norms:** The cultural expectation is respectful listening and trust in authority—the official is not expected to be interrupted or challenged.

**G – Genre:** This is a political announcement, a genre governed by conventions of gravity, unity, and

certainty.:

From a discursive angle, this speech act is not just informative—it performs legitimacy. The setting and participant roles legitimize the illocutionary force of the speech: when a government official speaks in a formal setting, the act of saying becomes the act of governing. The utterance "mobilizing all resources" carries institutional performativity—an idea that Austin (1962) would regard as a speech act that does something. Moreover, the context-dependent nature of the utterance highlights Hymes' core argument: that understanding a speech act requires more than just grammatical interpretation. We must understand who speaks, in what context, and to what end. As Hymes notes (1974, p. 55), "communicative competence is dependent on knowledge of both grammatical rules and contextual appropriateness."

Moreover, Jacob L. Mey's Pragmatic Act Theory (PAT) emphasizes that language use is deeply embedded in social and cultural contexts. Unlike traditional speech acts theories that focus on isolated utterances, PAT introduces the concept of *pragmemes*—generalized pragmatic acts that are instantiated in specific contexts as *practs*. This approach underscores the importance of situational factors in meaning-making. In a televised public service announcement, a presenter states: "Hurmatli fuqarolar, xavfsizlik kamarini taqing." ("Dear citizens, please fasten your seatbelts.") Here, the utterance functions as a pragmatic act—a *pract* within the broader *pragmeme* of promoting public safety. The effectiveness of this message relies not just on the words themselves but on the shared understanding of the context: a government initiative to reduce traffic accidents. The social norms, cultural expectations, and institutional authority all contribute to the interpretation and impact of the message.

Furthermore, Erving Goffman's Face Theory explores how individuals manage their social identity, or "face," during interactions. In media contexts, particularly in interviews and talk shows, participants engage in *facework* to maintain their public image and avoid embarrassment. During a live interview on a national television program, a journalist questions a government official about delayed infrastructure projects. The official responds: "Loyihalarimiz murakkab, lekin biz ularni muvaffaqiyatli yakunlaymiz." ("Our projects are complex, but we will complete them successfully.") In this exchange, the official performs *facework* by acknowledging challenges while reaffirming commitment to success thus preserving both personal and institutional face. The response mitigates potential face-threatening acts (FTAs) posed by the journalist's question.



When it comes to Mikhail Bakhtin's concept of dialogism posits that all language is inherently dialogic, shaped by and responsive to other voices. In media, this manifests as the interplay of various perspectives, creating a dynamic discourse.

A news segment features a report on agricultural reforms, including interviews with farmers, government officials, and economists. Each provides differing viewpoints:

- Farmers express concerns about implementation challenges;
- Officials highlight policy benefits;
- Economists discuss potential economic impacts;

This multiplicity of voices exemplifies polyphony, a key aspect of dialogism, where

the truth emerges from the interaction of diverse perspectives rather than a single authoritative narrative.

In addition, Michel Foucault's Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) offers a compelling lens through which to examine how power, knowledge, and language interlock to structure social reality. In his seminal lecture "L'ordre du discours" (The Order of Discourse, 1970), Foucault argued that discourse is not merely a vehicle of communication but a mechanism of control—one that produces knowledge, shapes perception, and regulates behavior. Unlike traditional discourse theories that merely describe language structures, Foucault emphasized that discourse governs what can be said, who may speak, and in what contexts. Within this paradigm, discourse is power—embedded in institutions, reproduced through repetition, and naturalized as truth. Example: The Ideological Weight of "Yangi O'zbekistonni birga quramiz" ("Let's build a New Uzbekistan together"). At first glance, this may seem like a motivational phrase, a benign call for unity. But under the magnifying lens of FDA, this slogan is much more than its surface suggests. Discursive Construction of Ideology: This phrase is not an isolated utterance; it is a ritualized speech act—a discursive performance institutionalized through frequent media repetition. It appears on television broadcasts, in presidential speeches, during school assemblies, and even on billboards and public transportation. This repetition normalizes a particular worldview: that national progress is inseparable from state leadership and collective obedience.

Who Speaks and Who Must Listen? Foucault's concern with the politics of who controls discourse becomes evident here. The slogan is typically voiced by political elites, government representatives, or officially endorsed media anchors. The audience—the general

public—is positioned not as originators of discourse but as receivers, whose task is to affirm and internalize the message.

Power-Knowledge Nexus: The slogan not only instructs but constructs knowledge—specifically, the idea that this "New Uzbekistan" is already under way, and your participation is a moral imperative. To question the slogan's vision becomes not just dissent but a challenge to an entire discursive regime. Foucault argues that discourse "disciplines" subjects—not through overt censorship but through the internalization of norms. In Uzbek media, the institutionalization of such slogans shapes public consciousness: It defines what is acceptable speech ("unity," "development," "togetherness"). It silences counter-narratives, like critiques of governance or alternative visions for reform. It maps citizens' social identities, casting them as collaborators in a national mission. As Foucault puts it: "In every society the production of discourse is at once controlled, selected, organized and redistributed by a certain number of procedures." (Foucault, 1970, p. 52) This is where FDA uniquely enriches speech act theory: it shows how institutional power shapes not only what is said, but how speech acts are received and interpreted. In Uzbek media, ideological declarations, though they may seem performative (in Searle's terms), gain their real force through institutional legitimization—they don't merely reflect reality, they construct it.

In the ever-evolving world of media, where attention is currency and impressions build identities, advertising doesn't merely inform—it performs, persuades, and positions. The intersection between stylistics (how something is said) and pragmatics (what is meant or intended) forms the bedrock of what is now known as pragma-stylistic analysis. This hybrid approach is brilliantly exemplified in the work of Alam, Ali, & Khan (2022), who analyze how media discourse—especially in advertisements—merges aesthetic language choices with pragmatic goals, especially in digital contexts.

Pragma-stylistic analysis explores how linguistic form, visual style, and communicative intent operate together in media. According to Alam et al. (2022), advertisements are crafted not only to showcase products but to perform speech acts—creating trust, desire, identity, and emotional resonance. These speech acts, when framed stylistically, become powerful tools of interaction between brand and consumer.

Advertisements, especially in digital formats, blur the lines between art and action, making slogans and catchphrases performative utterances—language that doesn't just describe reality, but alters it by creating

emotional alignment and behavioral influence. “Stylistic creativity paired with pragmatic function results in persuasive power that transcends traditional communication” (Alam et al., 2022, p. 1365) Example: The Pragmatic Power of “Hayotingizni osonlashtiramiz!” A perfect embodiment of this strategy is Ortel’s (company) widely circulated slogan: “Hayotingizni osonlashtiramiz!” (“We make your life easier!”)

On the surface, it’s a kind, helpful statement. But within the realm of pragma-stylistic analysis, it’s a multi-layered performative act with specific discursive features:

#### 1. Performative Act as a Commissive:

The statement functions as a commissive speech act (Searle, 1969)—the brand makes a promise to the consumer. This isn’t a simple descriptor; it’s an act of commitment, projecting reliability and usefulness.

#### 2. Stylistic Simplicity and Direct Appeal:

The sentence is short, emotionally comforting, and second-person oriented, directly involving the audience in the action. The verb “osonlashtiramiz” (we simplify) creates a relational bond—the brand is not just offering a product, it’s entering your life to improve it.

#### 3. Implicit Power Dynamics:

While seemingly harmless, the phrase also subtly positions the brand as a solution-giver, placing the consumer in a dependent, trusting role. This is aligned with Foucauldian perspectives on how discourse creates subjectivity—the speaker (brand) is empowered, while the listener (consumer) is guided.

#### Cultural Resonance in Uzbek Media

This stylistic-pragmatic blend resonates in Uzbek society, where warmth, collectivism, and mutual assistance are culturally valued. The speech act reinforces these values, aligning commercial messaging with national and emotional discourse. Furthermore, digital ads across Telegram channels and YouTube segments frequently use such speech acts in combination with soothing music, bright visuals, and domestic imagery, enhancing the stylistic performance. In the broader framework of speech act theory and discourse studies, this pragma-stylistic approach demonstrates how modern media, especially digital advertising, uses speech acts not just to communicate—but to build relationships, inspire action, and shape identity. The Artel slogan doesn’t just promise—it performs trust.

According to News Value Theory, as outlined by Bednarek and Caple (2017), media outlets strategically employ expressive speech acts to amplify the

emotional impact of a story, heightening its appeal and significance. The use of emotionally charged language is a key technique for engaging audiences, ensuring that the message resonates on a personal level and reinforces the urgency or gravity of an event. Consider the example: “Bu fojia hammamizni larzaga soldi!” (“This tragedy has shaken all of us!”) from an emergency report by Gazeta.uz (2023). This statement is an emotionally charged expressive, aiming not only to inform but also to stir emotions in the audience. The use of “fojia” (tragedy) and “larzaga soldi” (has shaken) evokes a strong emotional reaction, emphasizing the severity of the event. The language choice here serves to create a sense of collective emotional involvement, inviting the audience to connect personally with the reported tragedy. Bednarek and Caple (2017) argue that such speech acts are integral in news discourse, where the goal is often to not just relay facts but to draw viewers into the emotional landscape of the event. By emphasizing the impact on the community, this report shifts from a purely informational tone to one that seeks empathy and heightened emotional engagement. In discursive terms, the statement strategically utilizes emotional appeal to increase the news value of the event. The speaker does not just report an incident; they construct a shared emotional reality where the audience is invited to feel the collective shock and sorrow, amplifying the newsworthiness of the story. The emotional language ensures that the tragedy is not merely an event but an experience that resonates with the audience, making it more memorable and impactful.

Genre Theory, as proposed by Bakhtin (1986), emphasizes that speech acts adapt to specific genres, each carrying its own set of expectations, conventions, and communicative goals. This adaptability ensures that language functions effectively within different contexts, whether in news reporting, advertising, or interviews. Bakhtin’s theory highlights that speech acts not only reflect the content of a message but also adhere to the distinctive rules and expectations of the medium in which they appear. A prime example of this is the phrase: “Siz uchun maxsus chegirmalar!” (“Exclusive discounts just for you!”) used in advertising. This statement functions as both an expressive and a directive speech act. It expresses enthusiasm and exclusivity, appealing to the audience’s desire for special treatment, while simultaneously directing them to take action—likely to make a purchase or engage with the brand. In terms of Bakhtin’s framework, the phrase is genre-sensitive because it aligns with the expectations of the advertising genre, where the goal is not merely to inform but to persuade and evoke an emotional response. The use of “maxsus” (exclusive)

and “siz uchun” (just for you) is tailored to create a sense of personalized appeal, a common tactic in advertising to strengthen the relationship between the brand and the consumer. The directive element, urging action (purchase or engagement), is interwoven with the expressive elements to reinforce the emotional appeal while guiding the audience toward a specific response. Bakhtin’s concept of intertextuality also comes into play here: the phrase is not only shaped by the genre conventions of advertising but also draws upon broader cultural and commercial narratives. The use of “exclusive” discounts taps into a familiar discourse of consumerism, where individuals are encouraged to act upon their desires and perceived opportunities. Thus, this example illustrates how speech acts are crafted with sensitivity to the genre in which they operate. The combination of expressive and directive elements aligns with the persuasive goals of advertising, demonstrating how language adapts to its social function and cultural context.

Foucauldian Discourse Theory (Foucault, 1970) posits that language is not merely a vehicle for communication but a tool for constructing and perpetuating power relations. Speech acts, particularly those repeated within institutional settings, contribute to the formation of ideologies and societal norms. In the case of performative nationalism, repeated slogans serve to institutionalize certain national identities and reinforce the authority of the state. Consider the statement: “Biz kuchli davlatmiz!” (“We are a strong nation!”) from a presidential address in December 2023. This utterance serves as a performative act—its power lies not only in its content but in its repetition and institutional context. The phrase isn’t simply an assertion; it actively performs the reality it describes, reinforcing the narrative of national strength and unity. The repetition of such slogans in presidential addresses, state media, and public speeches helps institutionalize the idea of strength as a core national value. Foucault (1970) argues that repetition of specific discourses within institutions helps solidify power structures. By continuously invoking national strength, the speech act not only reflects the current political narrative but actively constructs it, making it a self-sustaining truth within the political discourse. This performative act aligns individuals with a shared identity, reinforcing the legitimacy of the political leadership and the idea of a unified, powerful nation. In Foucauldian terms, this speech act is a manifestation of power through discourse. It shapes the collective national consciousness, framing the political authority as the embodiment of strength. Over time, the repetition of such phrases institutionalizes them, making them seem natural, even inevitable, in the

political landscape. Thus, the performative nature of this speech act reflects how language can construct reality and solidify power within a given context.

Grice’s Cooperative Principle (1975) emphasizes that effective communication relies on the speaker’s adherence to four key maxims: quantity (providing the right amount of information), quality (ensuring truthfulness), relation (maintaining relevance), and manner (maximizing clarity). In media discourse, these maxims guide how information is presented to ensure that it is clear, relevant, and informative to the audience. Take the example: “Bugun soat 18:00 dan gaz uzilishi kutilmoqda” (“The gas supply is expected to be interrupted from 6:00 PM today”) from a local utility warning. This statement adheres to Grice’s maxims in a straightforward manner, ensuring clarity and relevance. The message is concise (maximizing quantity), truthful (maximizing quality), relevant (the information is directly applicable to the audience), and clear (delivered in a simple, unambiguous format). The pragmatics of this statement are audience-directed because it is tailored to meet the needs of the public in a way that ensures comprehension. The timing and nature of the gas supply interruption are presented in a way that helps the audience take appropriate action—whether that’s preparing for the interruption or adjusting their schedules. The media, following Grice’s principle, ensures that the message is not overloaded with unnecessary details but remains focused on what is immediately relevant to the audience’s daily life. In Gricean terms, this message reflects the careful balance between informativeness and brevity, ensuring that the audience receives essential information in an efficient, easily digestible format. By adhering to the Cooperative Principle, the message maximizes the potential for effective communication, guiding the audience’s actions and minimizing misunderstandings.

## METHODOLOGY

This research employs a qualitative, interpretive methodology, grounded in pragma-stylistic analysis and enriched by contemporary theories of speech acts and critical discourse analysis. Drawing from the works of Austin, Searle, Mey, Goffman, Hymes, Fairclough, Bakhtin, Foucault, and Grice, the study investigates how speech acts are discursively realized in Uzbek media texts. A diverse corpus of authentic Uzbek media content—ranging from televised broadcasts and talk show transcripts to online headlines, advertisements, and government announcements from 2023–2024—was carefully selected. These texts were chosen for their institutional relevance, stylistic variety, and cultural resonance. Each sample was analyzed for its pragmatic function, genre conventions, intertextual

references, and sociocultural context. The aim was not only to classify speech acts (assertives, directives, commissives, etc.) but to uncover their deeper ideological, relational, and performative roles within the media.

## DISCUSSION

The analysis reveals that speech acts in Uzbek media are far from neutral or isolated; rather, they are deeply embedded in cultural values, institutional dynamics, and audience expectations. Mey's Pragmatic Act Theory and Hymes' ethnographic perspective illuminate how context determines the function of utterances, particularly in formal settings like government broadcasts. Goffman's Face Theory helps explain the strategic use of politeness and indirectness—especially in official discourse—to preserve institutional authority while appearing inclusive and cooperative. Bakhtin's Dialogism shows how multiple voices in news reports and talk shows construct a layered, polyphonic narrative. Foucault's discourse lens exposes how repetition of ideological slogans, such as "xalq uchun" ("for the people"), shapes collective identity and reinforces dominant power structures. Meanwhile, Grice's Cooperative Principle reveals how media texts subtly balance informativeness with persuasive clarity to maintain credibility and public trust. Together, these frameworks demonstrate that speech acts in media serve a constellation of functions: they inform, persuade, manage impressions, and construct social reality.

## RESULTS

The findings underscore that speech acts in Uzbek media are not merely vehicles of information but complex, context-sensitive performances that serve persuasive, ideological, and identity-driven purposes. Three dominant discursive features emerged:

1. Contextual embeddedness – Speech acts are tailored to fit social hierarchies, institutional roles, and setting-specific expectations, reinforcing power relations while fostering relatability.
2. Politeness and indirectness strategies – Particularly in governmental and political discourse, softened directives and inclusive pronouns are used to maintain face and project solidarity.
3. Intertextual and ideological framing – Repeated phrases and culturally loaded expressions, such as nationalistic or emotive slogans, legitimize institutional agendas and shape public perception.

Moreover, pragmatic acts in advertisements often double as commissive and emotive appeals—e.g., slogans like "Hayotingizni osonlashtiramiz!" ("We make your life easier!") not only promise utility but cultivate

trust and emotional resonance. News reports strategically employ emotional intensifiers to enhance newsworthiness and engagement. In essence, speech acts in Uzbek media function as multifunctional tools—they communicate meaning, reinforce values, and sustain institutional narratives within a broader sociopolitical fabric.

## CONCLUSION

This study set out to explore how speech acts in Uzbek media transcend simple communication and instead function as dynamic, culturally embedded, and power-infused performances. By drawing on a rich theoretical tapestry—ranging from classical speech act theory to critical discourse analysis and pragmatic stylistics—it became clear that language in media is never neutral. It performs, it persuades, and it positions. From emotionally charged headlines to carefully worded political messages and commercially crafted slogans, speech acts in Uzbek media reflect the values, ideologies, and relational strategies of a society in motion. The interplay of indirectness, politeness, and intertextuality reveals a media discourse that is at once strategic and sensitive—aiming to inform while simultaneously shaping public perception, reinforcing authority, and fostering national identity. Ultimately, this research highlights the power of language not just as a tool of expression but as a social force—capable of building trust, asserting dominance, or inviting solidarity. In the evolving landscape of Uzbek media, speech acts operate as living evidence of how words do not just say something—they do something. As scholars, media practitioners, and critical readers, we are reminded that every utterance in the media is part of a larger dialogue—one that continues to shape the stories we tell, the identities we embrace, and the futures we imagine.

## REFERENCE

- Alam, M.M., Ali, Z., & Khan, M.S. (2022). Media Discourse: A Pragma-Stylistic Analysis of Advertisement Slogans. *Pal Arch's Journal of Archaeology of Egypt/Egyptology*, 19(4), 1363–1373, <https://archives.palarch.nl/index.php/jae/article/view/11319>
- Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to Do Things with Words*. Oxford University Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1981). *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Bakhtin, M. M. (1986). *Speech Genres and Other Late Essays*. University of Texas Press.
- Bednarek, M., & Caple, H. (2017). *News Discourse*. Routledge.
- Bednarek, M., & Caple, H. (2017). *The Discourse of*



News Values: How News Organizations Create Newsworthiness. Oxford University Press.

Fairclough, N. (1995). Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. Longman. p. 42.

Foucault, M. (1970). The Archaeology of Knowledge. Pantheon Books.

Foucault, M. (1970). The Order of Discourse. (English translation: 1981). In R. Young (Ed.), *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader* (pp. 48–78). Routledge.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual: Essays on Face-to-Face Behavior*. Anchor Books

Grice, H. P. (1975). *Logic and Conversation*. Harvard University Press.

Hymes, D. (1974). *Foundations in Sociolinguistics: An Ethnographic Approach*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Mey, J. L. (2001). *Pragmatics: An Introduction* (2nd ed.). Blackwell. SPRINGERLINK, [https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-43491-9\\_18?utm\\_source=chatgpt.com](https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-319-43491-9_18?utm_source=chatgpt.com)

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.

Van Ameren, F. H., & Grootendorst, R. (1984). *Speech Acts in Argumentative Discourse: A Theory of Argumentation*. Foris Publications. p. 120.