

# Linguistic Reflection Of Socio-Political Realias In Uzbek, Russian And English-Language Communicative Practice

Toshboeva Munisa Rustam Qizi

Second Year Basic Doctoral Student, Tashkent State University Of Uzbek Language And Literature, Uzbekistan

**Received:** 12 April 2025; **Accepted:** 08 May 2025; **Published:** 17 June 2025

**Abstract:** This study offers a comparative analysis of socio-political realias in Uzbek, Russian, and English-language communicative practices. Drawing on national language corpora and applying methods from contrastive linguistics and discourse analysis, the research identifies how culturally specific political concepts are linguistically represented in each language. Special attention is paid to institutional terminology, ideological vocabulary, and metaphorical constructs that reflect national identity and political culture. The results provide insights relevant to translation studies, intercultural communication, and linguistic anthropology.

**Keywords:** - Socio-political realia, Uzbek, Russian, English, political discourse, comparative linguistics, national corpora.

**Introduction:** Realias are based on aspects inherent in the culture of the people, which extend to various spheres of social activity. The research is grounded in the theories of linguistic relativity (Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis), discourse theory (Fairclough, van Dijk), and cultural linguistics (Sharifian), which emphasize the interplay between language, culture, and ideological worldviews. Socio-political realias are understood as culturally and historically specific phenomena that acquire unique lexical-semantic representations across different languages.

Socio-political realias, being one of the most important reasons, not only suggest the characteristics of political discourse, but also form the essence and type of manifestation of political communication. These realias describe socially significant situations, general philosophical trends and cultural-political orders that carry out political integration and form public speech. To understand the ethnocultural characteristics of political discourse, one must know the political and sociocultural situation of that country or that people, namely: Uzbek, Russian and English-speaking (in this case, American).

The class approach to language processes can be clearly seen in the area of socio-political vocabulary. The

peculiarities of language allow for exaggerating completely different meanings to equal language signs. The semantic meaning of socio-political terminology often has an obvious class phenomenon, that is, it is closely connected with the worldview and perception of the world, interpreted through the prism of class struggle. Thus, the same words, especially in the context of political discourse, can describe different meanings in accessible content. In addition, they often generate different ideas and connections among people from different social groups, which demonstrates the differences in their ideological attitudes.

Political discourse is not only a combination of language units, but also a speech formation associated with certain socio-political prerequisites. In this sense, a special role is occupied by the category of socio-political realias, which imply a combination of socio-historical, general cultural and ideological situations that establish the characteristics of the activity of political language in a particular state.

## METHOD AND METHODOLOGY

The inclusion of this aspect in the study is caused by the need for a systematic approach to assessing the ethnocultural features of political discourse. This study

employs a comparative, descriptive, and corpus-based methodology within the framework of linguistic and cultural analysis. The research is guided by the principles of contrastive linguistics, critical discourse analysis (CDA), and ethnolinguistic profiling to identify and interpret the ways in which socio-political realities are conceptualized, verbalized, and culturally marked in Uzbek, Russian, and English-language communicative practices.

## RESEARCH RESULTS

The above-mentioned category of realities was chosen for study based on the coefficient of use in political speech. It was found that in American political discourse 20% of realities are considered socio-political. In the Russian language, this percentage ratio is much lower and amounts to an average of 20%. The most restrained in this regard was the Uzbek political discourse, which averaged 15%.

Language	Approximate percentage of realities	Characteristic features of the realities usage
Russian	15–20%	High saturation with realities, frequent mention of government structures (State Duma, Kremlin), ideological concepts (sovereignty, traditional values), historical images (WWII, USSR)
Uzbek	10–15%	Realities are often linked to national identity and reforms: mahalla, taraqqiyot, Amir Temur, milliy qadriyatlar; moderate density of realities, neutral tone
English	12–18%	Predominance of institutional realities (Congress, White House, Brexit), lesser role of historical and cultural symbols; emphasis on political, legal and foreign policy terminology

Cultural and traditional foundations define the boundaries of what is permissible and predictable in the political sphere. In Uzbekistan, this is manifested in the observance of etiquette, collectivist values, and moral justification of power. In Russia, it is manifested in the emphasis on historical heritage, the desire for stability, and an ideology that affirms the role of a great power. In the United States, individualism, freedom of expression, and a willingness to engage in direct confrontation are prioritized. These differences result in unique discursive styles that are reflected in both the vocabulary used and the practical aspects of political statements.

To analyze the realities of political discourse related to the socio-political life of the countries under study, it is considered rational to provide a classification, supplementing it with examples from linguistic and cultural dictionaries and the media.

Socio-political realities can be divided into four main

categories, each of which, in turn, has its own subgroups:

The first category is administrative-territorial division, which includes various types of settlements: cities, towns, villages, as well as their constituent parts, such as streets, districts and squares.

The second category covers authorities and persons representing them. The third is the realities associated with political forces: movements, parties, politicians, state structures, social strata, as well as the names of educational institutions.

The fourth category is dedicated to the military sphere and includes designations of military uniforms, types of weapons, military ranks and military organizations.

According to the nature of our research, we are more interested in classifications that present the category of socio-political realities. In this case, the most indicative and detailed is S. Vlahov and S. Florin's classification.

Here it is necessary to pay attention to the subgroups of socio-political realities (SPR) considered by the classification. Let us consider the first category of SPR, the administrative-territorial structure, which includes:

- administrative-territorial units (туман, қишлоқ фуқаролар йиғини; губерния, уезд; state, county);
- populated areas (кишлак, аул; станица, хутор; township, uptown);
- details of the settlement (жума-базар; зума, старало; canton, department).

The second category is accordingly subdivided into the following:

- authorities (маджлис, курултай; дума, муниципалитет; congress, legislature);
- power holders (шах, визирь; царь, земский начальник; Lord Mayor, Sheriff).

A broader group of CPR is considered to be political forces, which, in turn, are divided into:

- political activities and figures (джадизм, хаким; большевизм, эсдеки; lobbying. congressman);
- patriotic and social movements (камолотчилар, Фидокорлар; партизаны, славянофилы; Trumpists, Rockefeller Republicans);
- social phenomena and movements (and their representatives) (Адолат, Миллий тикланиш; нэпман, болельщик; rock and roll, Martin Luther King.);
- ranks, degrees, titles, addresses («Фахрий мураббий» (Почетный наставник), «Мехнат шухрати» (Трудовая слава); статский советник, товарищ; Vice President, Reverend.);
- institutions (хакимият, махалля; облоно, загс;

college, Senate.)

- educational and cultural institutions (Баркамол авлод, медресе ;одиннадцатилетка, вуз; junior high school, school district.)
- estates and castes (and their members) – (оқсуяк, зиёли; дворянство, барин; White, Afro-American .)
- class signs and symbols ( хан, визирь ;князь, герцог; Uncle Sam, Mount Rushmore.)

Military realias are divided into:

- units (национальная гвардия, НКВД; военные комиссариаты, ОМОН; Delta Force, Secret Service .);
- weapons (меч, кинжал;катюша, Savage Arms MSR-15, Ruger LCP.);
- uniforms (шапка-ушанка, китель; нарукавные нашивки, кокарды; camouflage, chevrons.)
- servicemen (and commanders) – (Ватан химоячиси, аскар; прапорщик, гвардеец; patriot, draftee.)

The mass media, being the main channels for broadcasting political discourse, demonstrate significant differences in the linguistic design of political realia, conditioned by the cultural, historical and mental characteristics of society. A comparative analysis of publications in the media in Uzbek, Russian and English languages allows us to identify the specifics of the lexical-semantic and pragmatic content of political realias in each of the linguocultural spaces under consideration.

Uzbek media tend to use terms that reflect stability, national identity and statehood. For example, the article "O'zbekiston tashabbuslari – milliy manfaatlar va umuminsoniy qadriyatlar ustuvorligining yorqin ifodasi" emphasizes the priority of national interests and universal human values in the policy of Uzbekistan. Another article, "Taraqqiyot strategiyasi – Yangi O'zbekiston barqaror taraqqiyotining garovi," emphasizes development strategy as a guarantee of the country's sustainable progress. Expressions such as "barqaror taraqqiyot" (sustainable development) and "milliy manfaatlar" (national interests) emphasize the strategic and integrative nature of political discourse in Uzbekistan, focused on consolidation and modernization.

Political discourse in Russian media demonstrates a more pronounced polyphony and a wide use of evaluative vocabulary. In publications such as Kommersant and Izvestia, expressions such as "foreign policy course", "sanction pressure", "geopolitical stability" («внешнеполитический курс», «санкционное давление», «геополитическая стабильность») are often encountered. A characteristic feature is the use of metaphorical and

ideologically marked constructions, for example: "information war", "Western dictate", "sovereign democracy" («информационная война», «западный диктат», «суверенная демократия»). These elements give Russian political discourse an expressive coloring and form a dichotomy of "friend or foe" ("свой — чужой"), actualizing the concept of national identity through opposition to external influence.

In English-language media such as The Guardian, BBC News or The New York Times, an analytical style of presentation and a focus on neutral, factual presentation of information prevails. Typical examples of the representation of political realities are constructions such as "policy shift", "bipartisan agreement", "international sanctions". In this case, euphemisms or highly general terms such as "strategic interests" or "diplomatic efforts" are often used, which indicates a desire to avoid direct confrontation and ensure a balanced coverage of events. At the same time, in a number of cases, the presence of implicit assessments can be observed, especially in relation to authoritarian regimes or human rights violations.

## CONCLUSION

A comparative analysis of socio-political discourse in the Uzbek, Russian and English languages revealed significant differences at both the lexical-semantic and pragmatic levels. Uzbek political discourse is characterized by a high degree of institutionality and the purposeful construction of the image of a stable, modernizing state. Russian-language media demonstrate rhetorical richness, a tendency toward metaphorization and ideological labeling, forming a binary opposition of "friend or foe," which reflects the desire to mobilize the audience in conditions of geopolitical pressure. In English-language sources, the analytical model of presenting information with a predominance of neutral or euphemistic vocabulary prevails, which is associated with the pragmatics of objectivity and compliance with the principles of journalistic ethics.

Thus, the linguistic representation of socio-political realities is directly linked to the national mentality, media strategies and communicative norms of each cultural space. These differences should be taken into account not only within the framework of linguistic research, but also when analyzing the mechanisms of public opinion formation, intercultural dialogue, and political positioning in the global media space.

## REFERENCES

Влахов, С. Непереводимое в переводе / С. Влахов, С. Флорин. — 1980: Международные отношения, 1980. — 343 с.

М.А. Амири, А. Мадаени Аввал” Классификация Реалий В Русском И Персидском Языках” Гилянский университет, Иран, г. Решт, 2014. —с.94

Yusubov, Jaloliddin Kadamovich; Esonaliyeva, Gulnoza Dilmurod qizi “Taraqqiyot Strategiyasi – Yangi O‘zbekiston Barqaror Taraqqiyotining Garovi” 16.02.2024.

«США. Внешняя политика: последние новости». [kommersant.ru](http://kommersant.ru)

Tim Davie: BBC journalists' families are being persecuted in Iran». [thetimes.co.uk](http://thetimes.co.uk)

«BBC boss: Funding cuts aid Russian and Chinese 'assault on truth'». [thetimes.co.uk](http://thetimes.co.uk)