

Date: 29th November-2025

**CULTURAL CODES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK POLITICAL DISCOURSE: A
COMPARATIVE LINGUOCULTURAL ANALYSIS**

Gulbahor Komilova

PhD student, Fergana state university

gulbahorkomilova97@gmail.com

Annotation. This paper explores the concept of «cultural codes» in English and Uzbek political discourse through a comparative linguocultural and pragmatic perspective. Based on the ideas presented in Musleh Khusam's dissertation, the research identifies how political rhetoric reflects and constructs national cultural identities through emotionally charged lexical, metaphoric, and communicative patterns. The study integrates theories of discourse, culture, and emotion (Hall, 2021; Hofstede, 2020; Wierzbicka, 2018; van Dijk, 2018) and examines speeches by Shavkat Mirziyoyev and Western political figures such as Barack Obama and Winston Churchill. The findings reveal that English political discourse is characterized by individualistic and motivational cultural codes ("freedom," "progress," "change"), while Uzbek discourse is dominated by collectivist and moral codes ("unity," "stability," "justice," "faith"). These codes serve as linguistic reflections of cultural values and perform pragmatic functions of persuasion, solidarity, and ideological cohesion. The study contributes to the understanding of intercultural political communication by highlighting the interaction between emotional evaluation, metaphorical framing, and cultural meaning-making within political language.

«Keywords:» cultural codes, political discourse, linguoculture, Uzbek discourse, English discourse, emotion, metaphor, persuasion, identity, collectivism, individualism, communication.

Introduction

In the age of global communication, political discourse has become a powerful arena where culture and ideology meet through language. Politicians do not merely convey information — they «construct meaning» by embedding national values, collective memories, and emotional appeals within linguistic forms. These embedded patterns are what linguocultural theory terms «cultural codes» — systems of meanings shared within a given society that define moral, social, and emotional orientations (Hall, 2021; Wierzbicka, 2018).

The notion of «cultural code» has been explored across semiotics, anthropology, and linguistics. In political discourse, such codes become communicative tools for expressing ideology, moral authority, and national identity (van Dijk, 2018; Charteris-Black, 2019). As Musleh Khusam (2023) argues, political language operates as a “semiotic field of emotional and moral resonance,” where the cultural code determines the «acceptable emotional tonality» and the «range of persuasive strategies». For example, in English-language political culture, “freedom” and “individual responsibility” form the



Date: 29th November-2025

nucleus of motivational rhetoric, while in Uzbek discourse, “unity,” “justice,” and “faith” carry the weight of collective emotional identity.

The purpose of this research is to compare how cultural codes manifest in English and Uzbek political discourse — linguistically, semantically, and pragmatically — and to identify their communicative and ideological functions.

Methods

This study employs a «comparative linguocultural and discourse-analytic method.

Results

1. Cultural codes in Uzbek political discourse

Uzbek political rhetoric is deeply rooted in moral, spiritual, and collective values that function as «emotional anchors» for the audience.

The dominant codes include:

Type of Code	Core Concept	Example / Lexical Realization	Communicative Function
Moral code	<i>Adolat (Justice), Halollik (Honesty)</i>	“Halollik – xalq ishonchining garovi.”	Ethical persuasion
Collective code	<i>Birlik (Unity), Hamkorlik (Cooperation)</i>	“Biz bir xalq, bir Vatanmiz.”	Solidarity and identification
Religious-spiritual code	<i>Iymon (Faith), Sabr (Patience)</i>	“Sabr va mehnat orqali yuksalish.”	Moral endurance
Aesthetic code	<i>Nur (Light), Yo‘l (Path)</i>	“Yangi O‘zbekiston sari yo‘l.”	Optimistic vision

President Shavkat Mirziyoyev’s speeches often integrate evaluative triads — «faith–unity–progress» — to build emotional credibility.

Emotionally, Uzbek political speech maintains a «tone of reassurance»: moderate, calm, moralizing, and empathetic.

Paralinguistic features — soft intonation, rhythmic phrasing, and controlled pauses — contribute to the perception of sincerity and wisdom.

Cultural codes in English political discourse

English-language political rhetoric exhibits cultural codes of «individual empowerment, action, and progress.

Its key elements are:

Type of Code	Core Concept	Example / Lexical Realization	Communicative Function
Liberal-democratic code	<i>Freedom, Justice, Democracy</i>	“Freedom and democracy are the soul of our nation.”	Ideological legitimization



Type of Code	Core Concept	Example / Lexical Realization	Communicative Function
Motivational code	<i>Change, Hope, Responsibility</i>	“Yes, we can.” (Obama)	Emotional activation
Moral-ethical code	<i>Truth, Courage, Faith</i>	“We shall never surrender.” (Churchill)	Heroic resilience
Progressive code	<i>Future, Innovation, Growth</i>	“The future is ours to build.”	Directional optimism

These codes highlight the «agency of the individual» and the belief in human initiative as the engine of change.

For example, Obama’s recurring metaphors — «light», «journey», «dream», «hope» — create a semantic field of optimism and movement, contrasting with the Uzbek discourse of harmony and stability.

English political speech uses ««high intensity of emotion»» and ««dynamic intonation»».

Rhetorical repetition («We can... We must...»), contrast («not because it is easy, but because it is hard»), and inclusive pronouns («we, our nation») form the emotional rhythm of Western political motivation.

Parameter	Uzbek Discourse	English Discourse
Cultural orientation	Collectivist, moral, hierarchical	Individualist, liberal, egalitarian
Dominant values	Stability, unity, patience	Progress, freedom, initiative
Emotional tone	Calm, empathetic, respectful	Energetic, inspiring, assertive
Metaphoric system	<i>Light–path–faith</i>	<i>Dream–journey–change</i>
Persuasive mode	Ethical reassurance	Motivational activation
Target effect	Moral solidarity	Social mobilization

Both systems share universal affective metaphors (light vs. darkness, path vs. stagnation) but differ in ««directionality»»:

Uzbek discourse internalizes emotion as spiritual balance; English discourse externalizes it as motivational drive.

As Musleh Khusam (2023) notes, “Eastern rhetoric internalizes emotional impact through shared moral imagery, while Western rhetoric dramatizes emotion to activate social energy.”

This dichotomy reflects E. Hall’s (2021) idea of «high-context (Uzbek)» and «low-context (English)» communication cultures.



Discussion

The comparative analysis demonstrates that «cultural codes» serve as the «semiotic backbone of political persuasion». They shape how emotion, reason, and moral authority are linguistically expressed.

In both English and Uzbek discourses, the linguistic personality of a political leader embodies the collective cultural mindset — yet the communicative strategies differ due to distinct cultural worldviews.

«1. Linguistic personality and cultural identity»

In Uzbek rhetoric, the political leader speaks as a ««moral father figure»» — representing collective harmony, continuity, and spiritual leadership.

In English rhetoric, the leader speaks as a ««motivator and partner»» — encouraging individual participation and active responsibility.

Thus, the Uzbek leader's identity is ««ethos-based»» (moral credibility), whereas the English leader's identity is ««pathos-based»» (emotional inspiration).

Both forms function as variants of the «linguistic personality» — a concept deeply tied to the speaker's national communicative style (Karasik, 2020).

2. Emotional metaphors as cultural markers»

Metaphor analysis shows that emotion is not universal but culturally coded.

For instance, “light” in Uzbek discourse is spiritual and divine («nur» as God's blessing), while in English it is secular and progress-oriented (“light of liberty”).

Similarly, “path” in Uzbek rhetoric implies moral direction, while “road” or “journey” in English implies dynamic progress.

3. Pragmatic implications

Cultural codes perform three key pragmatic functions:

1. «Integrative» – uniting audience around shared values;
2. «Legitimizing» – justifying leadership and national ideology;
3. «Motivational» – stimulating emotional commitment and action.

The political leader's emotional language thus becomes a «cultural performance» of persuasion — intertwining values, emotions, and social identity.

Conclusion

The study concludes that English and Uzbek political discourses represent two distinct but complementary models of emotional-cultural communication.

In Uzbek discourse, cultural codes such as «justice, patience, unity,» and «faith» shape a moral-collective framework that appeals to empathy and spiritual harmony.

In English discourse, cultural codes like «freedom, change, hope,» and «responsibility» promote individual initiative and collective activism.

Both systems employ metaphoric language, evaluative lexis, and paralinguistic signals to create emotional resonance between speaker and audience.

However, the ««Uzbek model»» emphasizes stability and moral unity, while the ««English model»» prioritizes action and progress.



Date: 29th November-2025

Together, they reflect the dual essence of modern political communication — «emotion as both ethical balance and motivational force.»

Future research should explore how digital media reshape these cultural codes, transforming emotional discourse into multimodal and transnational forms.

REFERENCES:

1. Charteris-Black, J. (2019). «Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor». Palgrave Macmillan.
2. Fairclough, N. (2020). «Language and Power» (3rd ed.). Routledge.
3. Hall, E. T. (2021). «Beyond Culture». Anchor Books.
4. Hofstede, G. (2020). «Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, and Organizations Across Nations». Sage.
5. Karasik, V. I. (2020). «Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, and Discourse». Volgograd: Peremena.
6. Khusam, M. (2023). «Linguocultural Mechanisms of Emotional Influence in Political Discourse». Cairo: Ain Shams University.
7. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (2019). «Metaphors We Live By». University of Chicago Press.
8. Mirziyoyev, S. (2023). «Selected Speeches and Addresses (2017–2023)». Tashkent: Uzbekistan.
9. Obama, B. (2012). «Speeches on Hope and Change». New York: Crown.
10. Churchill, W. (1940). «Never Surrender: Selected War Speeches». London: Cassell.
11. van Dijk, T. A. (2018). «Discourse and Power: Contributions to Critical Discourse Studies». Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Wierzbicka, A. (2018). «Emotions Across Languages and Cultures: Diversity and Universals». Cambridge University Press.

