

## LINGUO-PRAGMATIC AND SOCIO-CULTURAL FEATURES OF GEOPOLITICAL TEXTS IN MASS MEDIA

**Gulnoz Mamarasulova**

*Associate Professor, PhD*

*Alisher Navo'i Tashkent State University of*

*Uzbek Language and Literature*

**Abstract:** *This article explores the linguo-pragmatic and socio-cultural features of geopolitical texts in mass media, focusing on the comparative analysis of English and Uzbek materials. The study examines how lexical choices, pragmatic strategies, and cultural frames shape the representation of global and regional political realities. These findings reveal the intricate relationship between language, ideology, and translation in shaping public understanding of world politics.*

**Keywords:** *geopolitical discourse, media communication, pragmatics, socio-cultural factors, translation, English-Uzbek comparison, terminology, framing, ideology.*

**1. Introduction.** Geopolitical discourse has become a dominant form of communication in today's mass media. Through news, commentaries, and editorials, the media constructs specific worldviews, defining allies, rivals, and national interests. Language serves not merely as a tool of description but as an instrument of persuasion, identity construction, and ideological framing. In multilingual contexts like Uzbekistan, geopolitical narratives are frequently translated or adapted from English-language sources, creating a complex interaction between global discourses and local cultural norms. Understanding these processes is crucial for translation studies, media linguistics, and international communication.

**2. Main body.** Scholars such as Norman Fairclough (1995), Teun A. van Dijk (2008), and Mona Baker (2018) argue that discourse analysis in media must consider both linguistic form and socio-ideological context. Pragmatics, concerned with meaning in use, helps to uncover the implicit intentions behind lexical and syntactic choices. Socio-cultural analysis, in turn, reveals how these linguistic practices are embedded in national traditions, political systems, and collective identities. In translation, these layers become even more complex, as translators must navigate between accuracy, acceptability, and ideological sensitivity.

English-language media are characterized by relatively high transparency, lexical precision, and argumentative coherence. Common pragmatic features include:

1. Nominalization and abstraction: e.g., escalation, deterrence, cooperation, engagement—used to depersonalize agency and convey neutrality.

2. Modal verbs and hedging: expressions such as may signal, could lead to, is likely to soften assertions, maintaining a tone of professional objectivity.

3. Intertextual references: mentions of treaties, historical events, and expert opinions add authority to discourse.

4. Evaluative lexis: terms like democratic values, strategic alliance signal ideological orientation toward liberal democracy.

Uzbek-language media demonstrate a distinct pragmatics rooted in socio-cultural norms of respect, indirectness, and collective identity. Common features include:

1. De-agentivization: frequent omission of actors (qaror qabul qilindi – “a decision was made”) to avoid explicit attribution of responsibility.

2. Euphemistic expressions: terms like xalqaro vaziyatdagi murakkablik (“complexity of the international situation”) replace direct references to conflict or criticism.

3. Politeness strategies: preference for neutral or positive framing when describing foreign leaders or partner states.

4. Metaphorical balance: idioms reflecting national identity or cultural solidarity (do‘stona munosabatlar mustahkamlanmoqda – “friendly relations are being strengthened”).

These pragmatic patterns reflect Uzbekistan’s diplomatic culture emphasizing neutrality, non-alignment, and respect for sovereignty. A comparison of English and Uzbek geopolitical texts reveals both structural and semantic asymmetries.

| Concept/Term        | English Usage                          | Uzbek Equivalent/<br>Translation           | Pragmatic<br>Implication                   |
|---------------------|--|--|--|
| Sanctions           | Associated with legality and pressure  | Iqtisodiy choralar (“economic measures”)   | Softened connotation; avoids confrontation |
| Democracy promotion | Positive value in Western discourse    | Demokratik islohotlarni qo‘llab-quvvatlash | Framed as gradual reform, not intervention |
| Security alliance   | Institutional cooperation (e.g., NATO) | Xavfsizlik bo‘yicha hamkorlik              | Emphasizes partnership, not bloc politics  |

Translators often adopt mitigation strategies, aligning texts with local communicative norms and state policies. This process demonstrates that translation of geopolitical terminology is also a form of pragmatic adaptation.

Socio-cultural context profoundly influences how geopolitical topics are discussed. In English media, open criticism, satire, and pluralism of viewpoints are culturally sanctioned and expected. In contrast, Uzbek media adhere to the principles of constructive reporting and social harmony, reflecting a collectivist communicative ethos. Religious and moral discourse also subtly interacts with geopolitical themes: values such as tinchlik (peace), barqarorlik (stability), and hamkorlik (cooperation) are central to the Uzbek conceptual universe. Consequently, conflictual metaphors common in English (“clash,” “stand-off,” “escalation”) are replaced by conciliatory or neutral expressions in Uzbek.

The process of translating geopolitical news from English into Uzbek is not limited to language transfer; it involves ideological filtering and cultural localization. Translators act as mediators who decide what to emphasize, omit, or rephrase to align with national discourse. For instance, the English expression “Western pressure on Central Asian states” may be rendered as “Markaziy Osiyo davlatlariga nisbatan tashqi ta’sirlar”, which generalizes agency and removes evaluative tone. Such choices ensure diplomatic appropriateness while maintaining informational integrity. Thus, translation plays a crucial role in shaping local perceptions of international politics.

The comparative findings indicate that while both English and Uzbek media share structural conventions of journalistic writing, headlines, attribution, quotation, they diverge significantly in pragmatic orientation. English texts favor assertiveness, explicit evaluation, and ideological transparency; Uzbek texts prioritize neutrality, collective identity, and cultural sensitivity. This difference is rooted in socio-political traditions and communicative culture. The pragmatic softening and lexical adjustments observed in Uzbek media demonstrate how national discourse reinterprets global narratives to preserve social harmony and political legitimacy.

**3. Conclusion.** Geopolitical texts in mass media are powerful instruments of ideological representation. Their linguo-pragmatic and socio-cultural characteristics reveal how nations linguistically construct political realities. The English-Uzbek comparison underscores that translation is not mechanical equivalence but a cultural act shaped by diplomatic, ideological, and ethical considerations. Recognizing these distinctions enhances the effectiveness of intercultural communication and contributes to more balanced global understanding.

## REFERENCES

1. Baker, M. (2018). *In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation*. Routledge.
2. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Media Discourse*. London: Edward Arnold.
3. Chilton, P. (2004). *Analysing Political Discourse: Theory and Practice*. Routledge.

4. Mamarasulova, G. (2024). Distinctive characteristics and complexity of sociopolitical texts. Buxoro davlat universiteti ilmiy axboroti, (2), 88–93. Bukhara.

5. Mamarasulova, G. (2024). Basic issues of translation of socio-political texts in a pragmatic aspect. International Multidisciplinary Journal for Research & Development (IMJRD), 11, 218–222. Delhi. <https://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd/article/view/1986>

