ANALYSIS OF ENGLISH IDEOLOGY ITEMS IN POLITICAL DISCOURSE

Sevara Oybek qizi Yusufjonova
UzSWLU, Faculty of English Linguistics
Supervisor: Oybek Saporbaevich Akhmedov, Professor, Doctor of Philological Sciences

ABSTRACT

This article presents research on analysis of English ideology items in political discourse.

Keywords: ideological, political, discourse analysis, social, political ideology, humanism, nationalism, autocracy, capitalism.

ANNOTATSIYA

Ushbu maqola siyosiy nutqda ingliz mafkurasi moddalarini tahlil qilish bo'yicha tadqiqotlarni taqdim etadi.

Kalit so'zlar: mafkuraviy, siyosiy, nutqiy tahlil, ijtimoiy, siyosiy mafkura, insonparvarlik, millatchilik, avtokratiya, kapitalizm.

Political discourse is highly ideological, maybe more so than any other type of discourse. First, it must be noted that political discourse is not a genre but rather a class of genres that are determined by the social domain of politics (Van Dijk, 1998b). Similarly, the discourse genres of scientific discourse, educational discourse, and legal discourse, respectively, describe the classes of conversation. Government deliberations, legislative debates, party platforms, and political speeches are just a few of the many genres that fall under the umbrella of politics.[1]

Ideologies are, among other things, belief systems. The members of a social group all subscribe to the same belief systems. Additionally, groups hold common knowledge and attitudes. A group's common views are referred to as "social representations" (SRs). The organizing, or "fundamental," views of these SRs are their ideologies. In addition to their "own" ideologically based "knowledge" (sometimes referred to by other groups as "beliefs"), communities often have more general, consensual, culturally shared knowledge, which is also referred to as "common ground" (culturally). This shared cultural experience may be viewed as the basis for all cognition, both within and between groups, and as such, it is assumed by various ideologies. Empirically, common

---

[1] Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). What is political discourse analysis? Amsterdam: Benjamins. p12

ground can be defined as any beliefs that are assumed in public discourse. This indicates that such common ground is non-controversial, commonsensical, and so non-ideological for a certain culture. The common standards and ideals that all culture members adhere to also form part of the common ground. [2]The cognitive core of a group's identity and that of its members, or the social self-schema of a group, can also be seen in ideologies and their structures. The social practices of actors as group members are governed by ideologies and the social representations they create.

However, the interaction between various ideologies in political speech is not merely accumulative. For instance, it's possible that fundamental professional standards occasionally conflict with the societal ideas that politicians advocate. So, even while the prevailing consensus demands adherence to democratic ideals, one may socially represent beliefs founded on principles of inequality, as is the case with racist ideologies. Politicians' allegiance to God may frequently conflict with their allegiance to democratic principles if they represent religious parties. In other words, a triangle formed by ideology, rhetoric, and politics raises intriguing theoretical and analytical issues.[3]

A political ideology, as used in social studies, is a particular set of ethical ideals, principles, doctrines, myths, or symbols of a social movement, institution, class, or large group that provides some political and cultural blueprint for a particular social order and explains how society should function. Political ideologies typically focus on how to distribute power and how it should be employed. While some political parties strongly adhere to one philosophy, others may draw general inspiration from a number of related philosophies without formally endorsing any of them. The effect of moral entrepreneurs, who occasionally act in their interests, is a contributing factor in an ideology's appeal. Political ideologies include two components: (1) aims, or how society should be run; and (2) means, or how best to get there.[4] The phrase "political ideology" is problematic; it has been referred to as "the most elusive idea in all of social science." It is possible to distinguish ideologies from political strategies (such as populism as it is commonly defined) and from single issues around which a party may be built (such as civil libertarianism and support or opposition to European integration), even though either of these may or may not be central to a particular ideology. Ideologies tend to identify themselves by their position on the political spectrum (such as the left, the center, or the right).[5]

[2] Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. London, England UK: Sage Publications.p11-12

[3] Geis, M. L. (1987). The language of politics. New York: Springer.p100

[4] D. McLellan. (1986). Ideology, University of Minnesota Press.p134

[5] Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Our masters' voices: the language and body language of politics. London: Methuen.p156

Some examples of analysis of English ideological items in political discourse:

1. Agrarianism - This philosophy regards farmers as the foundation of society. It argues for farmer ownership of agricultural property and highlights the significance of pro-farming policies.

2. Humanism- Although considered a philosophy, humanism may also be seen as a political ideology. It views human wellness holistically and centers life's governance on human flourishing. It views people as complicated individuals who require entertainment, medical care, and education to enhance their quality of life rather than as economic capital.

3. Nationalism- Nationalism promotes a nation's sovereignty, especially guarding against improper outside influences. It frequently stands in opposition to globalism. Nationalists believe that international norms erode a country's sovereignty and limit its ability to do as they like, in contrast to globalists who support international cooperation in establishing a rule-based society. Nationalists prioritize their country and are less concerned with events occurring outside of its borders.

4. Autocracy - An autocratic society is one where power is vested in a single individual. With no restrictions from the police or the judges, this one person has considerable control over their political system. Autocracies typically oppose democracy as well.

5. Capitalism - Today, the majority of western nations are governed by capitalism. It places a strong emphasis on people having the freedom to start their own businesses, trade commodities freely, and own their own means of production. Excellent market efficiencies are produced by capitalism, yet the poor are also overly exploited.[6]

Political contexts don't just dictate how political players communicate; rather, Van Djik (2006) writes that "there is a requirement for a cognitive partnership between conditions and discourse or text, that is a context" (Van Djik, 2006, p.733). These contexts determine how people perceive, experience, and portray the political situational factors that are pertinent to them. Political circumstances and political discourse structures together define political discourse. As a result, speakers or listeners will frequently consider being an MP, Prime Minister, party leader, or demonstrator to be a meaningful context category in political discourse.

Sociolinguistic research has shown that language use varies among different geographical locations, which can reflect and reinforce the ideologies of the groups in which it is used. As a result, opinions of language might be favorable or unfavorable depending on factors including social or

---

[6] Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (Eds.). (1998). Political linguistics. Amsterdam: Benjamins.p76

cultural background, level of authority, and status.[7] In conclusion, using English ideology items in political discourse is different from using in linguistics. Their own functions, meanings and roles have in political discourse. They are analyzed according to its categories.

REFERENCES

1. D. McLellan. (1986). Ideology, University of Minnesota Press.

2. Blommaert, J., & Bulcaen, C. (Eds.). (1998). Political linguistics. Amsterdam: Benjamins.

3. Geis, M. L. (1987). The language of politics. New York: Springer.

4. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). What is political discourse analysis? Amsterdam: Benjamins.

5. Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach. London, England UK: Sage Publications.

6. Atkinson, J. M. (1984). Our masters' voices: the language and body language of politics. London: Methuen.

7. Clark, H. H. (1996). Using Language. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

---

[7] Clark, H. H. (1996). Using Language. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.p112