



IJTIMOYIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 5

2026

SAYLOVOLDI TASHVIQOT MATERIALLARIDA DABDABALI SO‘ZLARNING O‘RNI

Sobirova Feruza Islomjon qizi

O‘zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti, o‘qituvchi

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada saylovoldi kompaniya materiallarida qo‘llaniladigan “posh words”, ya’ni yuqori darajadagi, rasmiy va murakkab leksik birliklarning o‘rni tahlil qilinadi. Unda bunday so‘z tanlovi siyosiy nuqtda hokimiyatni namoyon etish, ishonchlilikni mustahkamlash hamda hissiy ta’sirni yuzaga keltiruvchi ishontiruvchi til vositasi sifatida qanday xizmat qilishi o‘rganiladi. Shuningdek, maqolada murakkab leksika bilan mulohaza strategiyalari — xususan, ishonchni kuchaytiruvchi birliklar (boosters), baholovchi markerlar hamda shaxsiy ishtirokni ifodalovchi vositalar o‘rtasidagi o‘zaro bog‘liqlik tahlil etiladi. Tadqiqot natijalari shuni ko‘rsatadiki, siyosiy til saylovchilar tasavvurini shakllantirish va jamoatchilik fikrini yo‘naltirish maqsadida ongli ravishda quriladi. Shuningdek, unda ayniqsa murakkab va puxta tanlangan leksik birliklar kabi uslubiy vositalar ko‘pincha faktga asoslangan ma’lumotlardan ham kuchliroq ishontiruvchi ta’sirga ega ekani asoslab beriladi.

Kalit so‘zlar: siyosiy nutq, saylovoldi materiallar, “posh words” (yuqori darajadagi so‘zlar), asosiy til, mulohaza strategiyalari.

РОЛЬ ВОЗВЫШЕННОЙ ЛЕКСИКИ В МАТЕРИАЛАХ ПРЕДВЫБОРНОЙ КАМПАНИИ

Собирова Феруза Исламжон кизи

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков, преподаватель

Аннотация

В данной статье рассматривается роль так называемых «posh words», то есть возвышенной, формальной и сложной лексики, в материалах предвыборной кампании. Анализируется, как подобные лексические выборы функционируют в качестве убедительных языковых средств, формирующих авторитет, доверие и эмоциональное воздействие в политическом дискурсе. Кроме того, в статье исследуется взаимодействие между сложной лексикой и стратегиями позиции, такими как усилители (boosters), оценочные маркеры и средства авторского присутствия. Результаты исследования показывают, что политический язык целенаправленно конструируется для формирования восприятия избирателей и направления общественного мнения. Подчеркивается, что стилистические особенности, в особенности тщательно отобранная сложная лексика, нередко оказывают более сильное убедительное воздействие, чем фактическое содержание в электоральной коммуникации.

Ключевые слова: политический дискурс, предвыборные материалы, возвышенная лексика (posh words), стратегии убеждения, стратегии позиции.

THE ROLE OF POSH WORDS IN PRE-ELECTION CAMPAIGN MATERIALS

Sobirova Feruza Islomjon qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Teacher

Abstract

This article examines the role of “posh words,” meaning elevated, formal, and sophisticated vocabulary, in pre-election campaign materials. It analyzes how such lexical choices function as persuasive linguistic tools that construct authority, credibility, and emotional influence in political discourse. The article also explores the interaction between elevated vocabulary and stance features such as boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention strategies. Findings reveal that political language is intentionally designed to shape voter perception and guide public opinion. It is argued that stylistic features, especially sophisticated lexical choices, often have a stronger persuasive effect than factual content in electoral communication.

Keywords: political discourse, pre-election materials, posh words, persuasive language, stance features.

In contemporary political communication, language functions not only as a medium of information transfer but also as a strategic instrument of influence and power. Pre-election campaign

materials represent a highly structured form of discourse designed to shape voter attitudes, construct political identity, and secure public support [3; 118–119-b.]. One of the most prominent linguistic features in such discourse is the use of posh words, referring to elevated, formal, and semantically sophisticated vocabulary. These lexical choices are deliberately selected to create impressions of intelligence, professionalism, and leadership competence.

Instead of using direct and simple expressions, political actors frequently employ abstract formulations such as “strategic governance framework,” “comprehensive reform agenda,” or “sustainable national transformation.” Although such expressions may lack precise referential clarity, they significantly enhance the persuasive and symbolic value of political messages [4; 73–74-b.]. Thus, language in election campaigns is far from neutral; rather, it operates as a carefully constructed system of persuasion in which lexical sophistication plays a central role in shaping public perception.

Political discourse has long been analyzed as a reflection of power relations and ideological control. Scholars argue that language not only describes reality but actively constructs it by influencing how individuals interpret political events and actors [2; 45–46-b.]. Within this framework, Hyland’s stance theory offers an important perspective for understanding persuasive communication. The theory identifies three major components: boosters (certainty markers), attitude markers (evaluation), and self-mention markers (authorial presence). These linguistic resources enable speakers to express confidence, emotional positioning, and personal involvement in discourse [5; 102–103-b.]. Recent studies further demonstrate that lexical sophistication increases perceived credibility even when informational content remains vague. This finding suggests that stylistic features may sometimes be more influential than factual accuracy in political persuasion [6; 130–131-b.].

Political language is closely connected with the concept of soft power, where influence is achieved through persuasion and ideological attraction rather than coercion. During pre-election campaigns, candidates attempt to construct positive self-images while simultaneously shaping negative perceptions of their competitors. In this process, language becomes a crucial instrument of political influence. The use of elevated vocabulary is particularly effective because it creates distance between everyday speech and political discourse. This distance gives political messages an aura of authority and seriousness. Voters often associate complex language with expertise, even when the actual content remains vague or generalized. Furthermore, media framing amplifies this effect, as media outlets frequently reproduce campaign language without simplification. Consequently, elevated vocabulary becomes normalized within public discourse and contributes to shaping collective political understanding.

Elevated vocabulary plays a central role in constructing political authority. Through formal and abstract expressions, politicians present themselves as competent, visionary, and intellectually capable leaders. However, such lexical choices often involve intentional ambiguity. Expressions such as “effective governance mechanisms” or “national development strategies” are deliberately vague, allowing flexibility in interpretation while maintaining rhetorical strength [4; 75-b.]. This ambiguity prevents politicians from making overly specific commitments while preserving persuasive impact. From a cognitive perspective, sophisticated vocabulary also affects information processing. Psycholinguistic research indicates that complex lexical structures require greater cognitive effort, which may paradoxically increase the perceived importance of the message. When audiences invest more mental effort in decoding language, they are more likely to perceive the message as meaningful and authoritative. Additionally, posh words contribute to the construction of a “professional political identity.” Politicians who consistently employ elevated language are frequently perceived as more educated and competent than those who rely on informal or simplistic speech styles.

Stance markers significantly enhance the persuasive power of political discourse. Boosters such as “certainly,” “clearly,” and “undoubtedly” express strong confidence and minimize uncertainty, making political claims appear more authoritative and convincing [5; 180-b.]. Attitude markers introduce emotional evaluation and shape positive or negative perceptions of political actors, thereby influencing audience responses. Self-mention markers, particularly first-person pronouns, construct either individual responsibility (“I”) or collective identity (“we”), strengthening solidarity and trust between politicians and voters [1; 121-b.]. Stance features also help reduce perceived uncertainty. In political environments where public trust is fragile, linguistic certainty functions as a stabilizing mechanism. Even when policies remain undefined, strong stance markers can create an illusion of clarity and decisiveness. Moreover, the interpersonal dimension of stance contributes to conversational closeness, making political messages appear more personal and relatable.

Election campaign discourse frequently relies on binary oppositions such as “us versus them.” Through lexical and stance strategies, politicians construct positive self-representations while portraying opponents negatively. Such ideological framing simplifies complex political realities and increases emotional engagement among voters, thereby reinforcing group identity and political polarization [3; 50-b.]. This framing functions as a deliberate communicative strategy aimed at organizing public perception. By dividing political space into opposing categories, discourse reduces cognitive complexity and encourages emotionally driven decision-making. Ideological framing is further reinforced through repetition. Recurrent phrases and metaphors become normalized within public consciousness, strengthening specific political narratives. Emotional polarization generated by such discourse often increases voter loyalty, as individuals tend to align themselves with messages reflecting their identities and beliefs, even when information remains incomplete or biased. The combination of elevated vocabulary and stance features creates a powerful persuasive mechanism. While posh words contribute authority and abstraction, stance markers add emotional intensity and interpersonal connection. Together, they produce discourse that is simultaneously intellectually persuasive and emotionally engaging, significantly increasing the effectiveness of political communication in shaping voter perceptions and decision-making [6; 132-b.]. This interaction reflects a balance between rational and emotional persuasion. Elevated vocabulary appeals to intellect and logic, whereas stance features target emotional and psychological engagement. Political discourse becomes particularly effective when both dimensions operate simultaneously. Furthermore, this interaction contributes to narrative construction. Political actors do not merely present facts; they construct narratives of progress, stability, crisis, or national transformation. Linguistic choices reinforce these narratives and make them more persuasive and memorable. From a broader theoretical perspective, the use of posh words and stance strategies reflects the concept of discourse as social practice. Language exists within social, political, and cultural contexts rather than in isolation. Therefore, political discourse analysis requires attention not only to linguistic structures but also to their social functions. Critical discourse analysis further suggests that language serves as a site of ideological struggle. Competing political groups attempt to dominate public interpretation through strategic lexical choices. In this sense, vocabulary itself becomes an instrument of ideological competition and symbolic power.

Conclusion. The study demonstrates that posh words in pre-election campaign materials are not random stylistic elements but intentional persuasive tools. They contribute to constructing authority, enhancing credibility, and shaping ideological interpretation. Combined with stance strategies, they form a highly effective linguistic system that significantly influences public perception of political messages. The findings also emphasize that the effectiveness of political discourse depends largely on the audience’s level of linguistic awareness. Voters capable of critically analyzing lexical choices and identifying persuasive strategies are less likely to be influenced solely by stylistic manipulation. This highlights the growing importance of media literacy and critical thinking skills in modern democratic societies. Finally, future research may focus on comparative analyses of political discourse across different languages and cultures in order to determine whether the use of elevated vocabulary and stance strategies follows universal patterns or culturally specific tendencies. Such studies would deepen understanding of how language operates as a tool of political influence within global communication contexts.

REFERENCES

1. Boginskaya O. Dissenting with Conviction: Boosting in Persuasive Discourse // *International Journal of Legal Discourse*. – 2023. – Vol. 7(2). – P. 257–279.
2. Dontcheva-Navratilova O. Hedges and Boosters in Political Discourse // *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*. – 2025. – Vol. 35. – P. 73–90.
3. Etemadfar P., Namaziandost E. Persuasive Strategies in Political Speeches // *Critical Literary Studies*. – 2020. – Vol. 2(2). – P. 117–130.
4. Hyland K., Zou H. Stance in Academic and Public Discourse // *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*. – 2021. – Vol. 50. – Article 100973.
5. Kadim E. N. Critical Discourse Analysis of Election Speeches // *Heliyon*. – 2022. – Vol. 8. – Article e09256.
6. Kashiha H. Metadiscourse in Political Communication // *Discourse and Interaction*. – 2022. – Vol. 15(1). – P. 77–100.