

INSTITUTIONAL AND PERSONAL NATURE OF POLITICAL COMMUNICATION

*Ismatova Shakhnoza Akhror kizi**PhD Candidate, Karshi State University**Shaxnozaismatova006@gmail.com**+998 99 882 10 25**ORCID: 0009-0004-4560-1229**UDC 943.75:32(042)(021)*

Annotation: This article analyzes the two main forms of discourse in political communication – institutional and personal. From a sociolinguistic perspective, the author distinguishes between these two types on the basis of the speaker’s social status, adherence to language norms, and communicative functions. The paper focuses on the forms of address in political speech, the choice of linguistic means, and their semantic load. Moreover, it highlights the growing convergence and interpenetration of these two discourse types in modern political genres. The author particularly emphasizes that the increasing presence of personal elements in political communication enhances its effectiveness.

Keywords: political communication, discourse, institutional interaction, personal speech, sociolinguistics, political genres, forms of address, political language, communicative norms.

In sociolinguistics, discourse is divided into two main types: personal and institutional. This distinction depends on the speaker’s social status, the communicative situation, and the degree of adherence to communicative norms [1].

In personal discourse, the speaker expresses himself or herself with all individual characteristics, i.e., from a distinct personal position. Such communication often involves emotions, intonation, informal linguistic resources, and the expression of personal attitudes.

By contrast, in institutional discourse, the speaker acts as a representative of a certain social institution (e.g., government, parliament, political party), and thus as the bearer of a particular social role. This role strictly determines his or her choice of language and behavior. In this case, personal features retreat into the background, and the speaker interacts through an “institutional mask” [2].

Institutional communication is characterized by predefined communicative norms, social roles, and official duties. In political communication, for example, the status of participants (voter, deputy, party representative) and their political role (e.g., member of the ruling party or opposition) play a crucial role. Their activities are regulated by norms established by the respective social institution.

Every language has specific linguistic means that reflect whether discourse is institutional or personal. In political speech, the form of address carries significant semantic weight. A political leader, depending on the situation, may choose forms such as “participants of the meeting,” “youth,”

“respected compatriots,” or “voters.” In personal interaction, however, it is customary to use the first name, patronymic (or just the first name), or the pronoun “you (singular).”

A complete exclusion of personal features from institutional communication can diminish the human element, rendering political communication dry and bureaucratic. Nevertheless, excessive deviation from established norms may be negatively perceived by the public.

In contemporary political genres – especially in media appearances – the boundaries between institutional and personal discourse are increasingly blurred. Journalistic genres such as reportage, feuilletons, and analytical columns clearly demonstrate this convergence. Many politicians also employ colloquial speech elements in their addresses in order to appear closer to the people. This reduces the degree of institutionalism but increases communicative effectiveness.

The distinction between personal and institutional discourse depends on the purpose of communication, its topic, context, and the social roles of participants. In political communication in particular, these two discourse types constantly interact. Every language user must consciously recognize these differences and choose appropriate linguistic means in accordance with the situation.

References

1. Chudinov, A. P. (2006). *Political Linguistics*. Moscow: Flinta, Nauka.
2. Karasik, V. I. (2000). On the types of discourse. In: *Language Personality: Institutional and Personal Discourse*.
3. Habermas, J. (1984). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Beacon Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2709433>
4. Lasswell, H. D. (1948). The structure and function of communication in society. *The Communication of Ideas*, 37–51. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0056235>
5. Ismatova, Sh. A. (2025). Pragmatic analysis of the speeches of political leaders in international organizations. *Proceedings of the International Symposium “Social Sciences and Technical Engineering of the Turkic World.”* Tashkent, May 5–6.
6. Ismatova, Sh. A. (2025). Functional-stylistic features and forms of political communication. *Proceedings of the International Scientific-Practical Conference “Issues of Turkic Philology.”* Fergana.