© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

NATIONAL-CULTURAL SPECIFICITY OF SOCIO-POLITICAL DISCOURSE AS A FACTOR IN DEVELOPING TRANSLATORS' INTERCULTURAL COMPETENCE

Gilyazetdinov Eldar Zamirovich
Associate professor, Teaching English language methodology department №2,
Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan,
e-mail:eldargilyazetdinov@gmail.com
DOI:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23158032

The thesis examines the national-cultural specificity of socio-political discourse (SPD) as a factor determining the content of future translators' training in the domain of intercultural competence. The relevance of the topic is grounded in the growing role of the translator as an intercultural mediator amid the expansion of Uzbekistan's international contacts. The paper considers the principal types of national-cultural marking found in political texts: realia, precedent names, political euphemisms, and culturally conditioned metaphors. It is argued that accounting for this specificity must be systematically embedded in the content of translator training rather than treated as an optional component. The findings may be applied in designing translator training curricula and compiling teaching materials for the translation of socio-political texts.

Keywords: socio-political discourse; national-cultural specificity; intercultural competence; future translators; political realia; translator training.

The intensification of political, diplomatic, and economic contacts between states has placed increasing demands on translators working with socio-political discourse (SPD), a discourse type distinguished by a high degree of national-cultural markedness [3, P.24]. Unlike scientific-technical or business texts, socio-political texts are saturated with culturally and historically conditioned meanings that cannot be adequately rendered through purely linguistic transformation; they require the translator to possess a developed intercultural competence capable of recognizing and reconstructing culturally specific content [4, P.22]. This paper examines the principal manifestations of national-cultural specificity in SPD and considers their implications for the content of translator training.

The problem is of particular significance for Uzbekistan, where the accelerating pace of diplomatic and economic cooperation with foreign partners has expanded the range of socio-political material that professional translators are expected to handle, from bilateral communiqués and international organization documents to political commentary and analytical journalism, each genre carrying its own configuration of culturally marked content.

The literature review shows that we have the following types of national-cultural markedness in SPD:

Political realia. Realia denoting institutions, offices, administrative units, and social phenomena specific to a given political system frequently lack direct equivalents in the target language and culture. G.D. Tomakhin’s linguo-cultural dictionary catalogues numerous American realia of this kind [7, P.211], and comparable phenomena are readily observed in Uzbek and Russian political discourse, requiring translators to choose systematically between transliteration, calque, descriptive translation, and functional analogue.

Precedent names and allusions. Political speeches and commentary frequently rely on allusions to historical events, documents, and figures whose recognition presupposes shared cultural memory. Where such memory is not shared between source and target audiences, the translator must

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

decide between explicitation and omission, a decision with direct consequences for pragmatic equivalence [4, P.56].

Political euphemisms. V.O. Obvintseva's analysis demonstrates that euphemistic units in political mass media perform the specific function of softening or reframing socially sensitive content, and that their translation requires reconstruction of communicative intent rather than literal rendering [5, P.9].

Culturally conditioned metaphors. Political discourse relies heavily on conceptual metaphor to frame political reality (e.g., metaphors of conflict, journey, or family), and T.A. van Dijk's ideological analysis of discourse shows that such framing devices are themselves ideologically loaded and culture-specific, making their translation a matter of intercultural rather than purely linguistic competence [2, P.121].

The systematic character of national-cultural markedness in SPD implies that its treatment in translator training cannot be left to incidental exposure. V.N. Komissarov's view that translation competence includes an irreducible socio-cultural component [4, P.11] supports the position that instruction in the recognition and translation of culturally marked units should be built into the core curriculum as a distinct thematic strand, organized by type of markedness (realia, precedent phenomena, euphemism, metaphor) and by degree of translation difficulty. S.G. Ter-Minasova's broader argument that language and culture form an indissoluble unity [6, P.24] further reinforces the case for treating cultural competence not as supplementary to linguistic training but as constitutive of it.

Practically, this suggests that translator training programs should incorporate comparative analysis of parallel political texts across languages, structured glossaries of culturally marked political vocabulary, and guided translation exercises specifically targeting each of the four categories described above, an approach consistent with M. Byram's model of intercultural competence as an integration of knowledge, skills, and critical cultural awareness [1, P.34].

It is also worth noting that the trilingual environment characteristic of translator training in Uzbekistan, where students routinely mediate among English, Russian, and Uzbek, adds a further layer of complexity to the treatment of national-cultural specificity, since the same source-language unit may require different translation strategies depending on which of the two target languages is involved, owing to differing degrees of prior lexical borrowing and shared cultural reference between Russian and English political discourse on the one hand and Uzbek political discourse on the other.

Preliminary diagnostic work conducted among students of translation-oriented specializations indicates that recognition of culturally marked units is distributed unevenly across the four categories described above. Students most reliably identify realia denoting concrete institutions and offices, since these can often be resolved through reference sources; they are markedly less reliable in recognizing political euphemisms and culturally conditioned metaphors, both of which require inferential rather than referential processing. This asymmetry suggests that curricular attention to national-cultural specificity should not be distributed evenly across categories but should allocate proportionally greater instructional time to the more inferentially demanding categories of euphemism and metaphor, a point that has direct implications for the sequencing of thematic modules within translator training programs.

National-cultural specificity constitutes a defining feature of socio-political discourse and a substantial source of translation difficulty. Systematic classification of this specificity into realia, precedent phenomena, euphemisms, and culturally conditioned metaphors provides a workable basis for structuring the corresponding content of translator training programs. Embedding this content systematically, rather than incidentally, into the curriculum is a necessary condition for developing translators capable of adequate intercultural mediation in the socio-political sphere.

© 2026 International Conference on Multidisciplinary Sciences and Innovations . All Rights Reserved.

The list of used literature:

1. Byram M. Teaching and Assessing Intercultural Communicative Competence. - Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1997. – 252 p.
2. Van Dijk T.A. Ideology and Discourse Analysis // Journal of Political Ideologies. - 2006. - Vol. 11, No. 2. – Pp. 115-140.
3. Дейк Т.А. ван. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. - М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 312 с.
4. Комиссаров В.Н. Современное переводоведение: учебное пособие. - М.: ЭТС, 2002. – 424 с.
5. Обвинцева В.О. Роль политических эвфемизмов в СМИ. - М.: Престиж, 2003. – 120 с.
6. Тер-Минасова С.Г. Язык и межкультурная коммуникация. -- М.: Слово, 2000. – 624 с.
7. Томахин Г.Д. США. Лингвострановедческий словарь. - М.: Рус. яз., 1999. - 576 с.
8. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса. -М., 2004. –125 с.