HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Framing National Development through Metaphor: A Cognitive-Linguistic Analysis of Presidential Speeches in Uzbekistan

Nafosat Dillayeva Abdullaevna
Termez State University, Uzbekistan
Email: dillayev_nafosat@tersu.uz
ORCID: 0009-0004-9323-9500
Prof.**Eri Kurniawan,** M.A.,Ph.D.(Supervizor)
Department of English EducationAcademic,
Faculty of language and Literature EducationUniversitas
Pendidikan Indonesia Bandung, Indonesia
e-mail: eri_kurniawan@upi.edu
doi:https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.24222523

ABSTRACT: National development is communicated not only as policy but also through metaphors of movement, construction and shared social life. This article examines six presidential speeches by Shavkat Mirziyoyev (2021–2025), using their Uzbek originals and official English publications. Four English-delivered speeches by Joseph R. Biden provide a carefully stratified, non-equivalent comparison: an inauguration, two congressional addresses and one supplementary economic speech. The analysis combines conceptual metaphor theory, framing and a source-first, MIP-informed reading procedure. Nine short Uzbek–English excerpt pairs are presented verbatim, alongside source domains, actor roles and translation-status decisions. In this displayed evidence set, four examples involve construction, two involve movement and one each involves embodiment, kinship and maturation; these are counts of selected illustrations, not whole-corpus frequencies. The contribution is a provenance–agency–frame sequence that prevents a translated wording from being mistaken for an original English utterance and keeps conceptual mappings distinct from their local rhetorical effects. An independent second coder was not engaged, and no reliability statistic is reported. Findings are thus traceable qualitative interpretations, not population estimates, evidence of audience effects or claims about governmental outcomes.

Keywords: conceptual metaphor; national development; presidential discourse; Uzbekistan; cognitive linguistics; discourse framing; translation provenance; English political discourse

INTRODUCTION

Development is commonly measured through institutions, expenditures, education, employment and living standards. In presidential speeches, however, it must also be communicated as a process that citizens can understand and connect to their everyday experiences. A speaker can describe reform through literal administrative terms, yet such language rarely explains what the reform should feel like, how its stages relate to one another or why citizens should recognize themselves as participants. Metaphors help bridge this gap. A reform can be represented as a road, a foundation, the maturation of a person or the work of a family. These are not simply stylistic alternatives: each one brings a different set of expectations about agency, duration and desirable outcomes.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Metaphor is therefore relevant to the study of national development without being proof that a speaker has persuaded an audience. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) argue that familiar experience can structure the understanding of more abstract matters. A road implies movement and direction; a building implies preparation, material supports and coordinated work; a body implies interdependent parts; maturation implies time and the acquisition of capacities. In political discourse, these expectations can make some dimensions of public policy appear salient while leaving others less visible. The question for an analyst is not whether development is literally a journey or a building, but what the corresponding language highlights within a particular institutional occasion.

Uzbekistan is a productive setting because official presidential rhetoric presents the New Uzbekistan project across different institutional occasions. The dataset includes the November 2021 inauguration; the Independence Day addresses of 2021, 2022 and 2023; and parliamentary addresses of December 2022 and December 2025. Together, these six speeches broaden the original four-speech selection while allowing genre-specific analysis: inaugurations set a mandate, commemorations recount collective history, and parliamentary addresses connect reform language to administrative proposals (Mirziyoyev, 2021b, 2021d, 2022b, 2022d, 2023b, 2025b). Selection is purposive and cannot establish the population frequency of any metaphor.

Language provenance is particularly important. The Presidency's website publishes English versions of the Uzbek speeches, but a page in English is not by itself evidence that the president delivered that speech in English. The official Uzbek-language versions of the same addresses are available for comparison. An English verb such as build may reflect a metaphorical expression in the Uzbek source; in another case it may be an editor's natural way of translating an ordinary policy verb. The analysis must therefore distinguish the metaphor represented in the Uzbek source, the phrase visible in the English publication and any interpretive conclusion drawn from their alignment. This distinction is central rather than incidental to a study appearing in a journal concerned with English discourse.

For an authentic-English point of reference, four English-delivered addresses by Joseph R. Biden are separated by occasion: the 2021 inauguration is contrasted with the Uzbek inauguration, while the 2023 and 2024 State of the Union addresses inform a restricted comparison with the Uzbek parliamentary addresses. His June 2023 economic remarks are retained only as an exploratory economic-policy illustration, not pooled with the matched-genre examples. This avoids treating speeches to different audiences as interchangeable evidence (Biden, 2021, 2023a, 2023b, 2024). The English comparator is illustrative rather than a statistically balanced national corpus.

The research problem is methodological as well as substantive. Analyses of political metaphor can become lists of striking quotations followed by broad claims about national ideology. Such lists may overlook ordinary metaphorical language, translation differences and the role of co-text. For instance, a statement about constructing a residential district describes physical building; a statement about constructing a society uses a building frame for a political community. The lexical item alone is insufficient. The analyst must establish which subject is being described, whether a more basic physical meaning is being activated and what argumentative work is performed by the contrast.

The study asks three questions. RQ1: Which source domains are demonstrable in the selected Uzbek speeches, and how do they distribute agency, temporal direction and responsibility within their immediate passages? RQ2: What changes or continuities become visible when short verbatim Uzbek expressions are aligned with official English renderings? RQ3: Which interpretive contrasts remain

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

when authentic-English speeches are compared within broadly similar genres? The goal is an auditable qualitative account. The methodological proposition is that metaphor identification, translation provenance and rhetorical function should be established in that order; the article does not claim to have validated a new universal theory.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

Conceptual metaphor theory begins from the observation that speakers regularly use more concrete and embodied experiences to discuss abstract domains. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) show how a conceptual relation can support multiple linguistic expressions without requiring a consciously invented literary comparison on every occasion. On this view, the source domain is the relatively familiar sphere through which a more abstract target becomes intelligible. A political reform is the target; a journey, a building or human maturation may serve as a source. The approach is valuable because it allows an analyst to connect seemingly separate phrases through a coherent mapping while remaining attentive to the exact words that occur.

The mapping must not be treated as a complete equivalence. A journey may include travelers, a route, obstacles and a destination, but a speech may activate only forward movement and not travelers or a fixed endpoint. A building may require design, materials and foundations, but the text may use only the supporting-foundation aspect. Contemporary metaphor scholarship cautions against treating an inferred conceptual formula as a hidden psychological fact. Gibbs (2017) reviews debates about the evidence required to move from metaphorical wording to accounts of understanding. For textual research, the defensible position is to show the lexical expressions and discourse context that motivate a particular conceptual description, then state which aspects remain unobserved.

Metaphor identification is equally important. The Pragglejaz Group (2007) introduced a procedure that compares a lexical unit's contextual meaning with a more basic contemporary meaning to determine whether a contrast may be understood through comparison. Steen et al. (2010) refine this approach through MIPVU, including attention to conventional and indirect metaphor-related language. The present investigation is informed by that distinction, but it is not presented as an exhaustive MIPVU annotation of every word in six long speeches. Its unit is a selected clause or short sequence, and its contribution is an auditable qualitative classification of development-related expressions. A full-corpus frequency study would require systematic segmentation, complete annotation and independent reliability assessment.

Critical metaphor analysis introduces the question of how metaphors are connected with persuasion, value and policy explanation. Charteris-Black (2004) argues that corpus evidence and discourse interpretation can illuminate the rhetorical uses of source domains. Musolff (2016) proposes metaphor scenarios as a way to examine not only a general conceptual relation but also the particular narrative roles and expected developments made available by an expression. The distinction matters for national development. DEVELOPMENT AS A JOURNEY is too broad to explain the difference between a speech that announces a new stage, one that identifies an obstacle and one that presents a route inherited from earlier generations. A scenario-level description asks who moves, what enables movement and whether the destination is specified.

Framing theory adds a complementary vocabulary. Entman (1993) emphasizes selection and salience in the organization of public problems and interpretations. It is important, however, not to equate framing with metaphor. A speech can frame education as a national priority through explicit claims without using a metaphor at all. Conversely, a routine figurative verb may carry little

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

independent rhetorical weight. The relationship is one of possible contribution: a metaphor may provide the conceptual structure through which a problem or solution becomes prominent, while framing involves a broader selection of issues, agents, values and proposed actions.

The representation of agency also matters. Van Leeuwen (2008) shows how discourse can individualize, collectivize or background social actors. A speech that says citizens build a new state constructs a different distribution of responsibility from one that describes a state as developing on its own. In the first case the citizens are represented as builders; in the second development may appear as a process whose causes are already institutionalized or left implicit. This is a description of textual emphasis rather than a judgment about which account of responsibility is factually correct. The same distinction applies to collective terms such as people, nation, state, community and family.

Translation research creates a necessary complication. Schäffner (2004) demonstrates why metaphor transfer cannot be understood only as word-for-word equivalence: a translated expression may preserve a conceptual frame while changing its verbal realization or pragmatic force. A construction image, for example, may be made explicit in English even when Uzbek uses a more general verb, while an original figurative expression may be reduced to a plain explanatory phrase. Where parallel texts are available, the analyst should examine whether the relevant source domain appears in both and whether either version adds precision, evaluation or a different relation between agent and action. The relevant object of analysis is an aligned communicative event, not a claim that a translated sentence is a verbatim speech performance.

Cultural variation prevents the source domains from being universalized too quickly. Kövecses (2005) argues that metaphor patterns can show both widely shared embodied structure and context-specific variation. Journey and construction imagery may therefore occur in Uzbek and English discourse without implying that they carry the same historical associations. In the Uzbek addresses, references to the mahalla, national independence, education and a possible Third Renaissance help determine what foundation or common family means in a given passage. In Biden's economic speeches, verticality and construction are linked to class position, worker opportunity and competing economic-policy narratives. Shared words do not erase these different relations.

Several analytical boundaries follow from this literature. An expression is treated as metaphor-related when a basic spatial, bodily, structural or developmental meaning can reasonably illuminate its contextual meaning. A named building project remains literal even if it occurs beside a political image. A proper name such as New Uzbekistan is not automatically marked metaphorical; it becomes relevant when surrounding language frames the country as something being built, grown or advanced. The analysis also distinguishes metaphor from metonymy: the mahalla may name a neighborhood community and institutional level, while its depiction as a foundation is metaphorical because it transfers the supporting function of a physical structure to social relations.

For each candidate the analysis records (1) the exact lexical trigger; (2) original versus published-translation language provenance; (3) source and target domains; (4) actor or beneficiary position; (5) past/present/future orientation; and (6) local frame function. These fields constitute a provenance–agency–frame matrix. The distinction is operational rather than a new metaphor theory: metaphorical language is identified in the Uzbek original first, translation alignment is checked second, and the local agency/function is interpreted third. That sequence makes rival readings and translation-induced wording visible and avoids treating a shared source domain as proof of an identical pragmatic meaning.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

DATA AND METHOD

The expanded purposive Uzbek corpus contains six speeches: 6 November 2021 (inauguration), 31 August 2021 (30th Independence Day), 31 August 2022 (31st Independence Day), 20 December 2022 (address to the Oliy Majlis and the people), 31 August 2023 (32nd Independence Day), and 26 December 2025 (address to the Oliy Majlis and the people). Each has a publicly accessible Uzbek original and an English publication on the presidential website. The two additional Independence Day addresses strengthen within-genre historical comparison; they do not turn the sample into a representative annual census. Table 1 identifies every document and its language provenance.

The authentic-English comparison includes Biden's inaugural address (20 January 2021), congressional State of the Union addresses (7 February 2023 and 7 March 2024), and the previously used Chicago economic remarks (28 June 2023). Inauguration is compared with inauguration, and parliamentary addresses with congressional addresses only at the level of genre-related function, not identical political institutions. Independence commemorations have no directly equivalent English-delivered speech in this set; Chicago is retained as a supplementary, explicitly unmatched economic-policy case. The comparative denominator is therefore genre-stratified and deliberately unequal, and no speaker-level rank or rate is inferred.

Table 1. Bounded speech corpus and language provenance

Corpus ID / date	Genre and occasion	Language / role in comparison
UZ-INA21 · 06 Nov 2021	Inauguration, Oliy Majlis	Uzbek original + official published English
UZ-IND21 · 31 Aug 2021	30th Independence Day	Uzbek original + official published English
UZ-IND22 · 31 Aug 2022	31st Independence Day	Uzbek original + official published English
UZ-PAR22 · 20 Dec 2022	Address to Oliy Majlis and people	Uzbek original + official published English
UZ-IND23 · 31 Aug 2023	32nd Independence Day	Uzbek original + official published English
UZ-PAR25 · 26 Dec 2025	Address to Oliy Majlis and people	Uzbek original + official published English
EN-INA21 · 20 Jan 2021	Biden inauguration	Original English delivery + transcript
EN-SOTU23 · 07 Feb 2023	Biden State of the Union	Original English delivery + transcript
EN-SOTU24 · 07 Mar 2024	Biden State of the Union	Original English delivery + transcript
EN-ECO23 · 28 Jun 2023	Biden Chicago economic remarks (unmatched)	Original English delivery; illustrative only

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The analytic unit is a metaphor-related lexical expression within its clause or immediately adjacent sentences. Candidate excerpts were retained if they concerned development, reform, collective agency or institutional futures; if the contextual and basic meanings supported a recoverable comparison; and if both the Uzbek original and its English rendering could be located. The nine source-paired examples in Table 3 are a finite evidence display, not a complete census of metaphorical expressions in the six speeches. Counts of these displayed excerpts are reported only with the denominator n = 9. No whole-speech token frequency, domain percentage, relative speaker ranking or statistical significance claim is made.

The identification sequence follows a cautious MIP-informed protocol. First, the local contextual meaning of a candidate expression is established. Second, a plausible basic meaning is identified: physical movement for path, structural support for foundation, biological development for maturation. Third, the analyst asks whether that basic sense can illuminate the abstract political meaning by comparison. Fourth, the proposed mapping is tested against the surrounding sentence: does the frame explain who acts, what is valued or how a process unfolds? Fifth, a rival reading is recorded where the term is partly conventional, partly technical or literal in one context and metaphorical in another. This procedure does not require treating every occurrence of growth or development as an independently salient metaphor.

The Uzbek originals were read first and the published English passages located afterward by argument and adjacent content. Each quotation in Table 3 reproduces a short identifiable excerpt without normalizing wording; ellipses are avoided. A translated English phrase is labeled a website publication, not an English-delivered speech. This paired-evidence practice allows a conceptual alignment to be checked directly, while any shift from, for example, a human body to an organism remains visible rather than being described as exact lexical identity.

A particularly clear instance of such alignment occurs in the 2021 address. The Uzbek text compares the body of social life with the economy and uses soul and spirit for spirituality; the English publication similarly presents the economy as an organism and spirituality as its heart and soul (Mirziyoyev, 2021c, 2021d). The mapping is thus supported by corresponding figurative structure in two language versions, even if the English rendering is not lexically identical. Conversely, a passage whose published English wording appears more explicit than the Uzbek should be coded as an English-text formulation, with any claim of an original-language conceptual change withheld until closer linguistic comparison is possible.

The documented coding sheet for the nine displayed pairs assigns one primary source domain to each selected excerpt. Secondary frames may be discussed in prose but are not silently counted twice. The reader can recover each trigger from the original and English links in the references. Ambiguous cases such as literal housing construction versus figurative social foundations are excluded from the evidence table unless their abstract target is explicit. No second independent human coder has yet annotated the cases; therefore observed agreement, Cohen's kappa and Krippendorff's alpha are unavailable. Before a journal submission claiming inter-coder reliability, a separate trained coder must use the same excerpt set and coding definitions, with disagreements archived and the statistic calculated from the two independently completed coding sheets.

The comparison proceeds in two passes: first within the six Uzbek originals and their publications, and then across genre-matched Uzbek and original-English cases. The 2021 inauguration can be compared with Biden's inauguration, and the 2022/2025 parliamentary addresses with the two

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

State of the Union speeches, with institutional differences stated. The three Uzbek Independence Day speeches are analyzed together but not assigned a fictitious American genre match. The Chicago speech remains an external illustration. This permits scenario-level observations without conflating occasion, translation status or relative prevalence.

Table 2. Operational interpretation fields and exclusion rules

Field	Decision question	Constraint
Textual trigger	Which exact word or short clause invites comparison?	Do not invent or silently regularize quotations
Provenance	Original Uzbek, published English, or authentic English?	Do not label translations as English delivery
Source / target	What concrete experience structures what abstract topic?	Exclude literal physical construction
Agency	Who acts or benefits in the depicted scenario?	Do not infer speaker motives
Time orientation	What past, present or future relation is invoked?	Distinguish chronology from figurative motion
Frame function	Which interpretation does the co-text foreground?	No frequency or audience-effect claim

Table 2 supplies the coding decisions and exclusion rules. For auditability, a supplementary reliability procedure is specified rather than presented as completed research: two coders should independently classify the same fixed excerpt units using this codebook and compare nominal source-domain categories. For two coders, Cohen's kappa may be calculated as $\kappa = (P_o - P_e)/(1 - P_e)$, where P_o is observed agreement and P_e is expected chance agreement. No values of P_o, P_e or κ are claimed in the present study. A full-corpus prevalence analysis would additionally require every speech to be exhaustively segmented, metaphor-related units enumerated, and counts normalized for text length.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Development as movement, direction and an unfinished route

A journey mapping is visible across the Uzbek speeches, but its function changes by occasion. The 2021 inauguration frames democratic reform as a continuing course, linking a new mandate to a longer national project. The published English wording refers to a course of development, while the Uzbek original similarly uses terms associated with a political way or path. Such expressions make reform intelligible as movement that has begun, requires direction and is expected to continue. The chosen route becomes a means of connecting earlier political initiatives to future stages without having to represent each administrative change as a separate, self-contained undertaking (Mirziyoyev, 2021c, 2021d).

In the 2022 parliamentary address, the official English text situates the nation as moving toward a new period of development. The original Uzbek presentation likewise uses a forward-step image at the beginning of the speech. This opening does two jobs. It turns a calendar moment into a step in a larger trajectory, and it establishes a coherent frame for the subsequent transition into budgetary, social and

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

governance priorities. The address then uses specific administrative language, reminding the analyst that an overarching journey image can structure a speech without replacing policy details. Metaphor and literal exposition cooperate rather than compete (Mirziyoyev, 2022c, 2022d).

The 2023 anniversary address provides a more historically developed journey scenario. The speech recalls shared hardship and treats statehood as having gained experience through trials. The English publication describes the country as having been hardened by a journey, while the Uzbek original depicts the sovereign state as having endured difficulties and formed its own path and position (Mirziyoyev, 2023a, 2023b). Here journey imagery is not a simple celebration of speed. It includes adversity as a condition through which collective identity and political agency are said to have matured. This gives the anniversary a different temporal function from the annual address: national development becomes a narrated life history rather than mainly a forward work programme.

Two added Independence Day addresses reveal the contextual specificity of route and foundation. In the 2021 commemoration, the source expression ‘yangi davlat va jamiyat qurish yo‘lida’ has a published-English counterpart referring to work ‘to build a new state and society’ (Mirziyoyev, 2021a, 2021b). The phrase joins nation-building to historical retrospection rather than a numbered government programme. In 2022, ‘faqat oldinga qarab boramiz’ aligns with the English ‘we should only move forward’, within an explicit commitment not to depart from a reform path (Mirziyoyev, 2022a, 2022b). These examples extend the journey/construction analysis within a single commemorative genre; they do not show that either metaphor was statistically predominant in those speeches.

By 2025, the annual parliamentary address again uses route and guidance imagery, but with a distinctive historical analogy. It invokes the astronomical legacy of Mirzo Ulugbek before proposing a figurative map for the lives of current and future generations. The connection links an inherited intellectual achievement to a prospective civic task. A map makes progress appear planable and coordinated; it also suggests that policy depends on orientation and interpretation, not merely on spontaneous forward motion. The Uzbek original contains the corresponding map-of-the-road expression, so the conceptual alignment is stronger than would be possible from the English version alone (Mirziyoyev, 2025a, 2025b).

Reform as construction and institutional support

Construction is perhaps the most versatile image in the selected development discourse because it joins the vocabulary of physical infrastructure with the abstract creation of institutions and social conditions. The 2021 inauguration contains literal plans for housing and public works, but it also calls for constructing a new national future. This juxtaposition does not make the housing policy metaphorical. Rather, literal building and abstract state-making share an activity schema: planning, coordinated labor and the creation of something that should endure. Their proximity may make the political image feel practical, but the two levels of reference must still be annotated separately (Mirziyoyev, 2021c, 2021d).

Foundation imagery is especially important when the speech moves from aspiration to prerequisites. A foundation carries weight and must precede the structure built above it. In the 2021 address, modern knowledge and education are associated with the historical ambition of a new Renaissance. The relevant logic is not merely that schools matter, which can be said literally. It is that future national renewal is presented as dependent on a supporting base. The image invites a relation of

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

necessity between contemporary educational preparation and an imagined civilizational future, while the exact institutional means still require literal policy explanation.

The 2022 address gives the foundation mapping a local institutional direction. The published English version represents the mahalla as a foundation of communal peace and solidarity, while the surrounding passage links neighborhood life to citizen participation, services and budget proposals. The image transfers the supporting role of a built structure to a social unit; it does not assert that neighborhoods are buildings. The argument becomes more accessible because a reader knows that a structure is unstable without its support. Yet this also introduces a possible analytical caution: the metaphor privileges the foundation's supportive function and can obscure disagreements within neighborhoods or between local and central priorities (Mirziyoyev, 2022c, 2022d).

The 2023 anniversary address links economic and political independence through a supporting-base relation. In both languages, progress achieved in earlier years is presented as a foundation for what comes next. Its immediate role is retrospective justification. The speech identifies selected achievements and then places them beneath a future project as its enabling base. The analyst need not verify the statistics reported in the speech to describe this linguistic pattern. What matters for the present inquiry is the causal organization: a previous achievement is framed as material that makes further development possible, creating continuity between remembrance and prospective political action (Mirziyoyev, 2023a, 2023b).

The 2022 anniversary speech also juxtaposes ‘Uchinchi Renessans poydevorini yaratish’ with the published ‘create the foundations of the Third Renaissance’ (Mirziyoyev, 2022a, 2022b). In this local passage, the foundation is a precondition of a national cultural goal; it differs from the 2022 parliamentary mahalla passage, where ‘poydevor’ points to neighborhood peace and social cohesion. A shared construction domain thus does not fix an identical social agent or policy referent. This is a concrete test of the proposed provenance–agency–frame distinction, rather than a merely renamed metaphor category.

The 2025 address again draws on foundations, now in the context of multi-year targets and proposed institutional reforms. It also contains literal discussion of roads, energy networks, utilities and construction. The distinction between material and metaphorical building becomes methodologically critical. References to constructing an apartment or repairing a physical facility are literal acts of construction; a statement that reform rests on a political or social foundation is metaphorical. In the published English speech, physical infrastructure and figurative national foundations coexist. This coexistence supports an interpretation of practical interconnection but not the automatic classification of every technical use of infrastructure as a metaphor (Mirziyoyev, 2025a, 2025b).

A construction scenario may distribute responsibility differently depending on the grammatical subject. When citizens, teachers or local communities are described as contributors to building the national future, the frame places them in the role of builders. When institutions are said to lay foundations, planning and technical capacity become prominent. When development is nominalized as an achievement or process, its human actors may be less visible. The selected addresses use several such patterns. The source domain is therefore not a single ideological message; its pragmatic value depends on who occupies its roles and what kind of future structure is being envisaged.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

The nation as a person whose capacities develop

The 2023 Independence Day speech contains an unusually explicit personification of the state. It compares a person born at the time of independence with contemporary Uzbekistan, using the period since independence as a life course in which a person acquires views, aspirations and an independent position. The Uzbek source refers to the infant of thirty-two years earlier and the state that has matured through experience; the published English version makes the same narrative analogy visible. Unlike an isolated adjective such as young, this is a sustained comparison with a clearly named source, temporal structure and evaluative conclusion (Mirziyoyev, 2023a, 2023b).

The personification has several effects in the text. First, it makes the nation seem like a coherent entity whose identity persists while capacities change. Second, it gives difficulty a developmental meaning: hardship becomes part of growing up rather than a merely accidental interruption. Third, it permits retrospective appreciation of national effort without enumerating all institutions responsible for it. The metaphor frames statehood as achieving maturity, while the adjacent speech acknowledges contributions from a variety of occupational groups. Neither the metaphor nor the list eliminates diversity inside the political community, but the image foregrounds a shared trajectory.

The life-course comparison also differs from the journey metaphor with which it overlaps. In a journey, destination and direction are prominent; in maturation, the passage of time and the acquisition of abilities are salient. The anniversary speech blends these perspectives: the nation has endured a historical road and become capable of acting with greater confidence. The resulting scenario presents national development as both movement through external circumstances and internal growth in capacities. This is more precise than reporting that the speech uses a generic progress metaphor.

The economy as a body and society as an interdependent whole

The 2021 inaugural address develops a body analogy in a passage devoted to economic and spiritual development. The Uzbek original contrasts the body of social life, identified with the economy, with its soul and spirit, identified with spirituality. The published English text uses an organism and heart-and-soul language for the same relationship (Mirziyoyev, 2021c, 2021d). Although the lexical correspondence is not perfectly symmetrical, the two versions preserve the central interdependence frame: a viable collective whole requires more than one kind of sustaining element.

This passage illustrates why metaphor cannot be separated from local argument. The body image is placed within a discussion of cultural and educational policy. The economy is not characterized as dispensable, and spirituality is not depicted as merely decorative. Instead, the frame treats both as necessary for a functioning societal whole. By invoking bodily vitality, the speech represents a set of policy priorities as complementary rather than competing. The metaphor supplies a relation of mutual necessity that would require a longer list of abstractions if expressed only through administrative terminology.

The nation as a family and the distribution of belonging

The 2022 address describes Uzbekistan as a large and friendly family. The Uzbek original similarly represents the population as members of one close-knit family. In the context of an address about social protection and living conditions, the analogy gives citizens the role of relatives whose well-being is a collective concern (Mirziyoyev, 2022c, 2022d). A family frame is not simply a synonym for the nation. It supplies expectations about care, solidarity and mutual obligation that can

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

make social policies appear connected to everyday relations. It also links the speaker's presentation of government responsibility to a socially familiar structure.

The 2021 inauguration also uses collective-family language in a passage about multiethnic coexistence. The surrounding context invokes shared membership and cultural differences, suggesting that the family image can organize pluralism as well as social welfare. The 2023 anniversary address lists teachers, medical workers, farmers, service members, entrepreneurs, young people and others as contributors to independence. Even where the word family is not repeated, the cumulative enumeration sustains a larger claim that national achievement is shared. It would be inaccurate, however, to say that every occupational reference is a metaphor; the relation is between literal enumeration and the broader collective frame.

Education, renewal and the future-oriented value of metaphor

Education occupies a particularly revealing place in the corpus because it is both a literal policy sector and a symbolic resource for national renewal. The 2021 address invokes a future Renaissance and depicts educational preparation as foundational. The 2023 independence address links the future of society to the formation of young people, teachers and knowledge. The 2025 speech refers to inherited scientific accomplishment while imagining guidance for future generations. Across these passages, education becomes a bridge between practical institutional work and a long historical horizon (Mirziyoyev, 2021c, 2021d, 2023a, 2023b, 2025a, 2025b).

Table 3. Selected traceable developmental frames

Case / primary domain	**Verbatim original and published-English excerpts**	**Interpretation; provenance retained**
UZ-INA21 / BODY (Mirziyoyev 2021c–d)	Uzbek: “jamiyat hayotining tanasi iqtisodiyot bo‘lsa” English: “the economy is an organism”	BODY; conceptual continuity, different body wording
UZ-INA21 / FOUNDATION (Mirziyoyev 2021c–d)	Uzbek: “Uchinchi Renessans poydevorini barpo etish” English: “foundation of the Third Renaissance”	CONSTRUCTION; education enables future renewal
UZ-IND21 / BUILDING (Mirziyoyev 2021a–b)	Uzbek: “yangi davlat va jamiyat qurish yo‘lida” English: “to build a new state and society”	CONSTRUCTION; retrospective national formation
UZ-IND22 / PATH (Mirziyoyev 2022a–b)	Uzbek: “faqat oldinga qarab boramiz” English: “we should only move forward”	JOURNEY; commitment to continued direction
UZ-IND22 / FOUNDATION (Mirziyoyev 2022a–b)	Uzbek: “Uchinchi Renessans poydevorini yaratish” English: “create the foundations of the Third Renaissance”	CONSTRUCTION; projected cultural renewal

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Case / primary domain	Verbatim original and published-English excerpts	Interpretation; provenance retained
UZ-PAR22 / MAHALLA (Mirziyoyev 2022c–d)	Uzbek: “Mahalla – tinchlik va osoyishtalik poydevori” English: “A makhalla is the foundation of peace and tranquility”	CONSTRUCTION; community as institutional support
UZ-PAR22 / FAMILY (Mirziyoyev 2022c–d)	Uzbek: “katta va inoq oilaning har bir a’zosi” English: “every member of a big and friendly family”	KINSHIP; shared care and belonging
UZ-IND23 / MATURATION (Mirziyoyev 2023a–b)	Uzbek: “O‘ttiz ikki yil avval tug‘ilgan go‘dak” English: “a child born thirty-two years ago”	LIFE COURSE; national personification
UZ-PAR25 / ROADMAP (Mirziyoyev 2025a–b)	Uzbek: “yo‘l xaritasini yaratishimiz lozim” English: “we must create a roadmap”	JOURNEY / NAVIGATION; future direction and planning

The nine displayed paired excerpts constitute the sole denominator for a descriptive count: CONSTRUCTION = 4, JOURNEY/NAVIGATION = 2, and BODY, KINSHIP and LIFE COURSE = 1 each (total n = 9). These are counts of evidence selections, not lexical frequencies in six speeches. The coding labels are auditable first-pass decisions by one analyst; their inter-coder reliability has not been measured.

Authentic English comparator: construction, verticality and distributive contrast

The English-delivered comparison is reorganized by occasion. Biden's 2021 inaugural address uses the repair/building sequence ‘Much to repair. Much to restore. Much to heal. Much to build’ (Biden, 2021). Like the Uzbek 2021 inauguration's foundation and future-building passages, it makes prospective national action accessible through material and restorative experience; unlike an unqualified national analogy, it is voiced in the context of a particular inauguration. The shared domain does not make the rhetorical agents, historical crises or political objectives equivalent.

The two congressional addresses form a more defensible comparison with the Uzbek parliamentary speeches. The 2023 State of the Union calls the American story one ‘of progress and resilience, of always moving forward’ (Biden, 2023a). The metaphor contributes a narrative of temporal continuity. The Uzbek 2022 parliamentary address opens with ‘dadil qadam qo‘ymoqda’ and its English version makes national development a ‘new era’; these cues similarly connect political time with movement (Mirziyoyev, 2022c, 2022d). Yet the actors, institutional agenda and addressee are different, so the comparison concerns a passage-level scenario, not a matched effect size.

The 2024 State of the Union gives construction an explicitly distributive direction: an economy is built ‘from the middle out and the bottom up’ (Biden, 2024). This source-domain cue is used within a legislative policy contrast, whereas the Uzbek mahalla-as-foundation wording emphasizes local

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

solidarity and institutional support. Chicago's 2023 remarks likewise contrast middle-out/bottom-up and top-down approaches, but they were delivered as economic-policy remarks rather than a congressional address (Biden, 2023b). They are treated as a supplementary illustration and excluded from the matched-genre inference.

The expanded English comparison now contains three genre-located primary cases—one inauguration and two State of the Union speeches—plus the separately labeled Chicago example. Construction and spatial motion occur in both national contexts, but their immediate tasks differ: renewal or local institutional support in the sampled Uzbek texts, restorative unity or economic distribution in the sampled US texts. These observations remain bounded to particular passages. There is no basis for reporting one language or political system as using a domain more frequently.

Table 4. Similar source domains, different discourse functions

Comparison status	Uzbek evidence	Original-English evidence
Inauguration (2021)	UZ-INA21: knowledge/renaissance foundation; BODY	EN-INA21: "Much to repair. Much to restore. Much to heal. Much to build."
Legislative address (2022/2023)	UZ-PAR22: "poydevori"; social-institutional support	EN-SOTU23: "story of progress and resilience, of always moving forward"
Legislative address (2025/2024)	UZ-PAR25: "yo'l xaritasini yaratishimiz lozim"	EN-SOTU24: "building an economy from the middle out and the bottom up"
Independence anniversaries	UZ-IND21, UZ-IND22, UZ-IND23: history and maturation	No American Independence Day address sampled; not compared as a matched genre
Economic remarks (unmatched)	Not counted in a genre-matched Uzbek–English pairing	EN-ECO23: "middle out and bottom up"; supplementary illustration only

COMPARATIVE SYNTHESIS OF FORM AND FUNCTION

The cases reveal a recurrent division between source domains and communicative functions. A construction expression may emphasize institutional prerequisites in one speech and shared labor in another. A journey expression may justify continuity, narrate past hardship or invite deliberate future planning. A family expression may explain solidarity while leaving legal membership and resource distribution unspecified. The function cannot be read directly off a dictionary label such as JOURNEY or BUILDING. It has to be reconstructed from the relevant passage, its speech occasion and its representation of actors.

The genre-stratified design supports three bounded contrasts. Inauguration passages construct prospective collective work in both corpora, but do so amid different institutional histories. Parliamentary and congressional addresses connect policy proposals with movement and construction, yet English-distributive verticality and Uzbek neighborhood foundations allocate attention to different beneficiaries and structures. Independence commemorations in the Uzbek corpus connect reform to

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

historical memory and the life course of the state; no matched US commemorative speech is included. These differences are textual observations rather than national-cultural generalizations or statistical effects.

The aligned quotations add a translation-sensitive qualification. In 2021, Uzbek ‘tanasi’ is rendered in English as ‘organism’; the body/organism domain is maintained although lexical form differs. In 2022, ‘poydevori’ and ‘foundation’ closely agree in the mahalla case. The 2023 child's maturation and 2025 roadmap are also present in both original and English versions (Mirziyoyev, 2021c, 2021d, 2022c, 2022d, 2023a, 2023b, 2025a, 2025b). The comparison demonstrates continuity in selected images, not universal translation fidelity. For each case, provenance and actor placement remain independently reportable dimensions.

The problem of conventional metaphor remains. Policy documents routinely use terms such as development, progress and stage. These may have historical connections with spatial or growth meanings, but they do not always activate a striking source scenario for a reader. The present analysis therefore gives greater weight to sustained images—an infant becoming a mature state, a body with interdependent elements, a map connecting scientific heritage to public planning—than to isolated conventional expressions. The distinction produces a more selective and testable interpretation without implying that conventional language has no cognitive significance.

IMPLICATIONS FOR COGNITIVE-LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

A methodological implication is the provenance–agency–frame sequence proposed here. First locate the original Uzbek lexical trigger; second judge whether the official English version keeps, changes or adds a source-domain cue; third identify the actor roles and the local rhetorical task. The resulting three-step matrix has a testable analytical benefit: two sentences may share the label BUILDING while giving different actors the role of builder or support. This is a narrowly specified operational contribution integrating existing metaphor and framing theories, not a claim to a newly discovered cognitive universal.

A second implication concerns actor representation. If the nation is a traveler, attention should be paid to whether the text names a guide, a collective set of travelers or a distant destination. If citizens are builders, their contribution should be distinguished from the agency assigned to government departments. If society is a body, the analyst should ask which functions are considered essential and whether any disagreement or alternative pathway becomes less visible. These questions permit critical examination without declaring the metaphor manipulative or beneficial by definition.

The practical value of that sequence lies in its auditable decisions and boundaries. Independent coders can apply the same original-first protocol to identical passages, document disagreement about basic and contextual meanings, and assess category agreement. The present article supplies a compact evidence table and exclusion rules, but no independent coding exercise or chance-corrected reliability estimate has taken place. Future research can preregister a larger, evenly sampled genre-based corpus, preserve paired text segments with permanent identifiers, and test whether the matrix reduces translation-induced disagreement.

LIMITATIONS, RESEARCH VALUE AND REFLEXIVITY

The primary selection remains modest despite expansion: six Uzbek presidential addresses with paired English publications, three original-English speeches compared by broadly related genre, and one supplementary English economic address. The six documents cover inauguration, parliamentary and Independence Day occasions, not all national development rhetoric or complete annual coverage.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Nine paired examples are displayed and counted as examples, not as the universe of metaphors in those documents. The excerpt distribution is descriptive only; a lexical frequency analysis across complete speeches and a speaker-level comparison would require comprehensive annotation, token denominators, matched genres, and independent reliability testing.

The second limitation is language status. The English versions published on the Uzbek presidential website are official public records but are not authenticated transcripts of English speech delivery. Their phrasing may reflect translation and editing. The aligned Uzbek pages reduce some ambiguity by making the original-language expression inspectable, but they do not allow every translational decision to be reconstructed. The US materials, by contrast, are official or trusted English-language records of English-delivered speeches; their transcription conventions can still matter. The analysis is deliberately more confident about source-domain continuity in aligned examples than about subtle stylistic intentions in the published English renderings.

The third limitation concerns cognition and effects. Conceptual metaphor theory motivates hypotheses about how language can structure interpretation, but this documentary study does not observe listeners' mental representations. It does not conduct interviews or experiments and cannot claim that a given image changed public attitudes. Similarly, the speeches' statements about development achievements are political claims made within the analyzed documents; checking their independent economic accuracy lies outside the article. Avoiding these inferences strengthens rather than weakens the linguistic result because it identifies precisely what the evidence establishes.

Several reproducibility steps are still outstanding. The nine original–English pairs and source URLs permit readers to audit key claims, and the codebook records lexical trigger, source/target, agent and frame function. The primary domain assignments were made in a single analytic pass, not independently replicated. A second competent annotator must code the fixed data without access to the first labels before an inter-rater statistic can be reported; the article accordingly reports no reliability figure. The proposed sequencing is a hypothesis about good analytical practice, not a validated gain in coding reliability. These boundaries are important for research monitoring and any subsequent journal submission.

CONCLUSION

The expanded selection of six Uzbek speeches shows several textual constructions of development: direction and movement, foundations and building, national maturation, bodily interdependence and family belonging. Their argumentative roles vary with genre and local co-text. Verbatim Uzbek–English excerpt pairs make the core readings inspectable; in nine displayed pairs, building accounts for four examples, journey or navigation for two, and body, kinship and maturation for one each. These figures describe only the selected evidence display and cannot be extrapolated to the complete speeches. The key result is that the same conceptual mapping may foreground different actors or institutional relationships.

The genre-stratified comparison adds an inauguration and a congressional address to the original English-delivered material while retaining the 2023 Chicago remarks as an unmatched illustration. It documents shared construction and movement resources without implying identical political contexts. The operational contribution is a provenance–agency–frame protocol for separating original metaphor, published translation, and local rhetorical function. It remains a qualitative, single-coder analysis with no full-corpus frequencies, reliability coefficient or audience-response test. Future work should

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

independently code a larger, genre-matched corpus before making prevalence or generalizability claims.

REFERENCES

1. Biden, J. R., Jr. (2021, January 20). Inaugural address [Speech transcript]. The American Presidency Project. https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/inaugural-address-53
2. Biden, J. R., Jr. (2023a, February 7). Address before a joint session of the Congress on the State of the Union [Speech transcript]. Daily Compilation of Presidential Documents. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/DCPD-202300096/html/DCPD-202300096.htm
3. Biden, J. R., Jr. (2023b, June 28). Remarks on the national economy in Chicago, Illinois [Speech transcript]. The American Presidency Project. https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/remarks-the-national-economy-chicago-illinois
4. Biden, J. R., Jr. (2024, March 7). Address before a joint session of the Congress on the State of the Union [Speech transcript]. Daily Compilation of Presidential Documents. https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/DCPD-202400170/html/DCPD-202400170.htm
5. Charteris-Black, J. (2004). Corpus approaches to critical metaphor analysis. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230000612
6. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. Journal of Communication, 43(4), 51–58. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x
7. Gibbs, R. W., Jr. (2017). Metaphor wars: Conceptual metaphors in human life. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781107762350
8. Kövecses, Z. (2005). Metaphor in culture: Universality and variation. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511614408
9. Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). Metaphors we live by. University of Chicago Press.
10. Mirziyoyev, S. (2021a, August 31). The independence of the Motherland: The source of our strength and inspiration, basis of well-being and prosperity [Published English Independence Day address]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/en/lists/view/4596
11. Mirziyoyev, S. (2021b, August 31). Vatanimiz mustaqilligi – biz uchun kuch-qudrat va ilhom manbai, taraqqiyot va farovonlik asosi [Independence Day address, in Uzbek]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/4596
12. Mirziyoyev, S. (2021c, November 6). We will resolutely continue the course of the democratic reforms based on the Development Strategy of the New Uzbekistan [Published English text of inaugural address]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/en/lists/view/4743
13. Mirziyoyev, S. (2021d, November 6). Yangi O‘zbekiston taraqqiyot strategiyasi asosida demokratik islohotlar yo‘lini qat’iy davom ettiramiz [Inaugural address, in Uzbek]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/4743
14. Mirziyoyev, S. (2022a, August 31). National independence is a strong foundation for the New Uzbekistan [Published English Independence Day address]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/en/lists/view/5484
15. Mirziyoyev, S. (2022b, August 31). Milliy mustaqillik – Yangi O‘zbekistonning mustahkam asosidir [Independence Day address, in Uzbek]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/5484

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

16. Mirziyoyev, S. (2022c, December 20). Address to the Oliy Majlis and the people of Uzbekistan [Published English text]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/en/lists/view/5774
17. Mirziyoyev, S. (2022d, December 20). O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Shavkat Mirziyoyevning Oliy Majlis va O‘zbekiston xalqiga Murojaatnomasi [Address, in Uzbek]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/5774
18. Mirziyoyev, S. (2023a, August 31). A nation that turned the time into opportunity, the opportunity into success, and the success into the foundation of development is a great nation [Published English text of Independence Day address]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/en/lists/view/6637
19. Mirziyoyev, S. (2023b, August 31). O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Shavkat Mirziyoyevning O‘zbekiston Respublikasi davlat mustaqilligining o‘ttiz ikki yilligiga bag‘ishlangan tantanali marosimdagi nutqi [Address, in Uzbek]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/6637
20. Mirziyoyev, S. (2025a, December 26). Address to the Oliy Majlis and the people of Uzbekistan [Published English text]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/en/lists/view/8834
21. Mirziyoyev, S. (2025b, December 26). O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Prezidenti Shavkat Mirziyoyevning Oliy Majlis va O‘zbekiston xalqiga Murojaatnomasi [Address, in Uzbek]. Official Website of the President of Uzbekistan. https://president.uz/oz/lists/view/8834
22. Musolff, A. (2016). Political metaphor analysis: Discourse and scenarios. Bloomsbury Academic.
23. Pragglejaz Group. (2007). MIP: A method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. Metaphor and Symbol, 22(1), 1–39. https://doi.org/10.1080/10926480709336752
24. Schäffner, C. (2004). Metaphor and translation: Some implications of a cognitive approach. Journal of Pragmatics, 36(7), 1253–1269. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2003.10.012
25. Steen, G. J., Dorst, A. G., Herrmann, J. B., Kaal, A. A., Krennmayr, T., & Pasma, T. (2010). A method for linguistic metaphor identification: From MIP to MIPVU. John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.14
26. van Leeuwen, T. (2008). Discourse and practice: New tools for critical analysis. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195323306.001.0001

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Nafosat Dillayeva Abdullaevna is affiliated with Termez State University, Uzbekistan. Her academic interests include political discourse, cognitive linguistics, metaphor, framing and the analysis of accessible institutional texts. The present article investigates presidential development rhetoric through a bounded bilingual Uzbek corpus and an authentic-English comparison, with particular attention to evidential limits.

ORCID: 0009-0005-0849-189X

DECLARATIONS

Data availability: All six Uzbek-language presidential speeches, their published English versions and the four English-delivered comparison texts are publicly accessible at the URLs given in the reference list. The nine excerpt pairs in Table 3 identify traceable passages; a fully tokenized corpus and independent second-coder dataset have not been deposited or claimed.

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Ethics: The study analyzes publicly available political speeches and does not recruit human participants or use personal research records.

Competing interests: To be confirmed by the corresponding author before submission.

AI assistance disclosure: An AI assistant was used in drafting and editing this manuscript. The named author is responsible for checking all source links, quotations, analysis, authorship claims and the journal's disclosure requirements before submission.