

THE EFFECTIVENESS OF USING FRAMING TECHNIQUES IN POLITICAL INTERVIEWS

[Maftuna Juraeva,](#)

**Researcher at the Uzbekistan State, University of World Languages,
Uzbekistan**

Аннотация. В данной работе анализируется использование и эффективность фрейминга (рамочного подхода) в политических интервью. Фрейминг является важной стратегией политической коммуникации, которая влияет на восприятие информации аудиторией, представляя её с определённой точки зрения. В исследовании рассматриваются формы фрейминга в политических интервью, его применение в речи журналистов и политиков, а также его роль в формировании общественного мнения. Результаты показывают, что фрейминг оказывает значительное влияние на понимание и восприятие политических сообщений.

Ключевые слова: Политическое интервью, фрейминг, политическая коммуникация, общественное мнение, влияние СМИ, манипуляция, речевая стратегия.

Abstract. This study analyzes the use and effectiveness of framing techniques in political interviews. Framing is an important communication strategy in political discourse that influences how audiences perceive information by presenting it from a particular perspective. The research examines different forms of framing in political interviews, its application in the speech of journalists and politicians, and its role in shaping public opinion. The findings indicate that framing significantly affects how political messages are understood and received by the audience.

Keywords: Political interview, framing, political communication, public opinion, media influence, manipulation, speech strategy.

Introduction

Political communication plays a crucial role in shaping public perception and influencing societal attitudes toward political actors and events. Among the various strategies employed in political discourse, framing has emerged as a significant analytical concept that explains how information is presented and interpreted.

Framing refers to the process of selecting certain aspects of a perceived reality and making them more salient in communication, thereby promoting a particular interpretation of events. In political interviews, framing is especially important as it allows both journalists and politicians to construct meanings, emphasize specific issues, and guide audience interpretation. Through carefully structured questions and responses, interview participants can highlight or downplay certain aspects of political reality, which in turn affects how the audience understands and evaluates political messages. This study examines the effectiveness of framing techniques in political interviews, focusing on how these strategies influence message interpretation and public opinion formation. By analyzing the interaction between interviewers and political figures, the research aims to demonstrate the role of framing as a powerful tool in modern political communication.

Literature Review

In recent years, framing theory has become one of the most significant research areas in political communication and media studies. Framing is interpreted as a communicative mechanism that shapes how audiences perceive information by selecting and presenting it from a particular perspective. This approach plays an important role in constructing political meaning within political interviews, televised debates, and digital media contexts. Recent studies by Claes H. de Vreese analyze the functions of political framing in the media environment, emphasizing that framing is not only a journalistic choice but also a strategic element of political communication[1]. His work shows that the questions posed by journalists and the response strategies used by politicians in political interviews contribute to the construction of specific frames. Similarly, research conducted by James N. Druckman highlights the direct impact of framing effects on audience decision-making processes[2]. He empirically demonstrates that when political information is presented through different frames, individuals' evaluations of political events change significantly. This explains the existence of multiple interpretations of the same reality in political interview contexts. In their collaborative work, Dennis Chong and James N. Druckman focus on the competitive nature of framing,

showing that individuals exposed to multiple frames experience more complex political decision-making processes[3]. This perspective is particularly important for analyzing political interviews, as it reveals the communicative struggle between journalists and political actors. Dietram A. Scheufele examines the relationship between media framing and audience framing, noting that in the contemporary digital media environment, the rapid spread of information intensifies framing effects[4]. His research demonstrates how social media and digital platforms can rapidly amplify or reshape frames used in political interviews. Robert M. Entman develops framing theory as a central concept in political communication, emphasizing that the selective emphasis of certain aspects in media texts plays a crucial role in constructing political meaning[5]. His approach is widely used as a theoretical foundation for analyzing political interviews. Overall, the analysis of existing literature shows that framing is a key factor in determining the effectiveness of political interviews. It plays a central role in interpreting information, guiding public opinion, and constructing political reality. Therefore, studying framing remains one of the main directions in contemporary political communication research.

Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research approach to examine the effectiveness of framing techniques in political interviews. The primary methods used are content analysis and discourse analysis, which allow for a systematic examination of interview texts and communication strategies. Content analysis is used to identify framing patterns in political interviews, focusing on how questions and responses are structured to highlight or emphasize specific aspects of political issues. Discourse analysis is applied to explore the interaction between journalists and political actors, with particular attention to language use, context, and meaning construction. The data consists of selected political interviews from various media sources. These interviews were chosen based on their relevance to contemporary political issues and their potential to demonstrate different framing strategies. Overall, the methodological approach enables a clear analysis of how framing is

used in political interviews and how it influences the interpretation of political messages.

Analysis and Findings

The use of framing techniques in political interviews appears in both Uzbekistan and international practice as an important communicative mechanism for interpreting political reality and shaping public opinion. The qualitative analysis conducted shows that in presidential interviews, framing not only structures the question-and-answer process but also constructs the broader political narrative. In various interviews with the President of Uzbekistan, framing is often expressed through positive conceptual frames such as **“reforms,” “development,”** and **“public welfare”**. [6] For example, in interviews with international media representatives, questions about economic reforms are often formulated as: ***“How have the reforms implemented in recent years brought Uzbekistan to a new stage of development?”*** The phrase “new stage” presupposes positive outcomes in advance, thereby strengthening a **“progress frame”**. As a result, the interview tends to focus on achievements rather than problems. At the same time, problem framing is also observed in some cases. For instance, when discussing prices or economic pressure, expressions such as **“rising inflation”** or **“impact of the global economic crisis”** are used. This pre-defines the issue as a problem and places the respondent in a defensive position.

In interviews with foreign presidents, framing is more competitive and ideologically driven. For example, in interviews with former U.S. President Joe Biden, immigration is often framed through a **“national security”** lens: ***“How does the administration ensure that immigration does not threaten national security?”*** Here, immigration is automatically constructed as a **“threat,”** leading the audience to perceive the issue in terms of risk. In Donald Trump’s interviews, framing is frequently expressed through **“crisis”** and **“loss of control”** narratives. For instance, border issues are often described as a **“border crisis”**. This linguistic choice intensifies the problem and serves to legitimize a particular political stance. In interviews with former British Prime Minister Boris Johnson, the **“accountability frame”** is particularly prominent. For example, during the COVID-

19 pandemic, questions such as *“How does the government explain delayed decisions during the pandemic?”* were frequently posed[7]. This type of framing holds the politician accountable and emphasizes the consequences of decisions. The findings indicate that framing in presidential interviews performs three main functions: first, selectively highlighting specific aspects of political reality; second, guiding audience perception; and third, strengthening or defending political positions. Journalists construct frames through their questions, while presidents respond by accepting, reshaping, or reframing them. Overall, political interviews are not neutral exchanges of information but rather arenas of meaning construction and interpretative struggle. Framing is the central mechanism in this process, determining the effectiveness of political communication and directly influencing the formation of public opinion.

FRAMING IN PRESIDENTIAL INTERVIEWS: UZBEKISTAN vs UNITED STATES				
A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF FRAMING STRATEGIES				
FRAMING ASPECT		UZBEKISTAN PRESIDENT INTERVIEWS	U.S. PRESIDENT INTERVIEWS	
	Dominant Framing	“Development”, “Reforms”, “Stability”, “People’s Welfare” 	“Security”, “Crisis”, “National Interest”, “Freedom” 	
	How Problems Are Presented	Problems are presented mildly and usually linked to global factors. 	Problems are strongly dramatized using words like “crisis”, “threat”, “danger”. 	
	Journalists’ Questioning Style	Often assumes positive outcomes and focuses on achievements and progress. 	Often critical, confrontational, and aimed at holding the president accountable. 	
	Example Question Format	“Have the reforms of recent years brought Uzbekistan to a new stage of development?”	“Does immigration threaten national security?”	
	Type of Framing	Progress framing, Development framing, Stability framing 	Security framing, Crisis framing, Conflict framing 	
	President’s Response Strategy	Emphasizes achievements, explains reforms, highlights future goals. 	Defends policies, justifies decisions, or strengthens political position. 	
	Reframing (How President Redirects the Frame)	Links problems to “global processes” or “external challenges”. 	Redirects to “freedom”, “economic growth”, or “American values”. 	
	Emotional Language	Relatively neutral, optimistic and inclusive. 	Highly emotional and evaluative (e.g., “danger”, “crisis”, “unfair”). 	
	Overall Communicative Effect	Builds a positive image, strengthens trust, promotes stability and unity. 	Increases political debate and polarization, mobilizes supporters. 	
KEY TAKEAWAY		UZBEKISTAN APPROACH	VS	U.S. APPROACH
 Both Uzbek and U.S. presidents use framing to shape the way audiences understand political issues, but their approaches reflect different political cultures and communication goals.		- Focus on progress and reforms - Soft presentation of problems - Nation-building and unity - Long-term vision - Cooperative tone		- Focus on security and challenges - Strong presentation of problems - Accountability and debate - Short-term impact - Competitive tone
 CONCLUSION Framing is a powerful tool in political interviews. Journalists frame issues through their questions, while presidents respond by accepting, reframing, or reshaping the frame. This process directly influences public perception and the effectiveness of political communication.				

Figure 1.1. Comparative Analysis of Framing in Presidential Interviews: Uzbekistan vs United States

Figure 1.1 presents a comparative overview of framing strategies used in presidential interviews in Uzbekistan and the United States. The infographic clearly illustrates how political communication is structured differently in the two contexts, highlighting variations in dominant framing, problem representation, journalistic questioning style, and overall communicative impact. The analysis shows that in the case of Uzbekistan, presidential interviews are predominantly characterized by **progress, development, and stability framing**. The discourse tends to emphasize national reforms, socio-economic improvements, and long-term modernization goals. Problems are generally presented in a moderated form and are often contextualized within broader global or external factors. This creates a communicative environment where positive achievements are foregrounded, and political narratives are oriented toward nation-building and public trust. In contrast, presidential interviews in the United States demonstrate a strong presence of **security, crisis, and accountability framing**. Issues such as immigration, economic challenges, or foreign policy are frequently presented through risk-oriented or conflict-driven narratives. Journalistic questioning tends to be more critical and confrontational, often aimed at evaluating governmental responsibility and policy effectiveness. This results in a more adversarial communication style, where political discourse is shaped by debate and ideological competition. The infographic further highlights differences in emotional language use. Uzbek presidential interviews are generally characterized by a more neutral and optimistic tone, whereas U.S. interviews tend to include more evaluative and emotionally charged expressions such as “crisis,” “threat,” or “danger.” This difference significantly influences how audiences perceive political realities in each country. Overall, Figure 1.1 demonstrates that framing in presidential interviews is not merely a linguistic choice but a strategic communicative tool that reflects broader political culture. While Uzbekistan’s framing approach focuses on stability and developmental continuity, the U.S. model emphasizes accountability, contestation,

Conclusion

Framing techniques are a fundamental element in political interviews because they strongly influence how political messages are constructed, delivered, and interpreted. By selecting specific words, emphasizing particular facts, or presenting issues from a chosen perspective, political figures and interviewers can shape the audience's understanding of events without altering the core facts themselves. This makes framing a powerful communicative strategy in political discourse. The effectiveness of framing in political interviews is closely linked to how well it aligns with audience beliefs, values, and prior knowledge. When a frame resonates with the audience's existing views, it becomes more persuasive and memorable. On the other hand, if the audience is critical, well-informed, or aware of framing strategies, the impact may be reduced. This shows that framing is not universally effective in the same way for all viewers but depends on context and audience characteristics. In addition, the role of media literacy is crucial in determining how framing is received. Audiences with higher media awareness are more likely to recognize persuasive techniques and evaluate information critically, while less informed audiences may be more easily influenced by the framing used in interviews. Similarly, the skills of journalists and interviewees also affect the outcome, as both sides may strategically use framing to control narratives, redirect questions, or emphasize certain political agendas.

REFERENCES

1. Chong, D., & Druckman, J. N. (2007). Framing theory. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 10, 103.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.10.072805.10305>
2. Entman, R. M. (1993). Framing: Toward clarification of a fractured paradigm. *Journal of Communication*, 43(4), 51.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1993.tb01304.x>

3. Entman, R. M. (2007). Framing bias: Media in the distribution of power. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 163. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00376.x>
4. Scheufele, D. A. (1999). Framing as a theory of media effects. *Journal of Communication*, 49(1), 103. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.1999.tb02784.x>
5. Scheufele, D. A., & Tewksbury, D. (2007). Framing, agenda setting, and priming: The evolution of three media effects models. *Journal of Communication*, 57(1), 9. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0021-9916.2007.00326.x>
6. de Vreese, C. H. (2005). News framing: Theory and typology. *Information Design Journal + Document Design*, 13(1), 51. <https://doi.org/10.1075/idjdd.13.1.06vre>
7. Matthes, J. (2009). What's in a frame? A content analysis of media framing studies. *Journal of Communication*, 59(2), 349. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2009.01432.x>