

EXPLORING THE DIMENSIONS OF DISCOURSE CLASSIFICATION

Niyazova Gulnorakhon Gulyamovna

Associate professor at Faculty of Translation theory and practice, Tashkent State University of Uzbek Language and Literature named after A. Navoiy

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10359315>

Abstract. *The article explores the challenges in defining the term "discourse" within the contemporary domain of cognitive linguistics, specifically focusing on discourse analysis. The study emphasizes the current emphasis on understanding language development and functioning within historical and social contexts. The author surveys definitions of discourse provided by various linguists, highlighting the increasing diversification of the term, leading to a multitude of interpretations. Recognition emerges as the essence of discourse, wherein an individual is identified as actively engaged in present actions through a combination of linguistic elements and extralinguistic factors such as actions, interactions, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and places. The definition of "discourse" in linguistics primarily centers on extralinguistic aspects that shape discourse, including social, ideological, and cultural dimensions. The article illustrates various classifications of discourse, emphasizing the challenge of discourse analysis in classifying diverse discourse types with indistinct criteria. Special attention is given to mass media discourse, characterized by linguistic manipulation influencing public perceptions. Mass media, by presenting its version of reality, serves as an intermediary in shaping people's attitudes toward the actual world. The study explores linguistic manipulation tools within mass media discourse, highlighting their impact on the perception and representation of reality. In summary, the category of discourse encompasses both the verbal and extralinguistic components, encompassing cultural, social, and contextual elements. Although modern linguists identify various discourse types, the lack of distinct criteria for differentiation underscores the complexity arising from their diversity.*

Keywords: *addressant, addressee, discourse, discourse analysis, discourse utterance, types of discourse, communicative reality, extralinguistic context.*

Introduction

Researchers are increasingly focusing on the role of language in shaping cultural and semiotic aspects of social consciousness and intercultural interactions. This emphasis has led to a broader scope of linguistic research. Language learning now involves considering the historical and social context in which language evolves and functions.

Now, let's explore the concept of "discourse" within the cognitive-discursive paradigm of linguistics. The term was first introduced by Z. Harris in 1952 in the work "Analysis of Discourse," marking the beginning of modern text-based linguistics. Harris observed that morphemes and syntactic constructions are consistently repeated in related statements. Additionally, different expressions fitting the same context convey semantic equivalence [14].

It's important to note that due to the interdisciplinary nature of language study, the term "discourse" has undergone various interpretations. Many linguists acknowledge the polysemy of this term, suggesting multiple meanings [1-2]. V. G. Borbotko, for example, highlights that language, when viewed as discourse with its dynamic aspect, becomes an entirely new and intricately complex entity. The multidimensional nature of discourse has resulted in numerous

definitions and a relatively rapid evolution of concepts, even within the same scientific field [2, p. 13].

In the "Anglo-Russian Dictionary of Linguistics and Semiotics," three interpretations of the term "discourse" are presented. Firstly, in linguistics and semiotics, it is defined as a collection of thematically, culturally, and somehow related texts that facilitate the development and supplementation of other texts. Secondly, in sociology, social semiotics, and political science, influenced by M. Foucault, it is seen as communication representing a specific discursive practice—a complex interplay across diverse spheres of human knowledge. Thirdly, discourse is viewed as a form of speech communication involving a rational critical examination of the values, norms, and rules of social life, with the sole purpose of understanding [1].

Now, let's explore how the term "discourse" is used in modern foreign linguistics. In his book "Discourses and Power: Representations of Dominance in Language and Communication," T. A. van Dijk discusses the discursive nature of power relationships in contemporary society and their representation in various texts and discourses. He emphasizes that discourse is not only analyzed as an independent verbal "object" but also as contextual interaction, a social practice, or a type of communication within a social, cultural, historical, or political context [10, p. 21].

When analyzing the discursive reproduction of power, van Dijk underscores the intricate relationships among three key concepts: discourse, knowledge, and society. He argues that there is no direct influence that social structures exert on texts. Instead, social actors observe, experience, interpret, and represent social structures in their everyday interactions or communication. These subjective representations, mental models of specific events, knowledge, assessments, and ideologies ultimately shape discourses and other social practices. In essence, personal and social knowledge always serves as a mediator between society or social situations and discourse. As a result, Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) aim to examine social issues within the context of the triangulation of "discourse cognition - society," asserting that none of these dimensions can be comprehended without considering the others [10, pp. 36].

Mr. Widdowson views discourse as a model, with text being the tangible realization of this model. He sees texts as linguistic products of discourse, emphasizing that they are created with a specific communicative purpose, such as conveying messages, expressing thoughts or beliefs, explaining something, or influencing action or thinking. The communicative purposes collectively form the discourse that gives rise to the text. Readers or listeners, when interpreting the text, should extract its meaning and translate it into a communicative reality, termed "communicative reality." In this perspective, texts do not inherently make sense; instead, they serve as a bridge between discourses [12, p. 6]. Widdowson uses the term "discourse" to encompass both the process of producing text and what the text signifies to the recipient [12, pp. 7-8].

Ju. P. Ji makes a distinction between discourse in a narrow sense (discourse with a little 'd') as situational language use and actual discourse (Discourse with a big 'D'), which includes a non-verbal component. According to Ji, the essence of discourse lies in identification and recognition. Discourse is realized when an individual is recognized as a person involved in specific actions through a combination of language, actions, interactions, values, beliefs, symbols, objects, tools, and the surrounding context [13-14].

British linguist David Crystal points out two aspects of discourse analysis: one focused on the structure of natural oral speech found in interviews, conversations, comments, and speeches,

and another focused on the structure of written language found in essays, notes, and book chapters [11].

F. Elgorski challenges the notion that the term "discourse" is polysemous, asserting that it consistently refers to organized speech activity connected to non-linguistic fields (sociological, ideological, cultural context) or something unspoken (unconscious, supposed) [15, p. 22-23].

In summary, different scholars emphasize various aspects when defining "discourse," placing differing importance on parts of the extralinguistic context depending on their research traditions.

Discourse analysis encompasses several areas of investigation, as outlined by A. A. Kibrik, who identifies three key aspects: problems related to the structure of discourse, issues concerning the influence of discursive factors on language levels, and challenges in the classification of discourses [6, pp. 79-83].

Terminological classification of discursive statements is currently diverse, with various scholars proposing different typologies. B. N. Golovko, G. G. Pochtsov, V. I. Karasik, and G. M. Yavorskaya, among others, present different variants of discourse typology.

B. N. Golovko, for instance, categorizes discourse into pedagogical, political, social, ideological, public, scientific, critical, resonance, legal, military, parental, ethical, and pragmatic discourses. Each type is distinguished based on the utilization of specific communication strategies within them [3, pp. 32-35].

G. G. Pocheptsov classifies discourses based on speech features in context, symbolic reflection of real situations, and communicative situation. This results in categories such as TV and radio discourse, newspaper, theatrical, film discourse, literary discourse, public relations discourse, advertising discourse, political discourse, totalitarian discourse, unofficial discourse, religious discourse, untrue discourse, ritual discourse, ethical discourse, folklore, mythological discourse, festive discourse, non-verbal discourse, intercultural discourse, visual discourse, hierarchical discourse, and ironic discourse [9, pp. 74-98].

V. I. Karasik proposes a division into two main types of discourse: personal (personal-oriented) and institutional. In personal discourse, the speaker expresses individual thoughts, while in institutional discourse, communication follows societal norms, serving as a specialized and cliched form of interaction between individuals who may not be acquainted [4, p. 5-20]. Personal discourse, according to Karasik, includes household and life discourses. Household discourse pertains to everyday communication, while life discourse aims to convey the richness of the speaker's inner world using literary language [5, pp. 207, 238].

Unlike everyday communication, household discourse typically takes the form of a dialogue among familiar individuals. The participants, being well-acquainted, communicate closely and intermittently, often understanding each other with minimal words. In such conversations, details are often left unspoken.

Many authors classify discourses based on functional style, aligning them with different spheres of human activity. Media discourse, found in mass media, is diverse and includes political, journalistic, advertising, and radio discourses. The choice of media type is influenced by the cognitive preferences of the audience, characteristics of the target demographic, and communication strategies, both linguistic and extralinguistic. Printed media discourse, as analyzed by E. O. Mengeritskaya, encompasses types such as the "quality" discourse of the press, the

"popular" discourse of the press (including the yellow press and glossy magazines), and the discourse of specialized publications like scientific magazines [7, p. 77].

The unique aspect of media discourse lies in its orientation toward a mass audience. In the contemporary era of society's "total informatization," media entities acquire an interethnic character, preserving the social and cultural-historical memory of specific languages. N. Luman notes that much of our understanding of the world and society comes from the media, but there is often a sense of distrust due to suspected manipulation [16].

Media discourse has a notable impact on public consciousness, frequently employing manipulative techniques. A. K. Mikhalskaya suggests that, in the 21st century, the manipulation of public opinion takes precedence over traditional mass media functions like information, control, and education [8].

V. E. Chernyavskaya defines manipulation as a form of speech influence directed at the implicit, hidden urges of the audience to prompt specific actions. It involves covertly shaping desires, attitudes, and perspectives in alignment with the sender's interests, which may not necessarily coincide with those of the audience. Thus, by presenting their version of reality, the media become intermediaries in shaping people's perceptions of the real world [11, pp. 17-19]. In mass media discourse, communication takes on various forms, and the language chosen plays a crucial role in shaping how reality is perceived and conveyed.

The term "discourse" encompasses both the verbal aspect of communication and its extralinguistic components, including sociocultural and situational contexts. While modern linguists categorize discourse into different types, the diverse nature of these types makes it challenging to establish clear criteria that distinctly differentiate one type from another.

In conclusion, the study delves into the multifaceted realm of discourse, examining its diverse forms and functions within various contexts, particularly emphasizing its significance in mass media communication. The intricate interplay between verbal elements and extralinguistic components, rooted in sociocultural and situational contexts, underscores the complexity of discourse analysis.

The research has explored the classification of discourse by different scholars, revealing the variety of perspectives in understanding and categorizing this phenomenon. From household discourse to media discourse, each type has its distinctive features, shaping and being shaped by the communication strategies and purposes within its domain.

As the discourse landscape continues to evolve, the research underscores the challenge in establishing clear-cut criteria for distinguishing between types of discourse due to their inherent diversity. The choices made in language within mass media discourse, in particular, emerge as influential factors shaping the perception and reproduction of reality.

Ultimately, this study contributes to the broader discourse analysis field by shedding light on the intricate relationships between language, communication, and contextual elements. The dynamic nature of discourse, as evidenced by its various classifications and influences, highlights the need for continued exploration and understanding in this evolving area of linguistic research.

REFERENCES

1. *Anglo-russkii slovar' po lingvistike i semiotike* [English-Russian dictionary of linguistics and semiotics]. Ed. A. N. Baranova i D. O. Dobrovol'skogo. Moscow: Pomovskii i partnery, 1995.

2. Borbot'ko V. G. *Printsipy formirovaniya diskursa: Ot psikholingvistiki k lingvosin ergetike* [Principles of formation of discourse: From psycholinguistics to linguosynergetics]. Moscow: Knizhnyi dom «LIBROKOM», 2011.
3. Golovko B. N. *Intertekst v massmediinom diskurse* [Intertext in mass media discourse]. Moscow: Knizhnyi dom «LIBROKOM», 2012.
4. Karasik V. I. *Yazykovoii krug: lichnost', kontsepty, diskurs* [Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse] . Volgograd: Peremena, 2002.
5. Karasik, V. I. *Yazykovaya lichnost': institutsional'nyi i personal'nyi diskurs*. Sb. nauch. tr.. Ed. V. I. Karasika, G. G. Slyshkina. Volgograd: Peremena, 2000.
6. Kibrik A. A. *Yazyk i diskurs sredstv massovoi informatsii v XXI veke*. Ed. M. N. Volodinoi. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2011.
7. Mendzheritskaya E. O. *Yazyk i diskurs sredstv massovoi informatsii v XXI veke*. Ed. M. N. Volodinoi. Moscow: Akademicheskii proekt, 2011.
8. Mikhal'skaya A. K. *Yazyk sredstv massovoi informatsii kak ob'ekt mezhdistsiplinarnogo issledovaniya: tezisy dokladov mezhdunarodnoi nauchnoi konferentsii (Moskva, filologicheskii fakul'tet MGU im. M. V. Lomonosova, 25 –27 oktyabrya 2001 g.) / pod obshch. red. M. N. Volodinoi, M. L. Remnevoi*. Moscow, 2001. Pp. 22–26.
9. Pocheptsov G. G. (ml.) *Teoriya kommunikatsii* [The theory of communication]. K.: 1999.
10. Ten A. van Deik. *Diskurs i vlast': Reprezentatsiya dominirovaniya v yazyke i kommunikatsii* [Discourse and power: Representation of domination in language and communication]. Moscow: Knizhnyi dom «LIBROKOM», 2013.
11. Chernyavskaya V. E. *Diskurs vlasti i vlast' diskursa: problemy rechevogo vozdeistviya: uchebnoe posobie* [The discourse of power and the power of discourse: problems of speech influence: textbook] . Moscow: Flinta: Nauka, 2006. ISSN 1998-4812
12. Crystal D. *Encyclopedia of the English Language*. Cambridge University Press, 1994.
13. Gee J. P. *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. Routledge. Taylor and Francis Group. London and New York. 2005.
14. Harris Z. S. *Languages*, 1969. No. 13. Pp. 7–44.
15. Helgorsky F. *Le français modern*, 1982. No. 1. Pp. 14–39.
16. Luhmann N. *Soziale Systeme*. Frankfurt. Moscow, 1985.
17. Widdowson H. G. *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford University Press, 2011.
18. Niyazova G.G. *Concept of Discourse in Modern Linguistics*. Special Issue on Modern Trends in Science, Technology and Economy. www.ijtsrd.com ID: IJTSRD57377. 2023.