

THE SPECIFICS OF MEDIA DISCOURSE: CONCEPT, STRUCTURE, AND LINGUISTIC FEATURES

Tukhlieva Gavkhar,
DSc, Assistant Professor
Uzbek State World Languages University, Uzbekistan

Saroj Bastola
CEO /Founder VHS Bhaktapur /Career Disha Nepal / PI Education

Abstract

This article is devoted to the topical issue of studying the specifics of media discourse. The article's aim is to study the concept and essence of this phenomenon. The research methods were the following: analysis of scientific literature, comparative analysis of terms and concepts, induction, deduction and generalization of analytical conclusions. The article's author comes to the conclusion that discourse combines the verbal component of communication and its extralinguistic elements of a socio-cultural and context-situational nature. There are many classifications of discourse types, however, uniform and clear criteria demonstrating the distinction between one type and another have not yet been developed in linguistics. Journalistic discourse is a dynamic, active, constantly changing type of discourse. It is based on real events and phenomena occurring in the life of society, reflects specific actions in a certain period of time. A journalistic text implies a consistent presentation of theses, supported by convincing arguments (facts and examples). These theses must have a logical agreement so that the audience (readers or listeners) can form their own opinion on the basis of adequately perceived information. In journalistic texts, socio-political vocabulary is used, which is distinguished by its logic, reasoning, emotionality, as well as the evaluative nature of judgments and motivation.

Keywords: Linguoculturology, media discourse, concept, essence, media texts.

Introduction

In modern linguistics, there is a wide variety of approaches to understanding the term discourse. The concept of "discourse" began to be developed in science relatively recently, therefore, it gradually acquires new characteristics and additional meanings. A single definition of the term "discourse" has not yet been developed; therefore, it is rather difficult to choose any one from a wide range of definitions. The discourse is multifaceted, so the possibilities of its modeling are extremely limited and conditional. At the same time, there is no doubt that discourse implies the use of language in the communicative process. In a broad sense, discourse is a social



practice, a communication event in which people use language to convey information, ideas or beliefs, providing verbal interaction.

In a structural sense, this is a sequence of sentences, the study of which takes into account different levels of analysis (vocabulary, grammar, phonology, etc.). The formal structure of the discourse is not arbitrary, the choice of language functions is carried out consciously or unconsciously in accordance with dynamic contextual parameters, which include the situation of the discourse, its goals, the characteristics of speakers and listeners, etc. The definition of the term also covers the semantic representations that run through the entire discourse.

Despite the fact that discourse is an object of study of linguistics, its use has led to the penetration of this term into various social and human sciences, in particular, into anthropology, semiotics, sociology, social and cognitive psychology, ethnomethodology, history, etc.

The discourse is interactive, since the interlocutors in the process of communication tend to agree; it is a form of action aimed at changing the situation. This action develops in a context that gives it meaning. Discourse represents knowledge, interaction, society and culture, since it is a manifestation of all these aspects of social life.

The term “discourse” first appeared in the work of Z. Harris “Discourse Analysis” in 1952, which laid the foundation for modern text linguistics. The scientist pointed out that syntactic constructions and morphemes are constantly repeated in adjacent statements, moreover, different expressions that find themselves in an identical environment contain semantic equivalence. As a result of the later trend towards an interdisciplinary analysis of language, the concept of “discourse” has acquired many new interpretations and definitions. Linguists believe that there is a polysemy of the term in question. V.G. Borbotko notes that the language in the discourse acquires dynamics and the appearance of a completely new unusually complex object. Its multifaceted nature led to a plurality of definitions of this term, which very quickly evolved in concepts even within the same scientific areas.

According to E.S. Kubryakova, discourse is mainly understood as a “immersed in life” language in a “multidimensional space”, taking into account the context or situation of communication. This language has a structural organization characteristic of utterances in various areas of social life. The above definition allows us to talk about such types of discourse as legal, cultural, economic, political, etc. However, one should immediately make a reservation that the distinction and classification of discourses are highly debatable. That is why, considering the problems of discourse typology, the researchers L. Phillips and M. Jorgensen point to the need to perceive discourse mainly as an “analytical concept” and determine its limits “strategically with respect to the purpose of the study”: the latter determine the position of the researcher with respect to specific material, which is separate discourse. At the same time, the authors of this theory draw attention to the fact that existing organizations and social institutions should also be taken into account, since the language used in various spheres of social life is analyzed.

Discourse analysis is an interdisciplinary field of knowledge located at the intersection of linguistics, ethnography, psychology, sociology, stylistics, literary criticism and philosophy. Spanish scientists E. Calsamiglia Blancafort and A. Tucson Waltz argue that discourse is part of social life and appears as a tool that forms social



life. V.I. Karasik proposes to understand the communication of people as discourse in terms of their belonging to a certain social group or in relation to a specific typical speech-behavioral situation.

In connection with the foregoing, it becomes obvious that the definitions of the term “discourse” directly depend on a specific research tradition, therefore they make different accents in understanding which elements of the extralinguistic context have a priority discourse-forming character.

In modern linguistics, the terminological classification of a discursive utterance is rather heterogeneous. Many variants of discourse typology have been developed. In particular, B.N. Golovko, G.G. Pocheptsov, V.I. Karasik, G.M. Yavorskaya and many others.

We believe that attention should be paid to the classification of V.I. Karasik, who believes that two main types of discourse should be identified: personal (personality-oriented) and institutional ones. In the first, the speaker appears as a person in all the richness of his inner world, in the second, he becomes a representative of a particular social institution.

Developed by A.A. Kibrik’s classification of discourse types is also of interest to us, since he considers the category of formality as its criterion, which is based on the nature of social relations between the speaker and the addressee (other criteria include mode, genre, and functional style). Dedicated by A.A. Kibrik, the category of formality allowed him to build a system of opposition between personality-oriented and status-oriented discourse.

Personal discourse implies communication of close people who reveal their inner world to each other. This discourse can be everyday (everyday) discourse, focused on “a reduced code of communication, in which people are able to understand each other perfectly”, and existential discourse, aimed at “finding and experiencing essential meanings, artistic and philosophical comprehension of the world”.

Status-oriented discourse reflects the speech interaction of representatives of social groups or institutions, it is used by people who exercise status-role opportunities in the conditions of certain public institutions, the quantity and quality of which depends on the needs of society at a certain stage of its development.

According to M.L. Makarov, a social institution appears as a culturally specific, normatively organized, conventional system of forms of activity, determined by the social division of labor, and also aimed at meeting the special needs of society.

Institutional discourse is a conventional, normative, culturally determined, verbal interaction of people who take on specific status roles in a particular social organism, specially created to meet the needs of society.

In the context of the topic of our research, journalistic discourse is of particular interest, which is a special and complex communicative act in a social context. In essence, media texts not only reflect reality, but also construct its variants. They determine social reality, political aspects of social life, economic, moral, artistic, scientific and spiritual issues. In this regard, we can conclude that journalism is a social science based on the study of man. Journalistic discourse is the “media discourse”.

News reports are mainly written to inform the public about world events. They should be up-to-date to provide readers with important information. In this regard, news is quickly produced



and consumed. In addition to the world's political and economic agenda of interest to all, news coverage covers a wide variety of topics, including science, sports, health and technology, since all these issues are part of the social world in which events are of interest to the audience of readers. There are different genres of writing in news publications: editorials, reviews, financial reports, sporting events, government decisions, etc. Each genre uses certain textual strategies that encourage readers to expect a special kind of discursive experience, a certain look at some specialized part of the depicted world.

News reports go through a series of production processes involving journalists, reporters, correspondents, editors, translators, and chief editors before they reach readers. All of these agents must abide by the rules and policies adopted by their publications. From the very beginning of the process, namely the collection of news, to the last stage of their publication, the aforementioned agents make decisions in accordance with their functions and powers. Thus, news reports rarely reach the audience in their original form, they undergo transformation.

News is not created in a vacuum, but in a social context with its own structures and agents. News writers take into account the general knowledge and values of the publication, as well as the society in which they operate. As a result of the institutional processes of news formation, a target readership is created, which then becomes participants in the context in which news is produced and consumed.

Media discourse differs from other types of texts both in content and in form. News consists of different parts. There is a hierarchy in the structure of the news, where the most important information comes first, followed by details that support the main direction of events. The news scheme consists of a headline and a lead, which together form a summary; the main events, context and story that together form the backdrop, verbal responses and comments.

References

1. Борботько В.Г. Принципы формирования дискурса: От психолингвистики к лингвосинергетике. – М.: Книжный дом «ЛИБРОКОМ», 2011. – С. 57.
2. Дзялошинский И.М. Категория медиапространства в зарубежных и российских исследованиях // Российские исследования массмедиа и журналистики в международном контексте: сб. ст. / под ред. С. Г. Корконосенко. – СПб.: С.-Петербур. гос. ун-т, 2017. – С. 62-63.
3. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс / В.И. Карасик. – Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. – С. 193.
4. Кубрякова Е.С. О термине «дискурс» и стоящей за ним структуре знания // Язык. Личность. Текст: Сб. ст. к 70-летию Т.М. Николаевой. – М., 2005. – С. 29.
5. Макаров М.Л. Основы теории дискурса / М.Л. Макаров. – М.: ИТДГК «Гнозис», 2003. – С. 206.
6. Van Dijk T. (comp.). El discurso como interacción social. – Barcelona, Gedisa, 2000. – P. 7.

