

THE ADVANCEMENT OF UNDERSTANDING ON DISCURSIVE ANALYSIS

Khusanova Indira Akbardjanovna

Tashkent State Transport University

Assistant of the Department of Foreign Languages

Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2407-0786>

Abstract:

Discursive analysis is a widely recognized and extensively employed methodology in the social sciences. Researchers from various disciplines, including sociology, psychology, political science, anthropology, and communication studies, utilize this approach. Despite its significant traction and recognition, the development of discursive analysis has been an ongoing process. It continuously incorporates new perspectives, refines methodological approaches, and addresses critiques and challenges. This article aims to explore the advancements that have shaped our current understanding of discursive analysis, including its theoretical foundations, methodological intricacies, and broader implications for social science research.

Keywords: discourse analysis, educational culture, academic discourse, effective learning, linguistic phenomena, dialogic speech, science research.

Introduction

The importance of this research lies in the necessity for a comprehensive examination of academic discourse as an institutional entity, which is also a crucial element of contemporary educational culture. By analyzing the key features of academic discourse, it becomes possible to enhance communication between educators and students. This includes studying the various forms of communicative influence on students, increasing their motivation, and facilitating further research on speech strategies that promote effective learning. Additionally, it aids in reducing communication breakdowns, developing techniques, and implementing feedback methods. The proposed descriptive model in this study contributes to understanding the normative patterns of speech behavior utilized in the academic blogosphere. It also helps identify the linguistic stylistic, linguistic-pragmatic, and linguistic-cognitive characteristics specific to this genre of institutional discourse.

Literature Review

The concept of "discourse analysis" was first introduced to the scientific community by Harris in 1952[1]. This introduction paved the way for the exploration of self-explanation and self-description within society, viewing discourse as a communicative event that takes place within a specific semiotic environment and is expressed through various forms of communication[2]. Through discursive analysis, social processes can be examined, new public institutions can be understood, and the groundwork for predicting social development strategies can be established. The study of discourse analysis primarily focuses on three fundamental components: the typology



or classification of discourses, the structures that comprise discourse, and the connections between discursive phenomena and other linguistic phenomena[3].

The discursive approach focuses on the analysis of discourses that are centered around personality and status. These discourses can be both oral and written. In personality-oriented discourses, individuals tend to reveal themselves fully, as there are no social barriers or taboos hindering communication. On the other hand, status-oriented discourses mainly involve representatives of specific social institutions. Discourse is expressed through texts, which serve as the primary source of information about them. These texts are closely connected to the context in which they are produced. Therefore, when examining discourse, it is essential to consider its genre-stylistic (linguistic), socio-cultural (linguocultural, psycholinguistic), pragmatic (communicants, their intentions and speech strategies, tactics, and principles of communication), and cognitive factors (mental processes accompanying speech). These features are both influenced by and shape the context in which they exist.

Discursive analysis is often compared to the linguistics of the text, which views the text as a product of the speech-making process. It is seen as a complete written document that undergoes literary processing based on the specific type of document. The text is composed of a title and various specialized units that are connected through different types of lexical, grammatical, logical, and stylistic elements. This connection serves a specific purpose and has a pragmatic approach[4]. Both text linguistics and discursive analysis share the common goal of studying the phenomenology of written text and oral speech. I.R. Galperin distinguishes between oral and written speech by highlighting the colloquial vocabulary, phraseology, brevity, ellipticity, inconsistency, abruptness, instability, lack of cohesion, and the use of paralinguistic means in oral speech. On the other hand, written speech is characterized by literary and book vocabulary, the prevalence of complete utterances, and a logical and graphic structure. Galperin describes oral speech as "frankly convincing" [4].

Various terms are employed to refer to Internet discourse in contemporary times. These include electronic discourse, computer discourse, virtual discourse, computer-mediated discourse, and online discourse. T.I.Ryazantseva makes a distinction between "Internet discourse" and "communication in a computer environment." She emphasizes that the former term is frequently used to describe the characteristics of speech activity and language functioning in an electronic setting, while the latter term highlights the message transmission channel and the role of the media environment.

Research Methodology

We make a clear distinction between the concepts of "Internet discourse" and "electronic communication" because we believe that it is more accurate to use the term "Internet discourse" when studying the actual speech characteristics and the various factors that influence them (such as socio-cultural, cognitive, pragmatic, style-forming factors, as well as context, situation, communicants, etc.). The analysis of linguistic literature reveals that Internet discourse encompasses a wide range of definitions. For instance, according to E.N.Galichkina, Internet discourse can be described as a "multi-genre functional variety of public monologue and dialogic speech" that emerges through "computer communication"[5]. Similarly, E.I.Goroshko highlights



the Internet as a unique environment that shapes new genres, either by adapting existing paper genres or by allowing them to persist without significant changes[6].

The Internet serves as a vital source of information and also provides a unique communicative environment with distinct linguistic characteristics that were previously nonexistent[16]. According to Kozhina the language of the Internet is functionally and stylistically diverse, resulting in a wide range of genres that reflect different aspects of society found on the Web. Learning a language within this environment holds significant linguistic and didactic interest. Internet discourse is characterized by texts that are immersed in a virtual reality communication setting, as stated by Lutovinova. Various submodels or genres are identified within Internet discourse, such as blog discourse, e-mail discourse, synchronous/asynchronous communication discourses, chat discourse, Twitter discourse, forum discourse, and wiki discourse, among others. The institutional type of Internet discourse is defined by communicants, chronotypes, goals, values, strategies, and material, as described by Karasik. Anyone with Internet access can participate in Internet discourse. The chronotype of Internet discourse can vary greatly, as individuals can choose a convenient time and place to access information. The goals of Internet discourse are diverse, including information gathering, communication, sharing information with a virtual audience, and conducting audio and video conferences. The values of Internet discourse revolve around virtuality and globality. Speech strategies employed in Internet discourse can also vary, such as self-presentation, influencing the recipient's emotional state, persuasion, manipulation, and hoax. The material of Internet discourse encompasses information on various topics, including business, finance, education, politics, culture, and more [13,14,15].

Analysis and Results

Internet discourse, as a unique form of communication, is shaped by the characteristics of the online platform and involves a combination of written and oral elements, resulting in its language within the global network. It encompasses both written and spoken aspects, as it is visually represented while also being spontaneous and synchronous in interactive online exchanges. The linguistic aspect of Internet discourse is often examined in terms of the integration of written and spoken language. T.Y.Vinogradova refers to this type of communication as "written pronunciation"[7]. A.E.Voiskunsky, in his exploration of the use of written language in email and computer conferences, discovered that Internet discourse exhibits features not only of written and spoken language, but also of public, dialogic, monological speech, and autocommunication[8]. According to Voiskunsky, characteristics of written language in Internet discourse include author control over the message, the use of complex grammatical structures, explicit attempts to elicit a response from the recipient, sending pre-prepared and edited messages, and seeking assistance in translating messages between languages. Characteristics of spoken language include a conversational style, particularly among newcomers who have not yet adapted to the dominant communication style, emotional expression (often conveyed through graphics), attempts to interrupt the conversation partner, the use of grammatically incorrect constructions, and a somewhat chaotic dialogue.

Some genres of online communication exhibit characteristics of both oral and written speech, as well as elements of public speaking. These include filtering messages from the audience and the use of rhetorical questions like "Who can advise?" or "Who knows?" These features are commonly



found in public discourse. The primary mode of virtual communication is polylogue, which involves multiple participants engaging in dialogue. A.E.Voiskunsky also identifies signs of dialogic speech in online discourse, such as the initiation of chain polylogues and clashes of different viewpoints. Additionally, there are instances of monologue speech in internet conversations, such as unanswered messages or messages that do not require a response, like administrative warnings in blogs, chats, or forums. In terms of email communication, self-communication occurs, where individuals send messages to themselves. These self-addressed messages can serve mnemonic purposes, facilitate communication with other users sharing the same password, or act as a form of educational interaction. Consequently, internet discourse gives rise to its unique language, blending oral and written speech, auto communication, monologue, and dialogue, as well as incorporating voice, graphics, multimedia, and text[9,10,11,12].

The Internet serves as a unique platform where traditional genres either adapt or new ones emerge, exclusive to the digital realm. However, there are no definitive criteria for differentiating genres, as the hypertextuality of the multimedia environment blurs their boundaries, allowing for genre transitions. The birth of a new genre in the virtual world can give rise to a new speech community with fresh communicative experiences. For instance, the advent of modern electronic genres like blogging and microblogging has led to the formation of a distinct environment known as the blogosphere, encompassing various subgenres such as filters, notebooks, and personal diaries.

Conclusion and Recommendations

To summarize, the process of forming perspectives on discursive analysis requires acknowledging its theoretical foundations, methodological strategies, and significance in comprehending social occurrences. By tackling the obstacles and critiques associated with discursive analysis, and by incorporating various viewpoints and practical implementations, scholars can cultivate a stronger and all-encompassing comprehension of how language influences social existence. As discursive analysis progresses, it possesses immense potential in propelling social science research forward and aiding in a more intricate grasp of the intricate interplay between power and meaning within society.

References:

1. Harris Z. S. Discourse analysis [Текст] / Z. S. Harris // Language. – 1952. – V. 28. № 1.
2. Богданов А. В. Лингвокультурные характеристики афроамериканского рэп-дискурса [Текст]: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.19 / Богданов Антон Валерьевич. – Волгоград, 2007. – 290 с.
3. Кибрик А. А. Модус, жанр и другие параметры классификации дискурсов. Модус, жанр и другие параметры классификации дискурса [Текст] / А. А. Кибрик // Вопросы языкознания. 2009, №2. М., «Наука». С. 5-16.
4. Гальперин И. Р. Текст как объект лингвистического исследования [Текст]: монография / И. Р. Гальперин. Изд. 3-е, стереотипное. – М.: Едиториал УРСС, 2005. – 144 с.
5. Галичкина Е. Н. Прагмалингвистические характеристики жанра «чат» в компьютерном общении [Текст] / Е. Н. Галичкина // Аксиологическая лингвистики: проблемы коммуникативного поведения: Сб. науч. тр. / Под ред. В. И. К



6. Горошко Е. И. Интернет-жанр и функционирование языка в Интернете: попытка рефлексии [Текст] / Е. И. Горошко // Жанры речи. – Вып. 6. – Жанр и язык. – 2009. – С. 111-127
7. Виноградова Т. Ю. Специфика общения в Интернете [Текст] / Т. Ю. Виноградова // Русская и сопоставительная филология: лингвокультурологический аспект: сб. статей / Каз. гос. ун-т; Филол. ф-т. – Казань: Казан. гос. унт, 2004. – С.63-67.
8. Войскунский – 2000б: Войскунский А. Е. Гуманитарный Интернет [Текст] / А. Е. Войскунский // Гуманитарные исследования в Интернете. Сб. ст. / Под ред. А. Е. Войскунского. – М.: Можайск-Терра, 2000. – С. 3-10.

