

Theoretical Basis of Discourse Analysis

Shukurova Hulkar

Master of Termiz State University

Abstract: In this article discusses about theoretical basis of discourse analysis and given some important information about it.

Keywords: theoretical, “discourse analysis”, descriptive, expository discourse, argumentative discourse.

Introduction. The term discourse analysis is very ambiguous. The term “discourse analysis” is polysemic. Discourse analysis does not presuppose a bias towards the study of either spoken or written language. On the one hand, it refers to the close linguistic study, from different perspectives, of texts in use. On the other hand, discourse refers to socially shared habits of thought, perception, and behavior reflected in numerous texts belonging to different genres. Discourse is being extended at all areas as linguistics. It is the text linguistics perspective. Text linguistics as a different discipline has mainly been associated with written text. Discourse is the umbrella term for either spoken or written communication beyond the sentence. Any more detailed spelling out of such a definition typically involves reference to concepts of language in use, language above or beyond the sentence, language as meaning in interaction, and language in situational and cultural context.

Discourse analysis is the study of how language is used in texts. It looks at the ways in which people use language to communicate, and how this use of language affects the way that people interpret and understand what is being said.

Discourse analysis is used to analyze any kind of text, whether it be a written document or a spoken conversation. By looking at the ways in which language is used, we can better understand the meaning of what is being said.

Discourse analysis is defined as

1. Concerned with language use beyond the boundaries of a sentence/utterance;
2. Concerned with the interrelationships between language and society;
3. And as concerned with the interactive or dialogic properties of everyday communication.

In linguistics discourse analysis is naturally connected with speech or written discourse. Roughly speaking, it attempts to study the organization of language above the sentence or above the clause, and therefore to study larger linguistic units, such as conversational exchanges or written texts. It follows that discourse analysis is also concerned with language use in social contexts, and in particular with interaction or dialogue between speakers. Discourse analysis is sometimes defined as the analysis of language beyond the sentence. In linguistics, the term “discourse” refers to a structural unit larger than the sentence. Discourse minimally involves more than one sentence, and the sentences must be contingent. Just as every string of words is not a sentence, not every sequence of utterances is considered a “text.” For discourse, there are requirements of relevance in form and especially in meaning.

Discussion. Texts can be created by more than one participant, as in conversation, or in various forms of monologue, most notably narrative and exposition. Discourse analysis is part of applied linguistics; it is a multi-disciplinary field, and highly diverse in the range of its interests.

There are four types of Discourse Analysis:

- Descriptive Discourse
- Narrative Discourse
- Expository Discourse
- Argumentative Discourse

Descriptive Discourse - is used to describe and explain the features of a particular text or conversation. This type of discourse can be used to identify the main points of a text, to determine the author's purpose, or to analyze the structure of a conversation.

Narrative Discourse - in the context of narrative, discourse refers to the ways in which a story is told. This can include the use of specific language, dialect, and vocabulary, as well as the overall structure of the story.

Narrative discourse is a way of understanding and communicating stories. It can help us to make sense of our own experiences, as well as those of others. By studying narrative discourse, we can learn about the different ways that people communicate their stories.

Expository Discourse - is a type of discourse that is used to explain something. It is often used in academic settings, such as in essays or research papers. Expository discourse typically uses formal language and follows specific rules and conventions.

Argumentative Discourse - is a method that can be used to identify the different parts of an argument, and to track how an argument develops over time. This type of analysis can be used to understand how people interact with one another when debating, and to identify any potential weaknesses in an argument.

To conduct discourse analysis, researchers must first understand the basics of linguistics and how language works. They must also be familiar with the different methods of discourse analysis and know when and how to use them. Discourse analysis is a collection of methods for studying language in use. It is not a specific type of research, but rather a methodology that can be applied to any topic or discipline. The language used in discourse analysis is usually oral or written text. However, discourse analysis can also be conducted on the basis of non-linguistic artifacts, such as gestures or pictures. The focus is not so much in what someone has said or written, but rather about understanding how the language is used to create meaning. It goes beyond the literal meaning of the words, or even their intended meaning. The goal is to understand how language is actually employed in a particular setting (e.g., at home, at school, in a business meeting) within a specified context (e.g. a church, a classroom, an operating room).

When deciding whether or not to use discourse analysis, there are a few factors to consider. It is important to think about what kind of data you have available. If you only have a small amount of text, it might not be worth doing a full analysis. You need to decide what your goals are for doing the analysis. Are you trying to understand the messages being communicated? Or are you looking for something else, like patterns in the way the text is written? It is helpful to consider what resources you have available. If you are doing the analysis on your own, it might be less time-consuming to use a different method. However, if you are working with someone else to do the analysis, then it might be worth considering discourse analysis.

Discourse analysis has a number of goals, including:

- To identify the different ways that people use language in different situations.
- To understand how power relationships are established and maintained through language.
- To uncover the hidden assumptions and ideologies that underlie the use of language.
- To critically analyze the role that language plays in reinforcing or challenging unequal social relations.
- To develop new methods and approaches for analyzing discourse.

Some advantages of Discourse analysis are:

- It allows researchers to study language in its natural environment.
- Discourse analysis can be used to study a variety of topics, including the history of a particular group or the psychological effects of an event.
- This method is able to provide detailed insights into the way people use and understand language.

One limitation of discourse analysis is that it relies heavily on written texts. This can be problematic because written texts often do not reflect the way people actually speak. Another limitation is that discourse analysis often focuses on elite groups and does not take into account the experiences of marginalized groups. Finally, discourse analysis can be difficult to apply in practice because it requires a detailed understanding of the context in which language is used.

Approach means the adoption of one or more combination of the ways to certain aspects of the total discourse reality. Discourse Analysis can be categorized into internal and external approaches. The internal approach focuses on: looking for internal rules that native speakers use to generate grammatically correct sentences. Isolated sentences, grammatically well-formed, without context and Invented or idealized. The external approach focuses on: asking how we use language to communicate, any stretch of language felt to be unified, achieving meaning, in context and observed. In discourse Analysis there are varieties types of approaches developed from various sources. These are analyzed under four main headings: rules and principles, contexts and cultures, functions and structures, and power and politics.

These include speech act theory, politeness theory and conversation analysis. Develop speech acts or the communicative functions of sentences in conversation. For example; using utterances to report events, make statements about the requested information or action, or to prohibit action. Adjust one's language to fit the social context of the conversation in keeping with cultural conventions and social roles. Emerge conversational skill in face-to-face verbal interaction. These include knowing when and how to take a turn in conversation; how to initiate, elaborate, or terminate a topic, and how to respond to a speaker in keeping with the pragmatic constraints set by the preceding utterance. These involve issues of politeness, formality, and the age or status of one's listener in what have been called "styles" or "registers" of speech.

Conclusion. These are focused on ethnography of communication and interactional sociolinguistics. In cultural differences ethnography of communication offers a framework for the study of speech events, seeking to describe the ways of speaking associated with particular speech communities and to understand the role of language in the making of societies and cultures. It involves both (verbal and non-verbal) understanding of culturally specified ways of communicating and the various beliefs and attitudes. Interactional sociolinguistics aims at replicable analysis that

accounts for our ability to interpret what participants intend to convey in everyday communicative practice.

It pays particular attention to culturally specified contextual presuppositions, to the signals of “contextualization cues” such as code and style switching, and prosodic and lexical choices.

The list of used literatures:

1. Abdullayeva M. Filosofskiye problemi metodologii nauki. -T.: 2006,-28 b.
2. Aripova A.X. Notiqlik nutqining lisoniy-uslubiy vositalari: Dis...fil.fan.nom, - Toshkent, 2002. -186 b.
3. Azamat Ziyoy. O`zbek davlatchiligi tarixi. -T.; Sharq, 2000.-366 b.
4. Bart R. Izbranniye raboti: Semiotika. Poetika. M.: Progress, 1994. 616 s