Some Features Of Discourse Analysis And Implementation In Teaching Foreign Languages

Rakhmatullayeva Dilrabo Alimjanovna
Teacher, Uzbek State World Languages University

Annotaton: The article deals with some problems of discourse theory, including: the differentiation of the concepts "text" and "discourse", the linguistic nature of the term" discourse", the essence of discourse analysis, etc. The article provides a brief overview of the history of the formation of discourse analysis, and implementation in foreign language studies.

Key words: text, discourse, analysis, speech acts, communication, coherent, concept, critical thinking, rhetoric, phenomenon, cognitive, psycholinguistic.

Discourse is an object of interdisciplinary research, and the range of its use is so wide that one can speak of the pragmatism of the term. The origin of the theory of discourse analysis is connected with various directions of knowledge, the object of language learning – such as textual linguistics, the theory of speech acts, linguistic pragmatics, psycholinguistics, stylistics, rhetoric, and the theory of speech communication. The theory of discourse analysis, in addition to theoretical linguistics, also has points of intersection with a number of scientific disciplines and research areas such as philosophy, sociology, ethnography, mythology, literature studies, computer linguistics, artificial intelligence, psychology, logics, sociology, political science, anthropology, ethnology, semiotics, historiography, law, pedagogy, translation theory and practice, communication research and etc.

The complexity of discourse as an object of research that is a phenomenon of an intermediate nature between speech and communication, speech behavior, on the one hand, and the recorded text, on the other hand. Active research in the field of discourse analysis, aimed at establishing the status of discourse, allows us to talk about the diversity of this phenomenon, characterized by many signs. As the

linguist V.S.Li says "the concept of discourse cannot be reduced to one or two dimensions, in ontology it covers all aspects of the language, starting with cognitive (psycholinguistic), associated with human speech and thought activity, ending with the textual ones, which are also manifested in the peculiarities of using the language as a separate individual" [1].

E.S. Kubryakova, by analyzing the state of discourse analysis, notes the lack of a unified and holistic theory of discourse and a generally accepted definition of discourse and under the conditions of various approaches there is the inappropriateness of a priori preference for one of the existing definitions of discourse [2].

It is noteworthy that in a number of modern concepts of the functional direction that are not related to the theory of discourse, problems associated with discourse analysis are posed and solved, which indicates the complexity of the delimitation of the subject area of discourse analysis itself. As an example, we can say communicative speech registers (reproductive, informative, generative, and reactive) as a tool for analyzing text in the concept of functional (communicative grammar) from G.A. Zolotova`s works [3].

The above mentioned information allows us to conclude that, owing to the linguistic research of the 80s in the field of pragmatics, the knowledge of the language returned to its original course, interrupted by structuralism: to the study of communicative activity in the oral form. In this regard, before the discourse analysis, the following issues became relevant:

• development of new terminology,

• typology of discourse, the study of linguistic nature (linguistic features),

• identification of intentions, communicative strategy and tactics of communicants;

• study of the speech characteristics of each of the participants in the interaction;

• identification of the specific semantics and lexical and grammatical means of the entire discourse.

N.D. Arutyunova considers that language in discourse realization appeared in dynamics, which allow scientists to generalize a number of disparate facts in it. Thus, the discourse approach is the analysis of "speech immersed in life", taking into account heterogeneous extra-linguistic factors, including paralinguistic ones (gesture, rhythm, facial expressions, etc.). [4]

Currently, discourse is used to refer to as spoken and written works. The use of this term expresses a new understanding of the text and a new approach to it, which is associated with turning the text into an interdisciplinary object of study. So, Van Dijk defines discourse as a complex communicative phenomenon that includes text and social context in addition, general understanding of the participants in communication, their characteristics and also about the processes of production and perception of the message, which presents extra linguistic factors — knowledge about the world, opinions, settings and goals of communication. The discourse is associated with speech, with actual speech action, while the text is related to the language system or formal linguistic knowledge, linguistic competence. The use of discourse is always specific objects in a specific setting and context. Unlike text, discourse is a model of real the intentions of the speaker or writer in the context of a particular communicative situation [5].

Having analyzed the works of other scientists, discourse can be considered simultaneously as process of speech interaction corresponding with the appropriate space-time context, where participants are involved to communicate with their views, opinions, knowledge, and attitude to reality and as a result of interaction of verbal speech product. All this allows us to speak about the dualism of discourse, about the presence of one-temporarily dynamic and static properties.

Discourse can be considered in the broad and narrow sense of this word. In a broad sense, discourse is a communicative phenomenon that is the interaction occurs between people deal with in the process of communication actions in a specific temporal and spatial context. This action can be verbal, written, or both

non-verbal components (for example, talking to a friend, reading a newspaper). In the narrow sense of the word this concept means completed or the continuing verbal product of a communicative action, it's a written or spoken result that is implemented in the text, and this is interpreted by the recipient.

The essential value of teaching foreign language discourse is also important with its types: written and spoken. Despite the fact, that all discourse categories are implemented in these types of discourse, but they are manifested in different ways. The differences between written and oral types are first of all in data transmission ways. The first is characterized by the visual channel, which suggests the presence of temporary inconsistency between the communicants. The interaction of those who communicate in oral discourse is carried out directly at the moment of speech, they follow the pace, given by themselves, this allows us to talk about such features of this type, both spontaneity and fluency. When producing from the written discourse, the author has the opportunity to contemplate, review, change what is written, and suggest a possible reaction of his own to the reader of the text. The written form of communication can develop such qualities as logic, accuracy, clarity, correctness, and expressiveness. In oral discourse the participants of communication can use non-verbal language tools: gestures, facial expressions, and pauses which are not present in written discourse. Non-verbal data means transmission of information reflected in the written discourse by using the language code. The author tries to compensate their absence by using punctuation, font selection, underlining and etc.

It is important to the writer to convey all the details and specifics of the situation as quickly as possible more fully, with a detailed explanation and description of them. Accordingly, written discourse is more detailed and coherent and cohesive. In addition, oral discourse is characterized by simple syntactic constructions, the predominance of elliptical or incomplete sentences. On the contrary the written type uses complex-composed, complex sentences, complete

grammatical forms, as well as more cohesive. Taking into account these differences, the process of mastering the skills of oral and written discourse is organized respectively.

Discourse analysis is a fairly broad concept that denotes a process of learning how the language is used in various texts and contexts or in texts that accompany or even define the discourse itself. In scientific circles the term discourse analysis became widespread in the 1970s. According to the definition given by Abrams and Harfam in the "Glossary of literary terms" this term is related to "the use of language in fluent discourse continuing over a number of proposals and including interaction speaker (writer) and auditor (reader) in a specific situational context and within the framework of specific social and cultural conventions"[6].

In contrast to grammatical analysis, which focuses on the sentences, discourse analysis focuses on the broad and general use of language within and between separate groups of people. In addition, grammarians usually build their own examples, which later analyze, while discourse analysis relies on speech (oral and written) results of the work of a large number of people, as the goal is set identify popular ways to use the language.

G. Brown and G. Yule note that in "discourse analysis" the field for research is rarely formed on the basis of a single sentence (or even on based on a single text) [7]. For their observations, the authors of discourse analysis should, in first of all, collect the necessary amount of data – in our case – text units. Then, find in audio recordings or handwritten texts, such as phenomena such as the specificity of each text, common features and similarity of the text with others texts, non-standard forms in the text being studied and their compliance with the semantic load. Commonly, this means that discourse analysis consists of observation over colloquial, cultural, and actual use of the language, while grammar analysis is based entirely on the sentence structure, usage of words and stylistic choice at the

sentence level, which can often include it includes culture, but not the human element of discourse.

In recent years, discourse analysis has evolved in parallel with rhetorical research, in order to include much more a wide range of topics, from mass to private use of the language, from official to conversational rhetoric, as well as from oratory to written and multimedia discourse. According to K.Eisenhart [8] discourse analyses and analysis of rhetoric have a similar purpose, as they allow analyzing texts from the perspective of situational semantic fields and also to consider mass, culturing and evening way of presenting text material.

Moreover it can be considered that the concepts of "text" and "discourse" are not synonymous, therefore, they are different phenomena, and they should be studied both by linguistics and lingo didactics. This statement is important for the theory teaching foreign languages, since until now there has not been an independent method of teaching discourse, and, consequently, there is no purposeful formation of skills for understanding and generating discourse, without the presence of which it is impossible to talk about a full-fledged communicative competence. It is obvious that at present, when teaching communication in a foreign language and especially when teaching oral communication it is no longer possible to limit the use of just the concept "text", because this concept does not cover all properties speech works that need to be considered. According to E. Roulet, it is even preferable to teach foreign languages in theory and practice to use the term "discourse" rather than "text", since the use of the term "discourse" provides a triple advantage: first, it neutralizes the idea of writing works, as is typical of the text; second, clearly shows the difference between the two language structures: grammatical and discursive, and, third, pays attention to the minimum unit of communication, which is a speech act, not a sentence [9].

As Michael McCarthy notes the importance of discourse analysis and language teaching, "as discourse analysis is a fast-moving discipline, and the

knowledge of how language occurs in its natural contexts is growing all the time. There is, perhaps, little need to reiterate the conclusions that have constantly reared their heads in the course of this book, but this may be the right moment to restate one fundamental principle: just because linguists can describe a phenomenon convincingly does not mean that it has to become an element of the language-teaching syllabus. The practical pressures of language teaching mean that teachers will always rightly, want to evaluate carefully any descriptive insights before taking them wholly to heart as teaching points" [10].

Thus, discourse analysis in training provides an opportunity to stimulate students to self-study and develop critical thinking, which is vital not only in all areas of academic research education, but also for continuing education in general.

References:

1. Li V. S. Paradigms of knowledge in modern linguistics: Textbook. - Almaty: KazNU, 2003.

2. Kubryakova E. S. In search of the essence of language. Cognitive research. Moscow: Slavic culture languages press., 2012.

3. Zolotova G. A. Communicative aspects of Russian syntax. - Nauka. 1982;

4. Arutyunova N. D., Paducheva E. V. Origins, problems and categories of pragmatics // New in foreign linguistics. Issue 16. - Moscow: Progress, 1995.

5. Van Dijk, Teun A. "Handbook of Discourse Analysis Vol. 4: Discourse Analysis in Society." Academic Press. December 1997.

6. Abrams A., Harfam Z. Glossary of literary terms. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

7. Brown G., Yul G. Discourse analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University press, 2003.

8. Eisenhart, Christopher; Johnstone, Barbara. "Discourse Analysis and Rhetorical Studies." Rhetoric in Detail: Discourse Analyses of Rhetorical Talk and Text, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 2008.

9. Anikina O.V. Discourse as object of teaching in foreign language, "Cyberleninka", Bulletin of TSPU. 2011. Issue 2 (104)

10. Michael McCarthy. Discourse Analysis for Language teachers. Cambridge University press, 1991.