The opportunities of discourse

Sardora ABRAROVA¹

National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received March 2021
Received in revised form
20 March 2021
Accepted 15 April 2021
Available online
20 May 2021

Keywords:

discourse,
substantial,
linguistics,
structural,
componential analysis,
cognitive representation,
semiotics.

ABSTRACT

This article bargains with the classification issues of talk in English and considers diverse theory on the matter. Talk is analyzed as a critical perspective of cognition and cognitive etymology. Its examination takes into thought communicative conditions and capacities.

2181-1415/© 2021 in Science LLC.

This is an open access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Nutq va so'zlash qobilyatining imkoniyatlari

ANNOTATSIYA

Kalit so'zlar:

diskurs,
mazmunli,
lingvistika,
tarkibiy,
tarkibiy tahlil,
kognitiv vakillik,
semiotika.

Ushbu maqola ingliz tilida nutqni tasniflash masalalarini muhokama qilib, bu borada turli xil nazariyalarni ko'rib chiqadi. Maqolada nutq kognitiv va kognitiv etimologiyaning tanqidiy nuqtai nafari sifatida tahlil qilinadi. Uning tahlili jarayonida mulohaza qilingan kommunikativ sharoit va imkoniyatlarni hisobga oladi.

¹ lecturer, National University of Uzbekistan named after Mirzo Ulugbek. Tashkent, Uzbekistan.
E-mail: sardoraabrarova@gmail.com

Возможности дискурса и речи

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова:

дискурс,
субстанциальный,
лингвистика,
структурный,
компонентный анализ,
когнитивная
репрезентация,
семиотика.

Эта статья посвящена вопросам классификации разговоров на английском языке и рассматривает различные теории по данному вопросу. Разговор анализируется как критический взгляд на познание и когнитивную этимологию. При его изучении принимаются во внимание коммуникативные условия и возможности.

Discourse investigation takes under consideration the complete communicative occasion counting all conditions and capacities which empower it taking put. For that reason, the science of talk investigation needs an or maybe comprehensive supply of strategies. Fair as dialect and its utilization are subject to considerable changes all the time, the strategies included here will modify, as well. But to begin with we need to give an expansive assortment of single sciences, each of which explains a certain perspective of talk. As cases, we'll present three central areas of consider which must be respected by talk examination: structuralism, cognitive sciences and semiotics. Adjacent to these, there are other sciences which can be coordinates into a concept of talk examination: ponder of communication (electronic media, printed media, dissemination of instructive sources and so on), pragmatics, psycholinguistics (of which cognitive sciences frame a portion), rationale, sociolinguistics, social sciences...

DISCUSSION OF THE MATERIALS AND STRATEGIES OF EXAMINATION

Given a chunk of talked or written language as a content ready to analyze its inner organization, its structures. "Structural descriptions characterizes talk at a few levels or measurements of investigation and in terms of numerous diverse units, categories, schematic patterns or relations".

One can discover a beginning point for that kind of examination within the conventional structuralism (in Chomsky's wording): phonology portrays the composition of verbal articulations from phonemes, morphology depicts the composition of words from morphemes, sentence structure clarifies the structure of a sentence and content phonetics scrutinizes the inside structure of a content and the formal and topical relations of writings to each other, accounts look at the way stories are told, e. g. dissemination of data. This is imperative to be mindful of the contrast between this kind of auxiliary examination and the conventional linguistic wording (i.e. "case linguistic use") since we are concerned with the semantics of talk.

Geoffrey Leech has endeavored to present a semantic hypothesis of sentences which works on the auxiliary level. "We propose to halt attempting to fit semantic investigation into the units like things, verbs etc., and instep to explore for units and structures which work on the semantic level".

Subsequently, Leech presents componential investigation, which points at finding out "meaning units" that together shape a coherent structure of meaning, i.e. the meaning of a sentence. "The conclusion is that the semantic unit inside which componential investigation applies isn't as it were littler than a sentence, but is possibly bigger than a

word”. Siphon finds this unit within the concept of “predications” which comprise of arguments and predicates. This “componential investigation” may be a blend of predicative rationale and generative linguistic use. Because it is entirely structure-oriented it cannot suffice for bookkeeping for talk meaning or meaning in terms of talk investigation. But it is one shape of semantic investigation, determined from structuralism, which is, in the event that it is coordinates into a bigger, more comprehensive and more basic hypothesis, a supportive device.

Cognitive representation of talk proposes that one perspective of dialect which auxiliary examination completely overlooks is that dialect (parole) is more often than not created by a computer or other “culminate” brains, but by human creatures in certain social circumstances. Dialect generation, and with-it meaning generation, depends on *cognitive forms*.

It is outlandish to either create or get it talk whose basic complexity goes past the capacity of the human brain’s dialect preparing offices. In a dialog, for illustration, a member has as it were a certain degree of “overall-view”: the entire state of undertakings, the total past talk cannot be spoken to by a speaker. In this manner his understanding of a display articulation and his answer to that will be inside the limits of that marvel which Van Dijk calls “short-term memory capacity”.

Another critical perspective can be found within the procedures that a speaker conceives amid a conversation or whereas composing a content. These methodologies are impacted by a lot of situational components just like the kind of individuals he is talking/writing to, the attitude he needs to imagine, the intrigued he takes within the subject and so on. Here a imply to psychoanalytic feedback is additionally conceivable: Expressions, as Freud has as of now pointed out, may be affected by the intuitive; something that has not been aiming, but whose specifying is paradigmatically conceivable, is articulated automatically (“Freudian slip”).

Hence, in expansion to basic organization, we must take under consideration that talk is additionally organized with respect to these factors: cognitive representation, situational awareness, semantic procedures, impact of the intuitive.

Another vital measurement of talk has been investigated by the science of semiotics. Talk, on its most prompt and fabric level, is encoded in signs: talked dialect employments the phonological sign framework, composed or printed dialect comprises of letters taken from the in sequential order sign framework. Semiotics, at that point, looks at the nature of these signs and the way in which they work. Later considers by Derrida have appeared that fundamentally, signs don’t allude to objects (or concepts, for that matter) within the real world, but to each other. That’s, a sign features a certain meaning (reference to a concept or a protest) since it isn’t any other sign from the paradigmatic hub.

The phoneme /b/ of the word /bit/ alludes to begin with to the other conceivable phonemes, like /h/, / / or /p/, which, before /it/ frame negligible sets with /bit/. A differentiate, a distinction between two signs is fundamental in the event that a sign is to indicate anything particular at all. This gives significant reason to the preparatory reply “no” that I gave to the address of whether the linguistic sign framework could be a transparent vehicle for implications. Clearly there’s a pre-given structure of relations within the sign framework which lies within the materiality of signs. The hopeful portion of a sign, reference and the “thing” alluded to, is subordinate to the sign as matter.

In addition, the phonetic sign framework, like several code to which open has get to, could be a social framework. Society and its dialect utilize has significant impact on the

framework itself (e. g. creation of modern words or sentence structures, the foundation and breaking of taboos, the development of modern recording frameworks for dialect (composing, printing, replicating, recording of speech, digital media). To do equity to the socio-semiotic nature of talk semiotics must be a consider of signs in their connection to society. Signs, in this setting, are not as it were single images like a letter or a phoneme. A content, for occasion, is additionally a kind of sign which works inside talk and which includes a particular semantic work.

At last, a discourse investigation will be portion of a more grasping cognitive and social hypothesis approximately the rules and techniques that underlie the generation and understanding of media talk. Rather than simply relating, it'll attempt to clarify, in exact cognitive models, how different structures of media talk come around and how media talk is caught on and spoken to in memory. Subsequently, the connection between substance properties and particular "impacts" is part up in terms of a number of exceedingly complex cognitive and social-psychological models of data preparing.

Furthermore, the role of discourse in the language teaching is considerably increasing day by day. For instance, one of the common and popular branch of this field Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) can attract many of the researchers in terms of its practicality. One of the essential purpose of critical Discourse Analysis is to investigate the role of language in society and especially in political process which can deal with the social news and political speeches. The development of the internet and online learning and teaching can also effect to the exist language in the society. As the differences between the written text and ideology, the understanding between reader and writer have changed moderately and these factors also give the chance to the discourse to expend its opportunities.

REFERENCE:

1. Searle John. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1969.
2. Slembrouck Stef. What is meant by discourse analysis? 1998–2003.
3. Smith Steve. 'Positivism and beyond' in *International theory: positivism and beyond*, Edited by Steve Smith, Ken Booth, and Marysia Zalewski, – PP. 11–44. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
4. Steffek Jens. "Norms, Persuasion and the New German Idealism in IR". In *on Rules, Politics and Knowledge*, edited by Oliver Kessler, Rodney Bruce Hall, Cecelia Lynch and Nicholas Onuf, 191–201. Palgrave Macmillan. 2010.
5. Stubbs Michael. *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Sil Blackwell. 1983.