



Education Quarterly Reviews

Muzaffar, A. R. (2024). The Fields of Pragmatic Discourse Analysis. *Education Quarterly Reviews*, 7(4), 244-250.

ISSN 2621-5799

DOI: 10.31014/aior.1993.07.04.540

The online version of this article can be found at:
<https://www.asianinstituteofresearch.org/>

Published by:
The Asian Institute of Research

The *Education Quarterly Reviews* is an Open Access publication. It may be read, copied, and distributed free of charge according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license.

The Asian Institute of Research *Education Quarterly Reviews* is a peer-reviewed International Journal. The journal covers scholarly articles in the fields of education, linguistics, literature, educational theory, research, and methodologies, curriculum, elementary and secondary education, higher education, foreign language education, teaching and learning, teacher education, education of special groups, and other fields of study related to education. As the journal is Open Access, it ensures high visibility and the increase of citations for all research articles published. The *Education Quarterly Reviews* aims to facilitate scholarly work on recent theoretical and practical aspects of education.



ASIAN INSTITUTE OF RESEARCH
Connecting Scholars Worldwide

The Fields of Pragmatic Discourse Analysis

Ayten Rahimli Muzaffar¹

¹ Baku State University, Azerbaijan. Email: rehimliayten2@gmail.com
ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1574-1250>

Abstract

The article is devoted to the fields of pragmatic discourse analysis. Pragmatic approach to the discourse takes into account all the aspects of communication including both linguistic and extra-linguistic units, and provides efficient tools for affecting an addressee. The article has been written on the basis of synchronic descriptive method in the study of the English language. It is noted in this article that discourse analysis (discourse analysis) is a set of methods and techniques for interpreting various types of texts or statements as products of speech activity. The pragmatic approach to discourse involves analyzing it from the standpoint of speech acts, which allows us to consider pragmatics as one of the areas of discursive research. It is also stated that some definitions of pragmatics are almost identical to some definitions of discourse analysis, which may lead us to think that both fields of study are the same.

Keywords: Linguistics, Language, Discourse Analysis, Pragmatics, Text, The Methods, Science

1. Introduction

The concept of "discourse" has gained wide circulation and recognition in the educational, university, academic, journalistic and socio-political environments in general, as well as in journalistic writings. Discourse is one of the most common and polysemantic concepts of the humanities, the subject of which is the functioning of language, communication and their connections with social development. In the most general sense, discourse is a written or speech verbal product of a communicative action or event occurring between a speaker, listener (observer, etc.) in a certain temporal, spatial, social, cultural and other context. The concept of "discourse" expresses the socially conditioned organization of the speech system, as well as certain principles according to which reality is classified and represented (presented) in certain periods of time. This special meaning of the word "discourse" was first introduced by E. Benveniste, contrasting discourse (speech tied to the speaker) and récit (speech not tied to the speaker).

Discourse is a holistic communicative event of reality, which is united by its own content and meaning, its semiotic organization and structure, and is significant for the participants involved in it. In the socio-philosophical sense, discourse is a holistic complex, episode, situation, structure or direction of communicative activity, expressed in a certain semantic significance and logic of the semiotic system, allowing them to be understood, initiated and designed. Discourse is characterized by cognitive, axiological, educational and pragmatic functions: it is able to communicate knowledge, influence the emotional state, encourage action.

1.1. Objective of the study

The purpose of the article is to study the fields of pragmatic discourse, its being such a concept that its teaching subject includes language activity, communication and their relationship with social development.

1.2. Methodology

Research methods include direct contextual analysis, cognitive-linguistic, or linguistic description. With the help of these methods, the essence of pragmatic discourse analysis is revealed.

2. Presentation and discussion

The interdisciplinary direction that studies discourse, as well as the corresponding section of linguistics, are called the same thing – discourse analysis or discourse studies. As a scientific direction, discourse analysis was formed only in recent decades (1970s). This happened against the background of the opposite trend that dominated linguistics for most of the 20th century – the struggle to “purify” the science of language from the study of speech. L. de Saussure (2007) believed that the true object of linguistics is the language system (as opposed to speech). Attitudes in the science of language have begun to change and the opinion is gaining strength, according to which no linguistic phenomena can be adequately understood and described outside of their use, without taking into account their discursive aspects. Therefore, discourse analysis becomes one of the central sections of linguistics.

Discourse analysis (discourse analysis) is a set of methods and techniques for interpreting various types of texts or statements as products of speech activity carried out in specific socio-political circumstances and cultural-historical conditions. Discourse analysis as an independent scientific discipline or, at least, an autonomous branch of scientific knowledge, originated in the 1960s in France as a result of the combination of linguistics, Marxism and psychoanalysis within the framework of general trends in the development of structuralist ideology.

Currently, discourse analysis is perceived as an interdisciplinary approach that took shape at the intersection of sociolinguistics and linguacultural studies, but has absorbed the techniques and methods of various sciences of the humanities: rhetoric, linguistics, philosophy, psychology, political science, sociology, etc. Therefore, it is entirely acceptable to single out the corresponding approaches as the main research strategies carried out within the framework of AD, for example, psychological (cognitive, cultural-historical, etc.), linguistic (grammatical, textual, stylistic, etc.), semiotic (semantic, syntactic, pragmatic), philosophical (structuralist, post-structuralist, deconstructivist), logical (argumentative and analytical), informational-communicative, rhetorical, etc.

2.1. A Brief history of discourse analysis

Among the predecessors of discourse analysis as a specific scientific discipline, at least two research traditions should be mentioned. First, there is a tradition of ethnolinguistic studies, focused on recording and analyzing oral texts of different languages; among the most famous representatives of this tradition is the American ethnolinguistic school founded by Franz Boas. Second, there is a Czech linguistic school founded by V. Mathesius, which revived interest in such concepts as topic and communicative organization of the text.

Discourse analysis is the study of the language used by members of a certain language community. In the course of such analysis, both the form of language and its function, both spoken language and written texts are considered, and linguistic features of understanding various texts and types of oral speech are identified. Analysis of written texts may involve the study of topic development and the connections (cohesion) between sentences, while analysis of spoken language may focus on these aspects as well as on practices of step-by-step interaction, opening and closing sequences of social interactions, or narrative structure.

2.2. Methods of discourse analysis

The methods used by different schools of discourse analysis vary widely. In particular, the analysis of everyday dialogue and the works of W. Chafe (1987) rely on natural discursive material. In the analysis of everyday dialogue, generalizations are obtained by identifying recurring, dominant patterns, while W. Chafe (1987) gives priority to the method of introspection.

The empirical material consists not of natural but of experimental data, and the processing of the material includes the use of statistical tests standard for cognitive psychology. A special range of methodological issues is associated with the transcription of oral discourse. Any attempt at objective written recording (transcription) of oral language forces us to solve many complex interpretative and technical problems unknown to linguists who study exclusively written texts. Discourse specialists have long understood that when recording oral speech, not only words are important, but also many other circumstances - pauses, prosody, laughter, overlapping lines, incompleteness of lines, etc. Without these details, a meaningful analysis of oral discourse is simply impossible. At the same time, the development of consistent transcription methods and the choice of a reasonable level of detail are extremely difficult problems. Therefore, at present, the principles of transcription of oral discourse are the subject of almost an entire scientific direction (works of the group of E.A. Zemskaya, J. Dubois and his co-authors, J. Gampers, etc.). The next method of analysis of discourse is the method of conceptual analysis. The objects of the CA are concepts (meanings) conveyed by individual words, phrases, individual texts and even entire works. Each concept has a number of conceptual characteristics. For example, the concept "Telephone" has such characteristics as "communication, cost, types of telephones, call center, cellular communication, prestige", etc. These conceptual characteristics are revealed through the meanings of language units expressing (representing) this concept through dictionary definitions, speech contexts. Identification of conceptual characteristics through the analysis of language (language works) is called concept analysis. Let us analyze the content of two concepts represented in modern English and Russian languages, having studied dictionary definitions and contexts of use of the corresponding language units. We will limit ourselves to the analysis of dictionary definitions presented in only a few dictionaries, and also analyze the most well-known contexts of use of the corresponding words. The concept of "Culture" is usually associated in people's minds with a certain level of development of a person and society as a whole. In Russian, this concept is represented by the words "culture, culturality" and some others derived from them. A synonymous connection of these words with the words: "civilization, civility, intelligence" and their derivatives is also noted.

Having analyzed the interpretations of these words in English explanatory dictionaries, we can identify the following substantive features of the concept "Culture" in the English-language conceptual sphere: 1. physical and spiritual development; 2. socially acquired humanitarian knowledge and models of behavior, including socially established norms of assessments and judgments; 3. this knowledge as an area, subject, form of content (music, literature, other arts); 4. the state of spiritual development of a society or group as their general characteristics; 5. spiritual values developed by a given community, race, etc. (concepts, traditions, art); 6. intellectual and spiritual activity and the results (works) of this activity; 7. education and enlightenment; 8. special training and instruction; 9. improvement (of manners, taste ...); 10. something artificially created for any purpose.

The analysis of the semantics and word usage of Russian words allows us to identify the national specificity of this concept and the priority of certain conceptual features in Russian society. For example, in C. Ozhegov's (1997) dictionary the word "culture" is interpreted as "a set of industrial, social, and spiritual achievements of people" and includes various spheres of activity, and not just intellectual and spiritual activity, as in English.

By the way, in English there is also an additional component - "artificially created." Thus, there are certain differences in the content of the same concept in different languages. Propositional analysis is considered one of the main theoretical methods of analyzing linguistic data (D-SA). This method leads to a better understanding of the knowledge underlying this or that discourse analysis. A position is understood in general terms as an assertion or statement about the world (claim). The term "proposition" comes from the Latin proposition, which in logic means a judgment, and in linguistics - a sentence (from the English proposition), that is, some integral unit. A proposition is a genuine statement about the world, or an objective semantic constant. According to J. Searle (1986), a prop-I is what is asserted or stated and passes from person to person in acts of communication [9]. Often, a proposition can be accompanied by a subject variable expressing the speaker's attitude to the action, the speaker's

assessment of what is being communicated, the speaker's emotive attitude to what is being communicated. For example, in the statements:

I assert, I doubt that riots have begun in the city.

I believe, I know, I think that riots might not begin in the city

I deny, I am afraid, etc.

The predicates "to assert, to suppose, to be afraid," etc. express the speaker's attitude. They can be called a variable subject component. The stable core is associated with this variable component – "unrest will begin in the city." This is a stable semantic core (constant), denoting a possible or actual state of affairs. The term "proposition" is applied to this semantic core. That is the proposition of this sentence. In linguistic terms, propositions can be expressed in various ways, namely, in sentences, utterances, speech acts. Any sentence can be translated into a prop-u, and any text has a propositional basis. In a number of studies, propositions are considered as units of internal language (internal content), and a sentence is a unit of external language (surface structure). At the external level, there are not only lingual means of expressing propositions.

Another important methodological innovation of recent years is the increasingly active use of text corpora in discourse analysis. There are a number of computer corpora in the world, containing millions of word usages, which can be used to test hypotheses. Most of these corpora are related to the English language, but there are corpora for some other languages. Currently, discourse analysis has become quite institutionalized as a special (albeit interdisciplinary) scientific direction. Specialized journals devoted to discourse analysis are published - "Text" and "Discourse Processes". The most famous centers of discourse studies are located in the USA – these are the University of California in Santa Barbara (where W. Chafe, S. Thompson, M. Mithun, J. Dubois, P. Clancy, S. Cumming and others work), the University of California in Los Angeles (where E. Schegloff, one of the founders of the analysis of everyday dialogue, works), the University of Oregon in Eugene (where T. Givon, R. Tomlin, D. Payne, T. Payne work), Georgetown University (a long-standing center of sociolinguistic research, among whose employees is D. Shiffrin). In Europe, it is necessary to mention the University of Amsterdam, where the classic of discourse analysis T. van Dijk (2012) works. The term D became fully in demand in linguistics around the 70-80s of the 20th century along with the development of the science of "linguistic pragmatics." Pragmatics studies the relationship between a linguistic sign and a native speaker. Linguistic pragmatics is a discipline that studies language not "in itself and for itself," but as a means used by humans in their activities. Natural language is commonly said to be the most important means of human communication. However, with the exception of so-called factual communication, i.e., communication for the sake of communication, we use language to solve other problems: to report an important event, to encourage the addressee to take certain actions or stop them, to express our feelings or to evaluate someone's actions. Finally, in many cases, the use of language is, if not the only, then the most basic component of an action that fundamentally changes social reality or an individual's fate (cf. the abolition of serfdom, the conclusion of a truce, the passing of a guilty verdict or the awarding of a state prize). Therefore, it is entirely justified to study language as an instrument of action. It is from this perspective that linguistic phenomena are considered within the framework of linguistic pragmatics. In other words, pragmatics studies the relationship between a linguistic sign and a native speaker. This science is interested in the mechanism of speech. It solves the following questions: 1. Who speaks, to whom, what and why; 2. How a person constructs an utterance and how it is related to the communication situation.

Thus, the development of ling. pragmatics led to the development of discursive analysis and discourse. The actual linguistic uses of the term "discourse" are very diverse in themselves, but in general, behind them one can see attempts to clarify and develop the traditional concepts of speech, text and dialogue. Discourse - a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic factors: pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, etc. Linguistic pragmatics incl. a set of issues related to the speaking subject, the addressee, their interaction in communication, the communication situation. Discourse - speech "immersed in life," Discourse - text taken in the event aspect. Discourse is a process of communication through the interaction of communication participants.

The pragmatic approach to discourse involves analyzing it from the standpoint of speech acts, which allows us to consider pragmatics as one of the areas of discursive research. Thus, T.A. van Dijk (2012) emphasizes that "discourse, in the broad sense of the word, is a complex unity of linguistic form, meaning and action that could be

best characterized by the concept of a communicative event or communicative act" while "the speaker and listener, their personal and social characteristics, and other aspects of the social situation undoubtedly relate to this event. The process of transforming discourse into speech acts is called pragmatic interpretation of utterances. In this case, a communicative act, or illocution, is the production of a speech act and is the minimal unit of linguistic communication. An illocutionary act has illocutionary force, which is determined by the purpose of the utterance and the conditions of its implementation. Each utterance, immersed in a certain pragmatic context, can be an intention, desire, prediction, request, order, congratulation, etc., depending on its illocutionary meaning. Similarly, one can classify media discourse texts that represent assertions, accusations, recommendations, predictions, etc.

However, illocution is only one level of speech act analysis. The other two levels include locution and perlocution. A locutionary act has a locutionary meaning that characterizes the point of view of the linguistic elements used in it. A perlocutionary act has a perlocutionary effect, which is the result of the impact of the speech act on the addressee. It is the perlocutionary level of speech act analysis that seems to be the most significant in the study of political media discourse texts, which is explained by their main function - to influence the audience. Moreover, according to researchers, the constitutive property of political media discourse texts is manipulateness, which is the pragmatic effect of political media texts.

Some definitions of pragmatics are almost identical to some definitions of discourse analysis, which may lead us to think that both fields of study are the same. Such definitions of pragmatics can be classified under a broader approach called macropragmatics, and they differ from definitions given by a narrower approach known as micropragmatics. My view of pragmatics is more in line with the latter approach, and therefore I do not consider it the same as discourse analysis. However, pragmatics is an invaluable resource for discourse analysis, with which it shares some common ground but differs in method and scope. Indeed, both disciplines share the idea that it is undesirable to deal with abstract idealizations of how language is constructed, or prescriptive rules of how language should work, and therefore with how, when, why, etc. it is desirable to deal with e. speakers/writers actually use language for different purposes. However, as mentioned in 3, while discourse analysis is mainly an umbrella term for a range of methods and approaches to the analysis of written, spoken or signed language (e.g. conversation analysis, critical discourse analysis, etc.), pragmatics is not necessarily so. includes these approaches in its scope. A discourse analysis researcher undertaking any of these approaches will necessarily use pragmatic concepts and knowledge, but a pragmatic analysis researcher will not necessarily be part of any discourse analytic school of thought.

The consideration of discourse from the point of view of pragmatics (understood semiotically as part of Morris's triad of semantics - syntactics - pragmatics should begin with an analysis of the scheme: "langue is a system, a certain abstract mental construction, discourse are combinations by means of which the speaker uses the language code (i.e., seme), parole is a mechanism that allows these combinations to be realized (i.e. semiotic act)." As we can see, the first and third parts of the triad belong almost entirely to the field of linguistics. The second part can be of interest to literary scholars in many ways. Firstly, discourse here implies a speaker (in our case, rather a writer), this is important for literary theory, where the author always remains the center of attention of the researcher, even when proclaiming his (the author's) death. And secondly, here the role of discourse is indicated as a kind of code used by the speaker to implement the general language code.

Let us cite another quote:

In French linguistics, the dominant position goes back to Benveniste (1971): discourse is not a simple sum of phrases; at its birth, a break with the grammatical structure of the language occurs. Discourse is an empirical object that a linguist encounters when he discovers traces of the subject of the act of utterance, formal elements that indicate the appropriation of language by the speaker." Here we see, in essence, confirmation of the fact that discourse can be understood as an individual supra-linguistic code (i.e., a set of formal elements) that subordinates (to the point of breaking) the grammatical structure of language. Understanding such a code requires certain efforts on the part of the recipient, aimed at "connecting" to the discourse code and, thus, including oneself in the "utterance" situation (see above, point 2).

Now it is worth mentioning A. Greimas and J. Courtet (1983), who in their explanatory dictionary identified discourse with the semiotic process, arguing that "the whole set of semiotic facts (relations, units, operations, etc.), located on the syntagmatic axis of language" can be considered as related to the theory of discourse. [In this same work, they compared the concept of a "secondary modeling system" among Soviet semioticians with the concept of discourse developed on French soil (which should be interpreted as a process that presupposes a system). This latter definition turns out to be extremely important, since it introduces syntagmatic and paradigmatic dimensions into the concept of discourse as a code, and, consequently, the concept of systemicity.

Thus, discourse can be considered as a process (verbalized speech and thinking activity) and as a result (fixed text), as well as in these two aspects simultaneously. Since discourse is the result of interaction with society, when studying discourse, its role in shaping the addressee's opinion, as well as control over the addressee's opinion, is revealed. On the one hand, discourse research is aimed at studying the pragmatic situation to which it is addressed – thereby revealing the communicative adequacy of discourse and its implications. On the other hand, it is aimed at revealing the strategies for understanding it in certain conditions by the addressee and the ways to achieve the addressee's goals.

3. Conclusion

The fields of pragmatic discourse research are conducted in the mode of processing linguistic knowledge, while the researcher refers not only to his own linguistic knowledge, but also to knowledge about the real world, since in the process of understanding and generating speech, all databases stored in the human cognitive apparatus are activated. Thus, discourse is not simply a verbal manifestation of the subject, but also an indication that this subject think, knows, and communicates about it. Discourse can be understood as an external time space, or a network in which the events of the physical sign are located. Discourse is a systematic device for processing linguistic thought, as well as empirical experience, in which the system of categories of past and future, existing and possible worlds, with the already experienced and ideal confluence of circumstances, the rules of the game, and other attitudes are laid down. However, there is no final or timeless discourse, just as there can be no infinite discourse, because the formation of discourse does not form an infinitely repeating set of utterances, but is limited by the conditions of existence. Discourse does not have a historical or rhetorical community; rather, it is constituted by a certain limited number of utterances that arose in and were embodied at a certain point in time. Consequently, discourse is the result of the mental and linguistic processing of empirical experience embodied in a certain spatio-temporal environment through propositions.

Funding: Not applicable.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Informed Consent Statement/Ethics Approval: Not applicable.

References

- Benveniste* E. (1971) Problems in General Linguistics. Front Cover. University of Miami Press, - Language Arts & Disciplines - 317 pages.
- Chafe, William (1987). Cognitive constraints on information flow. In R. Tomlin (ed.), *Coherence and Grounding in Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 21—51.
- Chudinov A. (2007) Political linguistics: a tutorial. Moscow, Pp. 7–8.
- Guillaume J. Maldidier D. (1999) On new methods of interpretation, or the problem of meaning from the point of view of discourse analysis // *Quadrature of meaning*. Moscow, pp. 124-136.
- Hoffman V. (1983) The language of the symbolists // *LN, M.*, 1937, vol. 27-28. Greimas A.J. Courtet J.(1982) *Semiotics. Explanatory dictionary of the theory of language // Semiotics. M.*, pp. 481-550.
- Kobozeva I.(2003). *Intentional and cognitive aspects of semantic utterance: diss. Doctor of Philological Sciences.* Moscow, Page 112.
- Katz I. J., Fodor J. A. (1963.) *The structure of a semantic theory.* Language. Baltimore.pp. 170-210.

- Leech G. N. (1983) Principles of Pragmatics. 265 p.
- L. de Saussure, (2007). Procedural Pragmatics and the Study of Discourse. Universite de Neuchatel. Pp 139-158.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English. (2001) Third edition with New Words supplement. Б.М., s. 30.
- Morris C.W. (2001) Foundations of the theory of signs // Semiotics: Anthology. Moscow, , pp. 45-97
- Morris C. (1983) Foundations of the theory of signs // Semiotics. Moscow, Page 63.
- Ozhegov S. (1997) Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language / edited by N. Yu. Shvedova. 4th ed., suppl. M., P. 689.
- Serio P. (1999) How texts are read in France // The quadrature of meaning. Moscow, pp. 12-53.
- Searle J.R. (1986) Classification of illocutionary acts // New in foreign linguistics. Issue 17. Moscow, pp. 170-194.
- Searle, J. (1968) Speech Acts. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.203.
- Van Dijk T.A. (2012) Editor's Introduction: The Study of Discourse : An Introduction. The Emergence of a New CrossDiscipline. 14 p. URL: <http://www.discourses.org/OldArticles/The%20study%20of%20discourse.pdf>
- Van Dijk T. A. (1998). Towards a definition of discourse. [www-document] URL <http://www.nsu.ru/psych/internet/bits/vandijk2.htm>