

## EUROPEAN INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGICAL SCIENCES

VOLUME03 ISSUE05

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55640/eijps-03-05-14>

Pages: 48-53



## INTERPRETATION OF 'DISCOURSE' FROM ANTHROPOLOGICAL LINGUISTIC PERSPECTIVE

**Zokhida O. Amirova**

*Acting docent of English philology faculty Doctor of philosophy in Philological sciences (PhD) Karshi state university Uzbekistan*

### ABOUT ARTICLE

**Key words:** Discourse, language above, discourse analysis, anthropological linguistics, significance of language, cultural context.

**Received:** 21.05.2023

**Accepted:** 26.05.2023

**Published:** 31.05.2023

**Abstract:** Discourse is the creation and organization of the segments of a language above as well as below the sentence. It is segments of language which may be bigger or smaller than a single sentence but the adduced meaning is always beyond the sentence. The term discourse applies to both spoken and written language, in fact to any sample of language used for any purpose. Any series of speech events or any combination of sentences in written form wherein successive sentences or utterances hang together is discourse. 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.

### INTRODUCTION

Anthropological linguistics is the study of relations between language and culture, and the relations between cognition and language. Since it emerges, it has taken the commitment to explore the significance of language and the application of discourse. According to research findings of anthropological linguistics, discourse has its root in social activities (Paltridge, 1997). Discourse inter-relates with ideology and people's conducts. Discourse is, thus, a certain type of communicative or social activities performed by either an individual or social groups. Inspired by this definition, anthropological linguists have further classified discourse into such genres as jokes, stories, speeches, conversation and so on.

### THE MAIN RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Moreover, bearing in mind that discourse is a communicative and social act, experts on anthropological linguistic branch will necessarily emphasize situation and context in the process of

interpreting discourse. Performing profound studies on these two factors, academicians put forward or decipher influential notions like 'context of situation' (Malinowsky, 1923) and 'speech events' (Bauman, 1977; Hymes, 1981), under the guidance of which, anthropological linguists give highest prominence to ties among narrative events as well as narrative structure in discourse analysis. The experimental focus of their research is, accordingly, on genres, acts and events in specific context. To explain this in a foolproof way, language in use is what anthropological linguists centre on (Wenxing Yang & Ying Sun; 2010).

Discourse can not be confined to sentential boundaries. It is something that goes beyond the limits of sentence. In another words discourse is 'any coherent succession of sentences, spoken or written' (Matthews, 2005). Two paradigms in linguistics vis formalist paradigm and functionalist paradigm make different background assumptions about the goals of a linguistic theory, the methods for studying language, and the nature of data and empirical evidence. These differences in paradigm also influence definitions of discourse. A definition as derived from formalist assumptions is that discourse is 'language above the sentence or above the clause' (Stubbs 1983).

Discourse analysis is premised on the claim that effective historical agency, and thus the existence of individual and collective subjects who are capable of productive, creative, transformative action in the world, is produced in history rather than expressed in history. It is not subjects who produce meaning, but the networks of meaning that create subjects. In some earlier forms of discourse analysis, which was heavily tilted toward an analysis of the homogenizing, totalizing regularities in discursive structures, subjects, or authors often appeared as nothing more than anonymous, replaceable bearers (Träger) of the structures that defined them. In many ways this conception of discourse as a systematic process of meaning production mirrored the position of social historians who defined individual and collective agents in history as the inhabitants of social functions, or as bearers of the process of material production. Historians who took the linguistic turn in the 1980s and 1990s, however, were concerned with revealing the historical contingency of determining structures, with deconstructing systems of meaning production that allowed certain identities—of class, race, gender, ethnicity, and so on—to be experienced as natural realities or metaphysical essences. Attentiveness to the conflictual, dialogical, communicative dimensions of discourses in which historical identities were constantly constructed, modified, dissolved, and transformed did assume the effective agency of historical subjects (both individual and collective) who were able not only to negotiate among conflicting, multivocal, sometimes contradictory discourses, but also to redefine themselves as subjective agents.

Discursive agency, however, was decentered and contingent, the agency of constantly shifting 'identities' that were the creations of discursive practices themselves. Historical subjects were 'subjected' to the logics of the various discursive networks that they inhabited. But within the limitations defined by historical situation and status they made choices that might ultimately change that situation and status, and thus also their own identities. The question of agency in discourse analysis was not so much whether or not agency was possible within its terms, but what kind of agency was imaginable. Within the complex heterogeneous compounds of any cultural or discursive formation, a particular individual might simultaneously inhabit a whole series of dispersed, fragmented subject positions. Within each of them—as parent, worker, consumer, or as sexual, racial, or national subject—the individual could act, either individually or by identifying himself with other individuals similarly positioned in various discourses, to shift the hierarchical relations among identities, and to change the identities themselves. In discourse analysis, human agency, the identity and effectiveness of the

individual and collective subject, was construed as an always coming-to-be in worldly particularly, as historical through and through.

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. 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.

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.

## CONCLUSION

Discourse and discourse analysis have become central catchwords in social and education sciences in recent decades. Closely linked to the constructionist or linguistic turn across disciplines, research in the field of education increasingly adopts analyses that take language in context – texts, talk, and social interaction – as the starting point for their qualitative inquiry. In this article, we lay out for view the range of analytic foci under the broad umbrella term discourse analysis. Center stage is given to the variety of theoretical approaches and analytic emphases, and to the differences, dialog, and points in common between different analytic traditions and schools of thought.

## REFERENCES

1. Matthews, P.H. (2005). Oxford concise dictionary of linguistics. New York: Oxford University Press.

2. Stubbs, M. (1983). Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. Cichago: Cichago University Press.
3. Stubbs, M. (1983). Discourse analysis: The sociolinguistic analysis of natural language. Cichago: Cichago University Press.
4. Mokhinur B. Nizomova. The Issue Of Formation Of Communicative-Pragmatic Direction In Terminology. International conference of philology, Socialactivities and modern science. Published: May10,2023|Pages:83-86.
5. Chomsky, Noam. (2002). Syntactic structures. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
6. Widdowson, H. G. (2004). Text, context, pretext: critical issues in discourse analysis. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
7. Smith, G. & H. Kurthen. (2007). Front-stage and back-stage in hybrid learning. International Journal on Learning 6 (3), 455.
8. Narmuradov Z.R. Uralova O.P. Ingliz va O'zbek tillarida «Ta'lim», «Ilm» konseptlariga oid paremalarning lingvomadaniy tadqiqi. Filol. fanlari falsafa d- ri... diss.– Termez, 2022.– 180 b.
9. Ne'matov H, Rasulov R. O'zbek tili sistem leksikalogiyasi asoslari. -T.; O`qituvchi, 1995.7-b.
10. Oripovna, A. Z. (2022). Lingvokulturologiya konteksida "til" tushunchasi talqini. Международный журнал искусство слова, 5(2).
11. Amirova, Z. O. (2021). The "heart" component in the concept of "thoughtful". Current research journal of philological sciences, 2(12), 17-20.