
DISCOURSE AS AN ELEMENT OF THE COMMUNICATION PROCESS: IN PRAGMALINGUISTIC AND COGNITIVE AREAS

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.11075858>

Abdurakhmanova Nargiza Nusratullayevna

*Andijan State University Senior teacher of
Interfaculty Department of Foreign Languages*

Phone: +998 90 540 91 07

E-mail: n.n.abdurahmonova76@gmail.com

Abstract

The article talks about the use of discourse as an element of the communication process in the pragmalinguistic and cognitive spheres. In modern linguistics, information is given about the concept of discourse, several directions in the concept of discourse.

Key words

world linguistics, discourse system interactions, communicative (functional) approach, Instructive discourse, a speech process

In world linguistics, the research of discourse as an element of the communication process is extensive, including F. L. Kositskaya's cross-linguistic contrast of advertising discourse (as an example of Russian and French languages), M. L. Makarov's foundations of discourse theory, I. Yu. Myasnikov's uniqueness of genres in the discourse of periodicals, I.V. Silantsev's observations on the intersection of newspaper and novel discourse and discourse system interactions, L.D. Phillips, M.V. Jorgensen's observations on discourse analysis: legality and method appear as monographic studies, A.V. Korniyenko's discourse analysis, G.G. Slisshkin's text to symbol: consciousness and Linguistic and cultural concepts in discourse, T.Yu.Chaban's instructional manuals and textbooks found a fundamental description of various features of discourse. V. B. Kashkin's comparative study of discourse, G. N. Manayenko's articles on text, speech activity, discourse are aimed at solving this problem.

The interest in studying (researching) the text is explained by the purpose of considering the language as a necessary means of communication, studying the relationship between the language and the human activities carried out through the text. The rapid development of text linguistics as a science of the essence and

conditions of human communication marked a shift from language linguistics to speech linguistics, which led to increased attention to the communicative act.

In modern linguistics, the concept of discourse is ambiguous and has different approaches in different works. The concept of discourse can be defined based on several approaches:

1. Communicative (functional) approach. Discourse is manifested as oral communication (speech, its use, the field of use of language), as dialogue or conversation, that is, as a type of dialogical speech or speech different from the speech of the speaker. Within the framework of the communicative approach, the term "discourse" is interpreted as "a certain system of signs that has become a discourse according to its subject, object, place, time, and conditions of creation."

2. In the structural-syntactic approach, discourse is considered as a text fragment: a high-level text (complex syntactic whole, paragraph) is formed. Discourse is considered as a set of more than one sentences related to each other. Even meaningful interdependence is considered as the main character of the discourse.

3. In the structural-methodological approach, discourse is evaluated as a non-textual form of oral speech, a unit consisting of uncertain parts, a spontaneous, situational, methodologically characterized phenomenon formed in high context conditions.

4. The socio-pragmatic approach views discourse as a type of dialogue, life, social or ideologically limited communication, it is a language within a language and consists of specific texts.

The above-mentioned classification proves that there is a three-way view of discourse: on the one hand, pragmatics is focused on typical situational communication, on the other hand, it represents the processes occurring in the minds of the members of the dialogue, the characteristics of thinking, and, thirdly, it expresses the text itself.

The weight of adopted words is inextricably linked with the level of economic, technical, cultural and political development of each country. According to E. Benveniste, a distinctive feature of discourse is the interaction of concrete participants in communication: the speaker and the listener, as well as the speaker's appeal to the listener based on the communicative purpose. The structure of oral discourse is determined by various stages of a person's communicative action determined by internal and external factors (engaging in speech communication, starting the topic of communication/conversation, changing the role of the

participant in the process of the communicative act (the listener becomes the speaker, the speaker becomes the listener), from the communicative act exit).

Thus, summarizing the definitions given above, it can be noted that this term is interpreted close to the concept of "text" in modern linguistics. It is important to pay attention to the fact that it is dynamic and changing during speech communication. Some researchers evaluate the discourse as a phenomenon that includes two components at the same time, that is, the dynamic process of speech activity arising from the social context and its result, that is, the text. It is this view that is relatively acceptable.

Instructive discourse texts are studied in connection with the concept concept, which is the main unit of working memory from the point of view of cognitive approach. It is considered as the basic unit of cognitive process/activity.

E. V. Astakhova evaluates instructional texts based on English language materials as the manifestation of the concept of "Instruction". This also helps to show the uniqueness of the discursive activity aimed at instruction. The main idea of the concept is the situational idea of providing information consisting of instructions on how to do something. In this case, the situation can be understood as all aspects of social life. The analysis of the conceptual space of instruction allows the researcher to develop a frame model of the concept structure that contains variable information describing different situations. This model includes such elements as the participants of the situation, the object to be transmitted to the addressee, which requires special knowledge, the field of application, the instructional information transmission channel, the method of information transmission, the cognitive signs of the text, and the expected reaction.

Based on our observations, we came to the conclusion that instructional texts are a separate genre. This allows us to further explain the pragmalinguistic potential of instructional texts. Because it does not only explain the concrete situation, but also reflects the nature of giving instructions influenced by pragmatic factors. For this reason, a relatively adequate approach in accordance with the goals and tasks is the pragmalinguistic approach.

Another important task of pragmatics is to take into account the factor of the addressee along with the addressee. The changing participants of communication have certain knowledge, they are connected with the communicative attitude that manifests itself in a certain situation, indicating the place and time of communication. In the discourse understood as the exchange of addresses, a two-way relationship of speech characteristics appears: as mentioned earlier, the participants of the dialogue constantly change their roles, while maintaining their

social, ritual status and conditions, that is, the addressee and the position of the addressee changes. In such a speech process, along with the decoding of information, it is characteristic to expand and reduce them, to establish a stable feedback aimed at a more perfect decoding.

I.P. Susov evaluates the pragmalinguistic nature of discourse as follows: "The relationship of a speech act based on a consistent sequence is called a discourse. An address (or sequence of addresses) transmitted from a speaker to a listener acquires the status of a text when it is converted into a letter (or recorded as a sound). Thus, the text is considered as an "informational sign" that organizes the discourse.

In conclusion, it can be said that discourse is a tool that reflects the process of communication, and it deserves to be evaluated as a pragmalinguistic phenomenon. Evaluation as a cognitive process can be based on the fact that it is a set of texts aimed at describing a certain concept.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- 1.Беляева Е.И. Грамматика и прагматика побуждения: английский язык / Е.И.Беляева. – Воронеж: изд-во ВГУ, 1992. – 168 с.
- 2.Борботько В.Г. Элементы теории дискурса. – Грозный: Изд-во Чечено-Ингуш. гос. ун-та, 1981. – 113 с.
- 3.Валгина Н.С. Теория текста. – М.: Логос, 2003. –173 с.
- 4.Ван Дейк Т.А. К определению дискурса. – Л.: Сэйдж пабликэйшнс, 1998. – 384 с.
- 5.Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация. – М.: Прогресс, 1989. – 310 с.