

INTEGRATION BETWEEN DISCOURSE AND COMMUNICATION**Imomov Rahmiddin***Teacher, Karshi State University.*

Abstract: *Communication and discourse are two interrelated constructs that are intimately entwined and falsely taken to be one and the same. In order to structure communication as an ongoing process, discourse is essential. Therefore, our study aims to clarify these ideas while also revealing the complex connections between them. In this sense, the study thoroughly covered the theoretical underpinnings of discourse and communication and, as a result, demonstrated that they are completely interchangeable in every way. To do this, discourse analytic methods of cohesion and coherence are used in conjunction with content analysis methodology.*

Key words: *Discourse, discourse analysis, discourse strategies, cohesion, coherence, communication, non-verbal communication, verbal communication, oral communication, written communication*

INTRODUCTION

Whilst one could argue that language has existed since the dawn of humankind, communication has always been its primary purpose. In other words, communication—which is the fundamental purpose of language—is or involves discourse. Linguists are interested in language because of its importance and centrality to humanity. Prior to contemporary linguistic analysis trends, academics were mainly focused in describing the underlying frameworks and structures of languages, in this scenario, the traditional grammarians. The emergence of fresh perspectives on language study, however, switched the focus from prescriptivism to descriptivism, emphasizing functionalism. As a result, new fields like discourse analysis and communication studies were born, which saw language as discourse and as a means of exchanging ideas or knowledge. Scholarship in the social sciences has become more and more interested in how discourse reflects social realities and how people construct them collectively in order to better understand how social dynamics work. These attempts to understand the roles or functions of language in various contexts led to these developments.

Because they are deeply linked and the existence of one implies the other, discourse can be viewed as communication. Discourse is a relative social occurrence that relies on a variety of disciplines. It is a social performance (Wodak, 2016). Conversations or statements made in a social setting are referred to. Conversely, communication is a general term for actions involving the exchange of information, such as utterances (discourse) or discussions. "Communication presupposes discourse and all discourse forms," according to Keyton (2011). To better comprehend their interdependence and subtle distinctions, the notions of discourse and communication will be investigated in-depth in this regard.

DISCOURSE & DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Conversation has a wide range of definitions. Discourse can be defined as the formal verbal or written discussion of a topic that involves the transmission of thought through words. ---A plausible definition of discourse is offered by Stubbs as 'language above the sentence or above the clause' (1985). A syntactic description or explanation of conversation is provided by this definition. Van Dijk, who takes a contrary stance, claims that discourse is "text in context." (1996). Dijk's approach presents a sociolinguistics perspective on the idea of speech by taking into account the context in which it takes place. Because discourse cannot occur in a vacuum and requires specific individuals or interactants, the context is extremely important (Carta & Wodak, 2015). Text is a component of discourses and, in a sense, creates things out of linguistic acts, hence Wodak distinguishes between discourse and text. (Reisigl & Wodak, 2015).

There are many explanations provided by linguists. In Richardson's opinion, discourse is one of the words that academics use the most frequently today and is a term that is fashionable in many disciplines. (2007). To put it another way, the phrase is widely used and accepted in different academic subjects, which results in a variety of definitions. The term 'discourse' was used first by Zellig Harris who is a well known linguist in 1952 in his paper on Discourse Analysis according to Paltridge. However, Discourse as a subject first started to get significant attention in the 1970s when it ultimately evolved into a critique of communication's cognitive processes. It is predicated on the idea that language need context in order to be effective.

Discourse analysis is a cover phrase for the several traditions that can be used to analyze discourse. Brown and Yule provided an apt definition as 'the analysis of discourse is necessarily the analysis of language in use' (1983). According to this definition, discourse implicitly assumes communication, making discourse analysis the preferred method for researching conversation.

According to Van Dijk, discourse analysis can be used to build theories that explain the connections between language use, ideas, and social interactions. He goes further to dispel the widespread myth that discourse analysis can only be performed on spoken language because there is interaction between speakers clearly present (1996). Nonetheless, despite what would appear to be a passive relationship between the reader and the text, written materials can also be analyzed since readers internalize what they are reading.

In a nutshell, Mills (1997) agreed that 'discourse analysis could be seen as a reaction to a more traditional form of linguistics (formal, structural linguistics) which focused on the constituent units and structure of the sentence and which does not concern itself with an analysis of language in use'. Translation of the concept of structure from the level of the sentence to that of longer texts is what it is concerned with.

DISCOURSE STRATEGIES

A strategy is typically used to describe a technique, process, or approach to reaching a specific objective. Van Dijk conceived strategy as ‘cognitive representations of action sequences and their goals’ (1996). This means that one's desires or needs are evaluated in relation to what they know about their capabilities, the action, context, the potential outcomes, and other factors. In this regard, he viewed discourse strategies as ‘intuitive notions that underlie semantic relations between sentences and in terms of rules relating sentences with semantic macrostructures’ (Van Dijk, 1996). These intuitive conceptions enable accurate semantic relations or idea linkage in language. Hence, cohesion and coherence are the fundamental discourse techniques.

COHESION

This speaks of the grammatical or lexical connections that keep a text together and provide it with meaning. Lexical and grammatical cohesion are the two basic categories of cohesion.

Using both the group link between words and the properties of individual words is known as lexical cohesiveness. Reiteration and collocation are the two basic types of lexical cohesiveness. Repetition can take the form of synonymy, hyponymy, or repetition. Collocation, on the other hand, deals with words that frequently appear together in speech.

The logical and structural shape of words employed in discourse is the key to grammatical cohesiveness. The four primary categories of grammatical devices are conjunction, ellipsis, substitution, and reference. Reference, which deals with definiteness, is split into two categories: anaphoric reference and cataphoric reference. Whereas ellipsis includes complete omission of certain elements (words), substitution entails their replacement.

COHERENCE

The semantic facets of discourse are covered by this. Simply simply, when a conversation makes sense, it is considered to be coherent. Syntactical elements, cognitive processes, and semantic relations, such as the usage of deictic, anaphoric, and cataphoric elements, implications, and presuppositions, are used to produce coherence in conversation.

NOTION OF COMMUNICATION

The Latin word *communis*, which means common, is the source of the English word communication. According to Keyton in Lunenburg, communication is ‘the process of transmitting information and common understanding from one person to another’ (2011). This concept emphasizes the idea that there can be no communication until there is an exchange of information that leads to a shared understanding. Like every other talent, communication needs practice. All parties (components) engaged must effectively participate in this process.

BASIC FORMS OF COMMUNICATION

This concept emphasizes the idea that there can be no communication until there is an exchange of information that leads to a shared understanding. Like every other talent, communication needs practice. All parties (components) engaged must effectively participate in this process.

Non-verbal communication: There are no words used in this type of communication, making it rough or primitive. Instead, it conveys messages through the use of gestures, hints, body movements, voice characteristics, and spatial linkages (s). It is frequently used to convey negative feelings like dislike and ugliness. Compared to verbal communication, nonverbal communication is more spontaneous and less structured. Although it is unplanned, it is sometimes thought to be more trustworthy since it expresses the communicator's actual feelings. Also, as gestures and body language are perceived more quickly and easily than verbal communication, it improves the message's effectiveness. Yet, it is more efficient and has a bigger impact when used in conjunction with spoken communication (s).

Verbal communication: This entails the logical and systematic arrangement of words to communicate information or transmit a message between communicators orally or in writing. The written form is appropriate when attempting to reach a large audience that is concentrated in a place or due to proximity issues, whereas the spoken form (oral communication) is effective in reaching a focused target audience because it affords the speaker the opportunity to interact with the perceived audience. Overall, verbal communication is much more effective than nonverbal communication. This may help to explain why it has recently been the most popular form.

ORAL COMMUNICATION

This is the spoken process of passing on knowledge and concepts from one person or group to another. With the development of technology, new oral communication methods such as video conferencing and video phones have emerged (teleconferencing). Podcasts, which are online audio clips, and Voice-over-internet Protocol (VoIP), which enables phone users to communicate over the internet and save money on phone calls, are other contemporary forms of oral communication. Facebook, Whatsapp, etc. are few examples. There are two types of oral communication: formal and informal. Formal oral communication includes speeches or lectures delivered in a classroom as well as presentations made at conferences or business meetings. Conversations on the phone or in person fall under the category of informal oral communication.

WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

Any message or information transfer involving symbols or words falls under this (printed or handwritten). Of all the available business communication methods, it is the most significant and efficient. The antithesis of oral communication is written communication. Proposals, lecture notes, seminar papers, postcards, brochures, press releases, memoranda, etc. are a few examples of written communication formats.

REFERENCE LIST:

1. Carta, C., & Wodak, R. (2015). Discourse analysis, policy analysis, and the borders of EU identity. *Discourse Analysis, Policy Analysis, and the Borders of EU Identity*, 14(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1075/jlp.14.1.01car>
2. Reisigl, M. & Wodak, R. (2015). The Discourse-Historical Approach. In Wodak, R. & Meyer, M. *Methods of Critical Discourse Studies (Introducing Qualitative Methods series) (Third pp.87-121)*. SAGE Publications Ltd.
3. Wodak, R. (2016). "We have the character of an island nation". A discourse-historical analysis of David Cameron's "Bloomberg Speech" on the European Union. European University Institute.
4. Stubbs, M. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
5. Van Dijk, T. A. (1996). Discourse, power and access. In C. R. Caldas-Coulthard and M. Coulthard, eds., *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.
6. Mills, S. (1997) *Discourse*, Routledge: London
7. Gillian Brown and George Yule. 1983. *Discourse analysis: Coherence in the interpretation of the discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
8. Keyton, J. (2011) "Communication and Organizational Culture: A Key to Understanding Work Experiences," 2 Edition, Sage Publishing Inc., New York.
9. Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.