Discourse and Professional Linguistic Personality

Bektursinova Aysultan Marat qizi
Lecturer at the Department of Russian Language and Literature Karakalpak State University named after Berdakh

ABSTRACT

This article seems like a brief analysis of the history of the formation and development of discourse in linguistics. The article also investigates the issue of the formation of a professional linguistic personality, the formation of which is determined by a social institution that dictates communicative competence.

KEY WORDS: *professional linguistic personality, discourse, linguistics, philologist, communicative.*

Introduction. Today, in the scientific world, the term "discourse" is used in various disciplines such as literary studies, sociology, psychology, law, pedagogy, political science, anthropology, and linguistics. However, despite the widespread use of the term, there is still no single and comprehensive definition. The concept of "discourse" appeared relatively recently, and in the second half of the 20th century, a new field of research dedicated to the analysis of discourse appeared in linguistics - "discourse analysis".

Materials and methods. Discourse can be defined as a mode of communication that includes linguistic and non-linguistic elements that interact and form a semantic field. It is a complex system of socio-cultural, political, and identity practices that influence the formation of our perceptions of the world and ourselves. Discourse analysis allows us to study various aspects of discourse, including its structure, context, use of linguistic means, and representation of social realities. It helps us understand how discourse influences our thoughts, behavior, and perceptions of the world around us.

Results. Z. Harris is the founder of this trend, which began to develop with his article in 1952. At a time when linguists were mostly studying individual sentences, Harris began to analyze the distribution of elements in complete texts and the relationship between the text and the social situation in which it is used. He introduced the concept of "transformation" and began to study the regular characteristics of discourse, examining in detail the equivalent formal units and structures that emerge from sentence to sentence. However, his theory lacked the goals of discourse in the communicative interaction of people, as well as the concept of a broad context [3, p. 14].

Discussion. With the passage of time and the development of research in the field of discourse, new aspects have emerged that have broadened the understanding of this topic. Researchers have begun to pay attention to the goals and intentions that underlie discursive activity. They realized that discourse not only conveys information, but also serves as a means of influencing audiences, forming opinions, and establishing interaction between people. In addition, the notion of a broad context has come to play an important role in the analysis of discourse. Expanding the context allows you to take into account not only linguistic elements, but also social, cultural, historical and other factors that affect the communication process. Understanding the context helps to reveal the meaning of the discourse and understand its relationship to the surrounding situation. Thus, modern research in the field of discourse pays attention not only to the formal properties of the text, but also to its functional

aspects, the goals of communication, and the context in which communication takes place. This allows for a more complete understanding of discourse and its role in society.

Today, there are many methods, tools, and conceptual frameworks for studying this phenomenon. V.Y. Propp made a significant contribution to the development of discourse analysis by putting forward the idea that any analysis should include a structural component; F.S. Barrett pointed out the importance of background knowledge for understanding discourse and further emphasized the cognitive aspects of communication, such as remembering, storing, and retrieving information from memory. He noted such cognitive aspects of communication as memorizing, storing, and retrieving information from memory. It was this point of view that laid the foundation for the cognitive study of discourse: thanks to D. Pike, the term "discourse" as an object of language goes beyond the text, and the researcher's attention is drawn to the general features of human behavior [1].

Discourse itself does not arise, develop, or exist, but serves various spheres of human life and manifests its specificity in a certain communicative environment. A person's life is closely connected with society. In order to coordinate social relations, social institutions are created that satisfy the most diverse human needs. Every day, a person encounters various social institutions, performs certain social functions, and complies with the norms and requirements imposed by a particular social system.

Since all human activity is based on interaction with other members of society through language, it is necessary to emphasize that each social system determines a particular way of constructing communication within its sphere of activity, in other words, each system produces a corresponding type of discourse.

Conclusion. It should be noted that researchers agree that the socio-cultural status of a person, his social affiliation, profession or position is also one of the most important communicative factors in the formation of a linguistic personality. As the researchers rightly note, the choice of lexical units, terminology, grammatical design of discourse, the humanitarian or technical nature of linguistic thinking are the result of the synergetic impact of the sphere of professional activity and the professional status of the speaker. A person's professional status undoubtedly has a significant impact on the process of formation and formation of his linguistic personality, as well as on the expectations of others regarding his speech behavior and choice of linguistic means in certain situations of communicative situations. Society imposes requirements and expectations on a certain person, which this person must meet, otherwise the behavior of this person is considered a violation of social norms and rules [2, p. In other words, every linguistic personality must have communicative competence, which, according to M.O. Faenova, is understood as the communicative competence of a person. According to Faenova, communicative competence is the ability to form sentences in accordance with the linguistic context [5, p. 5].

References

1. Maslova V.A. Kognitivnaya lingvistika [Cognitive linguistics]. Moscow, TetraSystems Publ., 2018. 272 p. (In Russian).

2. Plavskaya T.V. Bilingual Thesaurus of a Researcher-Archaeologist as a Basis for the Creation of a Lexicographic Product of a New Type: Dissertation. ... Cand. Philol. Sci. / T.V. Plavskaya. Rostov-on-Don, 2009. 215 p. (In Russian).

3. Pravikova L.V. Sovremennaya teoriya diskursa: kognitivno-framovyy i argumentativenyy podkhody: monografiya [Modern Theory of Discourse: Cognitive-Frame and Argumentative Approaches: Monograph]. Pyatigorsk: PSLU Publ., 2014. 300 p. (In Russian).

4. Faenova M.O. Obuchenie kul'ture obshcheniya na angliyskiy yazyke [Teaching the culture of communication in English]. Moscow, Vysshaya shkola Publ., 2017. 144 p. (In Russian).