

DOI: 10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1603

Citation: Ogneva, E., Nikulina, D., Musaelian, E., Bogachev, R., Kutsenko, A., & Danilenko, I. (2018). Strategies of Discourse Modeling. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research*, 7(2), 729-735. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v7i2.1603>

Strategies of Discourse Modeling

Elena A. Ogneva¹, Daria E. Nikulina², Elena N. Musaelian³,
Roman E. Bogachev⁴, Alina A. Kutsenko⁵, Ilya A. Danilenko⁶

Abstract

Contemporary discourse modeling is the complex research methodology having many scientific algorithms. Every step of this discourse modeling methodology has the specific scientific purpose. The unity of these scientific purposes is the base to identify discourse modeling evolution steps. Modeling of political discourse and TV-discourse as the most manipulative discursive types realizes so important scientific problems to create socio-cultural model of society. The discourse model of society discovers reasons and results of transformation in discourse formations. Our discourse modeling methodology is discovering the specific feature of transformation in political discourse and TV-discourse's formations. The majority of discursive modeling strategies are based on the socio-cultural factors, and it should be noted that both the political and movie discourses are interrelated with them, and most frequently represented as cultural realities in discursive modeling. Formulation of discourse modeling strategies is one of the ways to identify the specific features of evolution's steps onto discourse socio-cultural model's development.

Keywords: Discourse, Political discourse, TV-discourse, Socio-cultural model.

¹ Belgorod State University 85 Pobeda Street, Belgorod, Russia, Postcode 308015. E-mail: Ogneva@bsu.edu.ru

² Belgorod State University 85 Pobeda Street, Belgorod, Russia, Postcode 308015.

³ Belgorod State University 85 Pobeda Street, Belgorod, Russia, Postcode 308015.

⁴ Belgorod State University 85 Pobeda Street, Belgorod, Russia, Postcode 308015.

⁵ Belgorod State University 85 Pobeda Street, Belgorod, Russia, Postcode 308015.

⁶ Belgorod State University 85 Pobeda Street, Belgorod, Russia, Postcode 308015.

Introduction

Language has been a social phenomenon, inextricably linked to the culture, history and various extralinguistic factors of its speakers since self-organization and the advent of its developed system. However, with the rise of writing, appears a problem of diachronic perception of the written text, when the understanding of the text directly depends on the understanding of its defining discourse [1].

Currently, discursive research has reached a qualitatively new level of development. In the framework of gradual evolutionary movement of discourse studies, its methodology is being improved, new goals and objectives, both theoretical and practical perspective are being set.

Discourse is multifaceted in nature and can be interpreted, according to N. F. Alefirenko, as "a rethinking formation of event character" [2: 248]. Another Russian scientist, V. Z. Demyankov, defines discourse as "speech (in particular, text) in its formation in front of the interpreter's mental eyes. The interpreter places the content of the next interpreted portion of the discourse within the framework of the already received intermediate or preliminary interpretation. As a result, the reference ambiguity is eliminated, if necessary, the communicative purpose of each sentence is determined and the drama of the whole discourse is revealed step by step" [3]. V. I. Karasik understands the discourse as "text immersed into a situation of communication" [4], allowing "multiple measuring" and complementary approaches in the study, of which pragmalinguistic, psycholinguistic, structural linguistic, linguocultural, sociolinguistic. In our opinion, "the modern discursive paradigm of knowledge is represented by a wide conceptual spectrum from the discourse consideration as a text to the study of this phenomenon as a communicative event" [5: 569].

Among the foreign researches in the field of discourse studies it is observed the wide array of methodological approaches to the solution of various scientific problems of modern discursive reality [6-9]. For example, according to Shevchenko, "discourse is a multifaceted cognitive-communicative-language system-gestalt" [10: 115].

In our studies it is revealed that the non-linearity of the discursive paradigm provides a communicative balance of this dynamic system as a cognitive format of knowledge, the evolution of which is due to the evolution of the society that implements the communicative function within this dynamic system. The discursivity of this cognitive format of knowledge is considered as a property inherent in the information environment of the society, a property that is the basic evolutionary spectrum of the implementation of the communicative function of the society. According to A. R. Usmanova, "the discursiveness can be interpreted as the inherent ability of non-equilibrium environment for self-organization" [11: 237]. This article studies the process of self-organization of the discursive system as a communicative reality.

Methodology

Without any doubt, a new level of discursive analysis evolution requires new methodological developments, which, along with previously developed methods, are aimed at solving urgent problems. One of the urgent problems is the development of strategic algorithms for discursive modeling. Thus, the author's matrix methodological approach to the study of factual material [12] contributes to the comprehensive consideration and modeling of the discourse of society, identifying problems and prospects of its development as a dynamic system, in particular the development of its two segments of political discursive reality and cinematic discursive reality. The use of the author's algorithm for predicting the degree of political discourse modifications and cultural discursive patterns of transforming society is aimed at identifying their synergising in cultural linguistic and politically oriented model of the region or a particular country, which is facilitated by the centripetal oriented conceptualization of the world that is based on the correlation axiomatically twofold society \leftrightarrow language.

Discussion

The term "discourse" has already been deployed in science and it is no longer any necessity in justifying the legitimacy of its use. The use in the areas of fundamentally different subjects of study has also led to a different interpretation of this term. The frequency of the use undoubtedly has led to a fashion for discourse as a collective imitation of the novelties and they began to replace with the "discourse" concepts and terms that have already been rooted in linguistic. However it should be noted that the discourse has occupied a niche in terminology quite legitimately, got its own definition and which is most important allowed to expand the possibilities of linguistic analysis.

Discourse is treated ambiguously in modern linguistics. There are several approaches to the discourse definition.

1. Communicative (functional) approach: discourse as verbal communication (speech, usage, language functioning) as a dialogue, conversation, i.e., the type of dialogical utterance, as speech from the speaker position opposed to a narration that does not considerate such a position.
2. Structural-syntactic approach: discourse as a text fragment, i.e., formation above the sentence level (super-phrasal unity, complex syntactic integer, a paragraph). A discourse is understood as two or more sentences that are semantically connected with each other, while the coherency is considered as one of the main discourse features.
3. Structural-stylistic approach: discourse as a non-textual colloquial speech organization, characterized by fuzzy division into parts, dominance of associative connections, spontaneity, situationality, non-low context, stylistic specifics.
4. Social-pragmatic approach: discourse as a text immersed in the communicative situation, into life, or as a social or ideologically limited type of utterance, or as a "language in the language", but presented in a special social entity form that has its own texts [4].

This classification is capable of understanding that the discourse nature is threefold: one side of it is addressed to pragmatics, to typical communicative situation, the other is addressed to the processes that occur in the sense of communication participants, and to their sense characteristics, and the third discourse side is turned to the text [13, 14].

Within the communicative-speech approach framework discourse is characterized as a communicative process and its equivalents are such notions as "speech", "speech action", "communicative situation". Within such understanding of discourse the concept of "speech" is implied in all its meanings: first of all as an oral natural speech which is opposite to the written form of the language; secondly as the process of speech activity itself and its result that is the functioning of the language within the process of communication. Discourse is viewed as "the equivalent of the "speech" concept in Saussure's conception, ie. Any concrete utterance; as a purposeful social action, as a component involved in the interaction of people and the mechanisms of their consciousness (cognitive processes). Discourse is the speech immersed in the life; speech together with extralinguistic factors, "the real time language functioning." In other words the discourse is being taken broadly as the process of using the language under certain conditions, as verbal communication. It is necessary to emphasize the difference between an utterance and discourse. First of all the volume of notions shall be taken: an utterance is a round within discourse and discourse is a set of utterances, an exchange of utterances. Secondly the degree of intention realization and achievement of a communicative goal is different.

An important discourse characteristic, including political discourse, is a communicative and pragmatic setting, which means linguistic resources targeted selection by a speech subject to exert a certain influence

on the addressee. The sources of political language research are the political media discourse (including newspapers, radio, television) and the actual political (institutional) discourse (leaflets, parliamentary debates, speeches at rallies, political parties documents, etc.) in their diverse varieties and intersections [15]. However, there are texts that combine the political discourse signs with the typical artistic, everyday or scientific discourse features.

The political discourse complex analysis as an object of linguistic-cultural study determines the political discourse characteristics and functions, discovers its basic concepts, reveals its semiotic space modeling principles, develops a political discourse signs typology, analyzes its intentional and genre aspects.

First of all specialists distinguish institutional political discourse, in that only texts created by politicians (parliamentary transcripts, political documents, public appearances, political leaders interviews, etc.) and mass media political discourse, within which mainly texts created by journalists and distributed through the press, television, radio, the Internet are used. The political discourse periphery includes hardware communication (instructions, conduct for employees rules, orders, etc.), texts created by people who are not professed politicians or journalists occasionally involved in political communication (letters addressed to politicians or state institutions, anecdotes, everyday talks related to political problems, etc.), texts in that artistic narrative elements are used (political detective stories, memoirs).

The public intend purpose of political discourse is to inspire the recipients (community citizens) for "politically correct" actions and (or) assessments.

Nowadays it is very important to study movie-discourse as a transforming reality format, since in the movie industry and high technologies development age, as well as the Internet accessibility, the books reading is increasingly being replaced by watching the same name movie or a series. On the one hand, it is useful for saving time, but on the other hand, the viewer imagination is leveled at directors and screenwriters who have already made worldview and characters. Therefore, when creating the subsequent movie product, it is necessary to consider the particular historical epoch features, the appearance of the characters and the environment. This is especially important when creating a movie or a series of a literary work. All this, as well as the characters' speech features, should be reflected in the TV-format discourse.

Next to the movie-discourse it is precious to study the features of the artistic discourse in the literary work the film and a series are based on, since it is necessary to arrange the movie characters cues so that the TV-format discourse is as close to the artistic original as possible, i.e., meaning should not be changed.

Moreover some linguists interpret discourse as speech behavior, as the process of the speaker's speech intentions fulfillment and interpreting them by the listeners in a specific speech situation that means that the communicative function of the language is brought to the fore. In other words one can speak of discourse as of a verbal behavior of the speaker being considered in its full expression (verbal intonational and paralinguistic) and aspirations taking into account all extralinguistic factors (social, cultural, psychological) essential for successful speech interaction.

The text in its standing before the interpreter's mind called discourse. The discourse consists of sentences or their fragments and the content of the discourse often, though not always concentrates around some "supporting" concept called "the topic of discourse " or "the discourse topic". The logical content of individual sentences - the components of a discourse - is called propositions. These propositions are connected by logical relations: the conjunction "and", the disjunction "or", the implication "if ... then", etc. Understanding the discourse the interpreter composes elementary propositions into a whole meaning placing the new information contained in the next interpreted sentence into the framework of already gotten or preliminary given interpretation.

Discourse and a text differ in the following features:

- 1) On the basis of the presence / absence of procedurally. Linguistics has narrowed the content of the notion of "text" as much as possible limiting it only to the material side and leaving the processuality for the researchers of discourse. This property is interpreted as functionality - structure, process – product, dynamism – static. In accordance with them the structural text is distinguished as a product and functional discourse – as a process;
- 2) On the basis of presence / absence of attachment to the time. Discourse can not exist outside the real, physical time in which it unfolds;
- 3) On the basis of presence / absence of relevance. Thus a discourse interpreted as speech immersed in life is not usually used in relation to ancient and other texts, since it is impossible to directly restore their connections with the social situation. In other words the sign of discourse is its relevance as its significance for the present moment;
- 4) On the basis of oral / written form. If the discourse is viewed as the process of using the language in spoken and written speech then the text is understood usually as any recorded speech (literary work, composition, document, etc., as well as a part or an extract from them).

Discourse is an integral part of social relations for on one hand it is formed by them and on the other hand it forms these relations. That is why any discourse can be regarded as a "special use of language" as a communicative event ("discourse is speech immersed in life"), as well as the "way of ordering the reality". Thus discourse is "a complex unity of the linguistic form, knowledge and action" because not only the language in actual use is involved in its realization but also extra-linguistic factors predetermining communication and which is the most important mental (cognitive) structures that determine the existence of discourse.

One of the main functions of discourse is to make an impact on the interlocutor. Consequently an important characteristic of discourse including political discourse as well is to be understood as a communicative-pragmatic setting which is understood as the targeted selection of linguistic means by the subject of speech to exert a certain impact on the addressee.

Conclusion

The discursive modeling strategic algorithms development is based on the fact that both the political discourse and the movie discourse are closely related to socio-cultural factors that are most fully displayed as cultural realities in the discursive model. The structure of this discursive model varies depending on the historical epoch, the geographical and social positions of the speakers, as well as on their gender and age aspects [16].

In our study, discourse is viewed as a complex matrix social model the study of which is at the junction of several scientific fields: linguoculturology, linguocognitistics, sociolinguistics and political linguistics.

A discourse matrix sociomodel can be represented in the form of a dynamic sum (aggregate) of discursive formations. By discursive formations are meant cognitive formats of knowledge that "are formed at the intersection of the communicative and cognitive components of discourse. The communicative component includes possible positions and roles that are provided in discourse to the native speakers - linguistic personalities. The cognitive component implies the knowledge that is contained in a discursive message. Discursive formations interact with each other partly coinciding in communicative and cognitive characteristics, according to the genres used" [17: 68].

Political discourse modeling along with movie-discourse modeling as two types of manipulative discourses reveal the prospects for further transformations of the discursive social model.

The discursive formations evolution within the frames of different types of discursive models is conditioned both thematically and chronologically. That is why there is no doubt that at the present time the problem of discourse modeling strategies principles development that is aimed at revealing the degree of modification of various formations is significant. The solution of the problem is aimed at revealing the problems and perspectives of the cognitive-communicative conditioned process of creating a discursive model of the society. Consideration of the specifics of the architectonics of political discourse models and movie discourse as two manipulative types of discourse reveals new possibilities in interpreting the evolving methodological approaches in modern discourse.

Footnotes

1. Bogachev, R.E, Musaelian, E.N., Miroshnichenko, L.N., Yarygina, O.N. (2015). The Notion Interconnections of "Os-Drihten" Within One Conceptual Meaning. *The Social Sciences*, 10: 1135-1137.
2. Alefirenko, N.F. (2009). *Zhivoe slovo: problemyi funktsionalnoy leksikologii: monografiya*. M. Flinta: Nauka. (In Russian).
3. Dem'jankov, V.Z. (2007). *Tekst i diskurs kak terminy i kak slova obydenного jazyka*. IV Mezhdunarodnaja nauchnaja konferencija «Jazyk, kul'tura, obshhestvo». Moskva. pp. 86-95. (In Russian).
4. Karasik, V.I. (2000). *O tipah diskursa. Jazykovaja lichnost': institucional'nyj i personal'nyj diskurs: sb. nauch. tr.* Volgograd: Peremena, pp. 5-20. (In Russian).
5. Ogneva, E.A. (2015). *Transformacija diskursivnoj modeli sociuma: problemy i perspektivy. Riski v izmenjajushhejsja social'noj real'nosti: problema prognozirovanija i upravljenija*. Voronezh: OOO «PT», pp. 569-573. (In Russian).
6. Crowhurst, M., & Emslie, M. (2018). *Discourse Analysis*. In: *Working Creatively with Stories and Learning Experiences*. Creativity, Education and the Arts. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
7. Gee, J.P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
8. Venhuizen, N.J., Bos, J., Hendriks, P., & Brouwer, H. (2018). *Discourse Semantics with Information Structure*. *Journal of Semantics*, 35, 127-169.
9. Reiss, T.J. (2018). *The Discourse of Modernism*. Cornell University Press.
10. Shevchenko, I.S. (2017). *Konceptualizacija komunikativnogo povedenija v diskurse; glava v kn. Kak narisovat' portret pticy: metodologija kognitivno-kommunikativnogo analiza jazyka: kol. monografiya*. Bondarenko, E.V., Martynjuk A.P., Frolova I.E., Shevchenko, I.S., Har'kov: HNU im. V.I. Karazina. (In Russian).
11. Usmanova, A.R. (2001). *Diskursija. Postmodernizm. Jenciklopedija*. Mn.: Interpresservis. (In Russian).
12. Ogneva, E.A. (2015). *Transformacija diskursivnoj modeli sociuma: problemy i perspektivy. Riski v izmenjajushhejsja social'noj real'nosti: problema prognozirovanija i upravljenija*. Voronezh: OOO «PT», pp. 569-573. (In Russian).
13. Edberg, H. (2018). *Text as a Site of Negotiation: A Model for Text Analysis*. In: *Creative Writing for Critical Thinking*. Palgrave Macmillan.
14. Jaworski, A., & Coupland, N. (Eds.) (2014). *The Discourse Reader* (3rd ed.). London; New York: Routledge.
15. Karasik, V.I. (2000). *O tipah diskursa. Jazykovaja lichnost': institucional'nyj i personal'nyj diskurs: sb. nauch. tr.* Volgograd: Peremena, pp. 5-20. (In Russian).

16. Ogneva, E.A., Danilenko, I.A., Kireeva, Ya.I., & Kutsenko, A.A. (2015). Interpretative Model of Linguacultural Knowledge. *The Social Sciences*, 10: 1101-1106.
17. Revzina, O.G. (2005). Diskurs i diskursivnye formacii. *Kritika i semiotika*. Vyp. 8, pp. 66-78. (In Russian).

References

- Alefirenko, N. F. (2009). *Zhivoe slovo: problemy funktsional'noj leksikologii: monografiya*. M. Flinta: Nauka. (in Russian).
- Bogachev, R. E.; Musaelian, E. N.; Miroshnichenko, L. N. & Yarygina, O. N. (2015). The Notion Interconnections of "Os-Drihten" Within One Conceptual Meaning. *The Social Sciences*, 10: 1135-1137.
- Crowhurst, M. & Emslie, M. (2018). *Discourse Analysis*. In: *Working Creatively with Stories and Learning Experiences*. Creativity, Education and the Arts. Palgrave Macmillan, Cham.
- Dem'jankov, V. Z. (2007). Tekst i diskurs kak terminy i kak slova obyden'nogo jazyka. IV Mezhdunarodnaja nauchnaja konferencija «Jazyk, kul'tura, obshhestvo». Moskva. pp. 86-95. (in Russian).
- Edberg, H. (2018). *Text as a Site of Negotiation: A Model for Text Analysis*. In: *Creative Writing for Critical Thinking*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Jaworski, A. & Coupland, N. (Eds.) (2014). *The Discourse Reader* (3rd ed.). London; New York: Routledge.
- Karasik, V. I. (2000). O tipah diskursa. *Jazykovaja lichnost': institucional'nyj i personal'nyj diskurs: sb. nauch. tr. Volgograd: Peremena*, pp. 5-20. (in Russian).
- Karasik, V. I. (2000). O tipah diskursa. *Jazykovaja lichnost': institucional'nyj i personal'nyj diskurs: sb. nauch. tr. Volgograd: Peremena*, pp. 5-20. (in Russian).
- Ogneva, E. A. (2015). Transformacija diskursivnoj modeli sociuma: problemy i perspektivy. Riski v izmenjajushhejsja social'noj real'nosti: problema prognozirovanija i upravlenija. *Voronezh: OOO «PT»*, pp. 569-573. (in Russian).
- Ogneva, E. A. (2015). Transformacija diskursivnoj modeli sociuma: problemy i perspektivy. Riski v izmenjajushhejsja social'noj real'nosti: problema prognozirovanija i upravlenija. *Voronezh: OOO «PT»*, pp. 569-573. (in Russian).
- Ogneva, E. A.; Danilenko, I. A.; Kireeva, Ya. I. & Kutsenko, A. A. (2015). Interpretative Model of Linguacultural Knowledge. *The Social Sciences*, 10: 1101-1106.
- Reiss, T. J. (2018). *The Discourse of Modernism*. Cornell University Press.
- Revzina, O. G. (2005). Diskurs i diskursivnye formacii. *Kritika i semiotika*. Vyp. 8, pp. 66-78. (in Russian).
- Shevchenko, I. S. (2017). Konceptualizacija komunikativnogo povedenija v diskurse; glava v kn. *Kak narisovat' portret pticy: metodologija kognitivno-kommunikativnogo analiza jazyka: kol. Monografija*. Bondarenko, E.V., Martynjuk A.P., Frolova I.E., Shevchenko, I.S., Har'kov: HNU im. V.I. Karazina. (in Russian).
- Usmanova, A. R. (2001). *Diskursija. Postmodernizm*. Jenciklopedija. Mn.: Interpresservis. (in Russian).
- Venhuizen, N. J.; Bos, J.; Hendriks, P. & Brouwer, H. (2018). Discourse Semantics with Information Structure. *Journal of Semantics*, 35, 127-169.