The Study on Dialogic Discourse

Sabina Ismayilova [1]

[1] *Baku Slavic University*
33 S. Rustam Street, Baku, Azerbaijan

Abstract. The article discusses the features and approaches to dialogic speech analysis. Through the analysis of dialogic discourse, new opportunities arise for studying human existence. Since the second half of the XX century, interest in interpersonal communication, dialogic discourse, and conversation analysis has significantly increased. The growing importance of communication in society is noted in modern humanities. Therefore, dialogue as an "ideal type" of communication and issues related to its characteristics are of particular importance in contemporary linguistics. Due to the study of dialogic discourse, new opportunities arise for studying man, his role in society, and social communication. The realisation of dialogues characterises the characteristics of thinking. Communication problems are multifaceted and express people's culture and thoughts. The issue of defining the conceptual and semantic meaning of dialogue as a basic concept of dialogue discourse is evident and necessary.

Keywords: dialogic speech; dialogic discourse; dialogue; conversation analysis; communication; implicitness.

INTRODUCTION

The study of dialogic discourse emerged through sociology. It is also an important research object for anthropology, psychology, communication theory, cognitive sciences, and other fields. There are both psychological and linguistic aspects of dialogic discourse. While linguistics reveals the system of means of expression of language in lessons, psychology examines the process of derivation and formation of speech. Because of it, the analysis of dialogical discourse can significantly help scholars to investigate research problems related to other humanities. Dialogic discourse analysis is one of the main systematic approaches for studying interpersonal interaction. Dialogue analysis goes beyond linguistics. In recent times, the dialogic discourse has been the leading research object of psycholinguistics and social psychology in a complex way.

In this article, we referred to the research of certain linguists to give an idea of the work done on dialogue in recent years. These scientific considerations strengthen our understanding of dialogic interaction in the speech process.

Studies show that interest in dialogic speech began in the 40 and 50 of the last century. The basics of dialogue theory can be found in the works of scientists such as L. Yakubinski, L. Sherba, V. Vinogradov, and M. Bakhtin in Russian linguistics.

In linguistic studies, dialogue as the primary research object of dialogical discourse is given particular importance based on its complexity and multifacetedness. Researchers dealing with living dialects often recognise the need for a "theory" of dialogue and monologue.

In several linguistic studies published in the XXI century, Emanuel Schegloff, Harvey Sachs and Gayle Jefferson are mentioned mainly while discussing the analysis of dialogic discourse. "Conversational Analysis method was brought to linguistics by three people: Emanuel Schegloff, Harvey Sachs and Gayle Jefferson" [16]. This method was later developed as it relates to everyday social behaviour. Forty years later, conversation analysis has become the dominant approach to studying human social interaction in sociology, linguistics, and communication studies. The most recent international conference on conversation analysis (2010) gathered more than 600 participants. The number of publications in this field is more than 5000, increasing. Shortly speaking, the area of

conversation analysis in the XXI century represents a rich and vibrant international community of scholars working in diverse languages, educational institutions, and mundane contexts" [16, p. 1].

The Dutch linguist T. van Dijk, who conducts serious research in text linguistics, discourse analysis and critical discourse analysis and has an exceptional role in the formation of discourse theory in modern linguistics, emphasises in his scientific opinions that the study of dialogic discourse is increasingly becoming multimodal. Therefore, the act of communication is investigated by various methods [19, p. 10]. Dialogical discourse evaluation includes investigating what knowledge the speakers can express to the listeners and studying how the existing social norms in the language affect the speech process. For example, Van Dijk notes that in the process of speech, mothers know more about their children than strangers. Therefore they can easily decipher details that other interlocutors cannot understand and express [19, p. 9].

In his scientific opinions, V. Bulanov concludes that it is essential for people to use the concept of "dialogical" discourse as the only possible universal type of intercultural communication [4, p. 8].

METHODS

The research aims to present approaches to the study of dialogic discourse with a complex (cognitive, social, pragmatic) approach. To deeply study various aspects of dialogical discourse, local and foreign linguistic literatures of the modern time were investigated, and materials were collected. Different research methods are used to study dialogic discourse by shedding new light on them.

The main methods for solving the tasks were the linguistic observation and description method, the generalisation and comparison method, the sociolinguistic analysis based on the correlation method of language and social phenomena, and the contextual and linguistic analysis method. After collecting the data, the information related to the topic was classified and written using analytical methods. The main methods used were the distributive analysis method and contextual methods. However, distributive analysis was used to describe linguistic units, and

contextual was used to describe pragmatic meaning. Linguistic research data were analysed through summarisation and interpretation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In our globalised world's ideological and political landscape, violent means have played a significant role in implementing this or that ideology. Still, today's reality has necessitated the use of civilised ways. We probably wouldn't be wrong if we said that dialogue is the most important of the civilised tools we have mentioned. Through discussion, people inform the other party about their opinions and positions in a civilised way. Dialogue allows people to convey their values and ideas to the other party freely.

One of the reasons why dialogues are so crucial in linguistic research is that the study of dialogic discourse creates ample opportunities for us to understand the role of speech and communication in everyday life. Dialogue is a significant part of our daily life.

Dialogue belongs to discourse. In other words, it is one of the types of speech and monologic discourse. As a rule, there are two participants in the dialogue. This includes genres such as domestic conversation, interviews, and debates. Both social and communicative situations influence the texts formed during dialogic discourse [18]. This has been shared knowledge by both parties. Through this knowledge, the participants can use implicit meaning, a significant factor in dialogue. N. Roy notes that talk is all that is said. It reveals the unsaid and the unspeakable" [14].

Widely used in different contexts and interpretations, the term "dialogue" stands out for its ambiguity. Therefore, dialogue is considered a method of artistic modelling, communication and interpersonal communication, a necessary condition of "real" mutual relations and spiritual connection, and the ethical basis of human life. As a result, the problem of defining the conceptual-semantic meaning of dialogue as the central concept of dialogic discourse is evident and necessary.

Human speech activity is a multifaceted phenomenon. This diversity is not only manifested in countless separate languages and dialects. This diversity exists in any given

language, dialect, or even the dialect of a particular individual.

Considering the language depending on the communication conditions is also the primary research issue of modern linguistics. The richness of dialogic discourse primarily results from different communication conditions and social groupings (territorial, national, state, professional, etc.).

Egyptian thinker Muhammad Khalifa Hassan in his book "Culture and Methodology of Dialogue", mentions the goals of dialogue as follows [8, p. 6–7]:
a) Provide mutual communication;
b) Helping representatives of different religions and beliefs to find a common language with each other;
c) To ensure the coexistence of humanity;
d) To take a united front against theories such as the clash and struggle of civilisations;
e) Create conditions for religious moderation;
f) Strive for the process of interfaith and interfaith rapprochement;
g) Editing ideas about religions;
h) Expand religious and cultural activities;
i) To identify the common aspects of humanity
j) Creating opportunities for cohabitation;
k) To develop the religious lifestyle of people.

"Dialogue" is a Greek word in a literary work written as a conversation between two people [3, p. 616]. A.Akhundov interprets "dialogue" as a judgment, a conversation between two people [2, p. 79]. Coming from the Greek word, it is the sequence of replacing replicas with each other (in a broad sense, it means the expression of replicas-answers with actions, gestures, etc.). There are two opinions about this term in dictionaries of foreign words: 1) dialogue or a conversation between two or more people, the primary form of speech organisation in dramatic works; 2) literary work, speech form [13, p. 120].

While examining the issues of forms and genres of speech, F. Shiriyev approaches dialogue as the primary form of interpersonal communication. He notes that dialogue is "a type of communicative activity in which the joint goal of the partners is to understand one partner's reasoning and the other partner's understanding of that reasoning. It is characteristic for dialogue that interlocutors change the roles of speaker and listener" [15, p. 111].

O. Akhmanova's dictionary describes the dialogue as follows: Dialogue is a form of speech. Every utterance is directed towards the interlocutor. Its relative brevity, laconicity characterises the dialogue and provides a syntactic structure" [1, p. 132].

Authors D. Rosenthal, and M. Telenkova's dictionary of linguistic terms defines several features of dialogue characterised as a form of speech in which two or more people exchange direct expressions. These include the brevity of statements (especially in the form of questions and answers), the extensive use of non-speech tools (facial expressions, gestures), the significant role of intonation, the extensive use of incomplete sentences, statements that are not prepared in advance, the predominance of simple sentences over book speech, etc. [13, p. 64].

The author T. Matveeva, in his "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms", interprets dialogue as the process and product of direct oral speech activity of each expression of two or more persons addressed to the interlocutors. He also notes that discourse is applied since conversation is related to a communication situation. However, not only the problem but also the general experience of the interlocutors, as well as their gestures, facial expressions, intonation, etc., play an essential role in the formation of dialogue [10, p. 88].

During our dialogic studies, we also encountered the term "polylogue" [10]. In this regard, it should be noted that modern scientists often associate the concept of "polylogue" with the idea of "dialogue". It is correct to talk about polylogue only as a non-standard form of dialogue with the coexistence of dialogues. Specific characteristics make polylogue the most problematic form of dialogue [4, p. 5]. It is known that the word polylogue is derived from the Greek word "polys" – many, and logos means a conversation between several people. Many researchers have also touched upon the issue of polylogue when characterising speech forms. Therefore, F.Shiriyev, in his work "Speech Culture and Rhetoric of the Azerbaijani Language", referring to the concept of polylogue, states that there is no fundamental difference in the use of the terms "dialogue" and "polylogue" in terms of the productivity of communication. In terms of content, it is partially compatible with the phrase "dialogue". Relation to the situation, self-emergence and non-linearity are maximally

reflected in the content-meaning structure of the polylogue [15, p. 111].

Nowadays, the use of dialogue to realise most of the goals of the world's socio-political and cultural activities has increased significantly. Dialogue is a means of understanding between states, nations and cultures to ensure coexistence in a world full of problems that threaten the security of people in the political, military, socio-economic, religious and cultural fields. In higher educational institutions of many developed countries of the West, dialogue is studied as a field of science and a discussion topic in auditoriums.

Paul ten Have characterises the dialogic discourse as a research object that can be studied for centuries, but only in the early 1960s gained serious and continuous attention of scientific research, refers to negotiations (our dialogues in context) as a form of socialisation for the sole purpose of people talking to each other, or as an interactive conversational activity regardless of intent. The scientist notes that "dialogical analysis" can be used with broader and more limited meanings. As a general term, it can refer to any study of people speaking together, "verbal communication" or "language use". But in a limited sense, "dialogical analysis" refers to the particular traditional analytic work begun by his collaborators, including the late Harvey Sachs, Emanuel Schegloff, and Gale Jefferson [11, p. 5].

The problem of dialogue and its communicative units is studied in many areas of linguistics, including pragmatic and cognitive linguistics. Different definitions of "dialogue" can be found in linguistics. In the studies of most linguists, dialogue is considered a form of active, communicative interaction between two or more people, the result of which is understood as the creation of a memorable speech. Dialogic discourse is defined as a speech act, a text connecting the events and additional pragmatic, cultural and other factors [12, p. 68].

In one of her works on dialogic analysis, Rebecca Clift notes that dialogical studies mark the first half-century of its existence as a field of research, continuing since Harvey Sacks' first lecture on conversation. Currently, attention is being paid to analysing dialogic discourse in other languages. The study of dialogic discourse by "language in context" links it to semantics and pragmatics. The fact that dialogic discourse focuses on establishing and recognising human activity makes it relevant beyond these areas. Therefore, research related to dialogic discourse has been published in several prestigious journals, including "Language in Society", "Journal of Pragmatics", "Discourse and Society", "Discourse Studies", and "Text and Conversation". In addition, two major international conferences are based on the study of dialogic discourse. The International Conference on Conversation Analysis, held once every four years, and the International Pragmatics Association Conference held once every two years, bring together experts conducting necessary research in this field [5].

CONCLUSIONS

Dialogic discourse analysis has developed over recent years as the primary method for studying language in the communication process in society.

Dialogue has become the primary tool of people in understanding, forming the heritage of thought, and achieving scientific achievements. The exchange acts as a means of teaching some sciences, a method of gathering knowledge and information. Therefore, essential steps should be taken to create a dialogue culture in training programs and pedagogical activity methods.

In addition, dialogue is also a means of communication between people and has played an essential role in the contact of one civilisation with other civilisations for many years.

REFERENCES

1. Akhmanova, O. (2004). *Slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov* Dictionary of linguistic terms]. Moscow: Sov. Encyclopedia (in Russian).

2. Akhundov, A. (2005). *Azarbajdzhan dilinin izahly lugati* [An explanatory dictionary of the Azerbaijani language] (Vol. 1). Baku: Elm (in Azerbaijani).

3. Məhərrəmli, O., & Ismayılov, R. (2006). *Azarbajdzhan dilinin izahly lugati* [Explanatory dictionary of the Azerbaijani language] (Vol. 1). Baku: Sharg-Garb (in Azerbaijani).

4. Bulanov, V. (2014). Dialogicheskiy diskurs i mezhkulturnaja kommunikasija [Dialogical discourse and intercultural communication]. *Vestnik TVGU. Serija "Filosofija", 4*, 63–70 (in Russian).

5. Clift, R. (2016). *Conversation Analysis (Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics)*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

6. Shpilnaya, N. (Ed.). (2019). *Dialogicheskaja lingvistika [Dialogical linguistics]*. Barnaul: AltSPU (in Russian).

7. Feshkina, I. (2009). Kommunikativnyj intsident v rusle mezhkul'turnoj kommunikacii [Communicative incident in line with intercultural communication]. *Vestnik Cheljabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Filologija. Iskusstvovedenie, 30*(10), 143–146 (in Russian).

8. Khalife Hasan, M. (2011). *Dialog medenijjeti ve metodologijasy* [Dialogue culture and methodology]. Baku: CBS (in Azerbaijani).

9. Lekhin, I., & Petrov, F. (Eds.). (1952). *Kratkij slovar' inostrannikh slov* Dictionary of foreign words] (7th ed.). Moscow: State Foreign Publishing House (in Russian).

10. Matveeva, T. (2010). *Polniy slovar' lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Complete Dictionary of linguistic terms]. Rostov-on-Don: Phoenix (in Russian).

11. Paul ten Have. (2007). *Doing Conversation Analysis* (2nd ed). London: Sage Publications Ltd.

12. Radkevych, V. (2015). Studying Dialogue in Linguistics: Main Aspects. *The Advanced Science Journal, 2015*(3), 68–71. doi: https://doi.org/10.15550/asj.2015.03.068

13. Rosenthal, D., & Telenkova, M. (1985). *Slovar'-spravochnik lingvisticheskikh terminov* [Dictionary-reference book of linguistic terms]. Moscow: Prosveshenie (in Russian).

14. Roy, N. (2017). The God of Small Things. *Financial Times*, 19. Retrieved from https://www.ft.com/content/42ef5c40-2433-11e7-a34a-538b4cb30025

15. Shiriyev, F. (2014). *Azerbajdzhan dilinin nitg medeniyyeti ve ritorika* [Speech culture and rhetoric of the Azerbaijani language]. Baku: Nurlan (in Azerbaijani).

16. Sidnell, J., & Strivers, T. (2013). *The Handbook of Conversational Analysis*. New York: John Wiley & Sons (in English).

17. Tannen, D. (2007). *Talking voices Repetition, dialogue, and imagery in conversational discourse.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

18. Van Dijk, T. (2008). *Discourse and Context: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

19. Van Dijk, T. (2014). *Discourse and Knowledge: A Sociocognitive Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.