

## **MEDIA DISCOURSE AS AN OBJECT OF LINGUISTIC RESEARCH**

The modern information environment is changing rapidly: new media platforms are emerging, communication formats are transforming, and along with them, new objects for linguistic analysis are appearing. Today, the language of mass communication performs much broader functions than simply conveying information: within it, meanings are formed, events are interpreted, and interaction between communication participants takes place. In contemporary linguistics, the study of these phenomena has been established within media linguistics – an interdisciplinary humanities discipline that emerged at the end of the 20th century and examines the functioning of language in mass media, with media text and media discourse as its basic categories [4, p. 98]. This is precisely why the study of media discourse acquires particular relevance: it enables us to understand how linguistic means influence public consciousness and shape the perception of reality.

In modern linguistics, the study of media discourse occupies a central place. This is no accident: mass media are increasingly influencing public opinion and the interpretation of socially significant events. Within the anthropocentric paradigm, language is no longer viewed as a closed formal system of signs but as a living, dynamic tool of social interaction that functions in specific communicative conditions. In this context, media discourse emerges as a special form of linguistic activity, inseparably linked to extralinguistic reality. Exploring the essence of media discourse, it should be noted that the very concept of discourse is a complex and multidimensional phenomenon across various humanities (linguistics, philosophy, sociology, psychology, etc.). In linguistics, this concept is used quite widely but lacks a single universally accepted interpretation among scholars. In a broad linguistic sense, discourse is considered a process of speech activity formed under the influence of a specific social context and involving pragmatic aspects of communication.

According to the Ukrainian scholar F. S. Batsevych, discourse is “a type of communicative activity, an interactive phenomenon, a speech flow that has different forms of manifestation (oral, written, paralinguistic), occurs within a specific communication channel, is regulated by the strategies and tactics of participants [...] a synthesis of cognitive, linguistic and extralinguistic [...] factors [...] results in the formation of various speech genres” [1, p. 138].

In the works of T. van Dijk, the concept of “discourse” is viewed as a form of speech activity that encompasses oral and written language, functions within a particular social context, and implements communicative interaction between participants, reflecting their knowledge, beliefs, and social relationships [7, p. 1–2]. In the modern lexicographic tradition, particularly in Marcel Danesi’s “Dictionary of Media and Communications” (2009), “discourse” is defined in three main meanings: as the use of language in communication, as a serious discussion on a particular topic, and as a specific style of speaking and writing (e.g., “discourse of science”). This definition gains particular importance through its reference to Michel Foucault’s concept, according to which discourse is a form of power that articulates and reinforces

in language ideas that are perceived as truth. In the modern understanding, discourse also encompasses non-verbal types of communication, including visual and narrative discourse [2, p. 98].

Despite certain differences in definitions, synthesizing the views of F. Batevych, T. van Dijk, and M. Danesi, we can conclude that discourse is a complex communicative process that combines social context, cognitive mechanisms, and linguistic means. This approach is the theoretical foundation for studying media discourse, which has a complex interdisciplinary nature and lacks a single universal definition.

In contemporary linguistics, increasing attention is paid to mass communication, as media discourse reflects not only communicative and informational but also political, economic, and cultural processes in society. The Ukrainian linguist D. Yu. Syzonov provides the following definition: media discourse is “a global universal category of modern communicative-informational discourse, which serves as a certain background in which current societal moods in various spheres of activity – politics, economy, culture, etc. – are reflected, as well as dynamic innovative processes, such as lexical innovations, semantic neologisms, “revived” archaisms, periphrases, catchphrases, borrowings from other languages” [6, p. 389].

Media discourse is studied within various scholarly approaches (psychological, sociological, political), but a special place is occupied by the communicative approach, which highlights its ability not only to reflect events but also to interpret them, influencing the consciousness of the audience. In the work “Theory of Media Linguistics” (2021) by L. I. Shevchenko and D. Yu. Syzonov, a number of characteristic features of media discourse are identified: group relevance, public nature, polemical orientation, staging, mass orientation, informational globality, comprehensiveness, and precedent place in the geocultural picture of the world [5, p. 41].

The diversification of media channels – from print to interactive – determines the special status of media discourse in media linguistics. In modern linguistics, two approaches to the typology of media discourse are distinguished. The first defines media discourse as a specific type of speech-and-thought activity characteristic only of the mass media sphere; within it, such variants as political, scientific, religious, etc. are distinguished. The second approach interprets media discourse more broadly: it refers to any type of discourse realized in the sphere of mass communication [5, p. 41–42].

The central category of media discourse is media text. The distinction between the concepts of “discourse” and “text” originates from the French school of discourse studies, particularly the works of E. Benveniste, P. Charaudeau, P. Sériot, and others. E. Benveniste gave the word discourse its terminological meaning, defining it as “speech appropriated by the speaker.” In his understanding, discourse is “any utterance that presupposes the existence of communicants: addressee, addresser, as well as the addresser’s intention to influence the interlocutor in a certain way” [3, p. 284]. In P. Charaudeau’s research, text is the visual embodiment of speech, a unique result that depends on the speaker and the conditions of its creation. At the same time, he emphasizes that the text intersects with many discourses, each of which belongs to a particular genre and relates to a specific communicative situation [3, p. 284]. Thus, text and discourse are not opposed to each other but are connected by cause-and-effect relationships: text is a product of discursive activity.

In the sphere of mass communication, the concept of text acquires a broader meaning, since media text goes beyond the verbal sign system. As D. Yu. Syzonov notes, media text is “a multi-level structure that unites verbal, visual, audiovisual and other components in a single semantic space oriented towards a mass audience” [6, p. 391]. An important characteristic of media text is its linguistic dynamism, which manifests itself in lexical innovations, authorial neologisms, and linguistic clichés. Consequently, media text is a type of text oriented towards a mass audience, combining verbal and media units, distinguished by a special type of author, and having a pronounced pragmatic orientation. Media discourse, in turn, appears as a coherent text in conjunction with extralinguistic, pragmatic, sociocultural and other factors.

#### REFERENCES

1. Batsevych F. S. Introduction to Linguistic Pragmatics. Kyiv : Akademia, 2011. 304 p.
2. Danesi M. Dictionary of Media and Communications. Zaporizhzhia : ZNU, 2009. 250 p.
3. Scientific Notes. Series "Philological Sciences". Nizhyn : NDU named after M. Gogol, 2014. Book 2. 305 p.
4. Shevchenko L. I., Dergach D. V., Syzonov D. Yu. Media Linguistics. Kyiv : Kyiv University, 2014. 380 p.
5. Shevchenko L. I., Syzonov D. Yu. Theory of Media Linguistics. Kyiv : Kyiv University, 2021. 214 p.
6. Syzonov D. Yu. Media Text and Media Discourse in the Modern Media Space. *Studia Linguistica*. 2013. Issue 7. P. 389–392.
7. Van Dijk T. A. Discourse as Structure and Process. London : SAGE Publications, 1997. 356 p.