

DISCOURSE: FROM GENERAL NOTIONS TO ACADEMIC DISCOURSE**ДИСКУРС: ВІД ЗАГАЛЬНИХ ПОНЯТЬ ДО АКАДЕМІЧНОГО ДИСКУРСУ****Denysova N.B.,***orcid.org/0000-0001-9744-4553**Senior Lecturer at the English Language and Communication Department
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University***Tsapro G.Yu.,***orcid.org/0000-0002-0748-7531**PhD in Linguistics, Associate Professor,
Head of the English Language and Communication Department
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University*

This article offers an exploration of different types of discourse, emphasizing its complex nature and the various theoretical approaches that address it. Discourse is examined as a multifaceted phenomenon that integrates linguistic, psychological, social, and cultural dimensions, illustrating the intricate relationship between language and its broader context. The study highlights various types of discourse – literary, institutional, and conversational – and provides a detailed analysis of institutional discourse, with a particular focus on academic discourse within scientific research and education. Academic discourse is explored in terms of its specific features, such as formal structure, precision, and specialized terminology, revealing how it plays a crucial role in shaping and communicating knowledge. Discourse is also analyzed as a communicative activity that involves interactive processes and cognitive functions, impacting how information is exchanged and understood. This type of discourse extends beyond educational contexts to encompass the entire scientific research process, underscoring the significance of precise language and structured argumentation in conveying complex ideas. The article also discusses computational methods, including corpus analysis, which support the analysis and encoding of discourse structures, such as discourse markers and structural divisions, within academic texts. By examining these features, the article provides insights into how academic arguments are formulated, presented, and disseminated, thus contributing to a deeper understanding of discourse in both scientific and interdisciplinary contexts. Computational approaches offer valuable tools for examining and comparing academic discourse' encoding structures and discourse markers.

Key words: discourse, discourse studies, varieties of discourses, institutional discourse, academic discourse.

Дискурс є складним і багатограним явищем, яке інтегрує різноманітні аспекти, такі як лінгвістичні, соціальні та культурні виміри, і саме через цей різнобічний характер його дослідження потребує застосування різних теоретичних підходів. У цій статті розглядаються різні типи дискурсу, підкреслюючи його складну природу та різноманітні теоретичні підходи до його вивчення. Дискурс досліджується як багатогранне явище, яке інтегрує лінгвістичні, психологічні, соціальні та культурні виміри, що ілюструє складні взаємозв'язки між мовою та її ширшим контекстом. У дослідженні висвітлюються різні типи дискурсу – літературний, інституційний та розмовний – і надається детальний аналіз інституційного дискурсу, зокрема академічного дискурсу в межах наукових досліджень і освіти. Академічний дискурс розглядається з точки зору його специфічних рис, таких як формальна структура, точність і спеціалізована термінологія, що показує його важливу роль у формуванні та передачі знань. Дискурс також аналізується як комунікативна діяльність, яка включає інтерактивні процеси та когнітивні функції, впливаючи на те, як обмінюється та сприймається інформація. Цей тип дискурсу виходить за межі освітніх контекстів і охоплює весь процес наукових досліджень, підкреслюючи значущість точної мови та структурованої аргументації у передачі складних ідей. У статті також обговорюються комп'ютерні методи, включаючи корпусний аналіз, які підтримують аналіз і кодування структур дискурсу, таких як дискурсивні маркери та структурні поділи в академічних текстах. Розглядаючи ці характеристики, стаття надає уявлення про те, як формулюються, представляються та поширюються академічні аргументи, що сприяє глибшому розумінню дискурсу як у науковому, так і в міждисциплінарному контекстах. Комп'ютерні підходи пропонують цінні інструменти для дослідження та порівняння структур кодування академічного дискурсу і дискурсивних маркерів.

Ключові слова: дискурс, дослідження дискурсу, різновиди дискурсів, інституційний дискурс, академічний дискурс.

Introduction. The study of discourse poses significant challenges due to the variety of theories and the lack of a single, universally accepted definition. This complexity makes the study of theoretical notions of discourse both a vital and demanding field of inquiry, as it bridges multiple disciplines and offers insights into how language functions across different social contexts. Discourse analysis not only

focuses on language structure but also delves into the underlying social and cognitive processes that shape and are shaped by language use.

Contemporary research examines discourse through the lens of social and mental processes, influenced by both linguistic and extralinguistic factors [36; 348]. Extralinguistic factors include the characteristics of discourse types, genres, subgenres,

and the demands specific to each. These demands differ based on the context: formal academic discourses require high levels of accuracy, logic, and evidence, whereas informal conversational discourses prioritize a natural tone and the use of commonly understood expressions. Additionally, the nature of discourse is shaped by power dynamics, ideologies, and cultural norms that dictate what is considered appropriate or effective communication in different settings.

Discourse is thus defined as a complex phenomenon with interconnected linguistic, psychological, social, and cultural dimensions. The linguistic aspect focuses on the structure and function of language within communication, including syntax, semantics, and pragmatics. The psychological dimension explores how discourse affects human thought, perception, and memory, influencing both the speaker's intent and the listener's interpretation. The social factor examines the influence of sociocultural norms, stereotypes, and identities on discourse formation and interpretation, highlighting how language both reflects and constructs social realities. The cultural aspect reveals how language embodies and transmits the values, traditions, and ideologies of a community, functioning as a key tool in the preservation and transformation of cultural heritage.

Due to its multifaceted nature, discourse studies demand an interdisciplinary approach that transcends traditional linguistic boundaries. This field integrates perspectives from linguistics, sociology, psychology, ethnography, mass communication theory, literary studies, stylistics, philosophy, and more [46]. This integration aims to provide a comprehensive understanding of how discourse operates across various contexts and societies, offering insights into the ways in which language shapes, and is shaped by, human experience.

Historical Development of the Discourse.

Discourse studies encompass various approaches to analyzing written, spoken, and visual communication, emphasizing the dynamic and context-dependent nature of discourse [23]. Grounded in linguistic, social, and cultural theories, discourse analysis seeks to uncover the underlying structures, power dynamics, and meanings embedded in texts.

Beyond established approaches, discourse analysis has continued to evolve, broadening its scope and incorporating insights from various disciplines such as anthropology, sociology, and even cognitive science [28]. This interdisciplinary expansion has enriched the field, allowing for more nuanced and contextually grounded analyses of language use. Anthropological contributions have been particularly significant, with early ethnographic studies by pioneering figures like Bronislaw Malinowski [43]

and Claude Lévi-Strauss [41] laying the groundwork for understanding the intricate relationship between language and culture. Malinowski's emphasis on the context of situation and the functional aspects of language within specific cultural settings was instrumental in shaping the way discourse is analyzed. His concept of "phatic communion" [43] for instance, highlighted how seemingly trivial exchanges serve important social functions in maintaining relationships and social cohesion.

Similarly, Lévi-Strauss's structuralist approach [41] to understanding myths and cultural narratives provided valuable insights into the underlying structures that shape discourse across different societies. His work demonstrated how language and discourse are not merely tools for communication but are deeply embedded in the symbolic systems that govern human thought and social organization. By examining the patterns and structures within cultural narratives, Lévi-Strauss revealed how discourse reflects and perpetuates broader social and cultural frameworks.

These anthropological perspectives have been further enriched by sociological approaches that examine the power dynamics, social institutions, and identity formations embedded in discourse

The study of discourse has evolved through multiple phases, with early influences stemming from structuralist linguistics, particularly the work of Ferdinand de Saussure. Structuralism's focus on language as a system of signs laid the groundwork for understanding discourse as a structured, rule-governed process. However, discourse analysis goes beyond structuralism by considering the social and cultural contexts that shape and are shaped by discourse [29].

Post-structuralist theories, especially those of Michel Foucault [33], have further advanced discourse studies by introducing the concept of power relations within discourse. Foucault [33] argued that discourse is not merely a reflection of reality but a means of constructing and controlling it. Discourse, in this view, is both a product of and a tool for social power, influencing what can be said, who can speak, and how ideas are communicated and understood.

Critical discourse analysis (CDA), influenced by Foucault and others, emphasizes the role of discourse in maintaining or challenging social inequalities. Scholars like Norman Fairclough (and Ruth Wodak) [30; 31; 32] have developed frameworks for analyzing how language reflects, perpetuates, and sometimes subverts power relations in society. CDA is particularly concerned with issues of ideology, identity, and power, examining how discourses serve to naturalize particular worldviews and marginalize alternative perspectives.

Another important strand in discourse studies is the sociocultural approach, which focuses on how discourse is used in specific social contexts. This perspective, influenced by the work of Mikhail Bakhtin [22] and others, highlights the dialogic nature of discourse, where meaning is co-constructed through interaction between speakers and listeners. It considers the ways in which discourse both shapes and is shaped by social practices, institutions, and cultural norms.

The interactional sociolinguistics approach, developed by scholars like John Gumperz [35], emphasizes the importance of context in discourse analysis. This approach focuses on how individuals use language in social interactions, paying particular attention to conversational strategies, code-switching, and the role of context in interpreting meaning. It suggests that understanding discourse requires not only an analysis of linguistic structures but also an awareness of the social and cultural contexts in which communication occurs.

Furthermore, the genre-based approach to discourse analysis, as explored by scholars like John Swales [44], examines how different types of texts, or genres, follow specific conventions and serve particular communicative purposes. This approach is particularly useful in analyzing academic, legal, and professional discourses, where genre conventions play a crucial role in shaping the content and form of communication.

Understanding Discourse in 21st-Century Linguistic Studies. Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) is a research movement that integrates perspectives from linguistics, socio-psychology, political science, and other disciplines [25]. Influenced by poststructuralist theories from Foucault [33], Wodak [49; 50], Pêcheux [42] and Gramsci [27] CDS examines how power dynamics and ideologies are embedded in language. Despite the significant influence of early discourse models, such as Laclau and Mouffe's Discourse Theory (DT) [39], these models are not always explicitly acknowledged within CDS, though their impact is evident [29].

In the 21st century, the term *discourse* is used in several key ways within linguistic studies [16]: 1) as a text or utterance situated within a specific socio-cultural context; 2) as a communicative event that encompasses both the text and its context, known as the "situation of utterance"; 3) as a form of speech, aligning with the French semiotic tradition, primarily focusing on oral communication; 4) as a type of discursive practice.

Critical Discourse Studies (CDS) has established itself firmly within the humanities and social sciences, gaining recognition as a distinctive and influential approach to language analysis across a range of dis-

ciplines [25]. This approach is characterized by its emphasis on understanding the intricate ways in which language functions to construct, maintain, and challenge power structures and ideologies. As Hart and Cap [37] describe, CDS operates as a "transdisciplinary, text-analytical approach to critical social research," which integrates methods and theories from various fields to explore the relationships between language, power, and society.

The core of CDS lies in its systematic, text-based analysis, which seeks to uncover how language not only reflects but actively shapes social realities. This focus is particularly evident in the study of how language perpetuates and reinforces ideologies and power dynamics within different contexts. According to Wodak [50], CDS provides a robust framework for analyzing how discourse operates as a mechanism for the reproduction of power and the legitimization of social inequalities. By examining the ways in which language constructs and sustains power relations, CDS reveals the often subtle and complex ways in which discourse influences societal structures and individual perceptions.

Discourse in CDS is understood not merely as a collection of texts but as a dynamic process that plays a crucial role in the social construction of reality. Through discourse, power is exercised and contested, and ideologies are communicated and challenged. This perspective highlights the importance of analyzing how different forms of discourse contribute to the maintenance of power hierarchies and the propagation of specific worldviews.

The diversity within CDS means it is not confined to a single methodology or research area. It draws from a broad spectrum of theories across the humanities, social, and cognitive sciences, resulting in varied interpretations of "discourse" and "studies" [37]. Discourse in CDS is understood as multidimensional and multimodal, both shaping and being shaped by socio-cultural and political contexts.

The "critical" aspect of CDS signifies its commitment to challenging how language perpetuates social inequalities. This criticality is interpreted broadly, with some scholars focusing on linguistic coercion and mystification rather than solely on political critique. This broad interpretation sets CDS apart from classical discourse theories, highlighting its unique research agenda and methodological focus.

Classification of Discourses. Traditionally, discourses are divided into three broad types [6; 7; 10]: 1) literary; 2) institutional (including political, diplomatic, legal, academic, media, etc.); 3) conversational.

Norman Fairclough [31] characterizes a genre or type as "a socially ratified way of using language

in connection with a particular type of social activity". Scientometric articles, for instance, belong to institutional discourse and are regulated in both content and form.

T. A. van Dijk [47: 51–52] associates discourse types with different genres, asserting that "in the news, we expect reports on political events..., but not on trivial... actions or events" He limits the types of discourse to a thematic repertoire, whose boundaries are not clearly defined and depend on interests, values, and socio-cultural norms.

Defining Discourse through Sociolinguistic Perspectives. K. S. Serazhim [17: 392] describes discourse as a sociolinguistic phenomenon, characterized by several features: 1) it is determined (directly or indirectly) by socio-cultural, political, pragmatic-situational, psychological, and other factors; 2) it has both a 'visible' linguistic structure (a coherent text or its semantically significant and syntactically complete fragment) and an 'invisible' extralinguistic structure (knowledge about the world, thoughts, attitudes, and the sender's goals necessary for understanding the text); 3) it is characterized by a shared world 'constructed' during the unfolding of the discourse by its reproducer (author) and interpreted by its recipient (listener, reader, etc.).

T. van Dijk [47; 48] expands on this by defining discourse as a communicative event, a complex unity of linguistic form, meaning, and action, reproduced by participants in communication. This event involves not only language in its actual use but also the mental processes that inevitably accompany the communication process.

O. Gryshchenko [34] offers an understanding of discourse that includes the following characteristics: discourse is communication, dialogue, interaction between communicants; it is a process, structure, system, a unique way of representing and perceiving the world, and an expression and manifestation of national identity. Discourse presupposes knowledge, as it encompasses different types of knowledge. Knowledge and news are closely linked and are processed through discourse. Any explicit or implicit knowledge and news influence the creation and understanding of discourse. True and fake information can alter existing types of knowledge, create new ones, affect mental processes, and form new mental models. Fake news, for instance, is a genre of news information and news discourse, an integrative type of media text. Its primary goal is to manipulate the consciousness of a broad audience using false information. Fake news can be studied within various types of discourse: news discourse, media, television, manipulative, political, fake discourse, and others.

Thus, knowledge, news, and fake information, presented in and through discourse, allow for the creation of 'new knowledge,' shape the audience's understanding of discourse, generate mental models, control and restrict access to certain information, manipulate the audience's consciousness, and transform traditional mental attitudes related to the pursuit of truth.

Discourse as a Communicative Activity. Discourse is increasingly understood as a complex and interactive phenomenon that encompasses a range of communicative forms, including oral, written, and paralingual expressions [40]. According to F. S. Batsevich [3; 4], discourse is a type of communicative activity characterized by its dynamic and interactive nature. It involves a continuous flow of speech regulated by the strategies and tactics of the participants, who influence and are influenced by cognitive, linguistic, and extralinguistic factors such as social, mental, and psychological contexts. This synthesis of various elements leads to the formation of diverse speech genres and communicative practices.

In Batsevich's view [2: 147–148], discourse is both a text and a live communication event. Texts, in this framework, are seen as static representations of discourse, stripped of their original participants and live contexts. Unlike discourse, which includes paralinguistic elements and reflects the full spectrum of communication, texts are units of linguistic analysis that do not capture the interactive dynamics of the original discourse. This distinction highlights the evolving nature of discourse, which transitions from a live, interactive process into a more fixed text upon completion of communication.

Recent studies of discourse [24] have increasingly focused on its role in reflecting and perpetuating power structures and social inequalities. These studies advocate for an eclectic approach that integrates ethnographic methods with insights from linguistics, pragmatics, and sociolinguistics. This interdisciplinary perspective is crucial for addressing the complexities of discourse as a site of social inequality. Traditional linguistic analysis has been critiqued for its narrow focus on textual and linguistic forms, prompting the development of frameworks that view discourse as embedded within broader societal and historical contexts.

This revised approach challenges conventional views of discourse and context by emphasizing the stratified and layered nature of discourse, a concept known as layered simultaneity. This perspective posits that multiple, non-equivalent influences intersect within discourse, affecting the construction of meaning in nuanced ways. It offers a more sophisticated understanding of ideologies and identities, portraying

them as dynamic and multifaceted rather than static. By addressing the limitations of traditional discourse analysis and engaging with broader social and cultural contexts, these studies contribute to a more comprehensive critique of social systems and inequalities, providing valuable insights into the complex interplay between discourse and societal structures.

Institutional Discourse. Its Characteristics and Varieties. Institutional discourse is identified as a powerful resource, perceived as a phenomenon created and implemented within the institutionally defined frameworks of certain spheres of social communication, namely social institutions [9]. These institutions, as proposed by English sociologist H. Spencer, are defined as "a stable form of organizing joint activities of people, historically formed, ensuring the functioning of communities and the entire social organism, and the socialization of individuals, allowing them to enter social life and fulfill certain social functions and roles" [20: 22]. These institutions collectively ensure the existence of society with its branched social structure.

Institutional discourse is characterized by social purpose, high predictability of communicative actions, clear persuasiveness, and conventionality. It transmits norms and standards of status-role behavior, reinforces binary relationships between norm and non-norm in moral imperatives, rituals, traditions, and codes of conduct of social institutions. Emphasizing the symbolic nature of discourse, N.I. Andreychuk [1] defines institutional discourse as a "repetitive functional-semantic unity of systematically organized signs, modeling the life world of a person in a specific era's society and serving as a macro-sign of the universal information mechanism – communication". The broad definition of institutional discourse that we adhere to was proposed by R.E. Pylypenko [15: 5]: institutional discourse is "a hierarchically organized environment of communicants and information-communicative interaction of speakers, united by a common institutional territory, status-role rules of behavior, related models of social and professional knowledge, as well as a specific selection of communicative strategies and tactics". The social institution as a component feature of institutional discourse determines the use of language, "roots" certain knowledge and perceptions in each participant in the communication process, dictates strategies and tactics of interaction between communicants within a social group [21].

Approaches to Analyzing Institutional Discourse. The existence and development of institutional discourse, the definition of its communicative mechanisms, and the set of means of expressing

information depend on the communication situation and the needs of society. Various approaches are chosen when studying institutional discourse, generally consistent with the well-known theories of discourse [1: 138], where the common view is the consideration of human behavior as speech activity.

According to N.I. Andreychuk, there are eight existing approaches to the analysis of institutional discourse: pragmatic, psycholinguistic, lingual-stylistic, lingual-cultural, structural-linguistic, cognitive-semantic, sociolinguistic, and linguo-semiotic [1: 138–139]. The pragmatic approach allows for the consideration of institutional discourse as interactive activity of participants in status-oriented communication, taking into account the time and place of the communicative process, the age and social characteristics of the communicants, intentions and motives of speech acts, etc. Institutional discourse is oriented towards establishing and maintaining contacts between communicants, information and emotional exchange, and the use of verbal and non-verbal means of expressing communicative strategies, communicative moves in the unity of their implicit and explicit content.

Encoding discourse structure involves several systematic methods to ensure clarity and coherence [8; 18]. One method is the use of explicit structural markers, which include clear divisions such as chapters, sections, and paragraphs that are often emphasized through typographic features. While these markers are more commonly seen in written texts, spoken language also uses analogous structural cues to organize discourse. Another method involves discourse markers, which are specific words or phrases, known as discourse markers or connectives, used to signal relationships between consecutive elements within a discourse. Words like "furthermore," "nevertheless," and "in any case" act as linguistic signposts that maintain the logical flow and coherence of discourse. Finally, attention-focusing mechanisms are employed through techniques such as marked word orders and specific referring expressions to emphasize which elements of the discourse are currently the focus. These mechanisms play a crucial role in guiding the reader's or listener's understanding of the discourse's structure and overall content.

Academic Discourse in the 21st Century. The first two decades of the 21st century have seen significant advancements in the study of academic discourse [14; 19], reflecting a period of rapid development in both fundamental and applied research. Two primary trends have emerged during this period: 1) establishment of academic discourse as a key component and 2) increase in contrastive studies.

There is growing recognition of academic discourse as a vital aspect of discourse analysis within scholarly traditions [5; 11; 13]. This development underscores its importance in understanding communication within education and research settings.

There has been a notable rise in contrastive studies conducted by researchers from various linguistic backgrounds. These studies focus on comparing academic discourse across different languages and cultures, reflecting a broader and more inclusive approach to understanding discourse. These trends are interconnected. The key findings from leading scholars have solidified the concept of academic discourse, leading to a more nuanced exploration of its theoretical positions and their application in various national language cultures. This development opens up new avenues for understanding the nature of academic discourse and its role in different linguistic and cultural settings.

Academic Discourse and Disciplinary Variability. Academic discourse encompasses a wide range of social and communicative activities related to education and scientific research. Hyland [38: 172] describes academic discourse as a crucial framework that shapes our understanding of the world and our place within it, emphasizing its broad scope. It includes all forms of communication within these fields, integrating both general social interactions and specific verbal activities. Hyland further argues that no scientific text can be considered an entirely impartial representation of reality. The arguments presented in scientific texts are influenced by the author's perspective and interpretation. Scientific persuasion involves anticipating and countering potential objections from readers through the use of disciplinary discursive tools. Thus, studying academic discourse involves examining the rhetorical practices used in various scientific disciplines and their manifestation in academic genres such as research articles, scientific reports, and presentations.

The analysis of academic genres through discourse analysis focuses on regular linguistic features and rhetorical strategies. For instance, research articles represent a highly refined genre where the process of research and thought is transformed into discourse that creates scientific facts. Language, in this context, becomes a technical means of interpreting new knowledge and positioning the participants within the discourse [38: 175].

Analyzing Academic Discourse. The focus on academic discourse is driven by contemporary researchers' interest in studying human cognitive-communicative activity across various discourses, particularly those associated with socially significant institutions. The term "academic" is preferred

over "scientific-educational" or "scientific-academic" because it succinctly encapsulates all processes occurring within higher education institutions, including scientific research and scholarly exchange.

Academic discourse is not limited to pedagogical tasks or pre-existing systems of knowledge. While it includes the communication between teachers and students, it also encompasses the entire scientific research process and discourse related to any scientific field. Pedagogical discourse, in contrast, is more narrowly focused on psychology, pedagogy, didactics, and related disciplines.

Numerous studies have explored academic discourse's theoretical and practical aspects, including its structural characteristics, functional styles, and forms of representation. However, questions remain regarding the essence of academic discourse and the completeness of approaches used to study its linguistic expressions [12]. This ongoing inquiry highlights the need for further research into institutional discourse, taking into account socio-cultural contexts, new scientific communication opportunities, and trends in discursive forms and practices.

Computational Approaches to Discourse Analysis. Given the complexity of academic discourse, computational approaches, such as corpus analysis, offer valuable tools for its examination. These methods effectively address the encoding structures of academic discourse, including explicit structural markers, discourse markers, and attention-focusing mechanisms. Computational techniques enable researchers to analyze large volumes of academic texts, uncovering patterns and structures that might otherwise go unnoticed.

Computational analysis is particularly useful for understanding how ideas are structured and conveyed within scientific texts. By examining the use of discourse markers, researchers can gain insights into how arguments are constructed, how evidence is presented, and how conclusions are drawn. Additionally, analyzing attention-focusing mechanisms reveals how authors guide readers through complex information, highlighting key points and emphasizing significant findings. CDS has evolved by incorporating recent advances in linguistics, such as corpus studies, which address critiques of bias in data selection and enhance statistical validity [26].

Computational approaches facilitate the comparison of academic discourses across different disciplines, identifying unique features and commonalities. This comparative analysis contributes to a deeper understanding of knowledge communication across various fields, ultimately supporting the advancement of interdisciplinary research and education.

Conclusions. Discourse as a communicative activity is a multifaceted phenomenon that extends beyond mere text to encompass a dynamic interplay of cognitive, linguistic, and extralinguistic elements. The interactive nature of discourse, as highlighted by scholars like Batsevich, emphasizes its evolving character as it transitions from a live communicative event into a static text. This transformation underscores the limitations of traditional linguistic analysis, which often fails to capture the layered simultaneity of influences that shape meaning within discourse. Moreover, the examination of institutional discourse reveals its role in reinforcing societal norms and power structures, reflecting

the broader social and cultural contexts within which it operates. The study of academic discourse further illustrates the complexity of discourse in specialized settings, where disciplinary variability and rhetorical strategies shape the communication of scientific knowledge.

Perspectives for further research lie in studying the academic discourse of scientific articles devoted to online learning with the help of programming tools to single out specific patterns, trends, and structures within these texts, which will allow for the identification of recurring linguistic features that characterize scientific writing on online learning.

REFERENCES:

1. Андрейчук, Н. І. Семіотика лінгвокультурного простору Англії кінця XV – початку XVII століття : монографія. Львів : Вид-во Львів. політехніки, 2011. 140 с.
2. Бацевич, Ф. С. Лінгвістична прагматика: спроба обґрунтування проблемного поля і дослідницької одиниці. *Мовознавство*. 2002. № 1. С. 30–34.
3. Бацевич, Ф. С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики. Київ : Академія, 2004. 158 с.
4. Бацевич, Ф. С. Лінгвокультурні аспекти комунікативної толерантності. *Соціогуманітарні проблеми людини*. 2010. № 5. С. 108–119.
5. Гохман, К. Є. Академічний дискурс у системі інституційних дискурсів. *Науковий вісник Південноукраїнського національного педагогічного університету імені К. Д. Ушинського: Лінгвістичні науки* : зб. наук. праць. Одеса : Астропринт, 2018. Вип. 26. С. 37–47.
6. Дискурс у комунікативних системах: [36 наук. ст.]. Київ : Міжнародний університет, 2004. 362 с. / редкол.: С. П. Денисова (голов. ред.) та ін.
7. Загнітко, А. П. Основи дискурсології. Донецьк : ДонНУ, 2008. 247 с.
8. Ільченко, О. М., Шпенюк, І. Є. Стереотипове заперечення в американському науково-академічному дискурсі: культурна специфіка. *Вісник Харківського національного університету ім. В. Н. Каразіна*. 2008. № 811. С. 12–16.
9. Колеснікова, І. А. Лінгвокогнітивні та комунікативно-прагматичні параметри професійного дискурсу: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філол. наук : 10.02.15 «Загальне мовознавство». Київ, 2009. 32 с.
10. Липко, І. Нариси з лінгвістичного аналізу дискурсу: до проблеми типології та характеристики: монографія. Харків : «БУРУН і К», 2014. 214 с.
11. Лівіцька, І. Науковий дискурс: рівні та особливості аналізу. Кіровоград : КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2011. 178 с.
12. Мартинюк, А. П. Словник основних термінів когнітивно-дискурсивної лінгвістики. Харків : ХНУ ім. Каразіна, 2011. 145 с.
13. Маслова, Т. Типологія наукового дискурсу в сучасній мовознавчій парадигмі. Англїстика й американїстика: збірник наукових праць. Дніпропетровськ : Вид-во Дніпропетр. нац. ун-ту, 2012. Вип. 10. С. 39–43.
14. Петровська, О., Баранова, С. Науковий дискурс та його компоненти. URL: <https://essuir.sumdu.edu.ua/bitstream/download/123456789/26210/1/Petrovs%27ka%20.pdf> (дата звернення: 26.07.2024).
15. Пилипенко, Р. Є. Інституційний комунікативний простір Німеччини (фахова мова економіки): автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня доктора філол. наук : 10.02.04 «Германські мови». Київ : КНУ імені Тараса Шевченка, 2007. 42 с.
16. Селіванова, О. О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Полтава: Довкілля – К, 2010. 824 с.
17. Серажим, К. Дискурс як соціолінгвальне явище: методологія, архітектоніка, варіативність: [на матеріалах сучасної газетної публіцистики] : монографія. Київ : Вид-во, 2002. 320 с.
18. Сологуб, Л. В. Методологія дослідження інституційних дискурсів. Львівський національний університет імені Івана Франка, 2016. С. 187–189.
19. Труба, Г. М. Науковий дискурс. Сучасне бачення. *Нова філологія*. 2021. № 84. С. 242–247.
20. Черниш, Н. Й. Соціологія: курс лекцій. Львів: Кальварія, 2004. 480 с.
21. Шепітько, С. Компонента наукового дискурсу. *Наукові записки. Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство)*. Кіровоград : РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2010. Вип. 89(5). С. 164–167.
22. Bakhtin, M. *The dialogic imagination* / M. Holquist (Ed.). Austin : University of Texas Press, 1981. 444 p.
23. Billig, M., Schegloff, E. A. Critical discourse analysis and conversation analysis: An exchange between Michael Billig and Emanuel A. Schegloff. *Discourse & Society*. 1999. Vol. 10, № 4. P. 543–582.

24. Blommaert, J. *Discourse: A Critical Introduction (Key Topics in Sociolinguistics)*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 2005. 312 p.
25. Breeze, R. Critical discourse analysis and its critics. *Pragmatics*. 2011. Vol. 21, № 3. P. 493–525.
26. Baker, P. *Using corpora in discourse analysis*. London : Continuum, 2006. 336 p.
27. Briziarelli, M., Karikari, E. Antonio Gramsci and communication. In *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Communication*. Oxford University Press. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190228613.013.78> (дата звернення: 15.06.2024).
28. Bucholtz, M., Hall, K. Identity and interaction: A sociocultural linguistic approach. *Discourse Studies*. 2005. Vol. 7, № 4-5. P. 585–614. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605054407>.
29. Cap, P. Discourse studies: Between social constructionism and linguistics. A critical overview. *Topics in Linguistics*. 2019. Vol. 20, № 2. P. 1–16. URL: <https://doi.org/10.2478/topling-2019-0006>.
30. Fairclough, N. *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1992. 259 p.
31. Fairclough, N. *Critical discourse analysis*. London: Longman, 1995. 270 p.
32. Fairclough, N., Wodak, R. Critical discourse analysis. In T. A. van Dijk (Ed.), *Discourse studies: A multidisciplinary introduction*. Vol. 2. London : Sage, 1997. P. 258–284.
33. Foucault, M. *The archaeology of knowledge and the discourse on language*. Trans. A. M. Sheridan. New York : Pantheon Books, 1972. 246 p.
34. Gryshchenko, O. Discourse: Knowledge, News, and Fake Intertwined. *Філологічний часопис*. 2024. № 1(23). С. 4–11.
35. Gumperz, J. J., Cook-Gumperz, J. Introduction: Language and the communication of social identity. In *Language and social identity*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press, 1982. P. 1–21. URL: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511620836.003>.
36. Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R. *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1989. 98 p.
37. Hart, C., & Cap, P. (Eds.). *Contemporary critical discourse studies*. London : Bloomsbury, 2014.
38. Hyland, K. Academic discourse. In K. Hyland & B. Paltridge (Eds.), *Continuum companion to discourse analysis* (pp. 171–184). London: Continuum, 2011.
39. Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. *Hegemony and socialist strategy: Towards a radical democratic politics*. London : Verso, 1985.
40. *Language, power and ideology: Studies in political discourse*. Amsterdam: Benjamins Publishing Company, 1989.
41. Levi-Strauss, C. The structural study of myth. *The Journal of American Folklore*, 68(270), 428. <https://doi.org/10.2307/536768>, 1955.
42. Pêcheux, M. Three stages of discourse analysis. In Michel Pêcheux : *Automatic discourse analysis* (pp. 235–241). Leiden: BRILL, 1995. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004458581_012
43. Malinowski, B. The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In *Meaning of meaning* (Vol. 2, pp. 352–402). London: Routledge, 2014. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315010847-25>
44. Swales, J. The concept of discourse community. In E. Wardle & D. Downs (Eds.), *Writing about writing: A college reader* (pp. 215–227). Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2011.
45. Teubert, W. My version of corpus linguistics. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 10(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.10.1.01teu>, 2010.
46. van Dijk, T. A. The study of discourse. In *Discourse as structure and process* (pp. 1–34). London : Sage Publications, 1997.
47. van Dijk, T. A. *Digital skills: Unlocking the information society*. London : Palgrave Macmillan, 2014.
48. van Dijk, T. A. *Discourse and power*. London : Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.
49. Wodak, R. Introduction: Discourse studies – Important concepts and terms. In *Qualitative discourse analysis in the social sciences* (pp. 1–29). London: Macmillan Education UK, 2008. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-137-04798-4_1
50. Wodak, R. (Ed.). *Critical discourse analysis (4 vols.)*. London : Sage, 2012.