

THE MULTIPLICITY OF DISCOURSE: TYPOLOGICAL CHALLENGES AND EMERGING FORMS

МНОЖИННІСТЬ ДИСКУРСУ: ТИПОЛОГІЧНІ ВИКЛИКИ ТА НОВІ ФОРМИ

Gryshchenko O.V.,
orcid.org/0000-0001-7678-9851
PhD in Linguistics,

Associate Professor at the English Language and Communication Department
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv Metropolitan University

The diversity of approaches to the study of discourse has produced various interpretations of the concept and a wide typology. Discourse is examined within a broad theoretical framework, which has contributed to the development of multiple theoretical perspectives on its nature and functions.

Discourse analysis, as an active and interdisciplinary research area, can be used to analyze language in a broader social, cultural, and cognitive context, providing a valuable insight into the way people perceive the world and engage with it. The present discursive space is characterized by an expansion of different types of discourses – some are separate and independent, others are complementary and intertwined. Despite this diversification, the classification of discourse types has been explored only to a small extent, with only a limited number of studies thoroughly focusing on the issue.

In recent years, the landscape of discourse analysis has been transformed significantly under the influence of new emerging technologies, changing political formations, and new ways of participating in social practices. These transformations have altered the ways in which individuals and communities interact, construct meaning, and negotiate identity across different media. The growing diversity of discourse forms reflects the impact of global change and supports its relevance in the analysis of the interplay between language, power, technology, ideology, and identity in the multifaceted and changing world of communication.

The author has compiled an extensive list of 300 discourse types, which are presented as a part of a broader classification framework. The study introduces a typology of discourse types based on 17 different criteria.

Key words: discourse, discourse type, typology, criteria, discourse of uncertainty, *we*-discourse.

Різноманіття підходів до вивчення дискурсу зумовило численні трактування цього поняття та формування об'ємної типології. Дискурс розглядається в межах широкої теоретичної парадигми, що сприяло виникненню різних наукових підходів до його природи та функцій.

Дискурс-аналіз як міждисциплінарна дослідницька галузь, що динамічно розвивається, дозволяє аналізувати мову в ширшому соціальному, культурному та когнітивному контексті, відкриваючи нові можливості для розуміння того, як люди сприймають світ і взаємодіють із ним. Сучасний дискурсивний простір характеризується розширенням спектру типів дискурсу – деякі з них є автономними й чітко окресленими, інші – взаємодоповнюючими та взаємопов'язаними. Попри таке урізноманітнення, класифікація типів дискурсу досі досліджена недостатньо: лише обмежена кількість праць приділяє цій проблематиці ґрунтовну увагу.

Останніми роками поле дискурс-аналізу зазнало суттєвих трансформацій під впливом новітніх технологій, змін у політичних формаціях і нових моделей соціальної взаємодії. Ці зміни вплинули на способи взаємодії індивідів та спільнот, конструювання значення та вибудовування ідентичності у різних медіа.

Зростаюче розмаїття дискурсивних форм відображає вплив глобальних змін і підкреслює актуальність аналізу взаємозв'язку між мовою, владою, технологіями, ідеологією та ідентичністю в багатовимірному, динамічному світі комунікації. Різні форми дискурсу є багатовимірними, взаємозалежними, вони перетинаються за функціями й структурою та можуть аналізуватися через спільні категорії й ключові виміри.

Автор уклав розширений перелік із 300 типів дискурсу, які подано як складову ширшої класифікаційної моделі. У роботі також запропоновано типологію дискурсів, побудовану на основі 17 різних критеріїв.

Ключові слова: дискурс, тип дискурсу, типологія, критерії, дискурс невизначеності, *ми*-дискурс.

Introduction. The diversity of approaches to the study of discourse has led to multiple interpretations of the concept and resulted in an extensive typology. The following features are viewed as relevant to the concept of 'discourse': discourse as *communication, dialogue, an interaction between communicators, a process, a structure*, discourse as *a system, a distinct way of representing and perceiving the world, a special language and world* that preserves, con-

veys, and transforms information using its discursive units, categories, and rules; discourse serves both as *a reflection and manifestation of national identity* [10, p. 5–6].

Numerous works on discourse reflect the growing interest in the field and highlight new areas of research: critical discourse analysis [4; 5; 2]; the structure of discourse, a cognitive-functional approach to discourse [11]; discourse-based approaches to lan-

guage study [14]; corpus-based discourse analysis [1; 8; 11; 15]; corpus-assisted discourse studies [9]; metadiscourse [9; 12]; discourse types [4; 5; 6; 7; 3; 13], etc.

This article **aims** to systematize the existing types of discourse and propose a typological classification of discourse types based on functional and contextual criteria.

Theoretical Background. Discourse analysis enables researchers to conduct multidimensional studies, providing an opportunity to gain new insights into language and the world at large. Teun A. van Dijk has conducted extensive research on discourse, particularly in relation to *knowledge, ideology, news, context, power, access, dominance, cognition, macrostructures, and social structures* [5; 6; 7]. Blommaert J. focuses on *context, inequality, identity, and power* [2]. Discourse can be analyzed through several intertwined key dimensions such as *knowledge, news, and truth* (versus *falsehood/lies*), which consistently shape its structure and function [10].

The contemporary discursive space is characterized by a variety of independent and incorporating, intersecting, and interconnected types of discourses. There is not a wide body of research dedicated to the classification of discourse; only a few studies have addressed this issue [3; 13]. N. Derkach presents a classification of discourse type based on the following typological features: according to the type of communication, the form of message, the degree of formality, the character of communication, the level of the emotional and pragmatic potential, the sphere of communication, and the genre [3, p. 43]. Discourse types are so closely linked and intertwined that discourse-based approaches to language study and “language attitudes” are adopted within metalinguistic discourse [14].

Results and Discussion. In recent years, discourse analysis has expanded into newer domains. It reflects rapid technological advancements, shifts social dynamics, and evolves political landscapes. These changes have reshaped how people and communities connect, how they construct meaning, and negotiate identity across various platforms and contexts. As a result, new types of discourse have emerged – such as *digital activism discourse, influencer discourse, trolling discourse, and AI discourse* – each rooted in contemporary communicative practices. These discourse types reflect not only the mediums through which communication occurs (e.g., social media, digital platforms), but also present socio-political concerns and cultural tensions. The diversification of discourse types underscores the field’s responsiveness to global change, its commitment to language analysis, and

interaction with power, technology, ideology, and identity in increasingly complex ways.

Up to now, various discourse types have been identified and have attracted academic interest. The number of different types of discourse is constantly growing. This paper introduces a collected list of more than 300 discourse types in alphabetical order (Table 1). It becomes crucial to develop a classification of discourse types. It is necessary to systematize these emerging discursive forms, contribute to comparative research, and provide a clearer understanding of their functions, structures, and contexts of use. This research outlines a typology of discourse types based on 17 functional and contextual criteria:

1) communication purpose/function/strategy – why the discourse is used:

persuasive: *advertising discourse, political discourse, propaganda discourse, manipulative discourse, public discourse*

informative: *journalistic discourse, educational discourse, scientific discourse, advertising discourse, news discourse*

expressive: *artistic discourse, poetic discourse, literary discourse*

evaluative: *judicial discourse, evaluative discourse, ethical discourse*

ritualistic: *religious discourse, ritual discourse, mythological discourse*

narrative: *narrative discourse, travelogue discourse, personal discourse;*

2) mode /channel of communication – how the discourse is delivered (channels):

verbal/spoken: *talk show discourse, radio discourse, courtroom discourse*

written: *newspaper discourse, academic discourse, literary discourse*

digital: *internet discourse, SMS discourse, multimedia discourse, social networking sites discourse, virtual discourse*

multimodal: *visual discourse, video discourse, AI image discourse, media discourse;*

3) social context/sphere of use – which context or sphere the discourse refers to:

political: *democratic discourse, republican discourse, totalitarian discourse, right-wing discourse, political party discourse*

educational: *classroom discourse, undergraduate discourse, pedagogical discourse, educational discourse*

medical: *health discourse, medical discourse, psychotherapeutic discourse*

legal: *courtroom discourse, judicial discourse, legislative discourse, legal discourse*

religious: *Islamic discourse, Orthodox discourse, biblical discourse*

media: *media discourse, PR discourse, metajournalistic discourse, Internet discourse;*

4) cognitive/interactional structure – how the discourse is produced, understood,

and organized in communication (how it reflects mental processes and influences participants' interaction in communication):

dialogic: *dialogic discourse, interactive discourse, interpersonal discourse*

monologic: *lecture discourse, presentation discourse, public discourse*

argumentative: *argumentative discourse, analytical discourse, incentive discourse*

reflexive: *metalinguistic discourse, epistemic discourse;*

5) cultural/national/language perspective – when the discourse focuses on

cultural, national, or linguistic features:

national/regional: *Ukrainian discourse, Canadian discourse, Iraqi discourse, American Republican discourse*

cultural: *folklore-ritual discourse, pop culture discourse, mythological discourse*

language-based: *linguo-imagological discourse, translation discourse, English (language) discourse;*

6) social/group/community identity – how discourse constructs, expresses, or

negotiates the identity of a social group or community:

in-group/out-group discourse, gamer discourse, youth discourse, LGBTQ+ discourse, religious discourse, feminist discourse, political party discourse, national identity discourse, minority group discourse, populist discourse, we-discourse, diaspora discourse, immigrant discourse;

7) register/formality criteria – it considers language styles used in a given

discourse based on the social context, relationship between participants, and purpose of communication:

formal: *scientific discourse, legal discourse, bureaucratic discourse, academic discourse*

informal: *colloquial discourse, slang discourse, student discourse*

mixed: *journalistic discourse, political discourse, Internet discourse;*

8) thematic content – refers to the main subject of discourse:

war/conflict: *discourse of war, conflict discourse, terrorism discourse, discourse of threat*

environment: *climate change discourse, environmental discourse, ecological discourse*

gender/social identity: *feminist discourse, gender discourse, LGBTQ+ discourse, minority group discourse*

technology: *AI discourse, technology and innovation discourse, digital discourse, discourse of social networking sites*

crisis: *Covid-19 related discourse, post-crisis discourse, economic inequality discourse, post-crisis discourse*

medicine: *medical discourse, healing discourse, health discourse, mental health discourse, pandemic discourse, psychotherapeutic discourse*

arts and humanities: *art discourse, poetic discourse, philosophical discourse;*

9) age group category – the types of discourse based on the age of

participants involved in communication or the target audience the discourse is intended for:

children: *children's discourse, fairy-tale discourse, animated movie discourse*

youth: *youth discourse, student discourse, adolescent/teenagers' discourse*

adults: *workplace discourse, managerial discourse, family discourse, corporate discourse*

middle-aged people's discourse, elderly people's discourse;

10) regional/locational criteria – classifies discourse based on a physical,

regional, or cultural location where it is produced and used; it reflects how local customs, dialects, sociopolitical context, or geography influence discourse (type of discourse may refer to a specific country, continent, or linguistic area):

local, regional, national, global

urban/rural: *urban discourse, village discourse, discourse of urban architecture, suburban discourse*

regional: *Israeli discourse, Indonesian immigrants' discourse;*

11) Internet/technology focus – it deals with discourse types that are created or

transmitted through digital technologies, especially online platforms; it covers discourse found on social media, in forums, blogs, chats, emails, video calls, messaging apps, AI-human interactions, online education, gaming discourse, etc.:

AI discourse, AI image discourse, computer-media discourse, forum network discourse, digital discourse, Internet discourse, SMS discourse, social networking sites discourse, trolling discourse, multimedia discourse, virtual discourse, online discourse, social-media discourse, innovation discourse;

12) emotional/psychological focus – when discourse centers around

emotional states or mental framing:

emotive discourse, manipulative discourse, aggressive discourse, persuasive discourse, empathic

discourse, depressive discourse, discourse of fear, discourse of uncertainty, discourse of hope;

13) power/ideological function – how discourse shapes and reflects power and ideology:

ideological discourse, populist discourse, propaganda discourse, neoliberal discourse, authoritarian discourse, totalitarian discourse, resistance discourse, parliamentary discourse, dictatorial discourse;

14) temporal focus – refers to the time orientation of discourse:

past-focused: *historical discourse, memory discourse, post-Soviet discourse*

present-focused: *crisis discourse, media discourse, social media discourse*

future-focused: *futuristic discourse, forecasting discourse, innovation discourse*;

15) genre/type of the text category – how discourse relates to traditional or

emerging genres:

fairy-tale discourse, fiction discourse, poetic discourse, legal document discourse, satirical discourse, travelogue discourse, scientific discourse, narrative discourse;

16) actor/participant role – it focuses on communicators or ‘actors’ of

discourse (the addresser, the addressee):

expert discourse, public discourse, managerial discourse, teacher-student discourse, leadership discourse, presidential discourse;

17) the ‘effect’ of discourse (similar to the concept of ‘effect’ in Lasswell’s

model of communication) – the impact of discourse on the audience, social structures, ideologies, and relationships – mental, emotional, behavioral, psychological, etc.:

public opinion discourse, behavioral discourse, protest discourse, activist discourse, effective discourse, climate discourse, incentive discourse, discourse of support.

Different types of discourse may construct societal views, influence perception, frame events and reality, reinforce understanding, alter attitudes over time, shape mindset, generate support or resistance, etc.

The typology that is presented remains incomplete since it does not include all existing discourse types. Discourses are multidimensional; they often overlap and demonstrate strong interrelationships. Furthermore, new discourse types arise due to societal, technological, and cultural changes. Some discourses may appear in multiple categories and refer to different domains and spheres. Various forms of discourse are interdependent, overlap in function and

structure, and can be analyzed through common categories and key dimensions.

We-discourse is studied within the concept of commonality. We define *we-discourse* as a spoken or written text in which the pronoun *we* and *we*-semes are used to identify and unite the speaker and the addressee; as a coherent text which reflects the socio-cultural interaction of communicators; as a specific type of communicative act that considers the recipient’s perspective and models their communication and relationship with the sender; as an indicator of the social context (encompassing participants in communication), cultural traditions, cognitive attitudes, and values in speech; as a macro-discourse that generates texts of various genres, each dominated by different communicative intentions, etc. It interacts with other discourse types (*political, diplomatic, interpersonal, family, cooperative*) and performs multiple functions (for example, a manipulative function in a *political* and *advertising discourse*; a unifying function – in an *interpersonal, family discourse*, and *community discourse*; a contrasting function – ‘we – they’ – in a *political party discourse, in-group/out-group discourse, manipulation discourse, racist discourse, oppositional discourse*, etc.). The idea of ‘togetherness,’ ‘unity,’ or ‘solidarity’ expressed through the concept of commonality can be seen as a key dimension in discourse analysis.

Similarly, the discourse of uncertainty may function as an independent entity while simultaneously serving as a component within other, broader discursive formations. We identify discourse of uncertainty as a communicative model in which information is presented in an unclear, ambiguous, and inexact way, primarily with the help of various types of adverbs: obviously, almost, maybe, perhaps, possibly, probably, presumably, supposedly, apparently, etc. Other linguistic means convey the idea of uncertainty and signal that something is not absolutely certain and confirmed: modal verbs, verbs of perception/belief, passive constructions, lexical hedges, etc. Various types of discourse express the idea of uncertainty within different discourse types: *political, manipulative, journalistic, argumentative, media, conspiracy, populist, public*, etc. In discourse analysis, uncertainty should be recognized as a significant analytical category.

The discourse of fake is a type of discourse whose primary purpose is to convey false and misleading information and to manipulate public consciousness. Fake news discourse (which can be viewed as a subset of *news discourse*) refers to communicative practices that are aimed at spreading deceptive information through mass media, influencing public per-

ception, and shaping attitudes and opinions [10]. The discourse of fake can be studied in close connection with *news, mass media, political, advertising, and totalitarian discourse*.

Conclusions and Perspectives. Scholarly attention to discourse analysis has increased and extended into various fields and domains. Technological progress and changes in social life have transformed the ways people interact and communicate. As a result, new directions of research have been established,

exposing the complexity and growing diversity of discourse types. These newly emerging discourses are related to different fields and spheres of activity. Moreover, these discourse types are often interconnected, share functions and forms, and can be examined through common analytical categories and key dimensions.

We see prospects for further research in expanding the criteria for discourse classification in connection with the growing number of discourse types.

REFERENCES:

1. Baker, P. Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis. London, 2006. 198 p.
2. Blommaert J. Discourse. A Critical Introduction. Cambridge University Press, 2005. 299 p. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511610295>
3. Derkach N.V. Discourse and its typology. *Studia Philologica*. 2024. № 23. P. 33–53. <https://doi.org/10.28925/2412-2491.2024.23>
4. Dijk A.T. Critical Discourse Analysis. *The Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 2015. Second Edition. P. 466–485.
5. Dijk A.T. Discourse and Cognition in Society. In D. Crowley & D. Mitchell. *Communication Theory Today*. Oxford, Pergamon Press. 1993. P. 107–126.
6. Dijk T. A. Discourse, Knowledge, Power and Politics. Towards Critical Epistemic Discourse Analysis. In Christopher Hart (Ed.), *Critical Discourse Studies in Context and Cognition*. Amsterdam, Benjamins. 2011. P. 27–63. <https://doi.org/10.1075/dapsac.43.03van>
7. Dijk A. T. Discourse, Power and Access. In C.R. Caldas-Coulthard, M. Coulthard (Ed.). *Texts and Practices: Readings in Critical Discourse Analysis*. London, Routledge. 1995. P. 84–104. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431382>
8. Flowerdew, L. Corpus-based Discourse Analysis. In J.P. Gee & M. Handford (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. Publisher, Routledge. 2012. P. 174–187. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244-11>
9. Flowerdew, L. Corpus-based Discourse Analysis. In M. Handford & J.P. Gee (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Discourse Analysis*. 2nd Edition. Publisher, Routledge. 2023. P. 126–138. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003035244>
10. Gryshchenko O. Discourse: knowledge, news, and fake intertwined. *Philological Review*. 2024. № 1. P. 4–11. <https://doi.org/10.31499/2415-8828.1.2024.306854>
11. Gylling M. *The Structure of Discourse. A Corpus-Based Cross-Linguistic Study*. Copenhagen Business School. 2013. 295 p.
12. Hyland, K. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. *Language in Society*. 2008. Vol. 37. № 1. P. 138–141. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0047404508080111>
13. Lepetiuk I. De M. Bakhtine à J.-P. Bronckart: Étude de la Typologie du Discours. *Scientific Proceedings of Ostroh Academy National University: Philology Series*. 2022. P. 28–32. [https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2022-16\(84\)-28-32](https://doi.org/10.25264/2519-2558-2022-16(84)-28-32)
14. Rodgers E. Towards a Typology of Discourse-based Approaches to Language Attitudes. *Language & Communication*. 2017. № 56. P. 82–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langcom.2017.04.002>
15. The Cambridge Handbook of Discourse Studies / edited by A. De Fina, Georgakopoulou. Cambridge University Press, 2020. 736 p. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108348195>

Table 1

Discourse Types in Alphabetical Order

Academic discourse	Internet discourse
Adolescent discourse	Interpersonal discourse
Adversarial discourse	Intersectional discourse
Advertising discourse	Intertextual discourses
Animated movie discourse	Iraqi discourse
Aesthetic discourse	Israeli discourse
Aggressive discourse	Islamic discourse
AI discourse	Journalistic discourse
‘AI image’ discourse	Judicial discourse
Algorithmic discourse	Jargon discourse
American Republican discourse	Leadership discourse
Analytical discourse	Legal discourse
Anti-corruption discourse	Legislative discourse
Apologetic discourse	Legitimate/illegitimate discourse
Archaeological discourse	Leibniz’s discourse
Argumentative discourse	LGBTQ+ discourse
Art discourse	Liberal discourse
Artistic discourse	Liminal discourse
Authoritarian discourse	Linguo-imagological discourse
Behavioral discourse	Literary discourse
Behavioral discourse of elite personality	Mainstream media’s discourse
Biblical discourse	Manipulative discourse
Brand discourse	Manipulative ideological discourse
Bureaucratic discourse	Managerial discourse
Business discourse	Marketing discourse
Cancel culture discourse	Mathematical discourse
Capitalist discourse	Media discourse
Canadian discourse	Media-political discourse
Channeling discourse	Medical discourse
Children’s discourse	Mental health discourse
Chinese discourse	Memetic (meme) discourse
Civic discourse	Memory discourse
Classroom discourse	Metajournalistic discourse
Climate (change) discourse	Metalinguistic discourse
Colloquial discourse	Metaphorical discourse
Colonial discourse	Metaphysical discourse
Communicative discourse	Migration discourse
Community discourse	Military discourse
Competing discourse	Minority group discourse
Computer-media discourse	Modal discourse
Conflict discourse	Moral discourse
Conspiracy discourse	Motivational discourse
Consumerist discourse	Multimedia discourse
Cooperative discourse	Musical discourse
Corporate discourse	Musical-poetic discourse
Courtroom discourse	Mythological discourse
Covid-19 related discourse	Narrative discourse
Crisis discourse	National discourse
Cross-cultural discourse	National identity discourse
Cultural discourse	Neanderthal discourse
Dating technologies discourse	Neoliberal discourse
Democratic discourse	News discourse
Demagogic discourse	Newspaper discourse
Design discourse	Online discourse

Descriptive discourse	Oppositional discourse
Dialogic/monologic discourse	Organizational discourse
Dictatorial discourse	Orthodox discourse
Digital discourse	Pandemic discourse
Diplomatic discourse	Parliamentary discourse
Discourse of business organizations	Personality discourse
Discourse of collaboration	Personal discourse
Discourse of compliment	Philosophical discourse
Discourse of conflict	Platform discourse
Discourse of court sessions	Poetic discourse
Discourse of defense	Political discourse
Discourse of deviance	Political party discourse
Discourse of discrediting	Polyintentional discourse
Discourse of drama	Pop culture discourse
Discourse of fake	Populist discourse
Discourse of fashion	Postcrisis discourse
Discourse of fear	Postmodern discourse
Discourse of freedom	Post-Soviet discourse
Discourse of hope	Post-truth discourse
Discourse of insult	Practical discourse
Discourse of life	Pragmatic discourse
Discourse of love	PR discourse
Discourse of national identity	Prescriptive discourse
Discourse of otherness	Presidential discourse
Discourse of painting	Presentation discourse
Discourse of peace	Professional discourse
Discourse of power	Proverbial discourse
Discourse of requests	Psychological discourse
Discourse of silence	Psychotherapeutic discourse
Discourse of social networking sites	Psychotic discourse
Discourse of support	Public discourse
Discourse of threat	Public opinion discourse
Discourse of TV commercials	Radio discourse
Discourse of uncertainty	Racist discourse
Discourse of urban architecture	Rational discourse
Discourse of village English	Reform discourse
Discourse of war	Refugee discourse
Disinformation discourse	Refusing policy discourse
Eco-anxiety discourse	Religious discourse
Ecological discourse	Resistance discourse
Economic discourse	Ritual discourse
Economic inequality discourse	Right-wing discourse
Educational discourse	Sacred discourse
Educational-pedagogical discourse	Satirical discourse
Effective discourse	Science fiction discourse
Election (election campaign) discourse	Scientific discourse
Electronic discourse	Secondary discourse
Elite discourse	Sexist discourse
English (language) discourse	Show discourse
Emancipatory discourse	Slang discourse
Empowerment discourse	Situationally un/conditioned discourses
Encircling discourses	SMS discourse
Environmental discourse	Social discourse

Continuation table

Epistemic discourse	Socio-political discourse
Esoteric discourse	Song discourse
Ethical discourse	Sports discourse
European Union discourse	Strategic discourse
Evaluative (judgmental) discourse	Student discourse
Existential discourse	Subcultural discourse
Fairy-tale discourse	Subjective/non-subjective discourse
Family discourse	Talk show discourse
Far-right discourse	Teacher-student discourse
Feminist discourse	Technical discourse
Figurative discourse	Technology and innovation discourse
Film discourse	Television discourse
Folklore-ritual discourse	Temporal discourse (post-/Soviet)
Forum network discourse	Terrorism discourse
Futuristic discourse	Theatrical discourse
Gambling discourse	Therapeutic discourse
Gamer discourse	Threat discourse
Gender discourse (male, female)	Tolerance discourse
Gluttonous discourse	Tolerant/intolerant discourse
Globalization discourse	Totalitarian discourse
Governmental discourse	Tourist discourse
Greeting discourse	Tourism discourse
Hashtag discourse	Translation discourse
Healing discourse	Travelogue discourse
Health discourse	Trolling discourse
Historical-political discourse	Ukrainian discourse
Humorous discourse	Uncertainty discourse
Ideological discourse	Undergraduate discourse
Immigration (immigrant) discourse	Urban discourse
Image discourse	Video discourse
Inclusive discourse	Village discourse
In-group/out-group discourses	Virtual discourse
Incentive discourse	Visual discourse
Indonesian immigrants' discourse	'Victim'/'survivor' discourse
Influencer discourse	Virtual discourse
Information warfare discourse	Weather forecasting discourse
Innovation discourse	We-discourse
Institutional discourse	Working class discourse
Interactional discourse	Workplace discourse
Interactive discourse	Worldview discourse
Intercultural discourse	Youth discourse