



DOI:10.29013/EJLL-26-1.2-62-66



DISCOURSE AND TEXT AS INTERCONNECTED STRUCTURES IN MODERN LINGUISTIC ANALYSIS

Veysal Shamsinur Aslanova¹

¹ Azerbaijan University of Languages

Cite: Aslanova V. Sh. (2026). *Discourse and Text as Interconnected Structures in Modern Linguistic Analysis*. *European Journal of Literature and Linguistics* 2026, No 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.29013/EJLL-26-1.2-62-66>

Abstract

The present paper investigates discourse as a multidimensional phenomenon in modern linguistics, emphasizing its interaction with text as a structured linguistic entity. Particular attention is paid to the role of contextual, cognitive, and communicative factors in shaping meaning beyond the sentence level. The study highlights that discourse is not merely a sequence of linguistic units, but a dynamic process in which coherence and interpretation emerge through interaction between participants. It is argued that understanding discourse requires an integrated approach that combines structural, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives.

Keywords: *discourse analysis, text structure, coherence, communicative function, context, linguistic interaction*

Introduction

In contemporary linguistics, the study of discourse has gained a central position as scholars increasingly recognize that language cannot be fully understood when analyzed solely at the level of isolated sentences. While traditional approaches to language focused primarily on grammatical structures and sentence-level analysis, modern linguistic theories emphasize that meaning emerges within larger communicative units. In this context, discourse is viewed as a dynamic and complex phenomenon that encompasses not only linguistic forms but also the cognitive, social, and contextual factors that shape communication.

The relationship between text and discourse represents one of the key issues in this field. A text is commonly understood as

a structured and coherent linguistic product, fixed in written or spoken form, whereas discourse is interpreted as language in action, embedded in a specific communicative situation. This distinction highlights the dual nature of language: on the one hand, it functions as a system of formal structures; on the other hand, it operates as a tool for interaction and meaning-making. Therefore, the analysis of discourse requires an integrative approach that combines structural, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives.

A fundamental aspect of discourse analysis is the concept of coherence, which refers to the logical and semantic unity of a text. Unlike cohesion, which is achieved through explicit linguistic markers such as conjunctions, pronouns, and lexical repetition, coherence arises

from the interpretation of meaning by participants in communication. It depends not only on the internal organization of the text but also on shared knowledge, contextual assumptions, and communicative intentions. As a result, discourse cannot be reduced to a mere sequence of sentences; rather, it constitutes a meaningful whole shaped by multiple interacting factors.

Another important dimension of discourse is its dependence on context. Linguistic expressions acquire their full meaning only within a particular situational, cultural, and cognitive framework. This includes both the linguistic context, which consists of preceding and following elements within the text, and the extralinguistic context, which involves real-world knowledge, social relations, and communicative goals. The interaction between these elements enables speakers and listeners to construct and interpret meaning effectively.

Furthermore, discourse plays a significant role in shaping and reflecting social reality. Through discourse, individuals negotiate meanings, express identities, and establish relationships within a community. This makes discourse analysis not only a linguistic endeavor but also an interdisciplinary field that intersects with sociology, psychology, and communication studies. By examining how language is used in real-life situations, researchers can gain deeper insights into the mechanisms of human interaction and the processes underlying meaning construction.

In light of these considerations, the present study aims to explore discourse as a complex linguistic and communicative phenomenon. It seeks to analyze its structural organization, semantic content, and pragmatic functions, as well as its interaction with text as a formal linguistic unit. The research is based on the assumption that a comprehensive understanding of language requires moving beyond sentence-level analysis and examining the broader context in which communication occurs. Through this approach, the study contributes to the ongoing development of discourse analysis as a key area of modern linguistics.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to examine discourse as a complex linguistic and communicative phenomenon and to clarify its

relationship with text within the framework of modern linguistic analysis. The research aims to identify the structural, semantic, and pragmatic features that characterize discourse and distinguish it from sentence-level language units. Particular attention is given to the role of coherence, cohesion, and contextual factors in the construction and interpretation of meaning.

Furthermore, the study seeks to analyze how discourse functions as a dynamic process shaped by communicative intentions, cognitive mechanisms, and extralinguistic conditions. It also aims to determine the ways in which discourse influences and organizes linguistic elements such as word order, grammatical structures, and lexical choices. By adopting an integrated approach that combines text linguistics and discourse analysis, the research intends to contribute to a deeper understanding of language as an interactive and context-dependent system.

Scientific Methodology

This study is based on an integrative methodological framework that combines principles of text linguistics and discourse analysis. The research adopts a qualitative approach, focusing on the interpretation of linguistic data within their communicative and contextual environments. The analysis is grounded in structural, semantic, and pragmatic perspectives, allowing for a comprehensive examination of discourse as a multi-dimensional phenomenon.

The primary method employed in this study is discourse analysis, which is used to investigate how meaning is constructed beyond the sentence level. Within this framework, particular attention is given to the identification of coherence and cohesion mechanisms, as well as to the role of contextual factors in shaping interpretation. Textual analysis is also applied to examine the internal organization of texts, including their segmentation, hierarchical structure, and the relationships between their components.

In addition, elements of functional analysis are incorporated to explore the interaction between linguistic forms and their communicative functions. This includes the examination of how grammatical structures, lexical choices, and syntactic patterns contribute

to the overall effectiveness of discourse. The study also takes into account cognitive and pragmatic approaches, emphasizing the role of speaker intention, shared knowledge, and extralinguistic context in the process of meaning construction.

The data for analysis are selected from representative examples of written and spoken discourse, allowing for the observation of linguistic phenomena in authentic communicative settings. Through a systematic and comparative analysis of these examples, the study aims to identify recurring patterns and to formulate generalizations about the structure and function of discourse. This methodological approach ensures both analytical depth and theoretical relevance, contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of discourse in modern linguistics.

Discourse as a field of linguistic inquiry has developed through various theoretical perspectives that go beyond traditional sentence-based analysis and focus on language as a communicative and functional system. In this respect, discourse is understood as a structured and meaningful whole in which linguistic elements interact within specific contextual and pragmatic conditions. The shift from sentence to discourse has allowed linguists to investigate how meaning is constructed across larger units, how speakers organize information, and how communication is shaped by cognitive and social factors. As a result, discourse analysis provides a more comprehensive framework for understanding language in use, emphasizing that meaning emerges not only from grammatical structures but also from their integration into coherent communicative contexts.

One of the key contributions to discourse-oriented linguistics is associated with William Labov, who explored the structure of narrative discourse and demonstrated how everyday spoken language reflects systematic patterns. Labov's model of narrative organization highlights the importance of sequencing, evaluation, and the communicative purpose of storytelling (Labov William. 1972, 48). His work shows that discourse is not random but follows identifiable structural principles that guide the production and interpretation of meaning in real-life communication.

Another influential perspective is presented by Deborah Tannen, who focused on the interactional and conversational aspects of discourse (Tannen Deborah. 1989). Tannen emphasized the role of repetition, involvement strategies, and interpersonal dynamics in shaping communication. Her research illustrates that discourse is deeply embedded in social interaction and that linguistic choices are influenced by factors such as relationships, context, and communicative goals. This approach highlights the importance of pragmatics in discourse analysis, demonstrating that meaning is co-constructed by participants in interaction.

From a different angle, Michael Stubbs contributed significantly to corpus-based discourse analysis (Stubbs Michael. 1983, 25). He argued that large-scale textual data provide valuable insights into patterns of language use, enabling researchers to identify recurring structures and tendencies in discourse. Stubbs' work emphasizes that discourse should be studied empirically, based on authentic data, rather than solely on theoretical assumptions. This methodological perspective strengthens the scientific foundation of discourse analysis and allows for more objective generalizations.

In addition, Norman Fairclough introduced the concept of critical discourse analysis, which connects language with power, ideology, and social structures. Fairclough's approach demonstrates that discourse is not only a linguistic phenomenon but also a social practice that reflects and shapes relations of power within society (Fairclough Norman. 1995, 76). By analyzing texts in their socio-cultural context, he showed how discourse contributes to the construction of social realities and the maintenance or transformation of ideological systems. Consequently, discourse analysis becomes a tool not only for linguistic description but also for critical interpretation of social processes.

The development of discourse studies has also been significantly influenced by pragmatic and interaction-oriented approaches, which emphasize the role of speakers and listeners in meaning construction. One of the key figures in this regard is Herbert Paul Grice, whose theory of conversational implicature explains how meaning often goes beyond what is ex-

PLICITLY stated (Grice Herbert Paul. 1975, 46). Grice introduced the cooperative principle and conversational maxims, showing that participants in communication rely on shared assumptions and inferential processes to interpret discourse. This perspective is crucial for discourse analysis, as it highlights that coherence is not only a property of the text itself but also a result of interpretive activity.

Another important contribution comes from John Searle, who developed speech act theory (Searle John. 1969, 98). According to Searle, utterances perform actions such as asserting, questioning, or requesting, which means that discourse must be analyzed in terms of its functional and intentional aspects. This approach demonstrates that language is not merely descriptive but performative, and that discourse reflects the intentions and goals of its participants. As a result, discourse analysis must consider not only what is said, but also what is done through language.

The role of interaction in discourse is further explored by Erving Goffman, who examined how social roles and situational contexts shape communication. (Goffman Erving. 1974, 56). Goffman's work shows that discourse is embedded in social practices and that participants organize their speech according to expectations, norms, and identities. His concept of "frame analysis" explains how individuals interpret situations and adjust their discourse accordingly, which is essential for understanding variability and flexibility in communication.

Finally, Dell Hymes contributed to the study of discourse through the concept of communicative competence (Hymes Dell. 1972, 107). Hymes argued that linguistic knowledge alone is not sufficient for effective communication; speakers must also understand how to use language appropriately in different contexts. His ethnographic approach emphasizes the importance of cultural and social factors in discourse, demonstrating that communication is governed by norms that vary across communities. This perspective reinforces the idea that discourse is a socially situated phenomenon, shaped by both linguistic structures and contextual conditions.

Discourse, therefore, should be understood as a dynamic and multilayered process in which linguistic structures, contextu-

al conditions, and communicative intentions interact continuously. It is not limited to the linear arrangement of sentences, but rather represents a complex system in which meaning is constructed through coherence, information flow, and the organization of thematic elements. Within this system, the relationship between form and function becomes especially important, as linguistic units gain their full significance only when integrated into a broader communicative context. Discourse also reflects the influence of extralinguistic factors such as social environment, cultural norms, and shared knowledge, all of which shape both the production and interpretation of texts. As a result, the analysis of discourse requires attention to multiple dimensions simultaneously, including structural organization, semantic content, pragmatic function, and cognitive processing. This multidimensional nature explains why discourse cannot be reduced to a purely grammatical or formal phenomenon, but must instead be approached as a holistic communicative system in which language operates as a tool for constructing meaning, expressing intentions, and maintaining interaction between participants.

Results

The analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that discourse represents a complex, structured, and context-dependent phenomenon that cannot be adequately explained through sentence-level analysis alone. The findings reveal that meaning in discourse emerges from the interaction of multiple dimensions, including structural organization, semantic content, pragmatic intention, and cognitive processing. It has been shown that coherence plays a central role in the formation of discourse, as it ensures the logical and semantic unity of the communicative whole, while cohesion provides the formal linguistic mechanisms that connect its elements. However, the study also confirms that cohesion alone is insufficient for full comprehension, since interpretation depends on contextual knowledge, shared assumptions, and the communicative goals of participants.

Moreover, the results indicate that discourse is influenced by both internal linguistic factors and external extralinguistic conditions. Linguistic structures such as word order,

grammatical forms, and lexical choices are not randomly selected but are shaped by communicative needs and contextual constraints. At the same time, discourse reflects cognitive processes, as speakers and listeners actively construct and interpret meaning based on their knowledge and experience. Social and cultural factors also play a significant role, as discourse serves as a medium through which individuals establish relationships, express identities, and negotiate meanings within a community. These findings highlight the integrative nature of discourse, where language, cognition, and society function as interconnected components of a unified system.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the study confirms that discourse should be understood as a holistic and dynamic communicative process that extends beyond the boundaries of formal linguistic structures. It is not merely a sequence of sentences, but a meaningful and organized whole in which structural, semantic, and

pragmatic elements interact to produce and convey information. The research emphasizes the importance of adopting a multidimensional approach to discourse analysis, one that incorporates textual organization, contextual factors, and communicative intentions in order to fully explain how meaning is generated and interpreted.

Furthermore, the distinction between text as a formal product and discourse as language in action highlights the necessity of examining both aspects in an integrated manner. Discourse analysis provides valuable insights into the functioning of language in real-life communication, revealing how linguistic forms are shaped by context, cognition, and social interaction. Ultimately, recognizing discourse as both a linguistic and social phenomenon contributes to a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of language, allowing researchers to move beyond purely structural descriptions and to explore the dynamic processes that underlie human communication.

References

- Tannen Deborah. (1989). *Talking Voices: Repetition, Dialogue, and Imagery in Conversational Discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hymes Dell. (1972). On communicative competence. In J. B. Pride & J. Holmes (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics*. Penguin.
- Goffman Erving. (1974). *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harvard University Press.
- Grice Herbert Paul. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* (Vol. 3, P. 41–58). Academic Press.
- Searle John. (1969). *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Stubbs Michael. (1983). *Discourse Analysis: The Sociolinguistic Analysis of Natural Language*. University of Chicago Press.
- Fairclough Norman. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.
- Labov William. (1972). *Language in the Inner City: Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

submitted 23.04.2026;

accepted for publication 07.05.2026;

published 30.05.2026

© Aslanova V. Sh.

Contact: aslanovashamsinur71@gmail.com