

## SPOKEN DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

**Asrorova Nargiza Isomitdinovna**

*nibotova@gmail.com*

*Senior Teacher*

*Tashkent International University of  
Finance and Management Technologies*

**Annotation:** *Selecting a methodological approach is fundamental in spoken discourse analysis, the systematic study of how language functions in social interaction. This choice is critical as it reveals underlying power dynamics, identity construction, and social structures within everyday talk. Key frameworks include Conversation Analysis (CA), which focuses on interactional structures; Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), which examines language in relation to power and ideology; and qualitative content analysis. The field involves ongoing debates, particularly concerning the merits of qualitative versus quantitative methods and the role of researcher subjectivity. Ethical considerations, such as informed consent and cultural context, are also paramount. Ultimately, the chosen approach directly shapes the research methodology, data interpretation, and the resulting insights, which can inform practices in fields like education, healthcare, and politics. A careful, theoretically-grounded selection is therefore essential for meaningful scholarly contribution.*

**Key words:** *spoken discourse analysis, methodological approach, frameworks, social interaction, ethical considerations.*

### INTRODUCTION

Spoken discourse analysis is a vital field within communication studies, dedicated to the systematic examination of how spoken language is used across various contexts (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2021). Its significance lies in its capacity to uncover the intricate dynamics of social interaction, power relations, and identity construction embedded within everyday conversation. The central challenge for researchers in this domain is the selection of an analytical approach, a decision that fundamentally shapes the research methodology and influences the interpretations and conclusions drawn from the data (Lester et al., 2020).

This article argues that a deliberate and informed approach to methodological selection is paramount for the validity and impact of research in spoken discourse analysis. It will explore the prominent theoretical frameworks available, discuss the methodological and ethical considerations that must guide the research process, and highlight the practical applications and inherent challenges in the field. The aim is to provide a comprehensive guide for researchers navigating the complex landscape of spoken discourse analysis, ensuring their inquiries are both methodologically robust and contextually relevant.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

The theoretical framework provides the foundational concepts and lens through which spoken discourse is analyzed. In deductive research, such as quantitative studies, the framework is established a priori, drawing on existing theories to guide hypothesis formation (Grant & Osanloo, 2014). For instance, sociolinguistic theories might inform a study on turn-taking. Conversely, in inductive research like grounded theory, the framework emerges from the data itself, which is particularly useful in Conversation Analysis (CA) for uncovering implicit conversational structures (Sidnell & Stivers, 2014). Major frameworks include:

**Conversation Analysis (CA):** Focuses on the micro-level structures of talk-in-interaction, such as turn-taking, repair, and adjacency pairs, to understand how social actions are accomplished (Wooffitt, 2005).

**Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA):** Examines the relationship between language and power, investigating how discourse reproduces or challenges social dominance and ideology (Fairclough, 2013).

**Qualitative Content Analysis:** Systematically categorizes textual data to identify themes and patterns within discourse, effective for uncovering nuanced meanings (Schreier, 2012).

### Methodological and Ethical Considerations

The choice of methodology is not merely technical but philosophical, influencing every stage of the research. A mixed-methods approach, combining qualitative and quantitative techniques, can offer both depth and breadth, triangulating findings for a more comprehensive understanding (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017).

Ethical considerations are paramount. Researchers must navigate issues of informed consent, participant privacy, and the subjective nature of interpretation, especially with linguistically and culturally diverse populations (Tracy, 2010). A dialogic approach to ethics is recommended, recognizing that cultural norms significantly influence perceptions of research.

### Research Methodology

This article employs a synthetic literature review methodology. A comprehensive analysis of existing literature on discourse analysis methodology was conducted, drawing from academic sources, methodological guides, and interactive articles as referenced in the provided document. The synthesis was structured around key themes: theoretical frameworks, methodological selection, data collection, ethical issues, and practical applications. The goal was to integrate these elements into a coherent framework to guide researchers in selecting an appropriate approach for spoken discourse analysis, rather than to present new empirical data.

### Results and Discussion

The synthesis of the literature reveals several critical factors for successfully navigating methodological choices in spoken discourse analysis. **Alignment of Framework and Question:** The primary determinant for selecting an approach should be the research

question. A study investigating the minute details of classroom interaction would be best served by CA, while an inquiry into political rhetoric and power would align with CDA (Gee & Handford, 2013). The theoretical framework, whether pre-defined or emergent, must provide a coherent lens for interpretation.

**The Centrality of Context:** A critical aspect of analysis is understanding the context in which the discourse occurs—its purpose, timing, and location (Wodak & Meyer, 2016). Social factors, including power dynamics, cultural norms, and social roles, heavily dictate communication patterns and must be accounted for in any robust analysis (Scollon & Scollon, 2001). **Flexibility in the Research Process:** While a clear initial plan is vital, researchers must remain flexible. New insights emerging during data collection and analysis may necessitate refining the chosen approach, enriching the final findings (Paltridge & Phakiti, 2021).

**Challenges and Limitations:** Researchers face several challenges, including methodological variability that limits cross-study comparability, cognitive barriers and jargon that can obscure meaning, and the procedural consequentiality of analytical choices (Talmy, 2010; Wetherall et al., 2001). Acknowledging these limitations is a strength of rigorous research.

## **CONCLUSION**

Choosing an approach to spoken discourse analysis is a complex but critical undertaking that sits at the heart of empirical communication research. This article has outlined a framework for this decision, emphasizing the need for a careful alignment between research questions, theoretical frameworks, and methodological tools. By grounding their work in a robust theoretical lens, adhering to strict ethical standards, and maintaining flexibility throughout the inquiry, researchers can ensure their studies yield meaningful and valid insights. The chosen approach significantly influences the understanding of spoken discourse, ultimately shaping practices and policies across diverse fields such as education, healthcare, politics, and media studies. Future research should continue to refine these methodologies and explore the applications of mixed-methods approaches to further advance the field.

## **REFERENCES:**

- Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.
- Fairclough, N. (2013). *Critical discourse analysis: The critical study of language* (2nd ed.). Routledge.
- Gee, J. P., & Handford, M. (Eds.). (2013). *The Routledge handbook of discourse analysis*. Routledge.
- Grant, C., & Osanloo, A. (2014). *Understanding, selecting, and integrating a theoretical framework in dissertation research: Creating the blueprint for your “house.”* Administrative

Issues Journal: Connecting Education, Practice, and Research, 4(2), 12–26. Lester, J. N., Cho, Y., & Lochmiller, C. R. (2020). Learning to do qualitative data analysis: A starting point. *Human Resource Development Review*, 19(1), 94–106.

Paltridge, B., & Phakiti, A. (Eds.). (2021). *The Cambridge handbook of discourse studies*. Cambridge University Press.

Schreier, M. (2012). *Qualitative content analysis in practice*. Sage Publications.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2001). *Intercultural communication: A discourse approach* (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishing.

Sidnell, J., & Stivers, T. (Eds.). (2014). *The handbook of conversation analysis*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Talmy, S. (2010). Qualitative interviews in applied linguistics: From research instrument to social practice. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 30, 128–148.

Tracy, S. J. (2010). Qualitative quality: Eight “big-tent” criteria for excellent qualitative research. *Qualitative Inquiry*, 16(10), 837–851.

Wetherall, M., Taylor, S., & Yates, S. J. (Eds.). (2001). *Discourse theory and practice: A reader*. Sage Publications.

Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Methods of critical discourse studies* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Wooffitt, R. (2005). *Conversation analysis and discourse analysis: A comparative and critical introduction*. Sage Publications.