

# The Specificity of Everyday Discourses

Habibova K.A.

Department of computational linguistics  
I. Nasimi Linguistics Institute  
Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences  
Baku, Azerbaijan  
konul\_habibova@mail.ru

**Abstract**—The article discusses the specifics of the everyday discursive space. The analysis is carried out on the basis of such categories of discourse formation as the type of generality of the participants in the discourse; purpose of discourse; discourse values; thematic structure of discourse; communication conditions; role structure of discourse; discursive strategies; genre structure; stylistic design; intertextual interaction. As a result, a conclusion is made about the high level of variability of everyday discourse, which ensures the inhomogeneity of its structure, represented by a concretely situational variety of individual everyday discourses.

**Keywords**—*everyday discourses; categories of discourse formation; socio-historically determined system of discourses; thematic structure.*

## I. INTRODUCTION

Modern linguistics is actively exploring the structure of discursive activity of native speakers. At the same time, researchers mainly focus on a certain socio-historically determined system of discourses, based on the principle of institutionalism.

Appeal to the discursive foundations of everyday life was actively manifested in a number of Western areas of humanitarian knowledge in the 70<sup>th</sup> of XX century, primarily in connection with the analysis of the structure of various forms of everyday communication. A rich tradition of the study of colloquial speech was formed at the same years in Russian philology (T.G.Vinokur, V.D.Devkina, E.A.Zemskaya, M.V.Kitaygorodskaya, E.N.Shiryayeva, L.A.Kapanadze, N.N. Rozanova, E.V. Krasilnikova, O.A. Lapteva, O.B.Sirotnina and others). On all the globality of the analysis of Russian spoken language, the specifics of the colloquial speech generating this type of speech did not receive a integrity description. Certain specific characteristics of everyday (common, every day, colloquial) discourse are reflected in the works [1; 2] and others. The study of everyday human activity through the prism of his speech activity was actively developed in social psychology and psycholinguistics.

V.Í. Karasik defines everyday discourse in the sociolinguistic approach frame as personality-oriented, opposed to institutional discourses [1], and this opposition is determinant in the analysis of discourse of this type. The factor of institutionalism has a stabilizing effect on discourses

(often the terms of communication within institutional discourses are specified in various directions, laws, instructions, manuals, etc.). Daily life is characterized by a principled openness of borders, and the main unifying feature of this area of communication is to set its participants to the possibility not to follow any institutional rules and regulations.

Herewith is impossible to say that everyday communication is not regulated by any norms. Within its framework there are stereotypical discursive rules based on the practical experience of the communication participants, worked out in this national-cultural community and mastered in an inductive way. The most important for understanding the specifics of this discourse is its characterization as “the least structured of all types of discourses” [3: 175]. If institutional discourses form types (according to M. Foucault discourse formations) on the basis of dependence on public institutions, then everyday discourses cannot be reduced to certain types, selected on the basis of a set of parameters – each parameter assumes a specific list of discursive groups of everyday life. The lack of direct orientation towards social institutions determines the inhomogeneity of its discursive structure.

The boundaries of the analytical spheres of discourse analysis are primarily determined by specific communicative situations, each of which forms its own discourse. In connection with this the use of the term “everyday discourse” in this work is connected with the appeal to two interdependent entities: 1) a set of discursive spheres free from institutional frameworks; 2) a specific discourse of everyday life, formed around a separate communicative situation.

The purpose of this work is to analyze the specifics of the discursive space of everyday life, on the one hand, demonstrating unity in its opposition to institutional spheres of communication, and on the other hand, manifesting it as an inhomogeneous palette of concrete everyday discourses.

Analyzing the discourse space of everyday life, we will involve those developed categories of discourse formation in modern studies [1; 4], which, in our opinion, most clearly represent the specific features of the object: 1) the type of generality of the participants in discourse; 2) the purpose of discourse; 3) discourse values; 4) thematic structure of

discourse; 5) conditions of communication; 6) the role structure of discourse; 7) discursive strategies; 8) genre structure; 9) stylistic design; 10) intertextual interaction.

Consider the specifics of the discursive space of everyday life in accordance with the designated categories of discourse formation.

## II. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

### A. *The type of communality of participants in everyday discourses*

The category of commonality of communication participants, determined by I.V. Silantyev as the main one in the system of categories of discourse formation [8] allows detecting the universal nature of everyday discourse, demonstrating all possible non-institutional principles for uniting participants in discourse activities: discourse practices of a subcultural and institutional nature [2: 27]. M.L. Makarov interprets considered category as a factor in the formality of a group of communication participants [3], according to which everyday discourse demonstrates a minimal level of formality in comparison with institutional ones.

By the nature of the participants' commonality, everyday discourse is divided into many non-institutional discourses. In the absence of institutional attitudes the dominant formation of communities in these types of discourse can be different grounds – interpersonal or situational [2: 27]. Interpersonal grounds connect participants to discourse regardless of the communication situation and form relatively stable communities characterized by manifestation of the role structure, working out of the communication principles (for example, family communication discourse, unprofessional communication discourse at work, etc.). Situational grounds underlie the formation of everyday discourses that unite the communication participants, who due to various circumstances, found themselves in a certain place at a certain time. This unification can be described as unstable, the principles of communication within its framework are formed situationally and largely determined by the personal qualities of its participants (for example, the discourse of the queue in the store or the train compartment discourse repeatedly mentioned in the literature).

Thus, everyday discourses are characterized by situational, interpersonal types of a different nature, non-institutional associations of participants, possessing varying degrees of stability.

### B. *Values of everyday discourses*

It is difficult to give a integrity description to the values of everyday discourses in accordance with the characteristics of their goals. It seems that in the context of everyday discourses one can identify current and potential values that regulate discursive activities. The actual value of everyday discourses is the value of extra-institutional unity, realized in the process of everyday communication. In addition, awareness of their personal position in a mini-group is of independent

significance for its participants. An indirect confirmation of this is the factor of initiation of communication: if within the framework of institutional discourses, communication participants enter into communication according to the rules of discursive regulation, then in everyday communication its initiation is carried out on the basis of the “goodwill” of communicants.

Potential values of everyday discourse are values formed within the cultural community to which communication participants belong (for example, values of Russian traditional culture, professional values, values of a particular subculture), as well as individual and personal values. Actualization of potential values is carried out depending on the specific situational conditions of communication and the topic of communication.

### C. *Thematic structure of everyday discourses*

I.V. Silantyev emphasizes the specifics of the thematic structure of everyday discourse: everyday discourse, “like a sponge, attracts thematically oriented discourses, supports and simultaneously dissolves them in his body. It is everyday discourse that checks thematic discourses for survival, assesses their significance and builds their hierarchy” [2: 29].

Thus, the fundamental heterogeneity of everyday discourse is realized not only in the free variation of participants in discourse activities, but also in the unlimitness of the topics of their verbal communication. The thematic structure of everyday discourse is principally open.

With all the potential diversity of topics of everyday discourse, the status of thematic subdiscourses is different: the range of topics formed within the framework of their own discourse practices of the communication participants is basic, and topics meaningfully perceived in verbal form from “strange” discursive practices are included thematically non-discursive. Thus, discussions about politics, the activities of official structures, as well as various public events for the majority of participants in everyday communication are not related to relaying their own experience, the information under discussion is received from various sources (media, fiction, eyewitness accounts) verbally. As a result, there is a high probability of consciously or unconsciously retransmitting “strange” texts in discussion. The theme of speech communication in the framework of any discourse, at any level of spontaneity of its communicative occurrence introduces manifestations of a number of cognitive attitudes related to this topic in a given socio-cultural environment in the discursive activity. Thus, the theme of war sets different semantic accents and forms a different emotional tone depending on the type of participants in the discourse in which this topic is realized (representatives of different generations, different levels of education, etc.).

Thus, the nature of the subject of speech communication is one of the significant factors of discourse formation in everyday discourses.

#### *D. Role structure of everyday discourses*

According to researchers, everyday discourse characterizes the “relatively free exchange of communicative roles” [3: 175]. If within the framework of institutional discourses, types of positions of participants in communication are formed in presupposition and status communication offers its participants a fixed pattern of communicative roles [3: 175], in everyday communication, the role structure of discourse is formed at the level of each specific communication situation.

In addition, if an institutional role structure is formed around the requirements of a social institution, the role structure of everyday discourses can be formed around various pragmatically oriented parameters that are relevant to the flow of a particular discourse. So, in discourses that are strategically focused on gathering information, the roles of the questioner and responder (informing, knowledgeable) are manifested, in discourses aimed at assessing reality (for example, the modern education system), the role of “judges” and “advocates”, in everyday educational discourses – the role of “specialists” and “students”.

In the organization of the role structure of everyday discourses, an active part is taken by a factor associated with the individual-personal characteristics of the subjects of communication (for example, the presence of leadership qualities of a participant in a discourse is significant). Due to the fact that the controlling function in everyday discourse, defined as personality-oriented [1] and is performed primarily by the participants of the discourse (in institutional-social control), the individual-personal properties of the subject of communication acquire special significance: “... participants in personal discourse is in its fullness of its qualities, in contrast to the participants of institutional discourse, the status-based, representative function of a person being a system-forming feature” [1: 203].

This factor has a significant impact on such basic categories of discourse formation as the goal of discourse (the goal set by the participant when initiating discourse) and the thematic structure of the discourse (thematic competence of the participant in the discourse). Thus, the main feature of the role structure of everyday discourses is the free exchange of communicative roles, their orientation on the pragmatics of communication, on the individual and personal characteristics of the participants in communication.

#### *E. Everyday discursive strategies*

The local nature of the objectives of everyday discourse determines the multiplicity of strategic decisions for their realization. Applied to the typical author's intention in everyday discourse the concept of “strategy of everyday life” to the greatest extent corresponds to the characteristics of the content of everyday human communication experience. According to I.V. Silantyev, “applied to everyday discourse, one can speak about the communicative strategy of everyday unity of people through various forms of direct exchange of current information, phatic communicative acts, etc.” [2: 20], and the strategic unity of everyday life lies within the

framework of which it is possible to identify- as more private - the strategies of information, assessment, coercion, etc.

Communicative strategies of everyday discourse relate to the respective intentions of institutional discourses in the same way as the primary speech genres in M.M. Bakhtin's interpretation to the secondary genres. In this case institutional discourses act in relation to everyday ones as an environment refracting the primary strategic intentions in accordance with institutional rules (compare with other discourses” [5: 75]).

Herewith due to the high level of data exchange in modern society, the channels for disseminating strategic transformations of institutional discourses undoubtedly have a reverse vector directed to the area of everyday life, the semiotic code of institutional discourses “returns” to everyday discourse, importing special meanings [3: 57]. The communication participants, who are included simultaneously in institutional and everyday discursive practices, do not strive for their clear differentiation in everyday life; moreover, they use some elements of institutional communication in everyday life to solve local communicative tasks.

Thus, the communicative strategies of everyday life, on the one hand, have the property of primacy in relation to the corresponding institutionally defined strategies, and on the other hand, they undergo a certain transformation under the influence of institutional activities.

#### *F. Genre structure of everyday discourses*

Specified in typical author's intentions of informing, evaluating, coercion communicative strategy of “common unity of people” [2: 20] in everyday discourse, is realized in the system of speech genres of everyday life, “respectively, we can talk about such genres of everyday discourse as question and answer, greeting and farewell, request and order, congratulations, regret and condolences, etc. Even the names of such genres are nothing other than basic intentions accompanying statements within the framework of these genre groups” [2: 17-18]. According to M.M. Bakhtin's classification these genres are defined as the primary speech genres.

The statement that the genre structure of everyday communication is constituted by primary speech genres (and respectively, the genres of institutional discourses are formed on the basis of their prototypes) is traced in a number of works [5: 8; 6]. However, this statement applies only to the genre structure of oral everyday discourses.

Written discourses of everyday life (written language) are realized in the genre system, the basis of which, in addition to the basic intention (“functional-target parameter” [7: 61]), is such a dominant feature as the “nature of the substrate” [7: 61], which defines the secondary character of the textual typology of discourses data (cf. the genres “student graffiti”, “marginal pages of notebooks”, “private note”, considered in [7,12,13]).

In connection with the foregoing, it seems necessary to return again to the idea that analyzing materials of everyday discourse the channel of information transfer becomes a significant discourse formation category, unlike institutional communication, where the category of “oral / written channel of information transfer” is included in the structure of the category of discursively caused genre. So, for example, in the political discourse, the genre of oral public speaking is implemented by the politician, the genre of inaugural address (oral genres) and the genre of political poster, the genre of leaflets (written genres); in educational discourse – the genre of report, lecture (oral) and genre of composition, exercises (written).

It is the maximum level of spontaneity, the concreteness of addressing and the synchronicity of the spatial-temporal interaction of participants in everyday discourses; as the qualities of oral everyday communication it determine the discursive genre structure, which is based on primary speech genres.

### III. RESULTS

The text formation in everyday discourses is distinguished by the maximum freedom of choice of language means, they are characterized by “a minimum of speech restrictions” [3: 175]. Considering the issue of the functional and stylistic design of everyday discourses, it should be noted that the speech environment of everyday life – as a set of everyday discourses – is shaped by the speech means of various forms of the national language: everyday-conversational style of the literary language, dialect speech, urban colloquial speech, social and professional jargon. Defining the extralinguistic features of the everyday-conversational style of a literary language M.N. Kozhina, L.R. Duskaeva, V.A. Salimovsky denotes the following conditions for its formation: “informality and ease of communication; direct participation of speakers in the conversation; unpreparedness of speech, its automatism; the prevailing oral form of communication, and usually dialogue (oral monologue is possible, too).

The more usual area of such communication is everyday” [8: 433]. These extra-linguistic conditions for the formation of this style determine its following features: “relaxed and even familiar character of speech (and individual language units), deep ellipticity, concretized (and not conceptual) character of speech, discontinuity and inconsistency from a logical point of view, emotional and evaluative informativity and affectivity” [8: 433].

Such a characteristic, emphasizing the conditions for the formation of a functional style, can certainly be attributed to the texts of everyday communication not only of the literary language, but also of its other forms. Thus, from the point of view of the conditions of the functional and stylistic design of texts, everyday communication in the sociolinguistic aspect is not differentiated. As a result, the presented M.N. Kozhina, L.R. Duskaeva, V.A. Salimovsky's description of the stylistic features of texts of the everyday-spoken style of a literary

language can be applied to the most diverse sociolinguistic respects to everyday discourses (participants of which can be carriers of not only a literary language, but also urban colloquial speech and dialect).

L.P. Krysin repeatedly notes in his works that currently “members of the same language community, owning different communication subsystems — languages, dialects, styles — use one or the other subsystem depending on the social functions of communication” [9: 468]. So, for example, persons owning “a dialect and (as a result of education) literary language rarely use these forms in the same situations” [9: 470]. Consequently, specific linguistic multilevel markers of dialect and city coloration as forms of the national language acquire the status of stylistic resources.

Understanding the functional style as a functionally determined form of speech behavior, organized according to the principle of speech system (by M.N. Kozhina), we note that with some qualitative difference in the stylistic resources of everyday-conversational style of the literary language from the corresponding linguistic forms of the dialect and urban simplicity, the patterns of functioning the indicated language means are generally the same. Moreover, in modern society, where universal secondary education is compulsory for all its members, possession of a literary language has ceased to be a property of a limited (albeit significant in volume) part of the society, and almost all non-literary forms of the national language are subject to the “leveling influence of the literary language” [10: 103]. Thus, there is an active convergence of stylistic forms of everyday life, both in terms of their speech consistency and stylistic resources. All this allows us to talk about the functional and stylistic commonality of the texts of a wide variety of everyday discourses.

Such an approach, which actualizes the functional similarity of speech design of various spheres of everyday communication, can be found in studies related to the analysis of the specifics of spoken language, understood as speaking communication of native speakers (including dialectal and colloquial speech, individual social groups, etc.). So, B.I. Osipov, G.A. Bobrova, N.A. Imedadze, G.A. Krivozubova, M.P. Odintsova, A.A. Yunakovskaya considered a colloquial speech as “an extensive stylistic layer of linguistic material, including part of the literary and all non-literary varieties of the national language. In other words, conceptually colloquial speech is a stylistic concept, and ontologically it includes everything that exists in direct communication: the colloquial style of literary speech, urban vernacular, rural vernacular (which, in our opinion, is still being formed in Russian), dialects, social and professional jargons” [11: 13].

Thus, characterizing the stylistic design of everyday discourses, we proceed from the fact that the discourses of everyday communication of carriers of various forms of the national language in modern society demonstrate significant similarities in the stylistic design of the textual component; functionally the determined form of everyday speech behavior can be designated as a style of everyday communication,

opposed to institutional communication styles, in the functional style considered as book styles of a literary language.

From the standpoint of discourse analysis, the functional style is the carrier of the “specified linguistic image of knowledge” [5: 73] - in this case, everyday knowledge. According to O.G. Revzina, “when comparing scientific and everyday discourse it is clearly seen: the same realities (for example, related to diseases, weather, trade) are called in these discourses in very different ways, thereby indicating to participants of discursive existence a way of speaking behavior them communicative situations” [5: 73]. In general, the functional and stylistic design of everyday discourses can be designated as the style of everyday communication. This form of speech behavior for native speakers is a kind of signal environment prescribing a certain form of discursive behavior, free from institutional frameworks.

This category was highlighted by O.G. Revzina in the framework of the analysis of the features of the functioning of discourse formations in the light of M. Foucault's theory [5]. As a significant aspect of the discourse differentiation, O.G. Revzina notes “the degree of manifestation of the ability to be an intertextual donor or receiver of an intertextual investment” [5: 66]. Similarly, it proposes to characterize the types of discourses of V.I. Karasik. But if O.G. Revzina focuses on the potential of discourses, then V.I. Karasik draws attention to the corpus of specific precedent texts of discourse [1], each of which is interpreted by O.G. Revzina [5] as intertextual mark.

According to O.G. Revzina intertextual marks (intertextual attachments) cover three areas of (connotative) meaning: (1) “individual experience of human existence (individual, or personal intertexts)” [5: 17] (individual “quotation fund” of memory, according to B.M. Gasparov [12: 106]), (2) “well-known intertexts” [5: 17] and (3) language intertexts related to functional styles. The latter “are characterized by the joint appearance of linguistic characteristics set that make up the linguistic appearance of functional styles as varieties of discourse” [5,13].

The textual component of everyday discourses has the property of actively using intertextual characters, both non-discourse and those born within this discourse. The locality of the goals of everyday discourse, the non-codified nature of communication patterns, and the intrinsic value of communication create a special need for relaying speech actions within the framework of this discourse: knowledge concerning with “I” as private person designed for intertextual distribution (through citation, retelling, representation in the form of rumors, gossips, etc.) primarily within the same everyday discourse” [5: 68]. Inside the discourses of everyday life, all kinds of intertextual signs are active.

Texts born in the discourses of everyday life, characterized by “a minimum of speech restrictions” [3: 175], easily allow the penetration of non-discursive formulas and precedent texts. This feature distinguishes them from institutional discourses, the content and textual structure of which is clearly

defined by social attitudes. Thus, one of the reasons for the interdiscursive activity of everyday discourses is the lack of an institutional framework in their textual organization.

Other reasons are related, firstly, to the thematic unlimitness of everyday communication and the need to use non-discursive speech models when addressing the topics that are fixed in them (including when addressing topics generated by social, professional discursive practices).

Thus, everyday discourses have a high level of intertextual activity, which is primarily explained by the freedom from the institutional framework, which ensures the openness of the penetration boundaries of non-text and non-discursive encloses..

#### IV. CONCLUSION

As a special type of activity, everyday discourse is primarily opposed to institutional discourses. Within the stated categories of discourse formation, it is characterized by non-institutional principles of association of participants, locality of goals, values of extra-institutional unity and awareness of their personal position in a mini group, openness of the thematic structure, chronotop universality, the availability of psychological attitudes of participants of discourse free from institutional frameworks of communication, primacy of communicative strategies and genres speech communication, functional and stylistic design of speech components in the form of style of everyday communication, as well as a special intertextual activity.

The specificity of everyday discourse lies in the high level of its variability, which ensures the inhomogeneity of its structure, represented by a concretely situational variety of individual everyday discourses.

#### References

- [1] Karasik V.I. Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse. M.: Gnosis. 2004, 390.
- [2] Silantyev I.V. Newspaper and novel: The rhetoric of discourse mixes. M.: Languages of Slavic culture. 2006, 224.
- [3] Makarov M.L. Fundamentals of discourse theory. M.: ITDGG "Gnosis". 2003, 280.
- [4] Kibrik A.A. Modus, genre and other parameters of the classification of discourses. Questions of linguistics. 2009, 2, pp. 3-21.
- [5] Revzina O.G. Discourse and discursive formations. Criticism and semiotics. 2005, 8, pp. 66-78.
- [6] Orlova N.V. Conversation genres and their “stylistic processing”: on the issue of the relationship between style and genre. Speech genres. Saratov. 1997. pp. 51-56.
- [7] Lebedeva N.B, Zyryanova E.G, Plaksina N.Yu., Tyukayeva N.I. Natural writing genres: Student graffiti, marginal pages of notebooks, private note. M.: KRASAND. 2011. 256.
- [8] Kozhina, M.N., Duskaeva, L.R., Salimovsky V.A. The style of the Russian language. M.: Flint: Science. 2008, 463.
- [9] Krysin L.P. Possessing different subsystems of the language as a phenomenon of diglossia. Russian word, one's own and someone else's: Studies in the modern Russian language and sociolinguistics. M. 2004, pp. 468-474.
- [10] Krysin L.P. On the prospects of sociolinguistic research in Russian. Russian Studies. Berlin. 1992, 2, pp. 96-10.
- [11] Osipov B.I., Bobrova G.A., Imedadze N.A., Krivozubova G.A., Odintsova M.P., Yunakovskaya A.A. Lexicographic description of the national-spoken language of the modern city: theoretical aspects. Omsk: Om. state Univ. 1994, 144.

- [12] Aleksandr S. Kuznetsov. Russian Professor's meeting. Russian Journal of Physical Education and Sport. 2019, 14(1), pp. 17-22. DOI: 10.14526/2070-4798-2019-14-1-18-24
- [13] Gasparov B.M. Language, memory, image: Linguistics of language existence. M.: New Literary Review. 1996, 352.