LINGUISTIC DIFFERENCE BETWEEN PROFESSIONAL
AND NON-PROFESSIONAL DISCOURSE

Berlinskyi Yu. V.

Postgraduate Student at the Department of English Philology
Izmail State University of Humanities
Repin str., 12, Izmail, Odesa region, Ukraine
orcid.org/0000-0002-9702-0774
yurii.berlinskyi@gmail.com

The article analyzes the current approaches to the definition of the concepts of "professional discourse" and "non-professional discourse" in modern linguistics. Discourse research in the article is carried out within the framework of the sociolinguistic approach. The problems of the article are in demand in modern linguistics, since the status of professional discourse today becomes the subject of many domestic and foreign studies, and the particular provisions of this topic, like the basic terminology, are still becoming the subject of active scientific discussions, which leads to the lack of unified definitions and standardized categories on this topic. The object of research is discourse; the subject of research is the definition of the concepts of "professional discourse" and "non-professional discourse". The views of various scholars on the concept of professional discourse are investigated, its boundaries are determined. The structure of professional discourse and the requirements to it are put forward by different linguists are studied. The criteria of discourse, established by scientists, are considered, and the absence of the possibility to establish the uniform criteria for this phenomenon is studied. The approaches of linguists to classify discourse are analyzed. The correlation of professional and institutional discourse in modern linguistics is analyzed. On the basis of the presented analysis, the common in the interpretations of professional and non-professional discourses and the lines of difference in modern linguistics are established. The components that make it possible to consider the discourse as professional and obligatory for such a classification are highlighted. The definition of the notion "non-professional discourse" is given. The possibility of the transition of one type of professional discourse to another in the conditions of the transition of key elements of discourse is considered. The functions of non-professional discourse are analyzed and the main such functions are compared with the functions of professional discourse.

ЛІНГВІСТИЧНІ ВІДМІННОСТІ
ПРОФЕСІЙНОГО ТА НЕПРОФЕСІЙНОГО ДИСКУРУ

Берлінський Ю. В.

аспірант кафедри англійської філології
Ізмаїльського державного гуманітарного університету
вул. Репіна, 12, Ізмаїл, Одеська область, Україна
orcid.org/0000-0002-9702-0774
yurii.berlinskyi@gmail.com

Ключові слова: *дискурс, інституційний дискурс, професійний дискурс, непрофесійний дискурс, професійна комунікація.*

У статті аналізуються актуальні підходи до визначення понять «професійний дискурс» і «непрофесійний дискурс» в сучасній лінгвістиці. Дослідження дискурсу у статті проводиться в межах соціолінгвістичного підходу. Проблематика статті є затребуваною в сучасній лінгвістиці, оскільки сьогодні професійний дискурс стає предметом безлічі вітчизняних і зарубіжних досліджень, а приватні положення цієї теми, як і базова термінологія, все ще стають предметом активних наукових дискусій, що призводить до відсутності уніфікованих визначень і стандартизованих категорій в цій темі. Об'єктом дослідження є дискурс, предметом дослідження – визначення понять «професійний дискурс» і «непрофесійний дискурс». Досліджуються погляди різних учених на поняття професійного дискурсу, визначаються його межі. Вивчаються структура професійного дискурсу і вимоги до нього, висунуті різними лінгвістами. Розглядаються критерії дискурсу, встановлені вченими, і вивчається відсутність можливості висунути єдині критерії до цього феномена. Вивчаються підходи лінгвістів до класифікації дискурсу. Аналізується співвіднесеність професійного та інституційного дискурсу в сучасній лінгвістиці. На основі представленого аналізу встановлюється загальне та відмінне в тлумаченнях професійного і непрофесійного дискурсів в сучасній лінгвістиці. Виділяються компоненти, що дають змогу вважати дискурс професійним, та обов'язкові для такого віднесення. Надається визначення поняття «непрофесійний дискурс». Розглядається можливість переходу одного виду професійного дискурсу в інший в умовах переходу ключових елементів дискурсу. Аналізуються функції непрофесійного дискурсу і проводиться зіставлення основних таких функцій з функціями професійного дискурсу.

The development of the theory of discourses is one of the urgent areas of modern linguistics. A.V. Golodnov notes that "modern linguistics, focused on the study of the functioning of language in various spheres of human activity, refers to discourse as a basic category that integrates linguistic and social practices" [1, p. 312]. Today there are many studies of individual discourses – medical, journalistic, pedagogical, legal, military, sports and others, but the problem of professional discourse is far from exhausted and still remains in the center of attention of philologists. Discourse research is carried out in the framework of the sociolinguistic approach. The object of our research is discourse; the subject of research is the definition of the concepts of "professional discourse" and "non-professional discourse".

The purpose of the research presented in the article is to clarify the essence of the concepts of "professional discourse" and "non-professional discourse", for which to describe the general in the interpretations of professional and non-professional discourses and to establish the features of differences in them.

In modern linguistic literature, it is possible to find a fairly large number of definitions of the concept of "discourse", but a single terminological definition, which would be fixed in all special dictionaries and reference books, has not yet been developed. In support of this, we are quoting N.V. Egorshina: "The definition of discourse, which could be considered exhaustive and which would be of a terminological nature, has not yet been developed, because this is an "interdisciplinary" phenomenon and it is not important what terminology the developer of the method uses,

on what theoretical positions he is, and the very result to which he comes is important. It should be noted that the discourse is understood by researchers very broadly: it is a manifestation, reflection, phenomenon of culture" [2, p. 121].

The ambiguity of approaches to the definition of the concept of "discourse" and the uncertainty of the boundaries of this concept is also evidenced by the fact that this term is identified with adjacent linguistic concepts, which was pointed out by T.M. Nikolaeva back in 1978: "Discourse is a polysemantic term of text linguistics, used by a number of authors in almost homonymous meanings. The most important of them are: 1) coherent text; 2) oral and spoken form of the text; 3) dialogue; 4) a group of statements related to each other in meaning; 5) a speech work as a given – written or oral" [3, p. 467].

Discourse is also understood in different ways. T.V. Yezhova notes that there are three approaches to understanding discourse: "1) discourse as a text, actualized under certain conditions, taking into account extralinguistic parameters (in linguistics); 2) discourse as communication, realized in the course of certain discursive practices (in sociology, social semiotics and political science); 3) discourse as a type of speech communication (in logic, philosophy, sociology, communication theory)" [4, p. 52]; and in pedagogy, in her opinion, it is possible to understand discourse as a context: "discourse is always interpreted within a certain context" [4, p. 52].

According to our observations, most researchers in defining the concept of "discourse" proceed from the definition of N.D. Arutyunova: "discourse is a coherent text in combination with extralinguistic (pragmatic, socio-cultural, psychological, etc.) factors" [5, p. 136–137]. Uniform criteria on the basis of which one or another type of discourse could be distinguished have not yet been established. Researcher M.A. Silanova points out this feature: "Discourses can be distinguished on the basis of many different grounds, for example, the relevance of one or another "narrow" type of communication (legal, pedagogical, medical discourse); chronotope (discourse of restructuring); way of communication (written and oral discourse); any social or ideological unity of the speakers (feminist, Marxist discourse), etc. It is not possible to form a closed taxonomy of discourses like a system of styles. The plurality of interpretations of the concept itself leaves room for the classification of discourses, since everyone is free to choose their own classification grounds for highlighting a particular discourse" [6, p. 30–31].

Despite the absence of a unified classification, most studies use the typology of discourses developed by V.I. Karasik from the standpoint of sociolinguistics, which "involves the analysis of communication participants as representatives of a particular social group and analysis of the circumstances of communication in a wide socio-cultural context" [7, p. 5]. Taking into account these criteria, two types of discourse are distinguished: personal (personality-oriented) and institutional, which is defined by the scientist as follows: "Institutional discourse is communication within the given framework of status-role relations. Institutional discourse is distinguished on the basis of two system-forming characteristics: goals and participants in communication" [7, p. 5].

Further, on the basis of the components identified by V.I. Karasik, such as participants, chronotope, goals, strategies, genres, etc., it is possible to describe specific types of institutional discourse: military, business, diplomatic, medical, pedagogical, political, religious, legal and others [7, p. 5–20]. What is the relationship between institutional and professional discourses?

To answer this question, let us point out the following: "Institutional discourse is a discourse carried out in public institutions, communication in which is an integral part of their organization. A social institution outwardly is a collection of persons, institutions, supplied with certain material resources and carrying out a specific social function. Understanding a social institution allows us to outline the main parameters of institutional discourse: a set of communication situations (speech events) typical for a given sphere, an idea of typical models of speech behavior in the performance of certain social roles, a certain (limited) topic of communication, a specific set of intentions and arising from them "speech strategies" [8, p. 59–60].

Professional discourse means "verbally mediated communication as a process of controlled interaction of subjects of professional activity, characterized by a certain set of norms, stereotypes of thinking and behavior. Professional discourse is a kind of institutional or socially oriented discourse. The number of varieties of professional discourses corresponds to the number of identified professional spheres of activity" [9, p. 32–33].

As you can see, professional discourse is defined as a kind of institutional discourse. An attempt to theoretically distinguish between these two concepts – institutional discourse and professional discourse – was made by A.O. Stebletsova, who, based on an analysis of various approaches to the definition and interpretation of these concepts in domestic and foreign linguistics, came to the following conclusion: "in the domestic theory of discourse the conceptual/substantive scope of the concept of institutional discourse turns out to be as broad as possible and includes the concept of professional discourse, or rather, institutional discourse is the very stencil (the term belongs to V.I. Karasik) that structures any professional communication to varying degrees of rigidity / standardization" [10, p. 28].

Professional discourse is realized in the process of professional communication – a type of communication, "which is characterized by the presence of supra-situational goals, common knowledge and perception of communicants, stereotyped communication situations. The main difference between professional communication and other types of communication (everyday, family, folk, etc.) is that it is initially included in the context of professional activity" [9, p. 35].

The main task of professional communication, according to E.I. Golovanova, is "the creation, storage, processing and transmission of information, the optimal organization of interaction in the process of activity, the assessment of activities to improve its efficiency, maintenance of cooperative and corporate characteristics of activities" [9, p. 34]. For the discourse to be recognized as professional, the following components are necessary: the sphere of professional activity, the participants in communication – specialists or a specialist or another person, the community of knowledge of the communicants, the stereotype of the communication situation proceeding in accordance with the rules and standards adopted in this professional environment, the motive of which is to complete the task for a socially significant result [11, p. 34].

In the professional communication of specialists, special linguistic units of a given field of activity must necessarily be present: terms, speech clichés, stable syntactic constructions, etc. But our life is characterized by the fact that very often elements of professional discourse, for example, terms, speech clichés, are used in non-professional discourse. For example, legal terminology is often present in the media: in newspapers, magazines, television, radio, etc. The same can be said about the penetration of elements of sports, political, medical, pedagogical and other discourses into everyday discourse. What, then, is the difference between non-professional discourse and professional one?

Professional discourse is a type of institutional discourse that is understood as a "coherent text" in conjunction with those extralinguistic factors that are determined by the speaker's professional activity: a set of oral and written texts generated by a linguistic person in professional communication. Consequently, non-professional discourse is a discourse that should also be understood as a "coherent text" in conjunction with those extralinguistic factors that are not related to the speaker's professional activity. Thus, non-professional discourse lacks such mandatory components as "communication of specialists", "professional activity", "professional environment", "standard of communication", etc.

However, an important question remains: in the case of using, for example, legal terms characteristic of the discourse of the same name, in a different environment (for example, in publicistic discourse), will the nature of professional discourse change?

We agree with the opinion of A.F. Kolyaseva, who states, that it seems impossible to talk about the boundaries between terminological and non-terminological vocabulary in a language without taking into account the characteristics of the speaker in accordance with the proposed model. The assignment of a lexical unit to a term or word of an everyday language is made depending on the speaker's professional affiliation and his communicative intentions [12, p. 13].

Based on the definition of legal discourse (for example, this: "legal discourse as a kind of institutional discourse is a status-oriented interaction of its participants in accordance with the system of role prescriptions and norms of behavior in certain legal situations of institutional communication" [13, p. 535]), in the publicist text there are elements of legal discourse, but at the same time, there, most often, are no professional participants in legal discourse; secondly, the strategic positions of specialists – participants in status-oriented interaction are not indicated; and thirdly, there is no speech specialists in a professional legal language; fourthly, the elements of the legal language listed above are not used in the system of institutional relations in which speakers could be included. Therefore, in our opinion, in this case we can talk not about professional legal discourse and not even about the special use of the legal language, but about informing readers, about popularizing legal knowledge, about promoting legal culture, about explanatory work among the population on legal issues, etc.

Summing up, it can be noted that professional discourse is a type of institutional discourse, which is understood as a "coherent text" in combination with those extralinguistic factors that are due to the speaker's professional activity: a set of oral and written texts generated by a linguistic personality in professional communication.

Consequently, non-professional discourse is a discourse that should also be understood as a "coherent text" in conjunction with those extralinguistic factors that are not related to the speaker's professional activity. Thus, non-professional discourse lacks such mandatory components as "communication of specialists", "professional activity", "professional environment", "standard of communication", etc.

Non-professional discourse differs from professional discourse in that it lacks the structural components of institutional (= professional) discourse: an idea of the social mission of this institution, a normative model of typical event-based status-role communication, a system of basic values, strategies and genres of this type of discourse. In other words, non-professional discourse lacks

typical events, typical participants, chronotopes, status relations are not confirmed, and officially accepted norms of communication, or regulations, and traditional forms of communication are not observed. Nevertheless, non-professional discourse may contain special discursive formulas (professional clichés, phraseology) and elements of a professional language – terms and terminological combinations. But the communication situation is not related to the professional activities of the communicants. Non-professional discourse also has its own audience, but in such cases it is accordingly unofficial.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Голоднов А.В. Риторический метадискурс: основания прагмалингвистического моделирования и социокультурной реализации (на материале современного немецкого языка) : монография. Санкт-Петербург : Астерион, 2011. 344 с.
2. Егоршина Н.В. Нарративный дискурс: семиологический и лингвокультурологический аспекты интерпретации : дисс. … канд. филол. наук. Тверь, 2012. 308 с.
3. Николаева Т.М. Краткий словарь терминов лингвистики текста. *Новое в зарубежной лингвистике*. Вып. 8 : Лингвистика текста. Москва : Прогресс, 2008. С. 467–472.
4. Ежова Т.В. К проблеме изучения педагогического дискурса. *Вестник ОГУ*. 2016. № 2. Т. 1 : Гуманитарные науки. С. 52–56.
5. Арутюнова Н. Д. Дискурс. Лингвистический энциклопедический словарь. 2010. С. 136–137.
6. Силанова М.А. Медиатизация юридических терминов в дискурсе современных СМИ : дисс. … канд. филол. наук. Москва, 2016. 260 с.
7. Карасик В.И. О типах дискурса. Языковая личность: институциональный и персональный дискурс. Волгоград : Перемена, 2000. С. 5–20.
8. Шейгал Е.И. Семиотика политического дискурса : дисс. … докт. филол. наук. Волгоград, 2000. 440 с.
9. Голованова Е.И. Профессиональный дискурс, субдискурс, жанр профессиональной коммуникации: соотношение понятий. *Вестник Челябинского государственного университета*. 2013. № 1 (292). С. 32–35.
10. Стеблецова А.О. Национальная специфика делового дискурса в сфере высшего образования (на материале англоязычной и русскоязычной письменной коммуникации) : дисс. … докт. филол. наук. Воронеж, 2015. 500 с.
11. Шатурная Е.А. Профессионально-ориентированный дискурс как объект овладения в неязыковом вузе. URL: https://psibook.com/linguistics/professionalno-orientirovannyy-diskurs-kak-obekt-ovladeniya-v-neyazykovom-vuze.html (date of accessed: 01.04.2020).
12. Колясева А.Ф. Терминология в зеркале обыденного и профессионального языкового сознания : дисс. … канд. филол. наук. Москва, 2014. 327 с.
13. Палашевская И.В. Функции юридического дискурса и действия его участников. *Известия Самарского научного центра Российской академии наук*. 2010. Т. 12. № 5 (2). С. 535–540.
14. Русакова О.Ф. PR-Дискурс: теоретико-методологический анализ. Екатеринбург : УрО РАН, Институт международных связей, 2018. 340 с.
15. Чепкина Е.В. Русский журналистский дискурс: текстопорождающие практики и коды : автореф. дисс. … докт. филол. наук. Екатеринбург, 2000. 38 с.

REFERENCES

1. Golodnov, A.V. (2011). Ritoricheskiy metadiskurs: osnovaniya pragmalingvisticheskogo modelirovaniya i sotsiokul'turnoy realizatsii (na materiale sovremennogo nemetskogo yazyka) [Rhetorical Metadiscourse: Foundations of Pragmalinguistic Modeling and Sociocultural Realization (Based on the Material of the Modern German Language)]. *Asterion*. 344 p.
2. Egorshina, N.V. (2012). Narrativnyy diskurs: Semiologicheskiy i lingvokul'turologicheskiy aspekty interpretatsii [Narrative discourse: Semiological and linguoculturological aspects of interpretation]. [Doctoral dissertation, *Tver University*]. 308 p.
3. Nikolaeva, T.M. (2008). Kratkiy slovar' terminov lingvistiki teksta. Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike. [Brief dictionary of terms of text linguistics. New in foreign linguistics]. Issue 8. *Linguistics of the text. Progress*. P. 467–472.
4. Yezhova, T.V. (2016). K probleme izucheniya pedagogicheskogo diskursa [To the problem of studying pedagogical discourse]. *OSU Bulletin*. No. 2. Humanities. P. 52–56.
5. Arutyunova, N.D. (2010). Diskurs. Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar'. [Discourse. Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]. P. 136–137.

6. Silanova, M.A. (2016). Mediatizatsiya yuridicheskikh terminov v diskurse sovremennykh SMI. [Mediatization of legal terms in the discourse of modern media]. [PhD dissertation, *Moscow Humanitarian University*]. 260 p.

7. Karasik, V.I. (2000). O tipakh diskursa. YAzykovaya lichnost': institutsional'nyy i personal'nyy diskurs. [About the types of discourse. Linguistic personality: institutional and personal discourse]. *Change*. P. 5–20.

8. Sheigal, E.I. (2000). Semiotika politicheskogo diskursa. [Semiotics of political discourse]. [PhD dissertation, *Moscow Humanitarian University*]. 440 p.

9. Golovanova, E.I. (2013). Professional'nyy diskurs, subdiskurs, zhanr professional'noy kommunikatsii: sootnosheniye ponyatiy. [Professional discourse, subdiscourse, genre of professional communication: the relationship of concepts]. *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University*. No. 1 (292). P. 32–35.

10. Stebletsova, A.O. (2015). Natsional'naya spetsifika delovogo diskursa v sfere vysshego obrazovaniya (na materiale angloyazychnoy i russkoyazychnoy pis'mennoy kommunikatsii). [National specificity of business discourse in the field of higher education (based on the material of English-language and Russian-language written communication)]. [PhD dissertation, *Voronezh State University*]. 500 p.

11. Shaturnaya, E.A. (2021). Professional'no-oriyentirovannyy diskurs kak ob'yekt ovladeniya v neyazykovom vuze. [Professionally oriented discourse as an object of mastery in a non-linguistic university]. https://psibook.com/linguistics/professionalno-orientirovannyy-diskurs-kak-obekt-ovladeniya-v-neyazykovom-vuze.html.

12. Kolyaseva, A.F. (2014). Terminologiya v zerkale obydennogo i professional'nogo yazykovogo soznaniya. [Terminology in the mirror of everyday and professional linguistic consciousness]. [PhD dissertation, *Moscow State University*]. 327 p.

13. Palashevskaya, I.V. (2010). Funktsii yuridicheskogo diskursa i deystviya yego uchastnikov. [Functions of legal discourse and actions of its participants]. Bulletin of the Samara Scientific Center of the Russian Academy of Sciences. No. 5 (2). P. 535–540.

14. Rusakova, O.F. (2018). PR-Diskurs: Teoretiko-metodologicheskiy analiz. [PR-Discourse: Theoretical and Methodological Analysis]. *Ural Branch of the Russian Academy of Sciences, Institute of International Relations*. 340 p.

15. Chepkina, E.V. (200) Russkiy zhurnalistskiy diskurs: tekstoporozhdayushchiye praktiki i kody. [Russian journalistic discourse: text-generating practices and codes]. [PhD dissertation, *Moscow State University*]. 38 p.