ISSN:3030-332X
Impact factor: 9,493
International journal of scientific researchers

METHODOLOGICAL PRINCIPLES OF RESEARCHING MEDIA DISCOURSE

Sh.M.Parpieva

Teacher at Uzbekistan State World Languages University

Z.M.Sabiralieva

Candidate of Philological Sciences,

Senior Teacher at Osh state university

Abstract: This article examines the principal methodological foundations underpinning the linguistic study of media discourse. It argues that media discourse, as a form of socially situated communication, cannot be adequately analysed through a single method; rather, it requires a principled combination of approaches that account for the text, its conditions of production and reception, and the broader social order within which it circulates. The paper reviews five interrelated methodological principles - contextual embedding, the integration of qualitative and quantitative analysis, critical orientation, multimodal sensitivity, and analytical reflexivity- and considers their implications for empirical research design. It concludes that methodological pluralism, disciplined by theoretical coherence and transparent procedure, offers the most productive route to valid and replicable findings in media discourse studies.

Keywords: media discourse, methodology, critical discourse analysis, corpus linguistics, multimodality, context.

1. Introduction

Media discourse holds a prominent position in current research on language and communication as the press, broadcasting and digital platforms are among the main sites where social meanings are constructed, challenged and naturalized. The media language is not a neutral conduit of events; it selects, organizes, frames them and does so participating in the construction of public knowledge. Thus, the methodological equipment used for the analysis of media texts has to be able to understand their linguistic texture as well as their social functioning. The article aims to outline the methodological principles that should guide rigorous research on media discourse and to explain how these principles are transformed into concrete analytical procedures.

One problem that keeps recurring in this field is the temptation to treat the media text as a self-contained object, whose meaning can be read off its surface. In contrast, Fairclough argues that media discourse is best understood as a three dimensional phenomenon of text, discursive practice and sociocultural practice, and that analysis must therefore move constantly between these levels. From this premise flow the methodological principles outlined below.

2. The principle of contextual embedding

The first principle holds that no stretch of media language can be interpreted in isolation from its context of production and reception. Context here is understood in several senses at once: the immediate co-text, the institutional setting of the newsroom or editorial board, the genre conventions of the report, the editorial, or the interview, and the wider social and historical conjuncture. Van Dijk emphasises that the link between discourse structures and social structures is typically indirect, mediated by the cognitive and social representations of language users[1]. A methodologically sound study therefore reconstructs the relevant context rather than assuming it, documenting the source, the date, the addressee, and the communicative situation of each text. By way of illustration, an analytically constructed headline such as

[1]Teun A. van Dijk, “Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis,” Discourse & Society 4.2. 1993. 252.

"Reforms Open the Door to a New Era" cannot be evaluated for its evaluative force without knowing who utters it, for which audience, and in response to what prior discourse.

3. The principle of combining qualitative and quantitative analysis

A second principle concerns the relationship between close reading and systematic counting. Qualitative discourse analysis offers depth and interpretive nuance but is vulnerable to the charge of selecting only those examples that confirm the analyst's expectations. Fairclough and others have recognised that this risk can be mitigated by combining detailed textual interpretation with quantitative evidence about recurrent patterns[2]. The discourse-historical approach similarly advocates triangulation across data sources, theories, and methods as a safeguard against bias[3]. Corpus linguistics provides the most developed quantitative resource for this purpose: tools such as frequency lists, keyword analysis, collocation, and concordancing allow the researcher to identify which lexical and grammatical choices are statistically salient across a large body of texts[4]. Mautner demonstrates how web-based and machine-readable corpora extend the empirical reach of critical analysis while imposing new requirements of sampling and representativeness[5]. The methodological gain is reciprocal: corpus findings direct the analyst's attention to patterns worth interpreting, while qualitative analysis explains why those patterns matter.

4. The critical principle: power, ideology, and metaphor

A third principle is the critical orientation that distinguishes media discourse analysis from purely descriptive linguistics. To analyse media language critically is to ask whose interests are served by particular representations and how relations of power are sustained or challenged through them. Charteris-Black's critical metaphor analysis exemplifies this orientation by treating metaphor not as ornament but as a persuasive resource that frames issues and primes evaluation[6]. This builds upon the foundational claim of conceptual metaphor theory that metaphor structures thought as well as language[7]. When, in an analytically constructed example, economic difficulty is consistently described as a *storm* to be *weathered*, the metaphor naturalises the crisis as an external, blameless force and positions the audience as passive sufferers rather than agents. The methodological lesson is that the analyst must make such framing visible and trace its ideological work systematically rather than anecdotally.

5. The principle of multimodal sensitivity

A fourth principle responds to the fact that media meaning is rarely carried by verbal language alone. Photographs, layout, typography, colour, and the spatial organisation of the page or screen all contribute to the message. Kress and van Leeuwen's grammar of visual design provides a systematic vocabulary for analysing these resources and for understanding how image and text interact to produce

[2]Norman Fairclough, Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language, 2nd ed. London: Longman, 2010. 132–133.

[3]Martin Reisigl and Ruth Wodak, "The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA)," Methods of Critical Discourse Studies, ed. Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 3rd ed. London: Sage, 2016. 31–35.

[4]Paul Baker, Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis. London: Continuum, 2006. 10–16.

[5]Gerlinde Mautner, "Time to Get Wired: Using Web-Based Corpora in Critical Discourse Analysis," Discourse & Society 16.6. 2005. 811–813.

[6]Jonathan Charteris-Black, Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2004. 34–39.

[7]George Lakoff and Mark Johnson, Metaphors We Live By. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1980. 3–6.

composite meanings[8]. Richardson likewise insists that the analysis of newspapers must attend to the interplay of words and images within the material design of the page[9]. With the shift to digital and participatory platforms, this principle acquires further importance: social media discourse integrates text, image, hyperlink, and user interaction in ways that classical print-oriented methods do not anticipate[10]. A multimodally adequate methodology therefore specifies in advance which semiotic resources fall within the scope of analysis and how their contributions will be described.

6. The principle of reflexivity and validity

The final principle concerns the integrity of the research process itself. Because critical analysis interprets meaning, it must guard against the circularity of finding only what the analyst set out to find. Reflexivity requires that researchers make their theoretical assumptions, selection criteria, and analytical categories explicit so that others can scrutinise and, in principle, replicate the study[11]. Validity in media discourse research is strengthened by transparent corpus construction, by triangulation across methods, and by accountability to the data - that is, by grounding every interpretive claim in identifiable textual evidence. These requirements do not reduce interpretation to mechanical procedure, but they discipline it, ensuring that conclusions about ideology and power rest on demonstrable linguistic and semiotic patterns rather than on impression.

7. Conclusion

The methodological principles surveyed here - contextual embedding, the integration of qualitative and quantitative analysis, critical orientation, multimodal sensitivity, and reflexivity - are mutually reinforcing rather than alternative. Taken together, they describe a methodologically pluralist but theoretically coherent programme for the study of media discourse. The central implication for research design is that no single technique suffices: the analyst must combine close textual reading, systematic quantification, critical interpretation, and attention to multimodal form, while remaining transparent about every analytical decision. Adhering to these principles allows media discourse studies to produce findings that are at once interpretively rich and methodologically defensible, and that contribute to a fuller understanding of how the media shapes social reality.

References

1. Baker, Paul. Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis. Continuum, 2006.
2. Bell, Allan. The Language of News Media. Blackwell, 1991.
3. Charteris-Black, Jonathan. Corpus Approaches to Critical Metaphor Analysis. Palgrave Macmillan, 2004.
4. Fairclough, Norman. Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language. 2nd ed., Longman, 2010.
5. Edward Arnold. Media Discourse. 1995.

[8]Gunther Kress and Theo van Leeuwen, Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design, 2nd ed. London: Routledge, 2006. 1–14.

[9]John E. Richardson, Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2007. 15–16.

[10]Majid KhosraviNik, "Social Media Critical Discourse Studies (SM-CDS)," The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies, ed. John Flowerdew and John E. Richardson. London: Routledge, 2018. 583–585.

[11]Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, "Critical Discourse Studies: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology," Methods of Critical Discourse Studies, 3rd ed. London: Sage, 2016. 22.

6. KhosraviNik, Majid. “Social Media Critical Discourse Studies (SM-CDS).” The Routledge Handbook of Critical Discourse Studies, edited by John Flowerdew and John E. Richardson, Routledge, 2018, pp. 582–596.
7. Kress, Gunther, and Theo van Leeuwen. Reading Images: The Grammar of Visual Design. 2nd ed., Routledge, 2006.
8. Lakoff, George, and Mark Johnson. Metaphors We Live By. U of Chicago P, 1980.
9. Mautner, Gerlinde. “Time to Get Wired: Using Web-Based Corpora in Critical Discourse Analysis.” Discourse & Society, vol. 16, no. 6, 2005, pp. 809–828.
10. Reisigl, Martin, and Ruth Wodak. “The Discourse-Historical Approach (DHA).” Methods of Critical Discourse Studies, edited by Ruth Wodak and Michael Meyer, 3rd ed., Sage, 2016, pp. 23–61.
11. Richardson, John E. Analysing Newspapers: An Approach from Critical Discourse Analysis. Palgrave Macmillan, 2007.
12. van Dijk, Teun A. “Principles of Critical Discourse Analysis.” Discourse & Society, vol. 4, no. 2, 1993, pp. 249–283.Место для уравнения.
13. Wodak, Ruth, and Michael Meyer. “Critical Discourse Studies: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology.” Methods of Critical Discourse Studies, 3rd ed., Sage, 2016, pp. 1–22.