



# CENTRAL ASIAN JOURNAL OF LITERATURE, PHILOSOPHY AND CULTURE

eISSN: 2660-6828 | Volume: 04 Issue: 03 Mar 2023  
<https://cajlp.ccentralasianstudies.org>

## On the Definition of the Concept of “Hybrid Discourse”

*Alimova Zilola Saydarifovna*  
*Researcher of the UzSWLU*  
*zilola2410@mail.ru*

*Received 25<sup>th</sup> Jan 2023, Accepted 24<sup>th</sup> Feb 2023, Online 6<sup>th</sup> Mar 2023*

### ANNOTATION

The state policy in the domain of security, defense and military organizations is the guarantor of state development as an independent and full-fledged member of the world community. Under current conditions national military policy affects all areas of the state. Military reality has been beyond interests of military specialists and extended over the other areas of social life. The article highlights hybrid forms of discourse and various definitions to it, given while being studied by many scientists and researchers.

**KEYWORDS:** hybrid discourse, manipulative function, institutional discourse, discursive analysis.

Despite the close attention of domestic and foreign researchers to the issue of discourse classification, hybrid discourse studies can still be measured in a meaningful way.

In foreign literature, the concept of “hybrid discourse” is associated primarily with the academic environment, and in one of the first references, hybrid discourse is interpreted as “a mixture of non-academic discourses with traditional academic discourses” [1; 21p].

The author of the study argues that modern students do not need to be guided by the norms of exclusively traditional academic discourse, but should experiment by creating “hybrid forms” [same source]. Similar views on the nature of academic discourse are characteristic of French researchers who argues that “university discourse can be viewed as a hybrid discourse that combines scientific and didactic” [2; 1-16p].

K. Wilkinson points out that “hybrid academic discourse includes two different discourses - classical literary English, as well as a discourse that is traditionally not accepted in academic circles” [3; 2p]. At the same time, the author positively assesses the use of hybrid discourse, since “people are often familiar with several types of discourse and do not necessarily adhere to any particular one, that gives rise to hybrid discursive forms in which, not always smoothly, different language practices from different types of discourse are mixed” [same source].

Hence, it can be assumed that hybrid discourse contributes to the implementation of the manipulative function inherent in institutional discourses: in particular, the use of hybrid types of discourse is necessary to expand the target audience and is designed to increase the likelihood that the message will be understood by the recipients.

This idea is confirmed in the article by K. Resch [4;1-29p], devoted to the study of the discourse of The Economist, which she characterizes as “a hybrid discourse located at the junction of journalistic, popular and didactic types of discourse”. This feature is primarily related to the goals of the publication itself, which are to “spread knowledge and inform” readers [same source].

Particular definition of a hybrid construction, which belongs to the Russian philosopher M.M. Bakhtin: “A hybrid construction is a statement that, by its grammatical (syntactic) and compositional features, belongs to one speaker, however, in reality combines two statements, two manners of speech, two styles, two “languages”, two semantic and axiological systems of views” [5; 77p]. Thus, thanks to hybridization, a whole series of discourses is created in a hierarchical form [same source].

F. Banda and O. Oketch also note the hierarchy peculiar to hybrid types of discourse. In their study, the authors agree that the interaction of African institutions influenced by the West and the English language with the local population, which uses the languages traditional for the given territory, generates hybrid discourses that combine local and international discursive practices [6; 181-200]. According to the authors, it is due to the use of hybrid discourses that it is possible to “minimize the differences associated with unequal access to power, as well as smooth out social differences” [same source].

This property of hybrid discourse can be characterized as neutralizing, which is confirmed in the article by A. Salam, who, examining the speech of President B. Obama, puts forward an assumption about the hybridization of political and religious discourse in order to “legitimize B. Obama’s political intentions to reconcile Americans and Muslims all over the world” [7; 223p].

Following their foreign colleagues, domestic researchers also note that “currently popular discursive and communicative practices tend to hybridize and converge” [8; 141p]. Moreover, according to A.A. Kibrik, the further development of discursive analysis as a scientific discipline is largely associated with the study of “combinatorics of discourse types” [9; 16p].

Unlike foreign researchers who initially studied hybrid types of discourse in the academic environment, in contemporary science, the study of hybrid discourses is often directly related to the political life of society.

Despite insufficient attention to the characterization of hybrid types of discourse in general, a number of works attempt to determine their place in the general classification of discourse using the example of military-political and military-journalistic discourses [10; 135-139p, 11; 15-21p, 12; 219-222p]. So, under the “hybridity” of discourse, researchers understand “a set of components of various institutional formats of discourse, the concentration and interpenetration of which can vary significantly” [13; 221p].

T.V. Dubrovskaya notes that “hybridity of discourse is not a mixture of styles, but a mixture at the level of ways to carry out socially significant actions, due to certain social factors” [14; 25-35p].

It should be noted that both definitions emphasize the institutional nature of hybrid discourses, from which their hierarchy stems. It is argued that “peripheral discourse most of all has hybridity due to the blurring of the boundaries between social institutions, and, consequently, between their respective discourses” [15; 190-194p]. At the same time, peripheral discourse is understood as “communication between a representative of an institution and someone who does not belong to this institution” [16; 193p, 17; 17-34p].

It should be noted that V.I. Karasik links the institutional nature of hybrid discourse with the existence of social institutions that popularize knowledge in certain thematic areas [18; 88-94p]. The content of the hybrid discourse is often “the subject field of the relevant field of knowledge, and the format is a special type of

media communication, focused on the transfer of adapted information for a particular population group" [same source].

The following statement confirms the assumption about the so-called "explanatory" property of hybrid discourse, due to which communication is established between public institutions and their clients.

Thus, we can conclude that the theory of hybrid discourse needs further development due to the insufficient number of domestic and foreign studies on this issue. Nevertheless, certain analogies are already traced in the views of domestic and foreign scientists on the nature of hybrid discourse, which are expressed as follows:

- 1) hybrid discourse belongs to institutional discourse;
- 2) hybrid discourse is hierarchical in nature;
- 3) "hybridity" of discourse is manifested in the combination of two or more discourses.

The question of the ratio of the original types of discourse in the resulting hybrid discourse remains open. We assume that we are talking about the existence of the so-called discourse-base and discourse-addition, the degree of interpenetration of which determines the specifics of the resulting discourse.

Further research on hybrid discourse should be focused on the most important types of discourse that affect the fundamental issues of society: we are talking about military-political and military journalistic types of discourse that address global issues of war and peace.

## References

1. Hebb, J. Mixed forms of academic discourse: a continuum of language possibility / J. Hebb // Journal of basic writing. – 2002. – № 2. – P. 21–36.
2. Carras, C. Transmission de contenus disciplinaires en contextes universitaires: une illustration au travers de cours magistraux / C. Carras, S. Courchinoux // Le français sur objectifs universitaires: perspectives théoriques et réalité du terrain. – 2014. – № 1. – P. 1–16.
3. Wilkinson, C. "Getting Things 'Alt' Enough": A Rhetorical Analysis of Composition Scholars' Use of Hybrid Academic Discourse / C. Wilkinson. – Auburn : Auburn University Press, 2009. – 82 p.
4. Resche, C. The Economist discours de spécialité économique ou discours sur l'économie? / C. Resche // Revue de l'Institut des langues et cultures d'Europe, Amérique, Afrique, Asie et Australie. – 2009. – № 11. – P. 1–29.
5. Бахтин, М.М. Философская эстетика 1920-х годов / М.М. Бахтин. – М. : Русские словари, 2003. – 957 с.
6. Banda, F. What can we say when the English used has gone so high-tech?:institutionalised discourse and interaction in development projects in a rural community in Kenya / F. Banda, O. Oketch// Journal of Multicultural Discourses. – 2009. – № 4 (2). – P. 165–181.
7. Salama, A. The rhetoric of collocational, intertextual and institutional pluralization in Obama's Cairo speech: a discourse-analytical approach / A. Salama // Critical Discourse Studies. – 2012. – № 9 (3). – P. 211–229.
8. Иванова, С.В. Актовая речь как гибридная полидискурсивная практика / С.В. Иванова // Вестник Рос. ун-та дружбы народов. Серия: Лингвистика. – 2017. – № 1. – С. 141–160.

9. Кибрик, А.А. Модус, жанр и другие параметры классификации дискурсов / А.А. Кибрик // Вопросы языкознания. – 2009. – № 3. – С. 1–19.
10. Солопова, О.А. Битва прошлого, битва за прошлое: «Курская Дуга» в военно-публицистическом дискурсе союзников / О.А. Солопова, М.С. Салтыкова // Взаимодействие языков и культур: материалы междунар. науч. конф. – Челябинск : Южно-Урал. гос. ун-т, 2018. – С. 135–139.
11. Солопова, О.А. Гибридные форматы дискурса: проблемы классификации / О.А. Солопова, К.А. Наумова // Филологический класс. – 2018а. – № 4 (54). – С. 15–21.
12. Солопова, О.А. Проект «Уральский регион в военно-публицистическом дискурсе периода Великой Отечественной войны»: интеграция научной и образовательной деятельности / О.А. Солопова, М.С. Салтыкова // Когнитивные стратегии филологического образования в России и за рубежом : сб. науч. ст. по итогам Всерос. науч.-практ. конф.. – Екатеринбург : Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2019а. – С. 219–222.
13. Солопова, О.А. Проект «Уральский регион в военно-публицистическом дискурсе периода Великой Отечественной войны»: интеграция научной и образовательной деятельности / О.А. Солопова, М.С. Салтыкова // Когнитивные стратегии филологического образования в России и за рубежом : сб. науч. ст. по итогам Всерос. науч.-практ. конф.. – Екатеринбург : Урал. гос. пед. ун-т, 2019а. – С. 219–222.
14. Дубровская, Т.В. Интервью с судьями как гибридный тип дискурса / Т.В. Дубровская // Юрислингвистика. – 2010. – № 10. – С. 25–35.
15. Хотног, А.В. Природа гибридного дискурса (на материале французского языка) / А.В. Хотног // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2019. – № 8. – С. 190–194.
16. Карасик, В.И. Дискурсология как направление коммуникативной лингвистики / В.И. Карасик // Актуальные проблемы филологии и педагогической лингвистики. – 2016. – № 1. – С. 17–34.
17. Карасик, В.И. Трансформация знания в современную эпоху: лингвокультурный аспект / В.И. Карасик // Известия Волгоград. гос. пед. унта. – 2017. – № 3. – С. 88–94.