

UDC 070

К.Б. Toganbayeva

A-Farabi Kazakh National University, Kazakhstan, Almaty
E-mail: toganbayeva@gmail.com

Discourse analysis of information conflicts

It is not enough to identify the specificity of media professionals in its relation to the «external» reality, but required to consider the information as a tool for social «interaction», which largely depends on the development and resolution of conflict. Which means that media activities should be considered not just in terms of lighting function of conflict situation, but also as a way to influence this situation.

Key words: the specificity of the field of information, a tool for social «interaction», media activities.

Қ.Б. Тоғанбаева

Ақпараттық қақтығыстарды талдау дискурсы

Ақпарат саласының «сыртқы» ақиқатқа қатысты ерекшелігін анықтау жеткіліксіз, ақпаратты көп жағдайда қақтығыстың даму барысы мен шешімін айқындайтын әлеуметтік «өзара әсер етудің» құралы ретінде қарастыру қажет. Яғни, БАҚ әрекетін тек қақтығыс жағдайды баяндаушы ретінде ғана емес, осы жағдайға әсер етуші әдіс ретінде қарастыру қажет.

Түйін сөздер: ақпарат саласы, спецификасы, БАҚ қызметі.

К.Б. Тоганбаева

Дискурс анализа информационных конфликтов

Автор статьи доказывает, что недостаточно определить специфику сферы информации в ее отношении к «внешней» реальности. Следует рассмотреть информацию как инструмент социального «взаимодействия», от которого во многом зависит развитие и разрешение конфликта. То есть деятельность СМИ должна быть рассмотрена не просто с точки зрения освещения конфликтной ситуации, но и как способ влияния на эту ситуацию.

Ключевые слова: специфика сферы информации, инструмент социального «взаимодействия», деятельность СМИ.

The growing importance of the media in modern political process creates a need of theoretical understanding of the information sphere in terms of its impact on the development of socio-political conflicts. In this regard, it is not enough to identify the specificity of media professionals in its relation to the «external» reality, but required to consider the information as a tool for social «interaction», which largely depends on the development and resolution of conflict. Which means that media activities should be considered not just in terms of lighting function of conflict situation, but also as a way to influence this situation. Starting example in this case is the analysis of the situation of military

conflict proposed by New Zealand researcher Donald Mathewson. In his paper «Media discourses. Analysis of media texts, «he points to the example of the armed conflict that before joining the active phase of getting some form of messages within the media. In this case, «the war could happen if it is structured in the wording of justification and glorification». [1,4]

The above example indicates a purely metaphysical interpretation of conflict. Using facts and events of «external» reality, the media have the opportunity to represent this reality from the standpoint of its possible change. Thus the media are able to define the purpose of the political

process. It is important that the scenario of events proposed by the media, does not necessarily have to get objective evidence. The latter circumstance becomes problematic for those researchers who are considering objective information as «collateral» freedom of the individual with respect to various kinds of media manipulation. Thus, proponents of positivist approaches treat the information as a result of «reflection» objective laws and insist on the possibility of its verification. One way to verify is to use rigorous scientific methods and expertise in the formation of informational messages. However, such an approach raises the problem of correlation of various symbolic forms used in the reflection of social reality. Variety of forms of presentation contains prerequisites for the emergence of misunderstanding information by audience in cooperation with the media. «In a world where the production of information is broader than its consumption, individual attention inevitably distracted from the content of the message to its form. N. Ferkhou calls it normal interaction».[2] An example of this is the situation of» redundancy «of information flows. Its essence lies in the fact that a variety of information flows produced does not match the ability of the audience to relate these flows between them. In general, the problem of information overload set in the AV Fedorov, «Information security in the global political process» in which the author relates the theory of the crisis of the information society with the «exaggeration» value of the amount of information produced as a criterion of social development. [3, 220]

Alternative interpretation of the information presented in the theory of social constructivism. Under this theory there is connection between the process of designing information and value (moral) preferences media. In turn, the way media and audience interaction is dependent on the values and traditions that exist in society. However, in the constructivist theory says little about how valuable background information relate to the constructed reality interpreted. Raises the question of how all this reality is necessary to create an informational message. Is there replace of a social construction of those metaphysical forms of information that representatives criticized the theory of «reflection»?

Original treatment of the problem of metaphysical constructs found in the sphere of social and political relations, presented in poststructuralist discourse theory. As in the case of positivism, criticism of metaphysics poststructuralists explained the threat that metaphysical form in discourse supplant

objectivity so much that a return to this objectivity would not be possible. However, the definition of objects of discourse in post-structuralism is fundamentally different from the positivist interpretation. Thus, M. Foucault in his work «The Archaeology of Knowledge», considering the objects of discourse indicates their unstructured nature. One example for it is the totality of non-statistical data, which at the level of discursive practices are formalized and brought before a researcher text.[4, 416]

Formalizing objects of discourse involves the use of certain forms of thought and language. In contrast to the positivist understanding of post-structuralism reflection of external reality depends on the form of social and political interaction. So it is a form of discursive practice sets the value and meaning of the objects of discourse that provides communication between agents of social relations. «The reconstruction of social reality is a function of any object of discourse. Usually this is done by forming a collective identity. This function is an object of discourse – the formation of collective identity – is fundamental; the other functions may be implemented only if appealing to her as a base.»[5] As already noted, the range of values and objects of discourse are different levels of granularity. Objects can be defined as a discourse referent in relation to the values formed by discourse. Paradox poststructuralist critique of metaphysics, is the inability to go beyond criticism of metaphysical forms, explains the specifics of discursive thought. Such thinking is always associated with the need to appeal to some form of thought, where the latest – «distinction» objective and symbolic are. It is a way to distinguish the referent and its value sets the Convention on the discursive domain values. In this regard, it is not surprising that the introduction of the category distinction is crucial for post-structuralist theory, since this category determines the shape of discourse.

Important contribution to the development of methods for the analysis of the information sphere contributed researchers of political media discourse. Given the experience of predecessors, representatives of this trend raised the question of possible substitution of level discursive objects to formal level of discourse. As part of a systematic approach to the analysis of discourse, it was found that the discursive form is capable to replace an area of discursive objects. That is a form of social interaction can be considered as a referent for a discursive practice. This situation has been defined as «naturalization» of discourse. On the one hand,

the naturalization of media discourse may indicate the existence of the Convention in conjunction audience and the media. On the other hand, it is possible that the convention is present only at the level of the media. «This situation is reflected in the fact that the texts do not mean the same for producers (of information), and for the audience that».[6,7]

In accordance with the proposed methods considering the information sphere, we can identify the main options of media influence on the development of socio-political conflict:

1) A high degree of verification media discourse suggests that in the field of information objectively reflects the development of the conflict. If the audience takes the form of interaction with the media, the activities of the latter provides the ability to control how the conflict proceeds.

2) Small objects of structured media discourse suggest that the coverage of the conflict depends on the method of formalizing discourse. Because the objects of discourse are less structured, the process

of formalization of the media discourse correlates with how the norms of social interaction relate to the area of unstructured objects. For example, entertainment or news media genre differently relate their audience and situation of conflict. It is important to consider that the methods of formalization can vary, depending on the choice of the objects of discourse that are accessed by the media. Therefore, coverage of the conflict in this case contains the prerequisites for conflict in the information sphere.

3) Naturalization of media discourse indicates that the processes of the conflict lighting shape have a greater value than the contents. The audience in this case focused not on the amount of factual material provided but for the quality of interaction with the media. Format of the media should be seen as a form of social consensus. Media activities are not aimed to create a certain attitude of the audience to the conflict; it is a reflection of this attitude. The exception here is the situation when the audience shows little interest in media relations.

References

- 1 Matheson D. Media Discourses. Analysing Media Texts. Open University, 2005. .p. 4.
- 2 Fox, J., Fox R. The power-discourse relationship in a Croatian higher education setting. Education Policy Analysis Archives. <http://epaa.asu.edu/epaa/v10n5.html>
- 3 Fedorov A. Information security in the global political process. M., 2006. p. 220.
- 4 M. Foucault, The Archaeology of Knowledge. St. Petersburg. 2004. p. 416.
- 5 Mikhaleva O. Discourse discourse object vs subject: system-signs <http://www.rus-lang.com/about/group/mikhaleva/state15/>
- 6 Talbot M. Media Discourse. Representation and Interaction. Edinburgh University Press, 2007. p. 7.