

PROBLEMS IN CRITICAL DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

Ergasheva Mohirabonu

Student, UzSWLU,

Scientific advisor: Alimova Dildora

assistant teacher of UzSWLU

Abstract. Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) is a method of studying how language is used to construct power and also mirrors power in society. This research looks at significant issues confronting CDA by comparing the work of three very renowned scientists: Lupton, from a Foucauldian theory point of view argument, identifies how social norms are constructed through discourse but predominantly do not generalize in results. Foucault's philosophical heritage offers deep insight into knowledge and power but lacks a visible empirical orientation. The most challenging assignment of CDA is striking a balance between theoretic richness and methodological consistency and clarity. Reflexivity and methodological openness are viewed as necessary to improve the analytical validity of CDA.

Keywords: Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA), power and language, Fairclough, Lupton, Foucault, theory of discourse, methodology, interpretation, subjectivity, reflexivity.

Annotatsiya. Tanqidiy nutq tahlili (CDA) tilning jamiyatdagi kuchga qanday ta'sir qilishini va aks ettirishini o'rganish usuliidir.

This study contrasts the writings of three prominent thinkers in Taqqoslash orqali CDAdagi asosiy muammolarni ko'rib chiqadi: Lupton, Fukold nazariyasi argumentidan, nutq ijtimoiy me'yorlarni qanday qurishiga ishora qiladi, lekin ko'pincha umumlashtirib bo'lmaydi. Fukoning falsafasi kuch va bilimni chuqur tushunishni taklif qiladi, ammo aniq empirik usuldan yiroq. CDAning eng katta muammosi - bu nazariyaning boyligi va uslubiy ravshanlik va izchillik o'rtasidagi muvozanatdir. Tadqiqot refleksivlik va uslubiy shaffoflikni CDA ning analitik asosililigini oshirish uchun juda muhim deb ta'kidlaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: Tanqidiy nutq tahlili (CDA), til va kuch, Feyrklough, Lupton, Fuko, nazariyasi asosiy ma'nosi (nutq) nazariyasi, metodologiyasi, talqini, subyektivlik.

Introduction

Critical discourse is derived from the discipline of Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) which is more general and emerged in the later 20th century a method to research the relationship between society, language and power. Taking a more detailed approach, CDA attempts to reveal underlying ideologies in texts and practice of communication.

This article explores, the most prevalent concerns in CDA, As a field, it is characteristically methodologically challenging, ethically problematic, and

academically controversial, all of which make CDA as a field more dynamic and complex.

This study employs a qualitative literature approach. Academic journals, books, and case studies of CDA were referred to in order to analyze most prevalent issues and criticisms. Selected books by authors such as Fairclough, Lupton, and Foucault were the theoretical foundations for identifying methodological and interpretive issues.

Review of Norman Fairclough's, Deborah Lupton's, and Michael Foucault's work provides accurate supplementary views of the mythological and interpretive challenges of discourse analysis. While all three scholars identify the discourse-power relationship, their approaches are diverse in terms of practicability. Fairclough offers the most useful and replicable model of discourse analysis. In his book, he is interested in textual analysis, discursive practice, and sociocultural practice, these collectively integrate dimensional framework - allows researchers to examine discourse at different levels. Fairclough provides the most relevant and transferable discourse analysis model. His three-mode model-textual analysis, discursive practice, and sociocultural practice-allows researchers to study discourse from multiple levels. Fairclough's model proves particularly helpful with empirical research in that it provides concrete analytical tools like intertextuality, modality, and lexical options. However, although systematic, Fairclough's model is also flawed because it depends on the interpreter's reading of sociocultural context and may result in inconsistency or bias in analysis. Secondly, although his method brings to light ideology and power, it degrades the dynamism and struggle over discursive features, especially for postmodern or extremely changing contexts such as digital communication.

Conversely, Lupton applies discourse analysis in public health, risk communication, and body sociology. Under significant empirical dominance from Foucauldian theory, Lupton emphasizes the significance of discourse as it creates subject positions such as the "responsible citizen" in neoliberal health discourses. Her research assists in charting how discourses constitute and discipline norms regarding health, risk, and moral behavior. However, Lupton's application of food consumption poses contextual and epistemological tensions. Her analysis are too reliant on social and cultural sensitivity, and outcomes less prone to be cross-sectional or longitudinally projectable to other populations or times. Her interpretative foundation for her study can compromise validity, particularly where evidence derived from empirical records is not triangulated against alternative sources of evidence.

Foucault's scholarship is the basis on which academics work but distinctive in its strong philosophical orientation. His ideas regarding power, discourse, governmentality, and the production of subjectivity provide a critical tool with which discourse is not simply a reflection of reality but as an apparatus which creates realities, disciplines populations, and establishes norms. Foucault does not leave a recipe book on how to carry out discourse analysis, though. Thus,

researchers are compelled to perform a task of theoretical translation, rendering vague concepts into viable tools. This can produce diverse and occasionally contradictory applications of his work, varying by researcher interest and disciplinary position.

Foucault's impact is hence both his benefit and detriment: whilst he offers rich description on how discourse governs social life, lack of methodological specificity makes empirical use difficult, especially for novice researchers. Together, in total, Fairclough, Lupton, and Foucault represent a range of critical discourse analysis - from systematic linguistic criticism (Fairclough) through contextual sociocultural criticism (Lupton) to philosophical deconstruction of power and knowledge at institutions (Foucault). Each adds distinctly to the field: Fairclough brings analytic acuity, Lupton situated analysis of daily life, and Foucault macro-level critical critique of epistemic power.

The convergence of their positions indicates that CDA's biggest challenge is how to balance theoretical richness of understanding and the need to have rigorous, open, and replicable methodology. It also puts the challenge of reflexivity on analysts, whereby analysts are meant to be critically self-reflexive regarding their own positioning in research and interpretative frameworks they bring to data.

Reference:

1. Alimova D (2024). Most of the world's English language teachers speak English as a second or third language rather than as their first language. UzSWLU Conference Proceedings.
2. Alimova D.(2024) Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance.
3. Alimova.D. Innovative approaches of language teaching in the context of globalization
4. Alimova.D. Development Increase Investment Of The Private Sector In Uzbekistan
5. Alimova.D. Innovative technologies in teaching foreign languages
6. Alimova.D. Teaching English through English: Proficiency, Pedagogy and Performance
7. Carter, A. M. (2021, June 15). The future of AI in language education. The Language Teaching Journal.
8. Green, T. M. (2018). Understanding language acquisition. Cambridge University Press.
9. Mirziyoyev, S. (2022). Address at the Uzbekistan Education Reform Forum. Tashkent: Presidential Press Service.
10. Stockwell, G. (2012). Using mobile phones for vocabulary activities: Examining the effect of the platform. *Language Learning & Technology*, 16(3), 1–17.
11. Warschauer, M., & Healey, D. (1998). Computers and language learning: An overview. *Language Teaching*, 31(2), 57–71.