PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF LINGUOCULTURAL COMPONENTS IN MULTIMODAL DISCOURSE

Mo'minova Maftuna Alijonovna

Uzbekistan National Pedagogical University, Faculty of Foreign Languages,

Acting Associate Professor, PhD

Email: mmaftun0709@mail.com

Abstract. This article analyzes the pragmatic functions of linguacultural elements in multimodal discourse, in particular, their role in fulfilling communicative intentions such as persuasion, manipulation, influencing, and prompting reflection. Theoretical approaches to this issue are reviewed based on scientific works conducted in international linguistics, especially in the fields of pragma linguistics, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis.

Keywords: multimodal discourse, cognitive approaches, advertisement clip, persuasion, manipulation.

In modern communication, types of multimodal discourse that integrate language and imagery are becoming increasingly widespread. "Multimodal discourse is a phenomenon that creates meaning through several semiotic modes such as text, sound, graphics, and video" [2]. For example, the simultaneous use of words and images to convey information in an advertisement is a clear instance of multimodality. To fully understand such discourse, the viewer must grasp not only the language but also the cultural meaning of visual signs. Therefore, in the analysis of multimodal discourse, linguacultural components—cultural meanings and connotations embedded in linguistic units—hold special importance.

Kress and van Leeuwen, in their research, examined the unity of text and image in elements such as newspaper photographs and advertising posters from the perspective of the "grammar" of signs, explaining how images convey meaning to people. As a result, multimodal discourse is viewed as a discourse performed simultaneously through several codes and channels. In it, various modalities (verbal text, image, gesture, sound, etc.) work together, complementing each other [3].

To analyze multimodal discourse, visual literacy is required—that is, the ability to interpret the form and content of images. At the same time, the meaning of visual signs may carry cultural connotations. The French semiotician Roland Barthes, in his article "The Rhetoric of the Image," showed that understanding the connotative (symbolic) meaning of images in photographs depends

on the viewer's knowledge of the world, as well as their national and aesthetic awareness [1]. In other words, a certain image may evoke a specific emotion or idea in one person while leaving another, from a different culture, indifferent—because understanding the hidden meaning of the image requires knowledge of the cultural code. From this perspective, the concept of a linguacultural component refers to cultural meaning embedded within a linguistic unit (word, phrase, figurative sign, etc.).

From a pragmatic standpoint, persuasion and manipulation in multimodal discourse are linked to the fact that the message carries a specific communicative intention. The speaker/writer employs various methods to achieve their goal, and these methods can be realized through both language and imagery. At first glance, "persuasion" and "manipulation" may seem like similar metalinguistic phenomena; however, linguistics emphasizes that there are significant differences between them.

From a pragmatic point of view, persuasion is an influence exerted by the communicator through open (legitimate) means, which fosters in the recipient a willingness to voluntarily accept a particular point of view. Manipulation, on the other hand, is a covert influence—often through illegitimate means—aimed at changing the recipient's opinion [7]. In "Propaganda and Persuasion" by G. Jowett and V. O'Donnell, it is emphasized that propaganda does not rely on open information but on hidden assumptions and one-sided representations, aiming to sway the recipient toward the manipulator's intended position. This may involve creating an enemy image or deliberately distorting signs.

Manipulation is effective only when the audience is weaker than the manipulator—that is, when it lacks information or the ability for critical analysis. Thus, manipulative discourse typically occurs in situations where the balance of power is shifted in favor of the manipulator.

In short, linguacultural signs that function as a cultural interface significantly enhance the effectiveness of the persuasion process. In the field of advertising and PR, the role of linguacultural components in persuasion is also considerable. Advertising communication, in the classical sense, is a multimodal discourse constructed to persuade the audience of the advantages of a particular product or service. Advertising messages usually combine colorful images, catchy slogans, the participation of celebrities, and details characteristic of the national culture. For example, in a commercial for a food product, the scene might show a mother lovingly preparing a traditional dish for her child. Here, both a visual image (the mother and child figure) and a cultural value (respect for family and affection) are presented simultaneously. Such frames evoke warm feelings in the viewer and generate trust toward the product—because, in the cultural context, the image of

a mother and child is interpreted as a symbol of love, safety, and sincerity. As noted in N. Oprish's research, English-language advertisements also activate cultural experience through text and image, meaning that the cultural signs needed to understand the ad are embedded in both verbal and visual components [10].

According to G. Cook, who studied the world of advertising, advertising discourse has a "closed contract" nature (i.e., it does not openly invite the recipient to a debate) and mainly exerts influence through imagery. Therefore, the key mechanism in advertising is association: the product is linked in the consumer's mind with pleasant images. These images are usually culturally significant—historical figures, famous movie characters, scenes of national holidays, and so on. In this way, advertisers create a connection in the consumer's mind between the product and cultural values.

For this reason, media literacy now teaches people to analyze mass communication not only according to its text but also according to its visuals and graphic signs. Another discourse-analytical approach—intertextual analysis and genre analysis—is also applied to uncover the semiotics of linguacultural signs in multimodal content. For example, researchers who have studied advertising discourse from an intertextual perspective (M. Luzón, 2019, and others) have noticed that many advertisements are filled with quotations and references from other texts: an allusion to Star Wars, a line from a popular song, a fragment of folklore, and so on. These give the advertisement an intertextual dimension and create a sense of familiarity for the audience. In this way, advertisers draw on prior cultural experiences to present their products in an atmosphere that feels "not at all foreign." This style is another example of using linguacultural components aimed at associative persuasion.

The study of the pragmatic functions of linguacultural components in multimodal discourse is still an incomplete field. Based on the above analyses, the following directions for future in-depth research in this topic are recommended:

Cross-cultural multimodal pragmatics: Compare multimodal discourses from different cultures and languages. For example, by conducting a comparative analysis of linguacultural signs in Western and Eastern advertising, it is possible to identify both universal and culture-specific pragmatic strategies. This would help reduce misunderstandings and differences in interpretation in communication.

Automated tools for multimodal analysis: In today's era of AI, it is possible to reveal patterns of linguacultural signs by analyzing large datasets (e.g., social media posts, advertisements, videos) computationally. Therefore, research on automatic recognition of

linguacultural signs and the creation of their pragmatic tags should be conducted in collaboration with information technology specialists.

Linguacultural pragmatics in translation: research on the preservation or transformation of linguacultural components when translating multimodal texts from one language into another. For example, in the translation of international advertisements, it is important to study how localization to the local culture is carried out, which cultural codes become incomprehensible in another culture, and how they are replaced. This issue is of both theoretical and practical significance.

Thus, linguacultural components in multimodal discourse occupy a central place in realizing various communicative intentions. Such discourse, performed through the integration of verbal text and visual signs, is difficult to fully comprehend when detached from its cultural context. Research has shown that without the necessary background knowledge, the audience is highly likely to misunderstand or fail to grasp the full meaning of a multimodal message. Therefore, for successful communication, the speaker refers to cultural codes, and the audience must be able to decode them to receive the message.

The pragmatic functions of linguacultural signs have been found to have several dimensions: they can strengthen the effect of persuasion (conviction), enable manipulation (covert influence on the mind), and create a general emotional impact. Cultural symbols and signs presented in the unity of verbal and visual codes have a strong influence on human cognition. From the perspective of pragma linguistics, this phenomenon is explained in terms of implicature and illocution; cognitive linguistics interprets it through conceptual models and metaphors; while discourse analysis reveals the social and ideological content embedded within.

REFERENCES

1.Barthes, R. (1964). La rhétorique de l'image. Communications, 4(1), 40–51. (Reprinted in Image – Music – Text. New York: Hill and Wang, 1977)

2.Forceville, C., & Urios-Aparisi, E. (Eds.). (2009). Multimodal Metaphor. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyterpublications-prairial.fr.

3.Kress, G., & van Leeuwen, T. (2001). Multimodal Discourse: The Modes and Media of Contemporary   Communication. London: Arnold.

4.Jewitt, C. (Ed.). (2009; 2014). The Routledge Handbook of Multimodal Analysis. Routledge.

5.Machin, D. (2007). Introduction to Multimodal Analysis. Hodder Education.

6.Norris, Sigrid (2004) – Analyzing Multimodal Interaction: A Methodological Framework

7.Rigotti, F. (2005). Toward a typology of manipulative processes. In L. de Saussure & P. Schulz (Eds.), Manipulation and Ideologies in the Twentieth Century: Discourse, Language, Mind (pp. 61–83). Amsterdam: John Benjaminslancaster.ac.uk.

8.Scollon, R., & Scollon, S. W. (2003). Discourses in Place: Language in the Material World.

9.Thibault P.J. Multimodal Transcription of a Television Advertisement: Theory and Practice // Baldry A. (Ed.) Multimodal Transcription an d Text Analysis. — London: Equinox, 2006. — P. 311–385.

10.Van Dijk, T. A. (2006). Discourse and manipulation. Discourse & Society, 17(3), 359–383lancaster.ac.uksciencedirect.com.