

TRUBA Hanna M.,

Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Ukrainian Language and Language Training for Foreigners;

Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University;

2 Zmiiienka Vsevoloda St., Odesa, 65082, Ukraine

e-mail: 3182009060@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9944-0476>

THE MESO-LEVEL OF DISCOURSE ANALYSIS IN THE STUDY OF NETWORK COMMUNICATIONS

Summary. The **purpose** of the article is to substantiate and introduce into scientific circulation the concept of the meso-level of discourse analysis as an intermediate analytical plane between the macro- and micro-levels for the study of network communications. The **object** of the research is network discourse; the **subject** of the research is the meso-level of this discourse (communicative strategies, tactics, and parameters of interaction organization in digital communities and genres). **Methods of research:** a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach combining the descriptive method, observation, analysis and synthesis, content and intent analysis, quantitative measurements of the dynamics of network priorities; special linguistic procedures – discourse analysis, pragmalinguistic, contextual-interpretative, and component analysis. **Scientific novelty** lies in the theoretical definition and parameterization of the meso-level of network discourse, the demonstration of its analytical potential based on online advertising material, and the proposal of a set of operational criteria for describing strategies/tactics in a multimodal environment. The two-tier (macro/micro) model is insufficient for a comprehensive analysis of network texts; the meso-level ensures the connection between ethical guidelines (macro) and linguistic exponents (micro), enabling a systematic description of the strategic and tactical organization of advertising communication, taking into account multimodality, interactivity, and platform limitations. In **conclusion** the proposed framework is applicable for further interdisciplinary studies and practical analytics of digital genres.

Keywords: network discourse, meso-level, communicative strategies and tactics, multimodality, pragmalinguistic analysis, content analysis.

Introduction. Formulation of the scientific problem and its relevance. At the present stage, the concept of text has expanded, especially in the context of the Internet; this has also influenced the concept of discourse, particularly in its online form. The old methods of discourse analysis do not work for analyzing texts on the Internet. An urgent question has arisen as to how texts on the Internet should be analyzed, since the two-level model of macro/micro level did not cover the full complexity of text and discourse in the network.

The **purpose** of our work is to introduce into scientific use the concept of the meso-level for the analysis of discourses related to the Internet. The **object** of the research is network discourse, and the **subject** of the research is the meso-level of network discourse.

The **main tasks include:** defining the boundaries of modern network discourse analysis; determining the specifics of the text for modern network discourse analysis; substantiating the need to distinguish the meso-level; developing research parameters and research specificity.

Materials and Methods. Given the need for a multidimensional analysis of the object and subject of the study, a comprehensive interdisciplinary approach was used, combining both general scientific methods (descriptive – for a general characterization of the subject of study; observation – for identifying core and peripheral features of the network space; analysis and synthesis – for detailing and further generalizing the results of observation; content and intent analysis – for determining the relevant topics and the nature of the factual material; quantitative method – for determining the dynamics of network priorities), as well as special linguistic methods (discourse analysis – for identifying the defining features of the object of study; pragmalinguistic analysis – for clarifying the leading strategies and tactics of network communication; contextual-interpretative

analysis – for identifying semantic transformations of speech material; component analysis – for its semantic qualification).

Analysis of previous research on the problem. Thus, the existing variety of discursive classifications is explained by the possibility of their study from different perspectives and, accordingly, by the choice of various criteria and principles of their gradation. As O. Chystotina notes, the high relevance of this concept “is manifested in the constant expansion of the subject field and the scope of discourse analysis, the emergence of new methods and approaches, and the involvement of ever new disciplines in the analysis of discourses, which ultimately makes it impossible to formulate an unambiguous definition of this concept” [4].

Summarizing, it should be noted that all the features of discursive amplitudes are analyzed within the framework of discourse studies, which examine the totality of speech and mental actions of communicants related to the cognition, comprehension, and presentation of the speaker’s world, as well as the understanding of the speaker’s linguistic worldview by the addressee (I. Frolova, O. Kryzhko).

At present, it is known that the concept of discourse (from Late Latin *discursus* – reasoning, reflection, speech) is ambiguous and multidimensional. This is also emphasized by K. Alekseieva, who notes that discourse is an extremely “polysemous term” [4]. P. Serio identifies eight meanings of the term *discourse*: equivalent to the concept of “language,” i.e., any specific utterance; a unit larger than a sentence; the influence of an utterance on its recipient, taking into account the situation of utterance; conversation as the main type of utterance; language from the speaker’s perspective, as opposed to narration, which ignores this perspective; the use of linguistic units, their actualization in speech; a socially or ideologically restricted type of utterance; a theoretical construct intended for studying the conditions of text production [18, p. 16].

An interesting point in this regard is J. Torfing’s view on the three generations of discourse theories, each of which contained criticism of the previous one [20, pp. 5–8]: the first generation interprets discourse in a narrowly linguistic sense—as a textual unit larger than a sentence; the second generation expands discourse analysis to include social practices (“discourses of power” by T. van Dijk and N. Fairclough); the third generation of discourse theories maximally expands the boundaries of this concept, eliminating the opposition between discursive and non-discursive phenomena (see works by A. Gramsci, J. Kristeva, E. Laclau, and others).

In the 20th century, the interpretation of discourse as a complex of verbal and non-verbal components of a social situation first appeared in the work *Discourse Analysis* by American linguist Z. Harris [3]; later, in the works of the French linguist É. Benveniste (Benveniste, Kuranova), who, in Saussure’s distinction between *langue* and *parole*, replaced the latter with the term *discours*, thereby expanding its scope to include the speaker, the listener, and the situation of utterance itself; in the studies of the Swiss scholar P. Serio [18, pp. 12–53]; and the Dutch researcher T. van Dijk, who considered discourse as “a communicative event occurring between a speaker, a listener (observer, etc.) during communicative action within a certain temporal, spatial, and other context” [10], as “a flow of language, language in its continuous movement, encompassing the full diversity of the historical era, as well as the individual and social characteristics of both the communicant and the communicative situation in which interaction takes place. Discourse reflects mentality and culture – national, collective, and individual” [14].

French philosopher and historian M. Foucault defined discourse as “a set of statements belonging to the same system of formations. In this sense, I can speak of climatic discourse, economic discourse, discourse of natural history, and discourse of psychiatry” [14], among others.

The works cited above formed three main schools of discourse study: the Anglo-American (M. Jorgensen, M. Stubbs, L. Phillips, Z. Harris), the German (J. Habermas, J. Link, W. Maas, W. Teubert), and the French (M. Foucault, M. Pechot, L. Althusser, J. Derrida, J. Lacan).

However, the first scholar “to assign the term ‘discourse’ a new meaning (‘speech inseparable from the speaker,’ or ‘speech plus the speaker’) was Émile Benveniste” [2, pp. 58–71].

Like any complex multidimensional phenomenon, discourse has its own structure and features. The structure of discourse is understood as the segmentation and organization of its components. Researchers commonly recognize three structural components of discourse:

1. A cognitive model of content, i.e., a generalized model of the referential situation;
2. Knowledge of the social context within which textual communication takes place;
3. Linguistic knowledge about discourse organization at the macro level (narrative text-building schemes) and micro level (semantic-syntactic knowledge) (see works by O. Kubriakova, V. Demyankov, and J. Brown [6]).

A more widespread approach is the two-component structural division of discourse according to the nature of its fundamental components: into linguistic (a set of systemic language units) and extralinguistic (social, pragmatic, sociocultural, situational, psychological, and other factors) [10, p. 165]. Within the linguistic component, it is often considered appropriate to distinguish between the propositional part (dictum) and the subjective component (modus) (Bally, C., Formanovskaya S., Shmelyova T.), where the dictum relates primarily to semantics and objective cognitive knowledge, and the modus – to pragmatics. In most studies, the utterance is regarded as the ultimate unit of discourse analysis.

In addition to the dictum and modus parts, the analysis and synthesis of discourse also presuppose knowledge of conversational rules of its organization – the rules of changing communicative roles, taking turns in speech, and understanding constitutive, metacommunicative, phatic, and didactic elements, including nonverbal components in all their manifestations. This constitutes the unity of three levels: the level of expression (phonation, kinesics, and proxemics), the level of transmission, and the level of meaning [1].

Discussion. The basis of such classifications lies in linguistic approaches, determined by the activation of psycholinguistic, sociolinguistic, stylistic, and other research focuses, since “the world, permeated by language, is entirely verbal; the foundation of signs recedes further and further, their signifieds are transformed into new signifiers, they endlessly quote one another and never come to a halt: writing acquires a universal character” [10].

In this regard, we observe a variety of elaborated discourses, including: political discourse (R. Barthes, R. Wodak, L. Zavalska, A. Kovalevska-Slavova, N. Kondratenko, L. Slavova, et al.); medical discourse (I. Holub, I. Lokota, T. Tukova, A. Tur, O. Shanina, L. Shutak, et al.); religious discourse (D. Hurska, N. Kravchenko, Yu. Lysetska, N. Odarchuk, M. Fedyshyn, et al.); legal discourse (I. Kobiakova, L. Koval, I. Rudnieva, I. Tsariova, et al.); military or patriotic discourse (A. Bashuk, L. Kompantseva, I. Nedainova, S. Potapenko, V. Samokhina, R. Sorych, et al.); scientific discourse (S. Baranova, O. Ilchenko, H. Kytsak, A. Romanchenko, Z. Shelkovnikova, et al.); advertising discourse (T. Kovalevska, N. Kutuza, S. Roaniuk, et al.); media discourse (D. Derhach, D. Syzonov, L. Shevchenko, L. Shulinova, et al.); sports discourse (S. Baranova, S. Siedokova, V. Suvorov, et al.); film discourse (O. Hohorenko, O. Hrydasova, O. Isaienko, T. Krysanova, et al.); as well as diary discourse (T. Kosmeda), philosophical-ethical discourse (A. Yermolenko), and supportive communication discourse (T. Buyalska), among others.

There also exist several more detailed linguistic approaches to the genre classification of discourses, including: pragmalinguistic, which distinguishes such parameters as *uniplanarity/multiplanarity of meanings*, *predeterminedness/openness of response*, *seriousness/non-seriousness of communication*, *cooperativeness/conflictuality of interaction*, etc. [5]; semiotic, focusing on cultural aspects of discourse and its *encratic* (power-related) and *acratic* (non-power) varieties as proposed by R. Barthes and M. Foucault; socio-communicative, based on communicative purposes and social priorities according to J. Habermas [3].

Another interesting attempt is the classification of discourses by the type of communicative activity, which identifies informational, argumentative, and socio-ritual communication [2]. The overarching goal of informational communication is the transmission of meaning or information; argumentative (persuasive) communication aims to influence the interlocutor. (It should be noted that conflating *rational* (argumentative) and *irrational* (suggestive) influence is not entirely correct, as they have different mechanisms and neurophysiological natures.) Socio-ritual communication, meanwhile, reflects the need to follow conventional norms.

According to A. Romanova, these are most clearly manifested in dialogic discourse, and the general distinction between monologic and dialogic discourse lies in the motivation and structuring of the communicative process (see also the works of A. Zahnitko, V. Kashkin, J. Kristeva, A. Romanova, et al.). However, such types of discourses are difficult to delineate in practice, as their boundaries are blurred and overlapping, and the monologic or dialogic nature of discourse is

highly conditional. For example, educational network discourse, analyzed in this study, can often have a polylogical nature (see the next section).

Further criteria for systematizing discourses may include: the channel of information transmission (oral and written discourse – though today hybrid discourse is also distinguished, as noted by V. Kashkin, combining both components. In our work, we emphasize the network communication channel – social media (T. Yusupova)); addresser–addressee characteristics (V. Karasik), which distinguish personal (individual-oriented) and institutional (status-oriented) discourse types; genre specification, proposed by H. Pocheptsov and other discourse analysts [3]; structural features, among others.

For a long time, the principle of multiperspectivity, formulated by M. Jorgensen [15], which allows the combination and integration of various approaches to discourse analysis according to the researcher's needs, remained underexplored. To develop this framework, the present study employs the theoretical concepts of E. Laclau and Ch. Mouffe [16], as well as the approaches of K. Serazhym and N. Fairclough [13]. It also draws upon relevant ideas from the French linguistic tradition, developed through the works of M. Foucault, P. Seriot, M. Pêcheux, G. Paret, S. Moirand, D. Manguot, A. Greimas, and J. Courtès.

The application of such approaches makes it possible to study the interconnections between discourse and the sphere of communication, as well as the structural and stylistic characteristics of the corresponding discourse. This theoretical framework enables the analysis of network discourse on three levels:

- the macro-level (general philosophical and ethical premises, extralinguistic content),
- the meso-level (communicative strategies and tactics), and
- the micro-level (linguistic representations).

Together, these levels provide grounds for a comprehensive qualification of the analyzed discourse.

Summarizing the analysis of scholarly approaches to the structuring of discourse, we can state that researchers most often distinguish a two-component model of its organization, in which discourse is viewed as a system of interaction between linguistic and extralinguistic levels. The linguistic component usually includes semantic, syntactic, pragmatic, and stylistic features of speech, particularly dictum and modus characteristics. The extralinguistic component encompasses social, cultural, psychological, situational, and other nonverbal factors that determine the nature of communication. This approach provides a comprehensive understanding of discourse as a phenomenon that functions at the intersection of linguistic and sociocultural reality.

Unlike traditional forms of discourse, network discourse is characterized by a fundamentally different level of complexity, multidimensionality, and multicomponent structure – a result of both the nature of the digital environment and new communicative practices. Its structure goes beyond the classical division into linguistic and extralinguistic components, requiring a more flexible, interdisciplinary analytical model.

Network discourse exists simultaneously in several interconnected planes, among which the following can be distinguished:

- verbal plane: the text itself – direct linguistic content, which may include linguistic features, style, genre, and structural organization;
- traditional extralinguistic factors: the social context, situational conditions of communication, status and role positions of participants, pragmatic goals, and audience expectations;
- multimodal elements specific to the digital environment:
 - *music* – used as an emotional or contextual marker that enhances or modifies the perception of discourse;
 - *visual image of the speaker* – appearance, clothing, facial expressions, gestures, environment, forming an additional level of communicative influence;

- *behavioral strategies and tactics* – speech behavior, response models, irony, self-irony, parody, intentional demonstration of “non-normativity” or challenges to traditional norms;
- *interactive elements* – comments, reactions, emojis, likes/dislikes, memes, etc., serving as means of secondary discourse and interpretation;
- *technical codes* – format, platform, and algorithms affecting how information is presented and perceived (e.g., streaming, TikTok, YouTube Shorts);
- *self-presentation and digital identity* – strategic construction of the speaker’s image aimed at shaping a particular impression, attracting attention, or building communities.

Based on the conducted analysis, it can be concluded that the macro-level of network discourse represents a deep structural plane that encompasses the ideological, philosophical, ethical, and psychomental foundations of discourse. It is at this level that the national worldview, social identities, core values, and strategems defining the meaning and purpose of communication are represented. The macro-level ensures the overall axiological logic of discourse and provides for its interpretation as part of a broader sociocultural and worldview context. It becomes especially significant under conditions of digitalization, when not only the channels but also the principles of knowledge transmission, education, and socialization are changing.

At the same time, within this study we propose to distinguish a separate meso-level of discourse, which occupies an intermediate position between the macro- and micro-levels. By the *meso-level of network discourse* we mean the level of strategic and tactical organization of communication, encompassing interaction within communities, group structures, and institutional formations. This level captures the speech behavior of discourse participants, the realization of communicative strategies and tactics aimed at achieving certain social goals – information exchange, self-presentation, persuasion, cooperation, or even conflict interaction.

The meso-level becomes particularly relevant in networked educational spaces, where a new communication culture is being formed, determined by digital genres (posts, stories, videos, streams, etc.) and the interactive nature of interaction.

In addition, the micro-level of discourse remains traditionally relevant, being related to the linguistic characteristics of the text. It includes the analysis of linguistic units, syntactic structures, lexico-semantic means, stylistic features, and the compositional organization of utterances. The micro-level makes it possible to examine the formal-linguistic realization of discursive strategies, their textual structure, as well as the features of linguistic encoding of meaning, goals, and speaker intentions.

Thus, the proposed three-level model of discourse (macro–meso–micro) ensures a holistic and multidimensional understanding of educational network discourse (END), allowing it to be analyzed simultaneously as a sociocultural, communicative, and linguistic phenomenon. Such an approach not only allows for a deeper understanding of the structure of modern educational discourse in the digital era but also offers a practical analytical framework for further interdisciplinary research.

In modern discourse studies, special attention is paid to the analysis of its various levels, among which the meso-level occupies a particular place, as its study enables a deeper understanding of the mechanisms of meaning and identity formation, as well as the dynamics of social interaction in the context of large groups or communities. At the same time, a key aspect of effective communication at the meso-level is the study of the use of appropriate communicative strategies and tactics, which serves as a link between the macro- and micro-levels [17] and requires a thoughtful analysis and choice of communication methods that optimally correspond to the goals and context of interaction.

Given this, we conduct a theoretical overview of the concept of the meso-level in the context of discourse in general and network discourse in particular – including the classification and analysis of relevant communicative strategies and tactics of educational network discourse (END), as well as a detailed examination of their interaction and influence on the construction of meanings, identities, and social relations at the meso-level.

In the modern sociocultural context, based on the dynamic interrelation between various identities and ideologies, the speech behavior of discourse participants acquires special significance. It functions not only as a means of communication but also as a strategy for achieving specific social, political, or personal goals.

Among the significant contributions to this field, it is worth mentioning the works of M. Weber, who introduced the concept of social action and emphasized the importance of communication for sociological research, particularly for understanding the structure and dynamics of communicative processes. In his fundamental work “*Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*” (1922), M. Weber developed a comprehensive theory of social action, highlighting the role of communication in the formation of social structures and emphasizing the importance of communicative strategies and tactics for mutual understanding and social interaction.

The development of theoretical foundations of communication in the modern context of digitalization and globalization is reflected in the works of M. Weber [3] and T. Goban-Klas [12]. In his seminal work “*Media i komunikowanie masowe. Teorie i analizy prasy, radia, telewizji i Internetu*” (*Media and Mass Communication: Theories and Analyses of the Press, Radio, Television, and the Internet*), T. Goban-Klas conducted a comprehensive analysis of communicative strategies and tactics of modern mass media, studying the impact of changes in information dissemination technologies and public perception. This work made a significant contribution to understanding the mechanisms of mass communication and their influence on contemporary society [12].

K. Deutsch, together with N. Wiener, made a fundamental contribution to understanding communication processes by introducing the concept of feedback. This principle allows a system to adapt and adjust its behavior based on the information received. The work of these scholars demonstrated that feedback is crucial for ensuring effective communication between participants in the process [9, pp. 546–566].

In addition, P. Lazarsfeld, B. Berelson, and H. Gaudet made a significant contribution to the development of the theory of the influence of *opinion leaders* and the processes of public opinion formation, thereby expanding the conceptual framework of communication. Their research opened new horizons for understanding the influence of communication processes on society, which has become invaluable in the social sciences [11]. Today, the study of communication processes has gained new momentum thanks to the works of such scholars as F. Batsevykh, O. Boiko, V. Ivanov, M. Naumova, M. Ostapenko, L. Shvelidze, and others.

Traditionally, in the field of communication studies, a distinction is made between communicative strategies and tactics. Communicative strategies encompass a broader plan of action aimed at achieving specific communicative goals within a defined context, including interpersonal, group, and mass communication. They require comprehensive planning and coordination to influence the perception, attitude, or behavior of the audience. Tactics, on the other hand, as lower-level units, represent concrete actions, steps, or techniques used to implement strategies in practice. Tactics can be adapted or modified depending on circumstances or audience response, which makes them flexible and reactive to changing communicative contexts. Together, they form a structure that enables effective management of communication processes [2].

A communicative strategy includes defining the overall purpose of communication; selecting and organizing semantic and grammatical elements of utterances with regard to context; structuring thematic relations; and adapting the communicative structure to a given mode of interaction (dialogic or monologic), style (formal, informal, etc.), and genre (for example, advertising, lecture, debate). A language communication strategy also involves choosing the optimal way to realize the speaker's intentions to achieve a specific communicative goal, including control and adaptation of the communication process to the conditions of a particular communicative situation [2; 4].

Strategies, which set the main direction of discourse, are fewer compared to tactics, which provide flexibility and adaptability in communication in response to communicative challenges. Tactics are dynamic and oriented toward changing the audience's perception in the desired direction, based on the speaker's speech skills and communicative competence.

There are two main types of communication: cooperative and conflict, which are key in speech behavior and have specific goals, mechanisms of influence, and possible consequences for discourse [5]. Thus, the cooperative type of communication aims at building mutual understanding and respect, empathy, and is the foundation of effective collaboration and joint problem-solving. The conflict type of communication reflects the opposition of interests, opinions, and identities, which may lead to disagreements but, on the other hand, also contributes to the expression of positions and the search for new solutions. The study of these types of speech behavior strategies opens up a broad field for analyzing their role in shaping social relations, developing cultural practices, and influencing individual and collective consciousness [3].

This study primarily relies on the work of L. Shvelidze, who identifies cooperative and conflict communication models with their characteristic interaction strategies, including argumentative, informative, self-presentational, and persuasive ones. The choice between cooperative and conflict strategies depends on the participants' orientation toward achieving consensus or allowing dissensus, which, in turn, affects the dynamics of interpersonal relations and communication effectiveness. From this perspective, our research seeks to reveal how cooperative tactics contribute to interaction and the achievement of shared goals. The conflict type includes strategies of discreditation, disagreement, and trolling, each realized through specific communicative tactics.

The cooperative type is based on collaboration, mutual understanding, and assistance among participants in the communication process. Its main goals are achieving common interests, resolving conflicts through dialogue and consensus, and maintaining positive relations among all parties. Cooperative communication is an interaction based on the shared intentions of communicants, the use of effective linguistic and speech means conditioned by common understandings of communicative goals and the mutual distribution of communicative roles [19, p. 5].

Communication scholars consider cooperative communication as an evolutionary property that emerged from the need for joint activity [19], the formation of partnership relations [6], and the necessity of “saving face”, aimed at maintaining harmony and cooperation in interpersonal communication [6].

This type of strategy is characterized by the following features [19, p. 5]: **mutual support**: participants actively support each other, seeking to understand each other's interests and needs; **openness and transparency**: communication occurs in an atmosphere of openness, where participants freely exchange information and ideas; **flexibility**: the cooperative approach requires readiness for compromise and the ability to adapt one's position to achieve a common goal; **joint problem-solving**: instead of competition or confrontation, participants jointly seek the best solutions to problematic issues.

Within the cooperative type of communication, the most commonly distinguished strategies are argumentative, informative, self-presentational, persuasive, and ritual. Thus, L. Shvelidze [5], describing network discourse, notes that the argumentative strategy appears in 17% of textual fragments and reflects the speaker's effort to express and justify their position using tactics of authority, dialogicity, subjectivity, and solidarity. On the other hand, the informative strategy (11% of all material) is aimed at neutrally presenting facts through descriptive, constative, and factographic tactics. The self-presentational strategy, recorded in 6% of the texts, relies on tactics of self-evaluation, hyperbolization, and idealization, emphasizing the speaker's positive characteristics. The persuasive strategy, expressed through calls to action, appears in 10% of the texts with varying degrees of categoricalness, including commands, requests, and recommendations. Finally, the ritual strategy, covering 15% of the material, plays an important role in maintaining

cooperative interaction through typical speech genres such as greetings, thanks, and condolences, emphasizing cultural norms of communication.

Conflict is a process of interaction between individuals, groups, or organizations during which the parties become aware of a mismatch or contradiction in their interests, goals, values, or expectations. A conflict situation arises when one party believes that the other party interferes or may interfere with the achievement of its goals or the satisfaction of its needs. Since conflicts can have different natures and manifestations, their study is of interest to many scientific disciplines, each of which examines conflict from its own specific perspective, which indicates its interdisciplinary nature [7].

Conflicts can take various forms and classifications depending on different factors such as the sphere of occurrence, the nature of development, methods of resolution, goals, causes, number of participants, symmetry of relations between the parties, and the degree of their organization. The research conducted by the Institute for the Study of Conflict [7] considers intrapersonal, interpersonal, group, and interstate conflicts, emphasizing that they arise for various reasons, particularly due to differences in needs, values, interests, and goals. The International Association for Conflict Management [7] distinguishes between acute and chronic conflicts based on their dynamics and emotional charge.

The Conflict Research Society provides a detailed analysis of the causes of conflicts, including economic, political, ideological, and social factors that determine their emergence. Researchers also note that it is important to consider the number of participants – from dyadic to polyadic conflicts – and their degree of organization – from spontaneous to well-planned situations – which reflects a wide range of possible conflict interactions (Institute for the Study of Conflict, 2009; International Association for Conflict Management; *Journal of Living Together*; *Conflict Research Society*).

An important aspect is the study of the linguistic exponents of conflict [8], in particular its linguo-pragmatic, linguo-cognitive, and linguo-cultural characteristics [8]. The study of language in conflict is carried out within such fields as communicative, cognitive, and suggestive linguistics, pragma-, socio- and ecolinguistics, and linguoculturology. In this regard, it is also worth mentioning a separate scientific field – **linguoconflictology**, which studies the causes of the emergence, development, and resolution of conflicts, as well as the principles, methods, and techniques of their prevention in various types of discourse (see works by A. Antsupov, F. Batsevych, L. Bilokononko, N. Bilous, N. Voitsekhovska, G. Grice, O. Demska, O. Yermolaieva, L. Zaval'ska, A. Kovalevska-Slavova, N. Kondratenko, T. Kosmeda, R. Lakoff, G. Leech, L. Strii, J. Searle, L. Shypilova, S. Formanova, and others), who have created the theoretical foundation for understanding the mechanisms of speech interaction and their influence on the dynamics of communicative relations, including conflict situations.

A conflict communicative strategy can be defined as a planned sequence of speech actions or tactics used in communication to create, maintain, or escalate a conflict between interlocutors. This strategy may include accusations, criticism, irony, sarcasm, or even direct insults aimed at discrediting or lowering the status of the interlocutor in the eyes of others. The use of a conflict communicative strategy may also be aimed at achieving certain personally relevant goals, such as protecting one's own interests, influencing the audience's opinion, or strengthening one's authority by diminishing that of the opponent.

The most common conflict communicative strategies include discreditation, disagreement, and trolling, which, in turn, are realized through specific communicative tactics.

Conclusions and research prospects. First of all, the theoretical contribution lies in the introduction into scientific circulation of the category of the *meso-level* as a stable unit for describing network discourse and in the synchronization of linguistic and socio-communicative perspectives of analysis. Empirical verification of the meso-level parameters has been carried out using corpora from different platforms (TikTok, YouTube, Instagram, X), as well as comparative studies of cooperative/conflict strategies in the fields of education, science, and advertising, and the

development of automated meso-analysis metrics for tracking tactics in real time. The article substantiates the need for the meso-level in discourse analysis of network communications: the two-tier (macro/micro) model proves methodologically insufficient for describing the multicomponent, multimodal, and interactive nature of digital genres. The concept of the meso-level has been formulated as an intermediate analytical plane that captures the strategic and tactical organization of interaction within communities/platforms, linking the axiological and ideological orientations of the macro-level with the linguistic exponents of the micro-level. As a result, a set of operational criteria for description has been proposed (types of strategies and tactics; participant roles/positioning; format and algorithmic conditions of the platform; interaction scenarios; degrees of interactivity; multimodal connections “text–image–audio–behavioral signals”). The practical value for digital genre analytics lies in the fact that the proposed framework can be applied to communication campaign auditing, interaction scenario modeling, optimization of engagement strategies, and reputation risk management in the online environment.

Л і т е р а т у р а

1. Ваховська О. В. Вербалізація концепту гріх в англomовному дискурсі XIV – XXI століть : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук. Харківський національний університет ім. В. Н. Каразіна. Харків, 2011. 20 с.
2. Загнітко А. Мовна особистість в епістолярному дискурсі: типологія лінгвоіндивідуалізацій і лінгвоіндивідуалізацій. *Гуманітарна освіта у технічних вищих навчальних закладах*. 2016. № 33. С. 58–71.
3. Труба Г. М. Психо- і нейролінгвістична специфіка освітняського мережевого дискурсу : евристичне моделювання : дис. ... д-ра філол. наук. Одеса, 2025. 740 с.
4. Чистотіна О. О. Дискурси події : між вірністю і зреченням : дис. ... д-ра філософії. Харків : ХНУ імені В. Н. Каразіна. 2021. 192 с.
5. Швелідзе Л. Д. Мовні засоби реалізації комунікативних стратегій у дискурсі соціальних мереж (на матеріалі української й англійської мов) : автореф. дис. ... канд. філол. наук : Вінниця, 2021. 22 с.
6. Brown G., Yule G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1983. 283 p.
7. Conflict Research Society. URL: <https://conflictresearchsociety.org/> (дата звернення: 18. 03. 2023).
8. Cui A., Li H., Wang D., Zhong J., Chen Y., Lu H. Global, regional prevalence, incidence and risk factors of knee osteoarthritis in population-based studies. *EClinicalMedicine*, Nov 26:29-30:100587. 2020. URL: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34505846/>
9. Deutsch K. *Peoples, nations, and communication*. NY: Times, 2000. pp. 546–566.
10. Dijk V. T. A. *Discourse Studies*. 5 vols. Sage Benchmark Series. New Delhi: Sage. 2007. 184 p.
11. Encyclopedia Britannica. Paul Felix Lazarsfeld. URL: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-science/Sociology>
12. Goban-Klas T. Media and Mass Communication: Theories and Analyses of the Press, Radio, Television, and the Internet. 2022. 548 pp.
13. Fairclough N. Metapragmatics, hidden assumptions, and moral economy. In *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use* Springer International Publishing. 2016. pp. 191–208.
14. Foucault M. *Archaeology of Knowledge* (2nd ed.). London: Routledge. 2002. 256 p.
15. Jørgensen M. W., Phillips L. J. *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. SAGE Publications Ltd., London, 2002. pp. 1 – 23. URL: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208871>.
16. Laclau E., Mouffe C. *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London. New York. 1985. 217 p.
17. Micro, Meso, and Macro Approaches by Anonymous. licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 3.0. URL <https://2012books.lardbucket.org/books/sociology-comprehensive-edition>
18. Serio P. Analyse du discours politique soviétique (Cultures et Societies de l'Est. 2). Paris: Institut d'étude slave. 1985. 315 p.
19. Tomasello M., Haun D. B. M. Conformity to Peer Pressure in Preschool Children. *Child Development*. 2011. 82 pp. URL: <https://www.scrip.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1178737>
20. Torfing J. Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments, and Challenges. In *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy, and Governance*, edited by D. Howarth & J. Torfing. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2005. pp. 1–31.

R e f e r e n c e s

1. Vakhovska, O. V. (2011), *Verbalization of the Concept of Sin in the English-Language Discourse of the 14th–21st Centuries : abstract for PhD thesis in Philology* [Verbalizatsiia kontseptu hrikh v anhlomovnomu dyskursi XIV–XXI stolit : avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk], V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University.
2. Zahnitko, A. (2016), *Linguistic Personality in Epistolary Discourse: Typology of Linguo-Individualizations and Linguo-Individualities, Humanitarian Education in Technical Higher Educational Institutions* [Movna osobystist v epistoliarnomu dyskursi : typolohiia lnhvoindyviduatcii i lnhvoindyvidualizatsii, Humanitarna osvita u tekhnichnykh vyshchykh navchalnykh zakladakh], № 33, pp. 58–71.
3. Truba, H. M. (2025), *Psycho- and Neurolinguistic Specificity of the Educational Network Discourse : Heuristic Modeling, Doctoral Thesis in Philology : 10.02.01*. [Psykho- i neirolnhvistychna spetsyfika osvitianskoho merezhevoho dyskursu: evrystychne modeliuvannia : dys ... d-ra filol. nauk]. Odessa. 740 p.
4. Chystotina, O. O. (2021), *Discourses of the Event: Between Loyalty and Renunciation : PhD Thesis in Philosophy* [Dyskursy podii: mizh virnistiu i zrechenniam : dys. ... d-ra filosofii]. Kharkiv: V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University. 192 p.

5. Shvelidze, L. D. (2021), *Linguistic Means of Implementing Communicative Strategies in the Discourse of Social Networks (Based on the Material of Ukrainian and English Languages): abstract for PhD thesis in Philology* [Movni zasoby realizatsii komunikativnykh stratehii u dyskursi sotsialnykh mrezh (na materiali ukrainskoi y anhliiskoi mov) : avtoref. dys. ... kand. filol. nauk] : Vinnytsia, 2021. 22 p.
6. Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1983), *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press. 283 p.
7. Conflict Research Society. *Official website*. Available at: <https://conflictresearchsociety.org/>
8. Cui, A. & Li, H. & Wang, D. & Zhong, J. & Chen, Y., Lu, H. (2020), *Global, regional prevalence, incidence and risk factors of knee osteoarthritis in population-based studies*. *EClinicalMedicine*. Available at: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34505846/>
9. Deutsch, K. (2000), *Peoples, nations, and communication*. NY: Times., pp. 546–566.
10. Dijk, V. T. A. (2007), *Discourse Studies*. 5 vols. Sage Benchmark Series. New Delhi: Sage. 184 p.
11. Encyclopedia Britannica. Paul Felix Lazarsfeld. *Official website*. Available at: <https://www.britannica.com/topic/social-science/Sociology>
12. Goban-Klas, T. (2022), *Media and Mass Communication: Theories and Analyses of the Press, Radio, Television, and the Internet*. 548 p.
13. Fairclough, N. (2016), *Metapragmatics, hidden assumptions, and moral economy*. In *Pragmemes and Theories of Language Use* Springer International Publishing. pp. 191–208.
14. Foucault, M. (2002), *Archaeology of Knowledge* (2nd ed.). London : Routledge. 256 p.
15. Jørgensen, M. W. & Phillips, L. J. (2002), *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*. SAGE Publications Ltd., London. pp. 1 – 23. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781849208871>
16. Laclau, E., Mouffe, C. (1985), *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*. London. New York. 217 p.
17. Micro, Meso, and Macro Approaches by Anonymous, licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 3.0. *Original source*: Available at: <https://2012books.lardbucket.org/books/sociology-comprehensive-edition>
18. Serio, P. (1985), *Analyse du discours politique soviétique (Cultures et Sociétés de l'Est. 2)*. Paris: Institut d'étude slave. 315 p.
19. Tomasello, M. & Haun, D. B. M. (2011), *Conformity to Peer Pressure in Preschool Children*. *Child Development*.. 82 pp. Available at: <https://www.scrip.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=1178737>
20. Torfing, J. (2005) *Discourse Theory: Achievements, Arguments, and Challenges*. In *Discourse Theory in European Politics: Identity, Policy, and Governance*, edited by D. Howarth & J. Torfing. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. pp. 1–31.

ТРУБА Ганна Миколаївна,

доктор філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри української мови та мовної підготовки іноземців

Одеського національного університету імені І. І. Мечникова;

вул. Змієнка Всеволода, 2, Одеса, 65082, Україна

e-mail: 3182009060@ukr.net

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9944-0476>

МЕЗОРІВЕНЬ ДИСКУРС-АНАЛІЗУ В ДОСЛІДЖЕННІ МЕРЕЖЕВИХ КОМУНІКАЦІЙ

Анотація. Метою статті є обґрунтування й запровадження до наукового обігу поняття мезорівня дискурсу-аналізу як проміжної аналітичної площини між макро- та мікрорівнями для дослідження мережових комунікацій. **Об'єктом** дослідження є мережовий дискурс; **предмет** дослідження – мезорівень цього дискурсу (комунікативні стратегії, тактики, параметри організації взаємодії у цифрових спільнотах і жанрах). **Методи дослідження:** комплексний міждисциплінарний підхід, що поєднує описовий метод, спостереження, аналіз і синтез, контент- та інтент-аналіз, кількісні вимірювання динаміки мережових пріоритетів; спеціальні лінгвістичні процедури – дискурс-аналіз, прагмалінгвістичний, контекстуально-інтерпретаційний і компонентний аналіз. **Наукова новизна** полягає в теоретичному окресленні й параметризації мезорівня мережового дискурсу, демонстрації його аналітичного потенціалу на матеріалі інтернет-реклами та запропонованні набору операційних критеріїв для опису стратегій/тактик у мультимодальному середовищі. Двоярусна (макро/мікро) модель є недостатньою для повноцінного аналізу мережових текстів; мезорівень забезпечує зв'язок між етичними настановами (макро) та мовними експонентами (мікро), дозволяє системно описувати стратегічно-тактичну організацію рекламної комунікації, враховуючи мультимодальність, інтерактивність і платформні обмеження; запропонована рамка придатна для подальших міждисциплінарних студій і практичної аналітики цифрових жанрів.

Ключові слова: мережовий дискурс, мезорівень, комунікативні стратегії і тактики, мультимодальність, прагмалінгвістичний аналіз, контент-аналіз.