ACADEMIC DISCOURSE AS A SYSTEM OF DISCOURSES OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE

Khamzayev Sobir Amirovich

Associate Professor at the department

"Theoretical aspects of the English language "

UzSWLU,Doctor of Philosophy in Philology (PhD)

Rakhimova Guzal Bagriddinovna

The master's student of

Linguistics and Literary Studies Department

Uzbekistan State World Languages University

guzal.rahimova.86@mail.ru

ABSTRACT. This research is based on the need for the comprehensive study of the academic discourse as the institutional one which is the important component of the modern educational culture. The analysis of the main characteristics of the academic discourse makes it possible to improve communication between the teacher and the students what is essential for us to study the forms of the communicative influence on students, to increase their level of motivation; promotes further research of speech strategies that ensure the most effective learning, helps to minimize the number of the communicative failures, to develop the techniques and methods of the feedback. The description model proposed in this article contributes to the understanding of the normative schemes of speech behavior that are used in the academic sphere and identify linguostylistic, linguopragmatic and linguocognitive characteristics of this genre of academic discourse. The purpose of this article is to expand the model of the complex analysis and to identify linguistic and cognitive-pragmatic features of the English-speaking academic sphere.

Key words: academic discourse, cognitive-pragmatic characteristics, text, oral and written speech, teacher, student.

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola zamonaviy ta'lim madaniyatining muhim tarkibiy qismi bo'lgan akademik diskursni har tomonlama o'rganish zarurligiga asoslanadi. Ushbu maqolada biz akademik diskursning asosiy xususiyatlarini tahlil qilish o'qituvchi va talabalar o'rtasidagi aloqani yaxshilashga imkon berishi hamda talabalarga kommunikativ ta'sir shakllarini o'rganishga, ularning motivatsiya darajasini oshirish uchun zaruriy omil sifatida hizmat qiladi. Shu bilan bir qatorda maqolada akademik nutqni tahlil qilish eng samarali o'rganishni ta'minlaydigan nutq strategiyalarini tadqiq qilishga yordam berishi va kommunikativ muvaffaqiyatsizliklar sonini kamaytirishga, talaba ishiga izoh berish texnikasi va usullarini ishlab chiqishga himzat qilishi keng ko'rib chiqiladi. Ushbu maqolada taklif qilingan tavsif modeli akademik sohada qo'llaniladigan diskurs xatti-harakatlarining me'yoriy sxemalarini tushunishga yordam beradi va ushbu akademik nutq janrining lingvostilistik, lingvopragmatik va lingvokognitiv xususiyatlarini aniqlaydi. Ushbu maqolaning maqsadi akademik nutq tahlil modelini kengaytirish hamda ushbu tadqiqot zamonaviy ta'lim madaniyatining muhim tarkibiy qismi bo'lgan akademik diskursni har tomonlama o'rganish zarurligiga asoslanadi. Shu bilan bir qatorda ushbu maqolada talabalarga kommunikativ ta'sir qilish shakllarini o'rganish, ularning motivatsiya darajasini oshirish masalalarini ko'rib chiqadi hamda ta'limda talabalarga o'rgatilayotgan fanlarni samarali uslublar bilan o'rganishlarini ta'minlaydigan nutq strategiyalarini tadqiq qilishga yordam beradi. Bundan tashqari talabalar bilan suhbat jarayonida kommunikativ muvaffaqiyatsizliklar sonini kamaytirishga, feedback, ya'ni talaba bajargan ishiga o'qituvching izoh berish texnikasi va usullarini ishlab chiqishga yordam beradi. Ushbu maqolada akademik sohada qo'llaniladigan diskursiv xatti-harakatlarining me'yoriy qoidalarini tushunishga yordam beradi hamda akademik diskurs janrining lingvostilistik, lingvopragmatik va lingvokognitiv xususiyatlarini

aniqlaydi. Ushbu maqolaning maqsadi akademik diskurs tahlilini kengaytirish, pragmatik va kognitiv xususiyatlarni aniqlashdir.

Kalit so'zlar: akademik nutq, kognitiv-pragmatik xususiyatlar, matn, og'zaki va yozma nutq, o'qituvchi, talaba.

Аннотация. Настоящее исследование основано на необходимости всестороннего изучения академического дискурса как институциональной, важной составляющей современной образовательной культуры. Анализ основных особенностей академического дискурса позволяет улучшить общение учителя с учениками, изучить формы коммуникативного воздействия на учащихся, что нам необходимо для повышения уровня их мотивации; способствует дальнейшему исследованию речевых стратегий, обеспечивающих наиболее эффективное обучение, способствует снижению числа коммуникативных неудач, разработке приемов и методов обратной связи. Модель описания, предложенная в этой статье, помогает понять нормативные схемы речевого поведения, применяемые в академической сфере, и дает представление о лингвостилистике этого академического речевого жанра, определяет лингвопрагматические и лингвокогнитивные характеристики. Целью данной статьи является расширение модели комплексного анализа и выявление лингвистических и когнитивно-прагматических особенностей англоязычной академической сферы.

Ключевые слова: академический дискурс, когнитивно-прагматические характеристики, текст, устная и письменная речь, учитель, ученик.

Introduction. The notion of discourse, its types and discourse analysis have undergone a course of over fifty years. Associated with a number of disciplines, this field of study is currently experiencing rapid development. Scholars of linguistic studies, philosophical studies, cognitive science and so on all have performed systematic research on this issue. The assimilation of research findings of various

disciplines, for one thing, has continuously brought about cross-disciplinary and theoretical approaches to discourse analysis; for another, it has, indeed, blazed a new trail for such a novel subject. For the first time, "discourse" was introduced into the scientific theory of text linguistics by the American scientist Z. Harris in 1952 as a linguistic term in the phrase "discourse analysis". Thus, the concept of "discourse", borrowed from structural linguistics, received an increasingly broad scientific interpretation and terminological ambiguity at the end of the twentieth century. The interdisciplinary trend of discourse analysis makes it inevitable that the term 'discourse' refers to diverse things via different viewpoints. Though the identical terminology 'discourse' is employed in many fields, its notion is, nonetheless, quite distinct. Sometimes discourse is treated simply as a word for language in use (Potter, 2004; Widdowson, 2007); at other times, discourse is theorized as a linguistics object or language above the sentence (Cameron, 2001; Martin & Rose, 2007). To complicate the matter, an increasing number of scholars further elucidate the concept of 'discourse' via unique theoretical perspectives. For instance, Potter (2004) deciphers discourse as texts and talk in social practices. That is, the focus is not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules (in linguistics), a system of differences (in structuralism), a set of rules for transforming statements (in Foucauldian genealogies). Instead, it is the medium for interaction; analysis of discourse becomes, then, analysis of what people do. Hoey (2001), in a similar fashion, also views discourse, especially the written discourse, as an interactive process between authors, readers or audiences. Alien to these two authors' viewpoints, Gee (1999), who categorizes such kind of notion in terms of more intricate and profound theoretical grounds, thinks of discourse as "socially accepted associations among ways of using language, of thinking, valuing, acting, and interacting in the right place and the right place and at the right times with the right objects". All these above mentioned facts manifest that discourse analysis can indeed be seen as a contested disciplinary terrain where a range of different theoretical notions and analytic practices compete,

and it is, therefore, indispensable to carry out systematic categorizations pertinent to the meaning and usage of this term 'discourse'. Although the distinct categorizations of discourse analysis turn out to be somewhat inconclusive or even in rivalry, it is nonetheless quite evident that research on 'discourse' principally falls under the umbrella of three major disciplines: linguistic studies, non-linguistic studies and interdisciplinary research.

Literature review and methods. Among the foreign specialists who have studied discourse, we will name first of all, the following authors: E. Benveniste, G. Brown, T. A.van Dyke, W. W. Dressler, W. Chaf, N. Copeland, D. Crystal, M. Holliday,Z. Harris, T. Givon, G. Kress, U. Labov, R. U. Langaker, G. Leach, D. Shiffrin,R. and S. Colin, S. Taylor, S. Thornbury, M. Wetherell, J. Yates, A. Jaworski,G. Yul. A lot of research foreign linguistics has been devoted to the development of discourse, nevertheless, we do not have a single definition of this term, which generates a high degree of discussion of the concept. For a long time, discourse was considered synonymous with text. Today, the discourse, as a rule, is opposed to such phenomena as text, speech, communication, style, dialogue, thinking (Asmus, 2001; Borbotko, 1998; van Dyke 1989; Karasik, 2004; Kozhemyakin, 2008; Makarov, 2003; Prokhorov, 2006; Sheigal, 1996). In addition to the above, an important and complex opposition is the linguistics of the text and the analysis of discourse. Discourse is opposed to the text as speech in dynamics, which acquires a certain meaning in the context of the text, that is, with certain communicative goals (intentions), circumstances, properties of communicants, the result and semantic features. Discourse is a coherent text, but the text also has a certain coherence. So, the sentences in the text are connected lexically and grammatically– using conjunctions and allied words, references, ellipses, lexical means, repetitions, intonation. The peculiarity of the discourse is that we perceive the text not only in connection with the external circumstances of communication, but also depending on our own linguistic and cultural background. The perception and analysis of information is carried out taking into

account the pragmatic components, which include linguistic and encyclopedic knowledge, personal experience, linguistic and cultural models (ideas about the world), as well as background knowledge and speech etiquette. And we can mention that the interaction of the teacher / teacher with students / students is carried out to institutional, cliched, regulated in form and content communication, conditioned by the social roles of the communicants. Researchers consider this type of communication with the different aspects, taking into account the system of certain parameters. In the academic sphere the following terms can be distinguished in the literature to denote this type of institutional discourse: educational, pedagogical, educational and academic. At the same time, there are no clear boundaries between these terms– the choice of the term depends on the research objectives and goals. We analyze these definitions, as well as their differences from scientific and scientific methodological discourses.

Results. It is established that the purpose of the educational discourse is the socialization of a new member of society, the transfer of knowledge, skills, social values to him [Komina, 2004, p. 103], as well as intellectual, psychophysical and spiritual development of the individual [Kirillova, 2010, p. 81]. Such a status-oriented communication is regulated by the norms and rules of social interaction, rituals and formulas that have a verbal and nonverbal expression. Knowledge of conventional rules and norms of speech behavior contributes to the achievement of a communicatively significant result and the successful development of interaction [Raschupkina, 2010, p. 35]. For example, with regard to argumentative educational discourse, E. A. Zhileva identifies the following set of coordinated actions of looking for a specific dictionary frame: 1) dialogical interaction is aimed at eliminating ignorance, uncertainty, inaccuracy in knowledge; 2) the type of interaction is subordinated to the structure of interactive space; 3) there is a sequence in the alternation of chain moves; 4) communicants follow the general scheme of dialogue development; 5) the structure and scenario of an argumentative communicative act are determined by illocative variables; 6) the dialogic process in educational

communication is formed by the participants of communication themselves; 7) action-impact and action-reflection of communicants are conjugate and simultaneous; 8) the achievement of the goals set in the dialogue is possible when taking into account personal and situational indicators .N. A. Komina emphasizes that the educational discourse is not just a sequence of speech works fastened by a logical or formal connection, it is a potential construct reflecting structure the personality of the communicant, his worldview with its own system of motives, attitudes, views and attitudes [Komina, 2004, p. 107]. "The educational discourse is understood as the process of transition of the linguistic characteristics of the lecturer's discourse during the semantic perception of the subject of the discourse (recipient/student) in the speech processability into the linguistic characteristics of the student's discourse. This process takes place in educational communication in the course of understanding-mastering / assimilation – assignment of the content of the linguistic consistency of the lecturer's discourse into the author's discourse itself, a variant of student speech" [Kalinina, 2002, p. 4]. The educational discourse is a two-component structure consisting of a lecturer's and student's discourse, while each of them is implemented in the corresponding educational and scientific texts. The division of educational discourse into teacher and student leads to interpretation of it as "a certain sum of statements of a teacher/students realized within the framework of some fragment of discursive practice ..."[Khokhlovskaya, 2006, p. 22]. The basis of educational communication is the basic a model that absorbed the following subsystems: 1) teacher/teacher (subject of communication); 2) student/student (object of communication); 3) communicative and organizational conditions of dialogue: communication goals, communicative processes in communication, a typical form of communication; 4) psycho-social context: the nature of relations between communicants, the psychological atmosphere of the communication process, interest/disinterest, cooperation /conflict, the code of trust, indicators of social status, individual typological characteristics of communicants. The structure of pedagogical discourse is determined

by its purpose – "the socialization of a new member of society (explanation of the structure of the world, norms and rules of behavior, organization of the activities of a new member of society in terms of his familiarization with the values and behaviors expected from the student, the verification of understanding and assimilation of information, evaluation of results)". The values of pedagogical discourse are embedded in the educational material, as well as in the ideological system of the society to which the participants of pedagogical discourse belong; the moral values of society. The realization of the goals of pedagogical discourse is subordinated to its strategies: explanatory, evaluating, controlling, facilitating, organizing. Genres of pedagogical discourse can be distinguished within the framework of a model built on the basis of such features as types of participants, types of scenarios, degree of ritualization; as well as on the basis of established forms of communication, for example, lesson, lecture, seminar, exam, parent-teacher meeting, parent-child conversation, etc. Among the precedent texts are school textbooks and anthologies, statutory educational programs, as well as children's books, fairy tale plots, song lyrics, proverbs and sayings, aphorisms on the topic of knowledge. These signs can be attributed to invariant ones, supplemented by their dependence on the situation of educational communication, the local nature of interaction, interpersonal relations of interlocutors.

Discussion. One of the main differences between scientific and educational discourse is in the participants of communication, as well as in the distance of communication between them: "the differences between reduced and fixed communication distances are not decisive". The educational discourse allows for the possibility of criticism; in scientific – they are at the same or almost the same social level. In addition, in scientific discourse, the self-exclusion of the scientist as an addressee occurs for the sake of the objectivity of the presentation. The constitutive features of scientific discourse are the goal (problematics), certain characteristics of the participants, the method of implementation. The purpose of creating a scientific discourse is to know the objective nature of the surrounding world; and the problematic

is the solution of a scientific problem. The form of existence of scientific discourse is dialogue, implicit, i.e. within the scientific context, or explicit, addressed to the reader/listener. The purpose of creating scientific texts is to solve theoretical and applied scientific problems. The scientific text is dialogical due to direct and indirect references to the scientific context, appeal to the public at the expense of discursive operators: obviously / besides / if we recall / compare / look / pay attention to; as well as appeals to the addressee's mental world (it is enough to remember that) and his imagination (let's assume that).Thus, a scientific discourse is one that "satisfies three the main requirements: its problems should be the study of the surrounding world, the status of its participants should be equal, and the way to implement it should be a creative dialogue in the broadest sense of the word". We emphasize that the goals of scientific and educational discourse are different: if in scientific discourse the goal is to know the world, then in educational discourse – personal development. The main strategy of scientific discourse is the objective fixation of scientific classifications and descriptions; educational – the formation of concepts and the motivational basis of the student's activity. Scientific and educational discourses are discourses with different communicative attitudes. Genres of scientific discourse are divided into primary and secondary. The structural features of primary scientific genres are the formal features of a scientific text: volume, structure, channel. The main primary genres include a report, a speech, an article, a dissertation, a monograph. Genre-forming characteristics of secondary scientific genres can be considered a change in the task, volume, structure, channel, code or complexity of the source text. Secondary genres are formed from primary ones by changing one or more of the above-listed characteristics. One of the subspecies of scientific discourse is scientific and methodological discourse that plays an important role in the use of language as a means of professional communication. Scientific and methodological discourse combines the features of scientific discourse (the need to transfer information), professional (the need to transfer skills and abilities), pedagogical the need to transfer knowledge, as well as historical, spiritual and cultural

values) and presentation discourse (the need for self-presentation).The most common categories of scientific and methodological discourse are structural cohesion, relative formality, integrity, completeness, composition, cliched) and pragmatic (polylogicality, informativeness, interpretability). They contribute to the implementation of the phatic and informative functions of the discourse, involving the exchange of data about the method, idea, discovery. The structural construction of the text, its integrity, graphic and logical formality contribute to the effective flow of the communicative process within the framework of this discourse.

Conclusion. To sum up, the terms considered are used to denote all manifestations of communication that occur within the framework of interaction between representatives of the scientific and pedagogical spheres. The analysis of a significant number of works showed the absence of clear boundaries between these terms. Pedagogical and educational discourses are investigated as a rule, it is isolated; although some authors study them in an integrated way; in some works, the terms "pedagogical" and "educational" are given as synonyms. From this it can be concluded that the goals facing the investigators determine an integrated or isolated analysis of discourses.

To implement a comprehensive study of an academic blog, it seems most appropriate to use the term "academic discourse", because it is a kind of hypernym and combines such terms as educational, pedagogical and educational discourses, as well as personality-oriented communication between students or by a teacher/students, which is present in the academic block and is regulated by the academic ticket.

REFERENCES.

1. Nikolaeva T.M. A concise dictionary of text linguistics terms // New in foreign linguistics. Issue VIII: Linguistics of the text. M. : Progress, 1978. 479 p.

2. Kecskes I., Obdalova O.A., Minakova L.Yu., Soboleva A.V. Study of the Perception of Situation-Bound Utterances as Culture-Specific Pragmatic Units by

Russian Learners of English // System. 2018. Vol. 76, August. P. 219–232. DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2018.06.002.

URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/journal/system/vol/76

3. Obdalova O.A., Minakova L.Yu., Soboleva A.V. Discourse as a unit of communicative and speech-thinking process in communication of representatives of different linguistic cultures // Language and culture. 2017. No. 37. pp. 205-228.

4. Obdalova O.A. Cognitive-discursive system of teaching foreign-language inter-cultural communication to students of natural sciences: dis. ... doctor of

Pedagogical Sciences. N. Novgorod, 2017. 426 p

5. Gural S.K. Teaching foreign-language discourse as a super-complex self-developing system: dis. ... doctor of pedagogical sciences. Tomsk, 2009. 589 p.

6. Gural S.K. Teaching discourse analysis in the light of a synergetic vision. Yalta,2012. 195 p.

7. Kibrik A.A. Analysis of discourse in cognitive perspective : abstract. dis. ... Doctor of Ph

8. Mordovina T.V. Teaching undergraduates written scientific discourse: on the material of a scientific article: English : abstract. dis. ... Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences. Tambov,2013. 24 p.

9. Makarov M.L. Fundamentals of the theory of discourse. M. : Gnosis, 2003.280 p.

10. Borbotko V.G. Elements of the theory of discourse: textbook. stipend. Grozny : Publishing House of the L.N. Tolstoy Chechen-Ingush University, 1981. 113 p.