ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: DEVELOPMENT IN ENGLISH LINGUISTICS AND UZBEK DISCOURSE TRADITIONS

Bektemirova Beknozakhon Baxtiyorjon qizi
PhD student, Fergana State University

Abstract

This article examines the development of academic discourse in English-language linguistics and its adaptation in the Uzbek academic context. The study outlines the evolution of academic discourse research from English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and genre analysis to contemporary approaches emphasizing discourse communities, rhetorical structures, and disciplinary variation. Particular attention is paid to the contributions of Swales and Hyland in shaping the theoretical foundations of the field. The article also explores the influence of multilingualism and internationalization on Uzbek academic discourse, highlighting the interaction between local scholarly traditions and global academic standards. The findings show that academic discourse is a dynamic phenomenon shaped by linguistic, cultural, and institutional factors.

Keywords: *academic discourse, genre analysis, EAP, academic writing, multilingualism, Uzbek academic discourse.*

INTRODUCTION

Academic discourse occupies a central position in contemporary linguistics, serving as the primary medium through which knowledge is constructed, transmitted, and legitimized in scholarly and educational communities. Broadly understood, academic discourse encompasses the full range of communicative practices – written and oral – that take place within higher education and scientific research contexts. From the genre-analytical frameworks pioneered in Anglo-American linguistics to the institutional and pedagogical emphases characteristic of post-Soviet linguistic traditions, the field has developed diverse theoretical orientations that reflect both universal communicative imperatives and culturally specific norms.

The concept of academic discourse gained its modern theoretical articulation through the work of Western – primarily British and American – applied linguists from the mid-twentieth century onward. It subsequently entered Russian-language scholarship, where it was adapted to the institutional realities of Soviet and post-Soviet higher education. In Uzbekistan, the study of academic discourse has emerged as an area of active inquiry, particularly given the country’s multilingual educational environment and the growing imperative to integrate into international academic communication. This thesis traces the development of academic discourse as a theoretical concept in English-language linguistics, examines its reception and adaptation in Russian and post-Soviet scholarship, and considers the particular challenges and characteristics of academic discourse in the Uzbek context.

Development of Academic discourse in English Linguistics. The systematic study of academic discourse in Western linguistics grew out of the discipline known as English for Academic Purposes (EAP), which developed in British universities from the 1950s onward in response to the influx of international students from former British

colonies. As Stebletsova explains, EAP was initially conceived as a methodological branch of applied linguistics charged with equipping non-native speakers with the communicative competencies required for academic writing and oral participation — skills such as composing essays, reports, and dissertations [4, p. 6]. Its theoretical foundations drew on M. A. K. Halliday’s functional grammar and the pedagogical work of Peter Strevens, whose collaborative publication with McIntosh laid the methodological groundwork for both EAP and English for Specific Purposes [4, p. 7].

The most influential contribution to the genre-analytical study of academic discourse was John Swales’s Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings [5], which Stebletsova identifies as the foundational text of the field [4, p. 7]. Swales proposed an integrated framework linking the concepts of discourse community, genre, and communicative task. In his formulation, a genre is a communicative event characteristic of a given discourse community and oriented toward a shared communicative purpose; genres belong to their communities, which determine their form, content, and nomenclature [4, p. 7]. Most consequentially for applied research, Swales developed the Create a Research Space (CARS) model for research article introductions, identifying three rhetorical moves: establishing a territory, establishing a niche (identifying a gap), and occupying the niche through the announcement of the present research [4, p. 8]. This model provided researchers and language educators with a principled, replicable framework for analyzing and teaching the introduction section – the very section most central to the study of academic writing across cultures.

Subsequent scholarship extended Swales's genre-analytical approach while introducing the important concept of disciplinary variation, developed by Ken Hyland. According to Hyland’s framework, as summarized by Stebletsova, academic discourse represents a way of constructing scientific knowledge and a complex of social practices and institutions for its dissemination [4, p. 10]. He demonstrated empirically that the rhetorical strategies and linguistic resources deployed in academic genres – including hedging, citation, authorial self-mention, and reader engagement – vary systematically across scientific disciplines. For instance, humanities authors more frequently use verbs such as argue, suggest, and hypothesize, which lend an evaluative, personal character to argumentation, while natural scientists prefer observe, show, and calculate, shifting emphasis to the research process itself [4, p. 10]. These disciplinary differences do not undermine the unity of academic discourse as a cognitive-communicative construct but enrich understanding of how different communities of practice construct and legitimate knowledge through language.

Academic discourse in the Uzbek context. In Uzbekistan, academic discourse occupies a particularly complex position owing to the country’s multilingual history and its ongoing negotiation of language policy in higher education. Uzbekistan’s higher educational system has historically functioned in multiple languages – Uzbek, Russian, and, increasingly, English – with each language carrying distinct prestige, institutional functions, and disciplinary associations. The Uzbek scholarly community thus faces the challenge of developing norms for academic writing and oral communication in a context where Anglophone conventions exert strong normative influence through the internationalization of research publication, while Russian-language academic traditions

remain institutionally embedded, and Uzbek-language academic norms are still being actively established and codified.

Research into Uzbek academic discourse has examined these pressures from multiple angles. The concept of academic discourse as analyzed in Uzbek linguistics reflects the dual influence of Russian-language theoretical frameworks (particularly the work of Karasik, Kubryakova, and Prokhorov) and the growing engagement with Anglophone scholarship, especially the genre-analytical tradition associated with Swales and Hyland. Uzbek linguists have noted that academic discourse in the Uzbek context is, in the broad sense, not confined to the university classroom but encompasses any communicative activity with scientific or educational thematic content, reflecting the social role of formal knowledge in public life [3, p. 41].

One characteristic feature of Uzbek academic discourse is its sensitivity to intercultural difference in the construction of academic genres. Comparative work on dissertation introductions – a genre of particular relevance given the academic context of this thesis – has highlighted divergences between Anglophone and Uzbek rhetorical conventions that manifest at the level of move structure, citation practices, and the degree of explicitness in signaling research gaps and purposes. Where Anglophone academic introductions, shaped by the CARS model, foreground the establishment of a research niche and the explicit articulation of a contribution to existing knowledge, Uzbek academic writing has historically placed greater weight on comprehensive literature review and the demonstration of scholarly breadth, reflecting different epistemic values and reader expectations.

These differences do not represent deficiencies but culturally grounded rhetorical choices that reflect distinct traditions of scholarly authority and knowledge validation. As the internationalization of Uzbek higher education proceeds – with increasing pressure to publish in English-language indexed journals and to adopt internationally recognized standards for research communication – the Uzbek academic community faces the task of navigating between local rhetorical traditions and the global norms that dominate the academic publishing landscape. This negotiation is itself a form of intercultural academic discourse, requiring bilingual or multilingual scholars to develop what might be called translingual academic competence: the ability to move flexibly between different rhetorical conventions while maintaining intellectual integrity and communicative effectiveness in each.

CONCLUSION

Academic discourse is a richly multidimensional phenomenon whose study has been shaped by the concerns of distinct scholarly traditions. In English-language linguistics, the field developed from EAP’s applied imperatives into a theoretically sophisticated domain encompassing genre analysis, disciplinary variation, corpus linguistics, and contrastive rhetoric. In Russian and post-Soviet scholarship, academic discourse has been theorized through institutional and sociolinguistic frameworks that foreground the relational and pedagogical dimensions of knowledge transmission. In the Uzbek context, these two traditions converge with the specific challenges of a multilingual educational environment in transition, producing a distinctive set of questions about rhetorical norms, language choice, and intercultural academic

competence. Further research that combines corpus-based methods with genre analysis and ethnographic attention to discourse communities will be essential to understanding how Uzbek academic discourse continues to evolve in dialogue with both its local traditions and the global norms of international scholarship.

REFERENCES

1. Дронов И. С. Обучение академическому дискурсу в целях обучения иностранному языку студентов лингвистических направлений подготовки // Вестник Тамбовского университета. Серия: Гуманитарные науки. – 2018. – Т. 23, № 175. – С. 45–51.

2. Иванкова Т. А. Англоязычный академический дискурс российского вуза как опосредованная коммуникация культур // Этнопсихолингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация. – 2020. – № 3. – С. 80–94.

3. Нажмиддинова М. М. Академический дискурс: интерпретация понятия в лингвистических исследованиях // Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies. – 2023. – Т. 3, № 15. – С. 37–45.

4. Стеблецова А. О. Академический дискурс в западных исследованиях на рубеже XX–XXI вв.: эволюция направлений и концепций // Вестник Волгоградского государственного университета. Серия 2: Языкознание. – 2020. – Т. 19, № 5. – С. 5–13.

5. John Swales Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990. – 260 p.