

DISCURSIVE FORMULAS AS A COMPONENT OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

*Bektemirova Beknozakhon Baxtiyorjon kizi, Fergana State
University, basic doctorant*

DISKURSIV FORMULARLAR AKADEMIK DISKURS KOMPONENTI SIFATIDA

*Bektemirova Beknozaxon Baxtiyorjon qizi, Farg'ona davlat
universiteti tayanch doktoranti*

ДИСКУРСИВНЫЕ ФОРМУЛЫ КАК КОМПОНЕНТ АКАДЕМИЧЕСКОГО ДИСКУРСА

*Бектемирова Бекнозахон Бахтиёржон кызы, базовый
докторант Ферганского государственного университета*



<https://orcid.org/0009-0001-0869-8146>

e-mail:
beknozabektemirova@gmail.com

Abstract: This article explores the nature, functions, and significance of discursive formulas in academic writing, with a focus on comparing their usage in English and Uzbek academic articles. The study highlights the similarities and differences shaped by linguistic norms and rhetorical traditions.

Annotatsiya: Ushbu maqolada akademik yozuvdagi diskursiv formulalarning tabiati, vazifalari va ahamiyati tahlil qilinadi. Ayniqsa, ingliz va o'zbek tilidagi ilmiy maqolalarda ularning qo'llanishi solishtiriladi. Tadqiqot til me'yorlari va ritorik an'analar tomonidan shakllangan o'xshashlik va farqlarni yoritadi.

Kew words: academic discourse, discursive formulas, scientific writing, intercultural comparison, phraseology, contrastive linguistics, institutional discourse.

Kalit so'zlar: akademik diskurs, diskursiv formulalar, ilmiy yozuv, madaniyatlararo taqqoslash, frazeologiya, chog'ishtirma tilshunoslik, institutsional diskurs.

Аннотация: В данной статье рассматриваются природа, функции и значение дискурсивных формул в научном письме, с акцентом на их употребление в английских и узбекских научных статьях. Исследование выявляет сходства и различия, обусловленные языковыми особенностями и риторическими традициями.

Ключевые слова: академический дискурс, дискурсивные формулы, научное письмо, межкультурное сопоставление, фразеология, сопоставительное языкознание, институциональный дискурс.

INTRODUCTION. Academic discourse has caught the attention of researchers especially since it helps the work of researchers reach out to others at an international level. Furthermore, difficult process of both international and scientific education, social interactions in an academic setting has made academic discourse be researched more prominent. In this type of discourse, it must be noted that discursive formulas play a key role in maintaining logical coherence and accuracy of the text.

The development of discourse as a linguistic phenomenon and its influence on cross-cultural

setting and cross-disciplines are considered in our research as basics. Since the full definition of discursive formulas have not been developed yet, in this article discursive formulas are analyzed as a part of institutional discourse.

Academic discourse can be defined as a complex of texts and speeches in science for transfer of knowledge, argumentation and discussion of scientific problems [1]. Furthermore, academic discourse encompasses all contexts of academic activity which are formed under the influence of the values of cultures and the expectations of communicants in different situations. This means

academic discourse reflects logic and specific features of particular society [7]. Accordingly, academic discourse of different languages has particular features which are specific to per language.

It is common-knowledge that any institutional discourse includes components such as aim, participants, chronotope, values, strategies, tematics, genres, precedent texts and discursive formulas [8]. Discursive formulas stay more unclear than other above-mentioned components. These formulas include phrases like “It is widely believed that...”, “The purpose of this study is to...”, and “The results suggest that...” Such formulas are not only grammatical constructions but also carry pragmatic and rhetorical significance. This paper investigates the role of discursive formulas in academic discourse, examining their structural, functional, and cross-cultural characteristics, particularly in English and Uzbek academic writing.

MATERIALS AND METHODS. The concept of discursive formulas intersects with several linguistic frameworks, including phraseology, discourse analysis, and genre studies. Sinclair emphasized the formulaic nature of academic language, noting that fixed expressions contribute to cohesion and fluency [5]. Hyland analyzed the interpersonal and metadiscursive functions of recurrent phrases [2], while Biber et al. highlighted their distribution across spoken and written registers [1].

In the context of academic discourse, these formulas help writers manage stance, hedging, engagement, and textual organization.

Studies in intercultural rhetoric have shown that the use of discursive formulas varies across linguistic and cultural communities [3]. Uzbek academic discourse, for instance, reflects a more formal, hierarchical, and impersonal tone, consistent with Soviet-era scholarly traditions. Comparative studies are still limited, but a growing interest in localizing academic writing practices has increased attention to discursive conventions in Uzbek-language texts.

This study relies on a corpus-based and contrastive approach, analyzing academic articles in English and Uzbek from the fields of linguistics and education. The English corpus includes peer-reviewed journal articles from international publications, while the Uzbek corpus is composed

of academic journal articles from national universities.

Discursive formulas were identified and categorized into four functional groups: introductory, argumentative, referential, and concluding. The analysis focused on frequency, structure, and rhetorical effect

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION. ***Functional Roles in English Academic Discourse.***

In English academic texts, discursive formulas are used explicitly and frequently:

Introductory formulas: “This study investigates...”, “The aim of this paper is to...”, “This paper analyzes”.

Argumentative formulas: “It can be argued that...”, “This evidence supports the claim that...”

Referential formulas: “According to Wray (2012)...”, “Several scholars have noted...”

Concluding formulas: “In conclusion...”, “The findings reveal that...”, “It was found out that”.

These formulas guide the reader clearly through the logic and structure of the argument. They are often reader-friendly, metadiscursive, and hedged to maintain objectivity.

Uzbek academic texts also use discursive formulas but with some key differences in structure and rhetorical strategy:

Introductory formulas: “Mazkur maqolada... ko‘rib chiqiladi” (In this article... is examined), “Ushbu maqolada ... ochib beriladi” (In this article ... is discussed), “Tadqiqotdan maqsad...” (The aim of the research is...)

Argumentative formulas: “Shuni ta’kidlash joizki...” (It is worth noting that...), “Demak, bu holat...” (Thus, this case...)

Referential formulas: “Tadqiqotchilarning fikricha...” (According to researchers...), “Ilmiy manbalarda qayd etilishicha...” (As noted in scientific sources...)

Concluding formulas: “Xulosa qilib aytganda...” (In conclusion...), “Shu asosida quyidagi natijalarga erishildi...” (Based on this, the following results were achieved...), “Natijalar shuni ko‘rsatadiki, ...” (The results show that ...)

Uzbek academic discourse tends to be more formal and less interactive. There is less direct engagement with the reader, and stance markers (such as hedging) are less common. The use of

impersonal constructions and generalized attributions reflects a traditional academic style.

Key Differences and Implications. Feature English Academic Discourse Uzbek Academic Discourse.

Reader engagement: frequent use of metadiscourse (English academic discourse); minimal reader engagement (Uzbek academic discourse).

Hedging/Stance: common (e.g., “It appears that...”); rare, statements are more direct.

Referential Formulas: specific and source-based; often generalized (“ilmiy manbalar”).

Verb Forms: active and passive balanced; more frequent use of passive voice.

Cultural Rhetoric Style: dialogic, structured around reader, monologic, structured around content.

These differences underscore the need for genre awareness and rhetorical sensitivity in cross-cultural academic communication. Writers transitioning between English and Uzbek academic traditions must adapt to the expectations of each discourse community.

CONCLUSION. Discursive formulas are vital elements of academic discourse, serving to organize, clarify, and legitimize scholarly communication. This study demonstrates that while both English and Uzbek academic texts employ such formulas, their use reflects distinct rhetorical conventions. English academic writing emphasizes clarity, interactivity, and writer stance, whereas Uzbek texts prioritize formal presentation and impersonal tone.

Recognizing these differences is important for bilingual scholars, translators, and academic writing instructors. Future research may focus on developing discipline-specific Uzbek academic writing guidelines and integrating contrastive rhetorical training into academic writing programs.

REFERENCES:

1. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Pearson Education.
2. Hyland, K. (2005). Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. Continuum.
3. Mauranen, A. (1993). Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A Textlinguistic Study. Peter Lang.
4. Najmiddinova M.M. Academic discourse: interpretation of the concept in linguistic research. Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS) Vol 3, Issue 15, 2023. B. 37-45.
5. Sinclair, J. (1991). Corpus, Concordance, Collocation. Oxford University Press.
6. Tursunov, U. (2021). Ilmiy uslub va matn strukturasi lingvistik xususiyatlari. Toshkent: O'zbekiston Milliy Ensiklopediyasi.
7. Хутыз И.П. Фактор адресата в письменном академическом дискурсе // Коммуникативные исследования. 2023. Т. 10. № 1. с. 146–162. DOI: 10.24147/2413-6182.2023.10(1).146-162.
8. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Волгоград: Перемена, 2002. 240 с.

