THE CHARACTERISTICS AND ASPECTS OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE: THEORY AND EXAMPLES"

Yusupova Azizaxon Abduvoxidjonovna
ASIFL, PhD student
aziza.yusupova.84@mail.ru
Orchid: 0009-0000-2706-5785
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.15665936

Abstract. This article is devoted to the study of the characteristics and aspects of scientific discourse, its theoretical foundations and practical application. The key concepts of discourse, the distinctions between discourse, speech, and text, and their relationship are examined. The paper analyzes the main approaches to the definition of discourse in linguistics, philosophy, and sociology, including works by researchers such as M. Foucault, N. D. Arutyunova, V. I. Karasik and T. A. van Dijk. Special attention is paid to the analysis of scholarly discourse as one variety of institutional communication. Its specific characteristics, such as strict logical structure, objectivity, terminological precision, and intertextuality, are considered. The article also provides examples of political, scientific, and media discourses in three languages (Uzbek, Russian, and English), demonstrating the influence of cultural and pragmatic factors on discursive practices. The findings contribute to a deeper understanding of scientific discourse as an important mechanism for social communication and knowledge sharing. The study can be useful for linguists, philologists, sociologists, and researchers engaged in the study of communication in an academic environment.

Key words: discourse, discourse analysis, typology, classification, aspects, speech, text, communication, context, social function, structure.

Introduction

Language and speech are shaped according to various communicative needs in society, and each field has its own distinctive speech characteristics. In recent years, the study of discourse has become one of the key areas of linguistic research. However, the differences between the concepts of "discourse", "speech", and "text" have not yet been definitively established. Although these terms have clear theoretical definitions, practical research does not allow them to be interpreted as a single concept. Therefore, there is a need for a deeper analysis of discourse.

The concept of discourse has existed since ancient times, and it refers to understanding the world, rather than knowing it. Aristotle's "Metaphysics" discussed the idea of knowing the world discursively, that is, through perception and discussion, and by the 20th century, discourse had also become a topic of discussion in linguistics.

Discourse is a method of forming and presenting knowledge, ideas, and opinions in speech or text. It encompasses not only the information itself but also the context in which it is presented, as well as the social and cultural aspects of communication. Discourse can be either spoken or written and includes academic means such as scientific articles, literary works, and political speeches. The study of discourse in linguistics, philosophy, sociology, and cultural studies provides insights into how language shapes social relations, governance, and ideologies.

In the linguistic worldview, discourse, speech, and text have distinct yet interrelated characteristics. These concepts are closely related but possess unique features and contexts.

Discourse is a complex concept that extends beyond simple speech or text; it serves as a fundamental tool for studying the interconnections between language, culture, and social relations. It integrates linguacultural aspects (the interaction between language and culture) and pragmatic aspects (goal-orientated influence). Discourse shapes human communication not only through language but also through cultural perspectives and values.

Discourse examines the ways in which meanings are constructed and used within socio-cultural contexts. It provides a broad analysis of issues, ideas, and relationships between communicators. Unlike mere linguistic structures, discourse extends to social relations, social context, and meaning.

Speech expresses human emotions and thoughts through language and typically occurs in specific situations, such as conversations or lectures. The main goal of speech is to exchange information, express opinions, and establish social relations.

Text is a meaningful collection of written symbols presented in books, articles, and other graphic formats. Texts have their own structural composition, grammar, and vocabulary. Unlike discourse and speech, text is often static and can be used in a specific context.

Discourse is closely connected with speech and text: while speech constitutes the discursive process, text is analysed within the discursive context.

Theoretical foundations

In science, a situation often arises when scientists cannot come to a single conclusion on some issue for a long time. This happens especially regularly within the framework of the humanities. This happened with the elusive concept from the field of linguistics – discourse.

This concept is very general: it describes a complex and multifaceted phenomenon that takes on a new colouring each time, and the number of such colours is unlimited. That is why scientists have studied individual aspects of discourse for a long time and argued a lot about its properties, characteristics and even definition.

The situation is made even more confusing by the nature of the environment in which it exists. Language, culture, and social norms – all these are dynamic phenomena that constantly undergo minor changes.

So, there are two different understandings of discourse: traditional and postmodern. The first of them appeared in Ancient Greece.

At that time, philosophers divided knowledge about the world into 2 types:

1. immediate (or intuitive)

2. Discursive – those that can be understood and accepted only through proof and reasoning.

In addition, ancient philosophers contrasted universal, holistic consciousness and discursive (reason). In its movement, reason studies and correlates individual meanings and statements.

This philosophy was continued in the Middle Ages by Thomas Aquinas. He argued that discursive thinking is a consistent movement of the mind from one object to another – i.e., it is based on reasoning.

A new interpretation of discourse appeared in the 20th century, when such philosophical trends as structuralism and poststructuralism developed. Today, most scientists give this phenomenon the following general definition: Discourse is a complex communicative

phenomenon, a hierarchy of knowledge, and also a set of linguistic statements that create a single semantic field or system. This definition reflects the ideas found in such scientists as M. Foucault, N. D. Arutyunova, V. I. Karasik, T. A. van Dijk and others. The following characteristics are the main characteristics of discourse:

- Linguistic nature: discourse is a form of communication; it is formed through language.

- Communicativeness: the main goal of discourse is the transmission of certain meanings.

-Special vocabulary: discourse is associated with linguistic activity in a certain area and has vocabulary from this area.

-Sociocultural nature: recently, the concept of discourse includes not only strictly linguistic but also extralinguistic factors that are important for understanding its nature (for example, knowledge of the world, historical context, etc.).

-Systematicity: various types of discourse are distinguished (the classification itself varies from scientist to scientist, but here are examples: scientific discourse, media discourse, Internet discourse, etc.).

Thus, I am it is worth emphasizing again that discourse is "a language within a language" within which there exists a special grammar, vocabulary, semantics, etc. that is characteristic only of it.

Literature review

The term "discourse" became prominent in the 1920s as a widely discussed concept in academia. French philosopher Michel Foucault and linguist Norman Fairclough were among the first scholars to study discourse. Foucault viewed discourse not only as a linguistic concept but also as a broader cultural phenomenon, emphasising its role in reflecting social and governance relations. According to him, the fundamental unit of discourse is an idea.

N.D. Arutyunova offers her definition of the term discourse as following: discourse is speech "immersed in life[1].

Linguist V. Z. Demyankov considered discourse to be a comprehensive system of speech and text within a socio-cultural context, linking it to communication and meaning-making processes. He argued that discourse is not merely an individual speech act or text but rather a phenomenon encompassing social, cultural, psychological, and communicative meanings and functions. His analysis focused on how discourse is formed, changes over time, and plays a role in social contexts. Demyankov advocated for an interdisciplinary approach to discourse studies, viewing discourse as a dynamic phenomenon whose elements change based on communicative conditions and social context. He emphasised that discourse serves functions such as expression, persuasion, and manipulation depending on the speaker's goals and motivations.

Yu. S. Stepanov described discourse as "a language within a language", proposing that it should be studied as a social, cultural, and communicative process. He viewed discourse as more than just speech or text, encompassing its meaning, function, and structure within a social context. According to Stepanov, discourse reflects social events, relationships, and cultural values, requiring attention to extralinguistic factors. His concept of discourse helps understand the complex relationship between language and meaning.

1

The definition of this discourse – that it is a language within a language – is a bit controversial, because several scientists have put forward such an interpretation. In addition to Yu. S. Stepanov, one can see such conclusions in the works of L. O. Cherneyko and V. I. Karasik.

I. N. Gorelov and K. F. Sedov note that discourse is a reflection of interaction (social and communicative interaction) of linguistic personalities and define this phenomenon as "a speech work that represents a segment of "living speech" and as "a speech work in the fullness of its cognitive and socio-cultural characteristics.

Understanding discourse as a communicative event is based on its representation as a communicative event in the concept of T. A. van Dijk, according to which "... discourse, in the broad sense of the word, is a complex unity of linguistic form, meaning and action, which could be best characterised by the concept of a communicative event or communicative act.

In addition to these scholars, many others have contributed to discourse studies, including T. van Dijk, I. R. Galperin, Deborah Schiffrin, Kaplunenko, and Robert de Beaugrande.

Uzbek linguist Sh. S. Safarov referenced V. A. Zvegintsev's definition of discourse as a "linguistic territory hidden behind clouds", emphasising the need for exploration and analysis of discourse.

The main aspects of discourse research include:

• Communication process: The interaction between the participants (addresser and addressee) and their mutual influence.

• Context: The social, cultural, and historical conditions in which discourse takes place.

• Social function: Discourse serves as a tool for shaping social norms, governance, and communication. For example, political speeches shape public opinion.

• Structure (form): Statements or texts are analysed in relation to purpose, subject, and strategy.

Research methodology

At present, the terminological classification of discursive statements is quite heterogeneous, as is the case with the definition of the term discourse itself. Different variants of discourse typology are presented in the works of scientists such as B. N. Golovko, G. G. Pocheptsov, V. I. Karasik, G. M. Yavorskaya, and others. For example, B. N. Golovko classifies discursivity into the following types: pedagogical discourse, political discourse, social discourse, ideological discourse, public discourse, scientific discourse, critical discourse, resonant discourse, legal discourse, military discourse, parental discourse, ethical discourse, and pragmatic discourses, to which all of the above belong, on the basis that certain communicative strategies are actualised in each of them. G. G. Pocheptsov classifies discourses from the following considerations: features of speech in the context of discourse, features of the symbolic reflection of the real situation by this discourse and features of the communicative situation. The author distinguishes between television and radio discourse; newspaper, theatrical, film discourse; literary discourse; discourse in the sphere of "public relations"; advertising; political, totalitarian, unofficial, religious, untruthful, ritual, etiquette, folklore, mythological, festive, non-verbal, intercultural, visual, and hierarchical discourse; and ironic.

From the standpoint of sociolinguistics, as V. I. Karasik rightly believes, discourse is communication between people, considered from the standpoint of their belonging to a particular social group or in relation to a particular typical speech-behavioural situation, for

example, institutional communication. V. I. Karasik's classification is particularly relevant to this research, as it allows for a detailed examination of the linguistic and pragmatic characteristics of scientific discourse within an institutional context. Taking into account all of the above, many scientists agree with the classification of V. I. Karasik in relation to modern society: political, administrative, legal, military, pedagogical, religious, mystical, medical, business, advertising, sports, scientific, stage and mass-information types of institutional discourse are distinguished. Besides, V. I. Karasik identifies two key types of discourse: personal (focused on the individual) and institutional. The first type assumes that the communicant manifests himself as an individual with all the richness of the inner world, while in the second case he acts as a representative of a certain social institution. According to Karasik, institutional discourse is a formalised and stereotyped type of communication in which participants interact, following the established norms of society, even if they do not know each other personally. Within the framework of this classification, personal discourse is divided into two main types: existential and everyday.

Investigation and results

DISCOURSE ANALYSIS

In modern linguistics, discourse analysis is applied in various fields:

1. Political discourse – texts and speeches related to political life.

• Example: A political leader's campaign speech.

• In Uzbek discourse, Amir Timur's decrees emphasised the unity of justice and strength to strengthen state governance.

• In Russian discourse, the phrase "Уважаемые граждане России!" ("Dear citizens of Russia!") aims to create social unity and trust.

• In English discourse, Barack Obama's slogan "Yes, we can" symbolised hope, unity, and change.

2. Scientific discourse – the language of terminology and argumentation in academic works.

• Example: In scientific articles, sentences are structured differently from everyday communication, using precise grammar and specialised terms.

• Immanuel Kant's Critique of Pure Reason contains terms such as transcendental idealism, illustrating the complexity of scientific discourse.

• Example sentence: "The process of photosynthesis converts solar energy into chemical energy."

3. Media discourse – texts and information in mass media.

 Example: The language used in advertising.

A commercial might say: "The next-generation smartphone! Everything you've ever wanted!" —demonstrating the use of emotional appeal to attract customers.

Business discourse – the act of making promises, building relationships, negotiating agreements, and achieving organi.

In Uzbek business discourse, *«SAM ANTEP GILAM» MChJga O'zbekiston Savdo-sanoat palatasiga so'nggi paytlarda mahalliy tadbirkorlik sub'ektlaridan Respublikamizda ishlab chiqarilayotgan polipropilen granulasini ichki bozorga yetkazib berishda uning hajmlarini oshirish yuzasidan amaliy yordam ko'rsatishni so'rab, ko'plab murojaatlar kelib tushmoqda. Masalan, Palata tomonidan 2016 yil 8 iyundagi 7/ASh-05-3447-sonli xat orqali «JURABEK LABORATORIES» MChJ QKning turli dori vositalarini qadoqlash uchun polimer granulalarga*

bo'lgan ehtiyojini qondirish borasida O'zbekiston Respublikasi Iqtisodiyot vazirligi va «O'zbekneftgaz» MXKsiga murojaat qilingan edi. Xuddi shunday Savdo-sanoat palatasiga zamonaviy eksportbop gilam mahsulotlari ishlab chiqarishga ixtisoslashgan «SAM ANTEP GILAM» Qo'shma korxonasi murojaat qilib, korxona faoliyatida asosiy xomashyo sanalgan polipropilen granulasini Eron, Koreya, Rossiya va Bangladeshdan sotib olish va bu xomashyo uchun katta miqdorda xorijiy valyuta mablag'i sarflanishini ma'lum qilgan. Bugungi kunda ushbu xomashyoni chetdan Respublikamizga olib kirishda yuqori import boj stavkalari qo'llanilayotganligi sababli korxonada ishlab chiqarilayotgan tayyor mahsulotlar tannarxi oshishiga olib kelmoqda. Natijada, «SAM ANTEP GILAM» QKsining gilam mahsulotlari Turkiyada ishlab chiqarilgan gilam mahsulotlari narxiga nisbatan ancha yuqori bo'lganligi uchun mahsulot eksport qilishda qiyinchiliklarni keltirib chiqarmoqda. Shu bilan birga, respublikamiz hukumatining 2016 yil 27 iyuldagi 216-sonli qaroriga muvofiq, "Uz-Kor Gas Chemical" MChJ QKsi tomonidan ishlab chiqarilayotgan polipropilen xomashyosini Respublika tovar xomashyo birjasi orqali ichki bozorda sotish yo'lga qo'yildi. Natijada, polipropilen granulasidan foydalanuvchi aksariyat sanoat korxonalari uchun polimer xomashyosiga bo'lgan ehtiyojlarini qondirish imkoniyati yuzaga keldi.

Rais A.

In Russian discourse, *Компания А: Мы заинтересованы в покупке 10 000 единиц вашего продукта по сниженной цене. Готовы ли вы обсудить оптовые расценки?*

Компания B: Благодарим за интерес. При заказе такого объёма мы можем предложить скидку в 10%. Однако для этого нам необходим долгосрочный контракт.

Компания А: Это разумно. Можно ли обсудить гибкие условия оплаты?

Компания B: Мы можем предложить 60-дневный срок оплаты вместо стандартных 30 дней. Это вас устроит?

Компания А: Да, это приемлемо. Давайте оформлять контракт.

In English discourse, Subject: Proposal for Strategic Partnership

Dear Mr Johnson,

I hope this email finds you well. We would like to discuss a potential strategic partnership between our companies. Our team has analysed market trends and believes that a collaboration could be mutually beneficial.

Please let us know a convenient time for a meeting to explore this opportunity further. We look forward to your response.

Best regards,

Sarah Collins

Marketing Director, ABC Corporation

Discourse analysis helps understand social relations, power dynamics, and the cultural dimensions of language.

LINGUACULTURAL AND PRAGMATIC ASPECTS OF DISCOURSE

The linguacultural aspect of discourse reflects cultural values and national characteristics.

Example:

In Uzbek, "Vaqt g'animat" (Time is precious) emphasises moral and educational values rather than material concerns.

In Russian, "Время – деньги" (Time is money) conveys the idea of valuing time as an economic resource.

In English, "Time is money" represents a culture where time is seen as a commodity that affects financial gain.

The pragmatic aspect of discourse focuses on achieving communicative goals through persuasion, control, or influence (e.g., advertisements and political speeches).

Examples:

1. Persuasion – A politician during an election campaign: "We will rebuild this country! We will create opportunities for every citizen!"

2. Emotional appeal – An advertisement: "This new car will make your life easier and ensure safety for your family!"

3. Speech acts:

Promise – "I will bring a cake for your birthday tomorrow."

Request – "Can you tell me more about this product?"

In this regard, scientific discourse deserves special attention, as it differs from other types of discourse in its purpose, structure, and principles of language use.

Scientific Discourse and Its Classification

The classification of discourse remains a controversial issue in linguistics. Researchers such as M. Foucault, Yu. S. Stepanov, G. D. Bondarchuk, and T. van Dijk have proposed different approaches to studying discursive practices. However, the most detailed and well-founded classification system was developed by V. I. Karasik, whose classification is of particular interest within the scope of this article.

Scientific discourse is considered one of the key types of institutional discourse and possesses the following distinctive features:

-Strict logical structure – Scientific texts are structured according to a specific scheme, ensuring clarity and coherence.

-Objectivity and reliance on evidence – Statements must be based on facts, research, and logical conclusions, avoiding subjectivity.

-Terminological precision – Clearly defined terms are used to minimise ambiguity.

-Intertextuality – Scientific texts are interconnected through references to previous research, forming a system of scientific collaboration.

-Impersonality – The personal element is minimised in scientific discourse, often achieved through impersonal constructions (e.g., "It was determined that…", "The research results indicate that…").

Scientific discourse is distinguished not only from a linguistic perspective but also from a socio-pragmatic point of view. The communication process within scientific discourse takes place within the scientific community and adheres to certain norms. As a result, scientific discourse includes specific genres such as monographs, scientific articles, lectures, dissertations, and reviews. All these genres serve the function of conveying and validating scientific knowledge.

From the perspective of modern linguistics and socio-pragmatics, scientific discourse is a complex phenomenon with unique characteristics that set it apart from other types of discourse. Primarily, scientific discourse requires a strict logical structure, objectivity, and terminological precision. Research has shown that scientific discourse is not just a linguistic phenomenon but also a crucial mechanism for social collaboration and knowledge exchange. Therefore, a deeper study of scientific discourse contributes to enhancing the effectiveness of scientific communication.

E.A. Krotkov identifies several key features of scientific discourse, including its capacity, content, and conciseness. He emphasises the structured nature of scientific communication, which follows a clear organisation of introduction, argumentation, conclusion, and summary. The language is generally uniform in terms of vocabulary and syntax, and the presentation is impersonal and objective. Scientific discourse often incorporates quotations and references to the works of other researchers and may include paralinguistic elements like diagrams, sketches, and illustrations. Additionally, it tends to have a nominal character.

Scientific discourse has a number of linguistic features:

Language. Scientific discourse uses terminology that is characteristic of each specific scientific field, be it physics, chemistry, mathematics or the humanities. The communicative code is adapted to the specifics of each discipline. In this context, neologisms and new terms are actively used, which facilitate the explanation of the phenomena under study and contribute to the enrichment of the language, improving the understanding of the surrounding world.

Objectivity. Scientific discourse assumes objectivity in the transmission of information. Research results should be based on specific, verifiable data and also use methods that ensure the reliability of the object of study.

Clarity. Clarity means that ideas and conclusions should be presented in a logical and structured order, ensuring accuracy and avoiding confusion. This is important so that the research results are easily digestible and understandable for the audience.

Graphics. Scientific discourse widely uses graphs, diagrams and pictures, which complement the text and help to more clearly present the research results. They explain data in a universal language, simplifying the understanding of the material under study.

Analysis and systematicity. Scientific discourse develops through analysis and systematicity. Elements that are the object of research are studied not only through observation but also through their analysis, which includes the study of the causes of phenomena and their impact on the environment. Systematicity in scientific discourse is to show the interaction of elements that cause certain phenomena. Together, analysis and systematicity help ensure the reliability and validity of scientific conclusions.

Scientific discourse can be presented in various forms:

Cognitive. One type of scientific discourse is informative discourse, the purpose of which is to disseminate knowledge about methods, experiments, and research results. The main objective of this type of discourse is to explain scientific concepts in simple and accessible language to a wide audience.

Didactic. Scientific discourse uses didactic methods to share knowledge through training. The content is created by specialists in the field and is aimed at an audience that already has a basic understanding of the topic. It is important to keep in mind that the choice of topic depends on various factors such as knowledge in the subject area, interests, motivation and career prospects.

Scientific discourse plays a crucial role in the academic and research communities by enabling the exchange of knowledge and discoveries. This study aims to analyse the fundamental characteristics of scientific discourse, considering its linguistic and pragmatic aspects. By examining examples from different languages, the article highlights variations in discourse strategies and their implications for international scientific communication.

Numerous researchers have explored scientific discourse from linguistic, pragmatic, and sociocultural perspectives. Karasik (2004) classifies scientific discourse as a type of institutional discourse, characterised by its formality, objectivity, and reliance on established rhetorical conventions. Swales (1990) introduced the concept of discourse communities, emphasising the role of shared norms and communicative goals in shaping scientific writing. This section provides an overview of key theoretical approaches, comparing different scholarly perspectives on the structure and function of scientific discourse.

Scientific discourse can be analysed through various linguistic and discourse theories, including:

Genre Analysis (Swales, 1990): Identifies the typical structure of scientific texts, such as research articles, conference papers, and dissertations.

Systemic Functional Linguistics (Halliday, 1994): Explores the role of language in constructing meaning within scientific texts.

Pragmatics and Speech Act Theory: Examines how scientific communication achieves its intended effects through specific discourse strategies.

This study employs a comparative discourse analysis approach, examining a corpus of scientific texts in English, Russian, and Uzbek. The methodology includes:

Textual Analysis: Identifying structural patterns and linguistic features.

Comparative Analysis: Examining differences in scientific discourse across languages.

Corpus-Based Approach: Utilising digital text corpora to identify frequency patterns of key linguistic features.

Linguistic Features

Scientific discourse is characterised by:

Formal Register: Use of precise terminology and structured argumentation.

Passive Voice: Commonly used to emphasise objectivity.

Nominalisation: The transformation of verbs into nouns to convey abstract concepts.

Structural Features

Scientific texts typically follow a standardised structure:

Introduction: Establishing research objectives.

Methodology: Describing research procedures.

Results and Discussion: Presenting findings and their interpretations.

Conclusion: Summarising key insights and implications.

Cross-Linguistic Differences

English: Emphasises clarity and conciseness, often employing direct argumentation.

Russian: Uses more complex syntactic structures and a formal tone.

Uzbek: Reflects linguistic and cultural influences, balancing formal and conversational elements.

Discussion

The findings suggest that while scientific discourse shares universal characteristics, linguistic and cultural variations influence its presentation. Understanding these differences is crucial for researchers engaged in international academic communication.

Conclusion

Scientific discourse is a dynamic and evolving field of study. By analysing its linguistic and structural features across languages, this study contributes to a deeper understanding of how scientific knowledge is communicated globally.

References:

1. Arutyunova, N. D. (1990). Discourse. Linguistic Encyclopaedic Dictionary. Moscow: Soviet Encyclopaedia.

2. Beaugrande, R. de. (1997). New Foundations for a Science of Text and Discourse: Cognition, Communication, and the Freedom of Access to Knowledge and Society. New Jersey: Ablex Publishing Corporation Norwood.

3. Chernejko, L. O. (2016). The Term "Discourse": The Search for the Signified. Vestnik Moskovskogo Universiteta. Seriya 10: Zhurnalistika = Bulletin of the Moscow University. Series 10: Journalism, (2), 34–41.

4. Demyankov, V. Z. (1994). Cognitive Linguistics as Diversity in the Interpretive Approach. Voprosy Yazykoznaniya, (4), 17–33.

5. Dijk, T. A. van. (1989). Language, Cognition, Communication. Collected Works. Moscow: Progress.

6. Dyke, T. A. (1989). Yazyk. Poznań. Communication. Moscow: Progress.

7. Foucault, M. (1992). The Archaeology of Knowledge. Tavistock Publications.

8. Galperin, I. R. (1981). Text as an Object of Linguistic Research. Moscow: Nauka.

9. Gorelov, I. N., & Sedov, K. F. (2001). Fundamentals of Psycholinguistics. Moscow: Labirint.

10. Golovko, B. N. (2012). Intertext in Mass Media Discourse. Moscow: Knizhnyi dom "LIBROKOM".

11. Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). An Introduction to Functional Grammar. Edward Arnold.

12. Kaplunenko, A. M. (1991). Historical-Functional Aspect of English Idiom: Monograph. Tashkent: Izd-vo Tashkent GPI im. Nizami.

13. Karasik, V. I. (2000). Language Personality: Institutional and Personal Discourse. Edited by V. I. Karasik & G. G. Slyshkina. Volgograd: Peremena.

14. Karasik, V. I. (2004). Language Circle: Personality, Concepts, Discourse. Moscow: Gnosis.

15. Kodirova, M. (2024). Business Discourse in Linguistics: Research, Classification, and Analysis. Actual Problems of Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(S/7). https://doi.org/10.47390/SPR1342V4SI7Y2024N19

16. Krotkov, E. A., & Kozhemyakin, E. A. (2013). Scientific Discourse. Discourse-Pi, (3). Available at: https://cyberleninka.ru/article/n/nauchnyy-diskurs (accessed: 26.02.2022).

17. Ochilova, N. N. (2020). Distinctive Features of Modern Scientific Discourse. Foreign Philology, (3).

18. Pocheptsov, G. G. (1999). The Theory of Communication. Kiev.

19. Rahmanova, G., Davlatova, K., Shahabitdinova, S., Odiljonova, A., Khayitova, S., & Akhunov, M. (2025). Migration and the elderly: Analysing the social challenges of families left behind. Edelweiss Applied Science and Technology, 9(1), 713–718.

20. Rahmanova, G., & Ekşi, G. (2023). English-Medium Instruction in Higher Education in Uzbekistan: Views on Effectiveness, Career Prospects and Challenges. World Journal of English Language, 13(5), p. 458. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.5430/wjel.v13n5p458