



MIRZO ULUG'BEK NOMIDAGI
O'ZBEKISTON MILLIY UNIVERSITETI
JIZZAX FILIALI



**KOMPYUTER IMLARI VA
MUHANDISLIK TEXNOLOGIYALARI
XALQARO ILMIY-TEXNIK
ANJUMAN MATERIALLARI
TO'PLAMI
2-QISM**



26-27-SENTABR
2025-YIL



**O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY TA'LIM, FAN VA
INNOVATSIYALAR VAZIRLIGI**

**MIRZO ULUG'BEK NOMIDAGI O'ZBEKISTON MILLIY
UNIVERSITETINING JIZZAX FILIALI**



**KOMPYUTER IMLARI VA MUHANDISLIK
TEXNOLOGIYALARI**

mavzusidagi Xalqaro ilmiy-texnik anjuman materiallari to'plami
(2025-yil 26-27-sentabr)

2-QISM

JIZZAX-2025

Kompyuter ilmlari va muhandislik texnologiyalari. Xalqaro ilmiy-texnik anjuman materiallari to‘plami – Jizzax: O‘zMU Jizzax filiali, 2025-yil 26-27-sentabr. 368-bet.

Xalqaro miqyosidagi ilmiy-texnik anjuman materiallarida zamonaviy kompyuter ilmlari va muhandislik texnologiyalari sohasidagi innovatsion tadqiqotlar aks etgan.

Globallashuv sharoitida davlatimizni yanada barqaror va jadal sur’atlar bilan rivojlantirish bo‘yicha amalga oshirilayotgan islohotlar samarasini yaxshilash sohasidagi ilmiy-tadqiqot ishlariga alohida e’tibor qaratilgan. Zero iqtisodiyotning, ijtimoiy sohalarni qamrab olgan modernizatsiya jarayonlari, hayotning barcha sohalarini liberallashtirishni talab qilmoqda.

Ushbu ilmiy ma’ruza tezislari to‘plamida mamlakatimiz va xorijlik turli yo‘nalishlarda faoliyat olib borayotgan mutaxassislar, olimlar, professor-o‘qituvchilar, ilmiy tadqiqot institutlari va markazlarining ilmiy xodimlari, tadqiqotchilar, magistr va talabalarning ilmiy-tadqiqot ishlari natijalari mujassamlashgan.

Mas’ul muharrirlar: DSc.prof. Turakulov O.X., t.f.n., dots. Baboyev A.M.

Tahrir hay’ati a’zolari: p.f.d.(DSc), prof. Turakulov O.X., t.f.n., dots. Baboyev A.M., t.f.f.d.(PhD), prof. Abduraxmanov R.A., p.f.f.d.(PhD) Eshankulov B.S., p.f.n., dots. Alimov N.N., p.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Alibayev S.X., t.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Abdumalikov A.A, p.f.f.d.(PhD) Hafizov E.A., f.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Sindorov L.K., t.f.f.d.(PhD), dots. Nasirov B.U., b.f.f.d. (PhD) O‘ralov A.I., p.f.n., dots. Aliqulov S.T., t.f.f.d.(PhD) Kuvandikov J.T., i.f.n., dots. Tsot M.P., Sharipova S.F., Jo‘rayev M.M.

Mazkur to‘plamga kiritilgan ma’ruza tezislarining mazmuni, undagi statistik ma’lumotlar va me’yoriy hujjatlarning to‘g‘riliqi hamda tanqidiy fikr-mulohazalar, keltirilgan takliflarga mualliflarning o‘zlari mas’uldirlar.

5. O‘zbekiston Respublikasi Jismoniy tarbiya va sport vazirligi hisobotlari, 2023–2024.

6. Nazarov S., Muhammedov B. XOTIN-QIZLAR SPORTINI RIVOJLANISHDA SOG ‘LOM ONA VA OILANING O ‘RNI: <https://zenodo.org/records/13898432> //Journal of Contemporary World Studies. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 7. – C. 36-39.

7. Nazarov S. FUTBOLCHILAR TEZKOR-KUCHLILIK SIFATLARI DARAJASINI O ‘YIN USULLARI SAMARADORLIGIGA TA’SIRI //Science technology&Digital finance. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 5. – C. 4-9.

8. Nazarov S. QISQA MASOFAGA YUGURUVCHI MAKTAB O ‘QUVCHILARINING TEZKOR-CHIDAMILIGINI RIVOJLANTIRISH USLUBIYATI //Journal of Contemporary World Studies. – 2024. – T. 2. – №. 5. – C. 4-9.

9. Назаров Ш., Турабеков О. Yuqori malakali futbolchilarni yillik siklda yuklamalar taqsimotini tahlil qilish //Новый Узбекистан: наука, образование и инновации. – 2024. – Т. 1. – №. 1. – С. 644-647.

TEXTUALITY STANDARDS IN ACADEMIC VERSUS NON-ACADEMIC DISCOURSES

Nazarov Asilbek

Master’s student Jizzakh branch of National university of Uzbekistan

Solnyshkina Marina Ivanovna

Jizzakh branch of National university of Uzbekistan

Annotation: This paper examines the application of textuality standards in academic and non-academic discourses. Using Beaugrande and Dressler’s (1981) model of seven standards—cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality—the study compares how these criteria are realized in two different communicative domains. The analysis reveals that academic discourse prioritizes cohesion, coherence, and intertextuality to establish scientific credibility and precision, while non-academic discourse emphasizes intentionality, informativity, and situationality to ensure accessibility and engagement for broader audiences. The findings highlight the genre-specific manifestations of textuality and their implications for discourse studies, pedagogy, and translation practice.

Key Words: textuality, academic discourse, non-academic discourse, cohesion, coherence, intertextuality, discourse analysis.

The concept of textuality plays a fundamental role in discourse analysis, as it determines what distinguishes a coherent, communicative text from a random sequence of sentences. De Beaugrande and Dressler (1981) established seven criteria - cohesion, coherence, intentionality, acceptability, informativity, situationality, and intertextuality

- that serve as standards of textuality. These standards are universal, but their actual realization depends on the type of discourse and communicative purpose.

This paper investigates how textuality standards manifest in two broad discourse types: academic and non-academic. Academic discourse encompasses research articles, conference papers, and scholarly essays, while non-academic discourse refers to texts such as news articles, blogs, advertisements, or everyday communication. By comparing the two, the paper seeks to highlight both the shared principles and distinctive strategies that characterize textual organization across genres. Academic discourse has been defined as a form of specialized communication aimed at constructing and disseminating knowledge (Hyland, 2009). It is highly conventionalized, governed by explicit norms of citation, argumentation, and structure. Non-academic discourse, by contrast, is broader and more flexible, covering texts that are not bound by institutional or scientific conventions. The seven standards of textuality offer a framework for systematic comparison: Cohesion ensures surface-level connectivity through grammar and lexis.

Coherence guarantees logical relationships and semantic unity.

Intentionality reflects the producer's communicative purpose.

Acceptability refers to the receiver's recognition of a text as meaningful.

Informativity measures the degree of novelty and unexpectedness.

Situationality ties the text to a communicative context.

Intertextuality connects a text with others within a discourse tradition.

This study employs qualitative discourse analysis. Two corpora were selected: (1) research articles from peer-reviewed journals in linguistics and (2) feature articles from online news outlets and blogs. Each corpus was analyzed according to the seven standards of textuality. The goal was not to quantify frequency but to illustrate how each standard is emphasized differently in academic and non-academic texts.

Academic texts rely on complex cohesive ties, including subordinating conjunctions (however, therefore, consequently) and precise referential pronouns. Such devices guide the reader through extended argumentation. Non-academic texts, by contrast, employ simpler cohesive strategies, such as short sentences, parallelism, and repetition, making them accessible to a general audience. In academic discourse, coherence is achieved through logical reasoning, hypothesis–evidence–conclusion structures, and explicit transitions between sections. Non-academic discourse often prioritizes narrative coherence, arranging information in a way that aligns with the reader's cognitive expectations (e.g., the inverted pyramid in news writing). The primary intention of academic discourse is to expand knowledge, persuade through evidence, and engage with existing scholarship. Non-academic discourse demonstrates more varied intentions: informing, entertaining, persuading, or even provoking emotional responses. Academic readers expect conformity to scholarly norms—rigorous argumentation, citations, objectivity—without which a text risks rejection. Non-academic audiences, however, expect clarity, brevity, and relevance. A text overloaded with technical terminology may fail the test of acceptability in this context. Academic discourse tends to present high informativity, but in incremental steps that require prior knowledge. Non-academic discourse emphasizes immediacy: headlines, slogans, and striking narratives often deliver information in condensed, easily

digestible form. The situational context of academic texts is long-term and cumulative, contributing to disciplinary debates. Non-academic texts, however, are often tied to specific and immediate contexts - news events, social media trends, or marketing campaigns - thus situationality becomes a key organizing principle. Academic discourse is characterized by explicit intertextuality: references, citations, and literature reviews are central. Non-academic discourse employs implicit or informal intertextuality, such as allusions to cultural events, public figures, or memes, often without formal acknowledgment. The comparison shows that while all texts must satisfy the seven standards of textuality, the balance of emphasis varies by discourse type. Academic texts are characterized by stability, precision, and cumulative knowledge, placing high value on cohesion, coherence, and intertextuality. Non-academic texts, on the other hand, adapt standards to the demands of accessibility and relevance, relying on intentionality, informativity, and situationality.

These differences have practical implications. For second-language learners, awareness of textuality standards can improve both academic and everyday communication skills. In translation studies, understanding genre-specific textuality helps translators produce functionally equivalent texts. In discourse studies, the comparative approach demonstrates that textuality is not merely a static property but a dynamic, context-sensitive phenomenon.

This paper has argued that textuality standards function as universal criteria for defining texts, but their manifestation depends heavily on the type of discourse. Academic texts foreground cohesion, coherence, and intertextuality to construct scholarly knowledge, while non-academic texts foreground intentionality, informativity, and situationality to engage broader audiences. Recognizing these genre-specific patterns deepens our understanding of textual communication and opens pathways for further research in applied linguistics, pedagogy, and intercultural communication.

References:

1. Beaugrande, R. de, & Dressler, W. (1981). *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman. ([https://archive.org/details/introductiontete0000beau](https://archive.org/details/introductiontote0000beau))
2. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman. Link (<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315836010>)
3. Hyland, K. (2009). *Academic Discourse: English in a Global Context*. London: Continuum. Link (<https://www.bloomsbury.com/academic-discourse-9780826498051/>)
4. Van Dijk, T. A. (1997). *Discourse as Structure and Process*. London: SAGE. Link (<https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446221884>)
5. Fairclough, N. (1995). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of language* (<https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315834368>)
6. Tanskanen, S. (2006). *Collaborating Towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse*.