



PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ACADEMIC DISCOURSE WITHIN THE ANTHROPOCENTRIC PARADIGM

Rakhmonova Dilnavoz Shavqiddinovna

Email: rakhmonova1989@gmail.com

Renessans ta'lim universiteti

Xorijiy filologiya kafedrasida katta o'qituvchisi

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.19949868>

ARTICLE INFO

Received: 25th April 2026

Accepted: 27th April 2026

Online: 29th April 2026

KEYWORDS

academic discourse, anthropocentric paradigm, pragmatics, speech acts, frame theory, sociopragmatics, discourse analysis

ABSTRACT

This study investigates the pragmatic features of academic discourse within the anthropocentric paradigm, which prioritizes the human factor in linguistic analysis. The research is motivated by paradigm shifts in late twentieth-century linguistics, where structural approaches were replaced by functional, cognitive, and discourse-oriented perspectives. The paper aims to analyze how academic discourse functions as a communicative and cognitive phenomenon shaped by social, cultural, and psychological factors. The methodology is based on qualitative discourse analysis, incorporating speech act theory and frame theory as analytical tools. The findings demonstrate that academic discourse is not only a means of knowledge transmission but also a dynamic system of interaction influenced by pragmatic intentions, emotional scenarios, and communicative strategies. The study concludes that integrating anthropocentric approaches with modern discourse analysis enhances both theoretical understanding and pedagogical practice.

Introduction: The development of modern linguistics has been significantly influenced by paradigm shifts that occurred in the late twentieth century. Traditional structural approaches, which treated language as a static system, have been replaced by anthropocentric, functional, and cognitive perspectives that emphasize the role of the human factor in language use (Humboldt, 1999; Sapir, 1921). This transformation has led to a deeper understanding of language as a dynamic and interactive phenomenon.

Academic discourse, as a specialized form of communication, plays a crucial role in the dissemination of knowledge and the organization of scientific interaction. From an anthropocentric perspective, academic discourse is closely linked to human cognition, communicative intentions, and social context (Maslova, 2001). Therefore, its analysis requires an integrated approach that combines linguistic, pragmatic, and cognitive frameworks.

2. Literature Review

The anthropocentric paradigm has been extensively developed in modern linguistics. Early contributions by Sapir (1921) and Whorf (1956) established the connection between

language and thought, while Lakoff and Johnson (1980) emphasized the conceptual nature of language through metaphor theory. Chomsky (1965), although primarily structuralist, contributed to understanding the cognitive foundations of language.

Speech act theory, introduced by Austin (1962) and further elaborated by Searle (1969), provides a key framework for analyzing the functional aspects of language. It highlights how utterances perform actions and influence communication. Grice's (1975) cooperative principle further explains how meaning is constructed through interaction.

Frame theory, developed by Minsky (1974), offers a cognitive perspective on discourse by explaining how knowledge structures shape communication. Recent studies (Fawns & Salder, 2020; Thornberg, 2008; Griffith, 2015) demonstrate the application of these theories in educational contexts, particularly in analyzing classroom discourse and communicative strategies. Despite these advancements, research in Uzbek linguistics on anthropocentric and sociopragmatic aspects remains relatively underdeveloped, indicating the need for further investigation.

3. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative research methodology based on discourse analysis. The data include examples of academic and pedagogical discourse, which are analyzed using speech act theory and frame theory.

The analysis focuses on:

- identifying types of speech acts in academic discourse,
- examining their pragmatic functions,
- analyzing communicative strategies and emotional scenarios,
- interpreting discourse through cognitive frames.

Such an approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of both the linguistic and pragmatic dimensions of academic communication.

4. Results and Discussion

Academic Discourse as a Pragmatic Phenomenon: Academic discourse is not limited to the transmission of information but also involves interaction, persuasion, and the construction of knowledge. As Maslova (2001) notes, it is shaped by cognitive and sociocultural factors.

Role of Speech Act Theory: Speech act theory plays a central role in understanding academic discourse. According to Searle (1969), speech acts can be categorized into representatives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations. These categories reflect different communicative intentions and functions.

In academic settings, speech acts are often used strategically. For example, directives may appear in the form of recommendations or instructions, while representatives are used to present arguments and findings. The effectiveness of these acts depends on their illocutionary force and perlocutionary effect (Austin, 1962).

Communicative Strategies and Emotional Scenarios

Communication in academic discourse involves both rational and affective dimensions. Emotional scenarios can influence the listener's perception and response. Positive strategies (encouragement, empathy) tend to foster cooperation, while negative strategies (fear, criticism) may lead to resistance.

For instance, in a classroom context, a teacher may use different communicative strategies to influence student behavior. A fear-based approach may ensure discipline but reduce motivation, whereas a positive approach enhances engagement and participation.

Limitations of Speech Act Theory: Despite its significance, speech act theory has certain limitations. It primarily focuses on the speaker's intention and does not fully account for the dynamic and interactive nature of discourse (Levinson, 1983). Therefore, it should be complemented with discourse analysis and sociopragmatic approaches.

Role of Frame Theory in Academic Discourse: Frame theory provides a cognitive framework for understanding how individuals interpret communicative situations. According to Minsky (1974), frames organize knowledge about typical situations and guide interpretation.

In academic discourse, frames help structure communication and facilitate understanding. Reframing techniques, as discussed by Weiner (1992) and Griffith (2015), can improve communication by altering the perspective of participants.

Conclusion: The study demonstrates that academic discourse is a complex and dynamic phenomenon shaped by cognitive, social, and pragmatic factors. The anthropocentric paradigm provides a valuable framework for understanding the role of the human factor in communication.

The integration of speech act theory and frame theory allows for a more comprehensive analysis of academic discourse, highlighting the importance of communicative strategies and cognitive structures. These findings have important implications for both linguistic research and educational practice, particularly in improving communication and teaching effectiveness.

References:

1. Austin, J. L. 1962. How to do things with words. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 5–6, 94–107.
2. Chomsky, N. 1965. Aspects of the theory of syntax. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 3–15.
3. Cicourel, A. V. 1973. Cognitive sociology. New York: Free Press, pp. 45–52.
- Grice, H. P. 1975. Logic and conversation. In P. Cole and J. Morgan (Eds.), Syntax and semantics Vol. 3, pp. 41–58. New York: Academic Press.
4. Humboldt, W. von. 1999. On language: On the diversity of human language construction and its influence on the mental development of the human species. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 48–52.
5. Lakoff, G., and Johnson, M. 1980. Metaphors we live by. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 3–6.
6. Levinson, S. C. 1983. Pragmatics. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 226–230.
7. Maslova, V. A. 2001. Linguoculturology. Moscow: Academia, pp. 15–22.
8. Minsky, M. 1974. A framework for representing knowledge. In P. Winston (Ed.), The psychology of computer vision pp. 211–277. New York: McGraw-Hill.
9. Sapir, E. 1921. Language: An introduction to the study of speech. New York: Harcourt Brace, pp. 207–214.
10. Searle, J. R. 1969. Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 23–42.

11. Sinclair, J., and Coulthard, M. 1975. Towards an analysis of discourse. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–10, 21–25.
12. Whorf, B. L. 1956. Language, thought, and reality. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, pp. 213–214

