AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 10.91 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-5| 2026 Published: |30-05-2026|

LEXICAL AND TERMINOLOGICAL ORGANIZATION OF SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE

https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20096231

Makhmudova Sabinabonu Rakhmatilla kizi
Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
Teacher, Department of English Language Practice
E-mail: sabinamaxmudova2000@gmail.com

Abstract

This article investigates the lexical and terminological organization of scientific discourse, with special attention to the role of academic texts in the development of linguistic and professional competence. The study distinguishes between specialized terms and common scientific expressions, explains their discourse functions, and shows how they contribute to cohesion, logical progression, and conceptual precision in research writing. Drawing on the material of academic articles and theses, the paper also discusses the relationship between terminology, scientific phraseology, and academic literacy. In addition to the theoretical overview, the article offers a functional classification of frequently used scientific expressions and presents a comparative table of English, Uzbek, and Russian examples. It is argued that scientific discourse is characterized by conceptual density, lexical recurrence, terminological exactness, and a high level of rhetorical organization. For that reason, scientific texts should be considered not only as sources of subject knowledge, but also as effective tools for teaching scholarly communication in a non-native language.

Keywords

scientific discourse, terminology, academic vocabulary, discourse markers, lexicology, scientific style, academic writing, professional competence

Introduction

Modern society is frequently characterized as an information society because theoretical knowledge has become a decisive factor in technological advancement, economic development, and the organization of social life [1, 1]. In such a society, science performs a variety of functions: it produces knowledge, supports innovation, influences public life, and shapes the intellectual habits of professional communities. As scientific activity becomes increasingly integrated into digital, educational, and institutional environments, it is more and more necessary to

regard science as a special type of discourse rather than merely a storehouse of facts.

Scientific discourse may be defined as a form of communication through which knowledge is formulated, interpreted, verified, and transmitted. It is shaped by conceptual accuracy, argumentation, methodological transparency, and disciplinary convention. Unlike everyday communication, scientific discourse is not primarily aimed at spontaneous interaction or emotional expression. Its central purpose is to explain phenomena, establish relations, define concepts, and justify conclusions. In this respect, the language of science functions simultaneously as an instrument of cognition and as a medium of professional interaction.

The growing importance of language in post-industrial and postmodern civilization has expanded the scope of modern linguistics. Language is now studied not only as an abstract grammatical system, but also as a cognitive, communicative, and social phenomenon. This broader orientation has encouraged researchers to reconsider traditional notions of text, meaning, communication, and knowledge representation. Within this framework, the cognitive-discursive approach occupies an important place because it examines language in relation to thought, perception, and contextualized communication. According to E.S. Kubryakova, the cognitive-discursive paradigm treats language as a means of understanding and describing reality, as well as a tool of communication and interaction [7, 2].

Terminology is one of the key components of scientific discourse. In the broad sense, terminology is the branch of lexicology that studies specialized vocabularies and term systems associated with particular areas of knowledge. At the same time, terminology is not limited to the collection of technical words. It is a complex interdisciplinary field located at the intersection of linguistics, logic, ontology, information science, and specialized branches of science and technology [11, 1]. Therefore, the study of scientific terminology has both theoretical and practical significance.

Scientific prose, however, is built not only on highly specialized terms. It also makes wide use of common scientific expressions such as in addition, therefore, for this reason, according to the results, as stated above, and in conclusion. These recurrent units are not tied to one narrow discipline, yet they are indispensable for the organization of scientific argument. They connect text fragments, mark logical transitions, indicate emphasis, and guide the reader through the progression of thought. In this sense, the lexicon of scientific discourse includes at least two interacting layers: field-specific terminology and general scientific phraseology [2, 147-149].

The purpose of the present article is to investigate the lexical and terminological resources of scientific discourse on the material of articles and theses. Particular attention is paid to the distinction between terms and common scientific expressions, the discourse functions of recurring lexical units, and the pedagogical importance of working with scientific vocabulary in a non-native language. The study also seeks to demonstrate that scientific texts are not merely repositories of specialized information, but valuable instruments for developing academic literacy and professional communicative competence.

Research Methodology

The present study combines descriptive, classificatory, comparative, and interpretive methods. Logical procedures of classification and systematization were used to group lexical units according to their discourse-organizing functions. Definitional, contextual, and word-formation analysis made it possible to clarify the semantic and structural properties of the lexical material. In addition, a comparative perspective was adopted in order to identify functional correspondences among English, Uzbek, and Russian scientific expressions.

From the linguistic point of view, the lexicon of scientific style is characterized by conceptual density, a strong preference for nouns and adjectives, the extensive use of terms with precise and restricted meanings, the relative absence of expressive vocabulary, and a noticeable degree of lexical repetition. These features create semantic compression and contribute to the relatively standardized character of scientific texts. In many cases, scientific discourse favors nominal constructions and stable collocations over more emotionally marked or stylistically varied forms [8, 256].

The study is also grounded in the idea that a term should be analyzed not as an isolated word, but as a verbalized form of conceptual knowledge. V.M. Leichik views a term as part of a dynamic process that links mental categorization with linguistic expression in a specific field of knowledge or activity [8, 256]. This approach is especially useful for the analysis of scientific discourse because it explains why terminological units must be studied together with their definitions, contextual use, and discourse function.

Literature Review

Research on scientific discourse, terminology, and lexicography occupies an important place in contemporary linguistics. In international scholarship, valuable contributions have been made by I. Igolkina, J.G. Scott, A.Yu. Panasyuk, V. Sterkenburg, L. Zgusta, and S. Landau. Their works show that lexicography is not merely a practical activity of dictionary compilation, but a theoretically grounded scholarly discipline with its own methodology and conceptual apparatus.

V. Sterkenburg identifies Ladislav Zgusta as one of the most influential figures in twentieth-century lexicography, emphasizing his role in establishing lexicography as an international field of study. Sidney Landau is similarly recognized as a major authority on American lexicography, especially through his book Dictionaries: The Art and Craft of Lexicography. These works, together with larger reference projects such as Dictionnaires: An International Encyclopedia of Lexicography, provide an essential background for the study of scientific vocabulary and specialized language.

A number of researchers have also examined scientific writing and the language of research communication more directly. L. Vladimirova points to the importance of methodological strategies for improving scientific writing skills and mastering key academic vocabulary. E.V. Ivanitskaya and E.V. Krasilnikova argue that scientific style should be developed in both oral and written forms and that scientific language competence is closely connected with the formation of a scientific way of thinking [6, 62-75]. N.N. Miroshkina broadens this perspective by stressing that students should be trained not only to understand scientific communication but also to internalize the conventions and norms of writing scientific texts in order to develop professional stylistic competence [9, 24].

Text linguistics also provides an important theoretical foundation for the study of scientific discourse. I.R. Galperin defines text as a complete communicative unit characterized by semantic integrity, conformity to literary norms and genre conventions, structured composition, cohesion, thematic focus, and pragmatic orientation [5, 18]. Similar traits are noted by V.E. Chernyavskaya, whose work on the interpretation of scientific text highlights the role of discourse organization and textual coherence in academic communication [4, 15-22].

In Uzbek linguistics, issues related to scientific language, terminology, and text organization have been explored in the works of H. Jalilov, A.R. Mamatkulov, A.G. Gulomov, T.H. Asadov, Kh. Doniyorov, B. Yoldoshev, Sh. Rahmatullaev, A. Boboyeva, I. Asomiddinova, and E. Begmatov. Their studies provide an important national background for the investigation of scientific discourse and its lexical features.

Analysis and Discussion

The primary purpose of a scientific text is to communicate logical knowledge, justify novelty, summarize observations, and formulate generalizations. In both structural and semantic terms, scientific writing is organized as a coherent whole. One of the central factors determining the informativeness of such texts is vocabulary, because lexical units form the material through which concepts are introduced, relationships are explained, and arguments are developed.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 10.91 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-5| 2026 Published: |30-05-2026|

The vocabulary of scientific discourse may be divided into three broad layers: common vocabulary, general scientific vocabulary, and special terminological vocabulary. In addition, scientific texts employ auxiliary lexical units that help organize information, establish coherence, and signal the logic of reasoning. This layered structure allows scientific discourse to be both precise and readable.

A further distinction may be drawn between terms and non-terms. Terms are lexical units directly associated with scientific definitions and specialized conceptual systems. Non-terminological scientific vocabulary includes common academic expressions and technical words that assist explanation without belonging to a narrow terminological subsystem. The boundary between the two categories is not fixed. Terms may gradually pass into common usage, while ordinary lexical items may acquire terminological value in specialized contexts. This movement demonstrates that scientific vocabulary is dynamic rather than static.

An important characteristic of scientific discourse is the coexistence of specialized terms and general scientific expressions. Although they often occur together in academic prose, they perform different communicative tasks. Specialized terms name concepts, methods, categories, and processes within a specific discipline. Their main function is nominative and definitional: they provide precision and reduce ambiguity within a professional field.

General scientific expressions, by contrast, are largely discipline-independent. Their role is organizational rather than narrowly nominative. They connect parts of the text, indicate logical relations, introduce examples, mark comparison, express consequence, and structure the author's reasoning. Expressions such as in addition, for example, therefore, as a result, according to the data, in our opinion, and as shown above are widely used in research writing across disciplines. Such units function as discourse markers and often become stable academic clichés. In scientific prose, these clichés should not be understood negatively; they often promote clarity, cohesion, and formal appropriateness.

Table 1. Functional differences between specialized terms and common scientific expressions

Feature	Specialized Terms	Common Scientific Expressions	Primary Function	Examples
Semantic scope	Field-specific and concept-bound	Cross-disciplinary or discipline-neutral	Naming vs. organizing knowledge	phoneme, hypothesis testing, morphology / in addition, thus, by definition

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 10.91 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-5| 2026 Published: |30-05-2026|

Feature	Specialized Terms	Common Scientific Expressions	Primary Function	Examples
Dependence on definition	Closely tied to formal or working definition	Usually understood through repeated academic use	Precision vs. cohesion	term, corpus, variable / as noted above, for this reason
Communicative role	Identifies object, process, or category	Connects, comments on, or structures argument	Reference vs. rhetorical guidance	experiment, discourse marker / however, in conclusion
Frequency in text	Concentrated in topic-focused sections	Distributed throughout the whole paper	Topic development vs. text management	methodology, data set / moreover, for example
Pedagogical value	Builds subject competence	Builds academic writing fluency	Professional competence vs. discourse competence	syntax, survey design / it should be emphasized

In addition to narrow terminological units, scientific discourse employs a shared academic metalanguage that recurs across articles, theses, and dissertations. Examples include abstract, background of the study, data, findings, hypothesis, methodology, questionnaire, reference page, research question, research problem, scope and limitation, and title. These units do not belong to one discipline alone; rather, they describe the architecture of research itself.

Mastery of such vocabulary is especially important for students and young researchers. Understanding the difference between findings and conclusion, or between a research problem and a research question, is not merely a lexical matter. It reflects a deeper understanding of research design, argument structure, and academic reasoning. Therefore, instruction in research vocabulary should be treated as an important part of academic literacy and not as a peripheral supplement to content study.

A practical way to analyze scientific phraseology is to classify lexical units according to the discourse operation they perform rather than by their grammatical form alone. This approach is especially useful because many academic expressions differ morphologically while remaining functionally equivalent in context. The same discourse function can be expressed by a conjunction, an adverbial phrase, a verbal formula, or a nominal construction.

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 10.91 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-5| 2026 Published: |30-05-2026|

The comparison of English, Uzbek, and Russian material shows that scientific discourse relies on a recurrent set of rhetorical operations. These include description, elaboration, causation, conditionality, concession, authorial stance, actualization of topic, emphasis, ordering, presupposition, definition, exemplification, generalization, comparison, and contraposition. Although the surface forms vary from language to language, the discourse functions remain strikingly comparable.

Table 2. Comparative discourse functions and examples in English, Uzbek, and Russian

Function	Role in scientific discourse	English examples	Uzbek examples	Russian examples
Description	Introduces or characterizes the object of discussion	we define; we point out that	shuni ta'kidlaymiz; ko'rib chiqamiz	укажем, что; рассмотрим
Elaboration	Adds clarification or further specification	in addition; more precisely	qo'shimcha ravishda; aniqrog'i	в дополнение; точнее
Cause and result	Shows logical consequence or reason	therefore; as a result; for this reason	shu sababli; natijada	следовательно; в результате; по этой причине
Contrast and concession	Marks opposition or limitation	however; nevertheless; on the other hand	biroq; shunga qaramay; boshqa tomondan	однако; тем не менее; с другой стороны
Authorial stance	Signals evaluation or scholarly caution	in our opinion; it seems reasonable	bizningcha; maqsadga muvofiq ko'rinadi	по нашему мнению; целесообразно считать
Topic management	Moves the discussion to a new point	as for; let us consider; turning to	endi ...ga o'tsak; ko'rib chiqamiz	перейдем к; рассмотрим
Definition	Introduces a formal explanation	by definition; we call this	ta'rifiga ko'ra; buni ... deb ataymiz	по определению; будем называть
Illustration	Provides examples or evidence	for example; as illustrated below	masalan; quyidagicha misol qilish mumkin	например; к примеру

AMERICAN JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND LEARNING
ISSN: 2996-5128 (online) | ResearchBib (IF) = 10.91 IMPACT FACTOR
Volume-4| Issue-5| 2026 Published: |30-05-2026|

Function	Role in scientific discourse	English examples	Uzbek examples	Russian examples
Ordering	Builds textual sequence	first; next; finally	birinchidan; keyin; nihoyat	во-первых; далее; наконец
Generalization	Summarizes preceding discussion	in general; summing up	umuman olganda; xulosa qilib	в общем; подводя итог

Additional Examples from Academic Writing

–Example 1 (definition + specification): By definition, discourse markers are lexical units that organize the progression of thought in a text. More precisely, they help signal sequence, consequence, contrast, and textual emphasis.

–Example 2 (causal progression): The experiment produced a limited set of responses; therefore, the findings should be interpreted with caution. For this reason, a broader sample is recommended for future research.

–Example 3 (authorial stance + topic shift): In our opinion, the distinction between term and non-term lexicon remains methodologically productive. Turning to classroom practice, this distinction can also be used to design vocabulary tasks for academic writing.

–Example 4 (comparison): As compared with everyday communication, scientific discourse relies more heavily on explicit connectors and nominal patterns. Similarly, thesis writing usually contains more overt metadiscourse than short research reports.

–Example 5 (generalization): Summing up, scientific vocabulary should be studied at two levels: the level of specialized concepts and the level of discourse organization. In general, successful academic writing depends on the balanced use of both.

The pedagogical importance of scientific vocabulary is difficult to overestimate. Many university students are expected to read articles, prepare theses, and participate in research-based communication, yet the lexical and stylistic conventions of scientific prose are not always taught explicitly. As a result, students may acquire subject knowledge without becoming fully competent participants in the discourse of their discipline.

Teaching scientific lexicon therefore means more than presenting isolated lists of terms. It requires attention to discourse markers, collocations, recurrent phraseological formulas, and the rhetorical conventions of academic writing. Students need to know not only what a term means, but also how it behaves in

context, what lexical combinations it forms, and what discourse function it performs. This issue becomes even more important in a non-native language environment. Scientific literature often includes abstract concepts that are difficult to verbalize without support from the learner's first language. In such cases, the native language may temporarily facilitate understanding. Nevertheless, the long-term objective remains the formation of independent professional competence in the target language. For that reason, lexical work aimed at clarifying abstract concepts and discourse conventions should occupy a central place in language education.

Conclusion

The analysis presented in this article confirms that the lexicon of scientific discourse is a complex and functionally differentiated system. It includes both specialized terminology and common scientific expressions, each of which contributes to the precision, coherence, and communicative effectiveness of academic texts. Specialized terms serve to identify and define concepts within a discipline, whereas common scientific expressions organize reasoning, connect text fragments, and guide the reader through the development of argument.

Scientific discourse is characterized by conceptual density, lexical regularity, terminological exactness, and a high level of rhetorical organization. Its lexical structure reflects not only the semantic demands of scholarly communication, but also its cognitive and institutional functions. Scientific vocabulary does more than name objects or processes: it supports knowledge construction, text organization, disciplinary interaction, and academic persuasion.

The study also demonstrates that scientific texts can be used productively in language education. Work with terminology, discourse markers, and common academic phraseology helps learners develop both linguistic competence and professional communicative competence. In this sense, the investigation of scientific lexicon is relevant not only for lexicology and discourse analysis, but also for pedagogy, curriculum design, and the teaching of academic writing.

Finally, a functional classification of recurring scientific expressions may serve as a useful basis for compiling specialized dictionaries, designing teaching materials, and improving automated analysis of scientific texts. Further research may focus on genre-specific lexical patterns, corpus-based analysis of thesis language, and the comparative study of scientific phraseology across additional languages.

REFERENCE:

1. Bell D. The Coming of Post-Industrial Society: A Venture in Social Forecasting. –New York: Basic Books, 1999. – 616 p.
2. Bolshakova E.I. Phraseological Database Extended by Educational Material for Learning Scientific Style. / The 2001 Joint International Conference. – New York, 2001. – P. 147-149.
3. Bolshakova E.I. Lexicon of Common Scientific Words and Expressions for Automatic Discourse Analysis of Scientific and Technical Texts. – Moscow, 2007. V – P. 5.
4. Chernyavskaya V.E. Interpretation of Scientific Text. – Moscow, 2007. – 128 p. Galperin I.R. Text as an Object of Linguistic Research. – Moscow, 2008. – 147 p.
Ivanitskaya E.V. Transformation of Scientific Style in a Changing Communication Environment. – Language and Text, 2016. – p. 62-75.
5. Kubryakova E.S., Demyankov V.Z., Luzina L.G., Pankrats Yu.G. Brief Dictionary of Cognitive Terms. – Moscow, 1996. Leichik V.M. Terminology: Subject, Methods, Structure. 4th ed. – Moscow, 2009. – 256 p.
6. Miroshkina N.N. Formation of linguistic and stylistic competence of students when studying scientific style, https://pglu.ru/upload/iblock/ae3/uch_2010_viii_00020.pdf, access: 05/3/2019. (Мирошкина Н.Н. Формирование лингвостилистической компетенции студентов при изучении научного стиля, https://pglu.ru/upload/iblock/ae3/uch_2010_viii_00020.pdf, доступ: 3.05.2019.)
7. Dictionary of Word Combinations Frequently Used in English Scientific Literature. Nauka Publ., Moscow, 1968.
8. Dictionary of Verb-Noun Combinations of the Common Scientific Speech. Nauka Publ., Moscow, 1973 (in Russian).