

Academic Discourse Personality

Aliyeva Gunay Dilgam *

Azerbaijan State Pedagogical University, Baku, Azerbaijan

Abstract

Now that academic discourse assumes the interaction of teachers and students, it presents specific interest. This paper deals with the investigation academic discourse personality types. Various approaches and aspects of discourse personality are analyzed in this article. It is stated in the article that the academic discourse is meant to be the speech system basing on academic branches. The content signs of the academic discourse also include the distinguishing features of teachers' and students' behavior in the teaching process. The paper touches upon the interactive relations of teachers and students in the academic discourse as well. The typicality of academic discourse is derived from the unique distinction making activity which is associated with the analytical or logical mode of experience. Besides, the paper highlights that academic discourse requires the doers to perform things with language like explanation, definition, comparison, contrast, classification, agreement, disagreement, illustration, elaboration, making claims, seeing implications, inference, exemplifying, anticipating, and conclusion.

Keywords: discourse personality, academic discourse, extravert, introvert, linguistic personality

INTRODUCTION

Since the publication of the academic thesis titled "Discourse Analysis" authored by Harris (Harris 1952, p.6) discourse analysis has undergone a course of over fifty years. Though employed in many fields, the notion "discourse" is quite distinct. Sometimes discourse is treated simply as a word for language in use (Potter 2004, p. 610); at other times it is theorized as a linguistics object or language above the sentence (Cameron 2001, p.206). To complicate the matter, an increasing number of scholars further elucidate the concept of "discourse" via unique theoretical perspectives.

For instance, Potter (Potter 2004, p.611) deciphers discourse as texts and talk in social practices. That's, the focus is not on language as an abstract entity such as a lexicon and set of grammatical rules (in linguistics), a system of differences (in structuralism), a set of rules for transforming statements. Instead, it is the medium for interaction; analysis of discourse becomes, then, analysis of what people do. Discourse, often broadly defined as language in use, is certainly more than language. It is ways of "behaving, interacting,

valuing, thinking, believing, speaking, and often reading and writing that are accepted as instantiations of particular roles ..." (Gee 1999, p.12).

In other words, discourse has no generally agreed-upon definition, and confusingly many uses. Potter (Potter 2004, 610) identifies five versions of discourse analysis, among which three relate to linguist and psychological studies, the fourth one is the standard Foucauldian discourse analysis, and the final model belongs to Potter and Wetherell's own (1987), e. g. exploring discourse as texts and talks in social practices. Cook (1998), primarily sorts out three genres of discourse analysis, i.e. the British and American School, Foucault school, and Critical discourse analysis school, in the virtue of different research schools.

T.A. van Dyke is sure that the prevalence and frequency of the use of the term "discourse" is due to the fact that it is vague and difficult to define (Karasik 2014, p.25).

M. Halliday and R.Hasan in their book "Cohesion in English" write," by this we mean the larger structure that is a property of the forms of discourse themselves; the structure that is inherent in such concepts as narrative, prayer, folk, ballad, formal correspondence, sonnet, operating instructions, television drama and the like (Halliday 1976, p. 326). Then they add that it is safe to say that every genre has its own discourse structure (Halliday 1976, p.327).

V.Karasik is in the opinion that from the sociological point of view person-oriented and status-oriented types of discourse can be distinguished; the former applies to everyday speech at home and to fiction, and its main point consists in communicating with a well-known (or seemingly well-known person) person, whereas the latter is used when people talking with each other take their partners as representatives of some group, and here various kinds of institutional talk (legal, political, religious, academic, advertising...discourse) are relevant (Karasik 2014, p.23).

In academic discourse the distance between the participants is usually closer than in legal discourse, thus the borderline between the person and status-oriented communication is to some extent diffused. The purpose of this paper is to investigate approaches to academic discourse studies based on situational roles of persons participating in communication.

Academic discourse presents specific interest, since it assumes the interaction of teachers and students. It has academic focus, namely it is used within the framework of training and information exchange in various educational institutions, that is it has thematic (the sphere of education) and target (information transfer) focuses.

"Academic discourse is more than grammar; it has functions like exposition, clarification, and conclusion, requiring us to do things with language like explain, define, compare, contrast, classify, agree, disagree, illustrate, make claims, elaborate, see implications, infer, exemplify, anticipate, and conclude. In addition, imbued as it is with cognitive as well as analytical processing, competence in handling academic language is far more than the "skills" of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. If one wishes to do something about low levels of academic literacy, one first has to be able to measure that ability accurately and reliably.

Since it is a complex ability that encompasses many subcomponents, a language test that is multifaceted is preferable to a monotone test design, and is likely to be more reliable. The same would apply to language courses to develop academic literacy (Makapov 1998, p.3).

Academic discourse is a means through which these developments materialize, and it offers a fertile ground for research in pragmatics and discourse analysis.

Academic discourse refers to the ways of thinking and using language which exist in the academy. Its significance lies in the fact that complex social activities like educating students, demonstrating learning, disseminating ideas and constructing knowledge, rely on language to accomplish.

Professor Hyland, one of the leading scholars who has published extensively in the area of academic discourse studies, attributes this growing interest in academic discourse to three major developments in the academy worldwide, i.e. diversity of students in universities as a result of widening access policies, concern with qualities in teaching and learning, and English as a lingua franca of research and scholarship (Hyland 2009, p.4).

DISCUSSION

Language “lives” in social context, so discourse helps form academic relationships and determines social status for students and teachers. Being the major means of academics expressing themselves, discourse also brings enormous reputation and economic payback as grants, discoveries, patents, theories and insights always result in academic discourse. Competition arises in the attempt to gain recognition and economic benefit and thus creates and strengthens institutional hierarchies.

In his book “Discourse Analysis; English in a global context” Hyland introduces three approaches to understanding and doing research in discourse analysis: the textual, contextual and critical approaches. Textual approaches are concerned with the manner in which individuals use language to express their ideas, identities and communities, including genre analysis, corpora analysis and multimodal analysis.

Contextual approaches consist of the sociology of science, socio-historical approaches and ethnographic approaches.

Critical Discourse Analysis (CDA) and academic literacies represent different perspectives of discourse and contain very different theoretical premises. They are the most relevant to the study of academic discourse. Although there is not one single way to analyze academic discourse, there is always one best way.

Hyland also introduces the terms academic disciplines, specialist sub-fields and knowledge domains in order to identify a specific discourse community. He argues that despite all the critiques and discussions around the notion of community, it is a fact that “language does not work in a vacuum” and “discourse is socially situated” (Hyland 2009, p.66).

The four relevant discourses are corpus based and closely related to the real academic world, so they are both theoretically and practically useful.

Research is a systematic process of inquiry that has become established not only in the academy with its respective disciplines and fields of knowledge, but also institutionalized in governments, industries, corporations, and special interest groups.

We include in the concept of academic discourse the following subgroups: pedagogical, didactic, scientific, educational and training.

The linguistic essence of the language lies in the fact that it exists primarily in the linguistic consciousness - individual and collective. The linguistic personality is the carrier of linguistic consciousness, that is the person existing in the language space, in communication, in stereotyped behaviors fixed in the language, in the meanings of linguistic units and the meanings of the texts.

Scientific discourse is determined by I.Karasik as verbal attitude between two equal interlocutors, while in pedagogical discourse unequal relations between the interlocutors are obvious. Both subgroups of discourse are informative, whereas pedagogical discourse has also an educational property. For instance, at schools the students are not only taught different subjects, but they are also taught good manners, i. e. what can be done and what can't be.

Pedagogical discourse is closely connected with the process of socialization of students that is the goal of educational process. Scientific discourse assumes a scientific polemic between equal interlocutors, for instance, the participants of scientific conferences, who are well versed in the proposed theme and are ready to discuss or to offer scientific views. This communion is purely informative.

In connection with the study of the psychological and behavioral components in the interpersonal relations of the "teacher-student" M.Y.Olesh-kov singles out the didactic discourse, which is aimed at studying the attitudes of the teacher-student in the lesson.

To the didactic discourse belong the so-called organizational moments of communication between the teacher and the student on everyday topic not related to the teaching material.

The notion of the linguistic personality as a combination of abilities and characteristics of a person conditioning the creation and perception of texts was first introduced into the scientific use by Vinogradov and then it was presented in the form of a certain system model.

One of the linguists who investigated linguistic personality thoroughly, Y.N. Karaulov considers the linguistic personality as the combination of abilities and characteristics of a person causing him to create speech works (Караулов 1987, p.3). The concept in question admits a double interpretation: individual and dynamic. In the first case we accept individual as an individual, i.e. a subject of social relations that has its own unique collections of personal qualities. In the second case, we assume that at a certain stage an individual is not a personality, i. e. he does not possess socially conditioned distinctive characteristics.

A linguistic personality can be characterized from the standpoint of linguistic consciousness and speech behavior, that is from the position of linguistic conceptology and the theory of discourse.

According to L.V.Sherba the linguistic consciousness is objectified in speech activity, i.e. in the process of speaking and understanding. Speech activity is carried out by the individual and conditioned by his socio-psychophysiological organization.

Speech activity and speech organization of a person are closely interconnected, nevertheless they can be contrasted as phenomenon and activity. In the speech organization of a person five aspects can be distinguished:

- 1) language ability as an organic opportunity to learn to communicate (this includes psychological and somatic characteristics of a person;
- 2) communicative need, i.e. addressability, focus on communicative conditions, on participants in communication, language team, cultural bearers;
- 3) communicative competence, as a developed ability to communicate in its different registers for the optimal achievement of the goal, the competence a person possess, while he can develop the ability;
- 4) linguistic consciousness, as an active verbal "reflection in the inner world of the external world";
- 5) speech behavior as a conscious and unconscious system of actions, revealing character and image of a person;

Language ability and communicative need act as prepositions for language mastering and communication, communicative competence as a spinning of linguistic consciousness in the choice of communication. The realization of these means in a concrete speech is expressed in a text, i.e. written or pronounced by a separate individual, not by the people. The listed components of human speech organization are heterogeneous, the most concrete is the act of speech behavior, the most abstract is human's language consciousness, including feelings, will, thinking, memory in their inseparable unity.

The most important component of a person's speech organization is linguistic consciousness. It is important for the psychologist to focus on the mental component of linguistic consciousness.

T.M. Nikolayeva singles out three kinds of stereotypes in speech behavior:

- 1) A speech stereotype, a piece of the sentences included in the text represented by the free components of the utterance. This is someone else's speech in the speaker's speech.
- 2) Communicative stereotype, in the same situations the same expressions-cliches are used. These are etiquette formulas, clichéd expressions of business communication.
- 3) Mental stereotype, the desire to think in dual and gradual categories, the former refers to a more archaic stage of consciousness;

Y Karaulov mentioned three levels of language personality:

- 1) Verbal-semantic – assuming for the bearer a normal possession of the natural language, and for the researcher – a traditional description of the formal means of expressing certain expressions.
- 2) Cognitive-thesaurus, whose units are concepts, ideas, notions that are formed in each linguistic individuality in a more or less orderly, more or less systematized picture of the world reflecting the hierarchy of values.
- 3) Pragmatic (motivational) including goals, motives, interests, attitudes and intentions (Караулов 1987, p.24).

At the end of 1995 at the conference “Ethnic and linguistic self-knowledge” he proposed some results of generalization and comprehension of various concepts and presented the three-part structure (core – modification – periphery) of the given concept field.

- 1) Linguistic personality, niche in the subject (linguistics);
(comprehending the world and reflecting it in his speech); the individual, the author of the text, the native speaker, informant, the active informant, the speaker, the verbal portrait;
- 2) Linguistic personality of a specialist-philologist (philological personality), character (artistic work), a specific historical personality, a national linguistic personality;
- 3) Scientific paradigm: man-language, anthropological linguistics, national culture, language knowledge, knowledge of the language, language worldview, knowledge of the world, thesaurus of the linguistic personality, linguistic consciousness, national consciousness, the mentality of the people, mental space, the native speaker, associative connections, associative field, inner lexicon, individual lexicon, psycholinguistic experimental texts (Караулов 1987, p.45).

Typology of linguistic personalities can be built of different grounds. It is possible to define the following types of linguistic personalities:

- 1) A man for whom communication in his native language is natural in his communicative environment;
- 2) A man for whom communication in a foreign language is natural in his communicative environment;
- 3) A man who speaks in a foreign language for the purpose of studying;

Sociological typology by O.Klapp deserves attention. He distinguishes social types of personalities like heroes, clowns, villains, etc.

ANALYSES

Discourse studies comprise many directions of communication analysis, the main trends may be represented as structural, topical and situational.

Structurally discourse is a sequence of communicative moves which vary in monologue and dialogue on the one hand, and in oral and written forms, on the other hand. According

to V.Karasik, the key points of a structural approach to discourse are the categories of discourse opposed to text.

Topical discourse is communication about something. Here the main attention is directed to the description of words and set-expressions that people use while talking and the concepts they apply to.

Situational discourse is a kind of activity where we underline not what is said, but rather how it is said. A situational approach to discourse is a logical development of a paradigm change in Linguistics. A situational approach to discourse makes it possible to take a close look at persons engaged in communication. Persons engaged in communication comprise different features, such as biological, social and spiritual. Each of them is the subject matter of different subjects: Psychology, Sociology, Culturology and Linguistics.

As we know, the psychological classification of people is based on temperament (natural qualities), directivity (demands and ideals), and abilities (intellectual, volitional, emotional peculiarities) which correlate with biological, social and spiritual features of personality. People natural qualities determine their conscious and subconscious trends of behavior in communication.

According to Carl Gustav Jung, in the respect of the differentiation between extravert and introvert types of humans may be taken as the starting point in the psychological classification of discourse personalities. Extravert speakers are good orators and they may appear in different public meetings. Politicians, teachers, actors exemplify this class. Extraverts know how to win the audience, that is why they avoid long sentences and sophisticated metaphors.

The following is a text of President Obama's prepared remarks to the Muslim world, delivered on June 4, 2009, as released by the White House.

I am honored to be in the timeless city of Cairo, and to be hosted by two remarkable institutions. For over a thousand years, Al-Azhar has stood as a beacon of Islamic learning, and for over a century, Cairo University has been a source of Egypt's advancement. Together, you represent the harmony between tradition and progress. I am grateful for your hospitality, and the hospitality of the people of Egypt. I am also proud to carry with me the goodwill of the American people, and a greeting of peace from Muslim communities in my country: assalaamu alaykum.

The full text of the statement delivered by Prime Minister David Cameron after British voters in a referendum elected to leave the European Union:

The country has just taken part in a giant democratic exercise — perhaps the biggest in our history. Over 33 million people - from England, Scotland, Wales, Northern Ireland and Gibraltar - have all had their say.

We should be proud of the fact that in these islands we trust the people with these big decisions.

We not only have a parliamentary democracy, but on questions about the arrangements for how we are governed, there are times when it is right to ask the people themselves, and that is what we have done.

The British people have voted to leave the *European Union*, and their will must be respected.

I want to thank everyone who took part in the campaign on my side of the argument, including all those who put aside party differences to speak in what they believed was the national interest.

And let me congratulate all those who took part in the “Leave” campaign —for the spirited and passionate case that they made.

The will of the British people is an instruction that must be delivered. It was not a decision that was taken lightly, not least because so many things were said by so many different organizations about the significance of this decision.

Above given texts are examples showing extraverts’ characteristic features. As we mentioned, their speeches are characterized by avoiding long sentences, set expressions, so that they may cause the audience listen to them.

In contrast to extraverts, introverts prefer to remain in the shadow in as much as they are engaged in professions which don’t consist of talking. As an example to introverts, we can name scientific researchers and writers whose communicative self-realization and written speech better suits their inner organization.

Computer Science

Computer scientists are, in fact, scientists. They are focused with the theory of computational applications. That means they understand the “why” behind computer programs. Using algorithms and advanced mathematics, computer scientists invent new ways to manipulate and transfer information. Computer scientists are generally concerned with software, operating systems and implementation.

Like Neo in *The Matrix*, computer scientists can see and make sense of code. Computer science students will learn the fundamentals of different programming languages, linear and discrete mathematics, and software design and development. Computer scientists study the machine itself and understand how and why various computer processes operate the way they do.

In above given example we can come across with a lot of terms that are mainly used in scientific papers, dissertations, books. The terms like “computational application”, “algorithms”, “to manipulate”, “linear and discrete mathematics”, “implementation” are more often used in scientific literature.

Another biological approach to discourse personality types deals with mental disorders. Now that abstract mental norm is an abstraction, in a situation of stress everybody can lose their control of their syntax and semantics.

The key notion in directivity is motivation. Here we can name various classification dealing with motivation. For instance, E.Berne (Berne 1988, p.22) describes constructive and deconstructive people and they have their own strategies and behavior. K.Horney (6, 19) distinguishes three kinds of people: those apt to compliance, to aggression, to detachment.

According to K.F.Sedov there are three types of personalities; courteous, invective and rational. He characterizes these personalities like this: courteous people do their best to avoid any possible conflict, invective people always try to dominate, people characterized like rational persons have got sense of humor and they use their humor to settle difficult problems (Sedov 1999, 23).

Sociological classifications of people are also numerous and varied. They may be subdivided into several groups:

- 1) Social status discourse;
- 2) Institutional communication;
- 3) Sociolects circulation;

Social status includes ascribed and achieved features of a person he/she has. While the former characterizes the persons' age, gender, ethnicity, the latter deal with educational, economic, and various stratification levels the people are marked with. All the features have verbal and non-verbal manifestations. There are some words and expressions that show social status of speakers. Here belong forms of address, terminologies.

Proper slang in a conversation is a typical example of someone's class identity. It should be noted that zero usage of certain words or expressions is a marker of social status.

Institutional discourse is an effective instrument for organizing society according to the functions people fulfill as its members. In a social institution there are two types of people: agents, who embody the institution, and clients, who address them. Agents usually lead the discourse, give explanation, expert opinions and recommendations, express explicit evaluation. Clients follow directions and obey them. As an example to the institutional discourse we can show the relations between a doctor - a patient, a teacher - a student, an officer- a soldier, a manager - a worker. In these cases a doctor, a teacher, an officer and a worker are agents, a patient, a student, a soldier and a worker are clients. Clients are bound to do what they are told.

A sociolect is a variant of verbal behavior belonging to a certain social group. Prison jargon is a sociolect. Prisoners live in the same social community and have the same lifestyle. Another example to a sociolect is a social group called hippies.

The classification of personalities within Linguistic Culturology is aimed at describing certain type of people who correspond to the relevant features of a definite culture. Here we can mention two approaches: deductive and inductive approaches.

A deductive culturological approach to discourse personality types may take text functions as the basic classification. In the past the earliest texts appeared. These texts were repeated word by word from generation to generation they were myths, legends. They taught the youngest generation how to respect the old, parents, to guard their land, their sacred books. As an example to these sacred books we can show one of the first written legends in Azerbaijani "Dədə Qorqud", the legend that comprises a lot of didactic materials. This book teaches the growing generation how to love the parents, motherland, how to respect mother tongue and traditions.

The linguistic personality in the condition of communication can be considered as a communicative personality - a generalized image of the bearer of cultural, linguistic and communicative activities, knowledge, attitudes and behavioral reactions.

In relation to communicative personalities one can single out the value, cognitive and behavioral plans of this notion.

The value plan of a communicative personality contains ethical and utilitarian norms of behavior peculiar to a certain ethnos for some period of time. These norms are fixed in the moral code of the people, reflect the history, the worldview of people united by culture and language.

The cognitive plan of a communicative personality is revealed through an analysis the world pictures. At the level of cultural and ethnic consideration substantive and categorical-formal interpretations about the world, language are distinguished.

The behavioral plan of a communicative personality is characterized by a specific set of intentional and extra-verbal speech and paralinguistic means of communication. Such characteristics may be considered in socio-linguistic and pragmalinguistic aspects. To the first group belong men's, women's, children's, adults' speeches, the speeches of educated and less educated people, native and non-native speakers. To the second group belong reactive, interactive, discursive communicative personalities.

The value plan of a communicative personality manifests itself in the norm of behavior fixed in the language. Norms of behavior generalize and regulate a lot of specific situations in communication and therefore refer to especially important values fixed in the words and phraseological units.

Norms of behavior are of a prototypical nature, we keep in mind the knowledge of typical actions, attitudes, expectations, responses, and evaluate reactions in relation to typical situations. At the same time we allow possible deviations from the behavioral norm, and such outliers always contain additional characteristic of the participants in the communication.

Finally there are behavioral taboos, violation of which causes a negative reaction of the participants and stops communication. For instance, in the English-speaking communities there are various ways to end the dialogue. The matter is what is acceptable for the British may turn out to be unacceptable for the Americans, or vice versa. For instance, in the USA you can often hear the expression "Have a nice (good) day!" At the same time there is a note in the British dictionary that such a phrase is appropriate, first of all, in the communication between the shop-assistant and the customer.

We can distinguish the following types of participants in the normative situations:

- 1) The curator – the man who knows how everybody should behave, the collective image of a custodian of norms;
- 2) The expresser – a person or a group expressing their relationship to someone or something on the basis of a certain standard;

3) The respondent – a person or a group to whom the expresser addresses with the expectation of reactions to a certain norm.

4) The public – passive participants in the norm situations.

Normative situations are reflected in the language and in a more explicit form are prefixed in proverbs, which in a concise form are the most essential prescriptions and assessments of the people's behavior. No doubt, the proverb as a genre of verbal creativity is peculiar to peasant class and in the English-speaking communication there is tendency to avoid using proverbs in as much as it contains teaching and may put the addressee in the position of a guilty or an inexperienced person.

The analysis of English and Azerbaijani proverbs made it possible to distinguish two large types of statements that differ in the type of a curator. To the first type belong the statements that are used with didactic goals.

a) A bird in the hand is worth two in the bush.

Əldəki bir quş koldakı iki quşdan yaxşıdır =Sərçə olsun, əlimdə olsun, göydə uçan laçını neylərəm. = Soğan olsun, nəgd olsun.

b) Don't cut your nose to spite your face.

Sifətin açıq getsin deyə burnunu kəsmə. = Qara qul özünü öldürdü ki ağasına ziyan olsun.

c) Let every man praise the bridge he goes over.

Üstündən keçdiyın körpünün qədrini bil.= Su içdiyın bulağa tüpürmə.

d) False friends are worse than open enemies.

Dəli dostun olunca, ağıllı düşmənin olsun.

In the examples mentioned above the curator evaluates people who have violated or may violate the rules of conduct and demonstrate inconsistency.

The second type of proverbs consists of utterances that are used for self-justification.

e) Like father, like son. -- Ata necədirsə, oğlu da elə olar. = Ot kökü üstə bitər.

f) No smoke without fire. -- Od yanmasa, tüstü çıxmaz.

g) No man is so old but he thinks he may yet live. -- İnsan nə qədər qoca olsa da yaşamaq istəyir. = Can şirin olar.

h) Let the dead bury the dead. -- Qoy ölünü ölü basdırsın. = Keçənə güzəşt deyərlər. Olan oldu, torba doldu.

These examples show that not everything depends on the people. There may be situations that a person is weak to prevent them.

The cognitive plan of the language personality is the degree of mastery of the world by man through language.

The behavioral characteristics of a language personality is a collection of verbal and non-verbal indices defining a linguistic personality as an individual or as a type. In the broadest sense, speaking of a person in the aspect of his communicative behavior, we

mean the pragmalinguistic parameters of the linguistic personality, i.e. we consider communication as an activity having motives, goals, strategies and ways implementing them.

Pragmalinguistics is a collection of theories and concepts that relate to speech, real communication, and not linguistic units and the rules of their combinations. In pragmalinguistics theories of communicative postulate, speech acts, manipulative actions, non-verbal communications are worked out in detail.

The traditional linguistic semantics is oriented towards the illumination of the meaning of the linguistic unit, in pragmalinguistics the emphasis is on the integral sense of these units derived from both meaning and the situation of the communication.

An important characteristic of the behavior of the linguistic personality is the communication strategies realized by this person (Макаров 1998, p.137).

Communication strategies express a chain of decisions of the speaker, a choice of certain communicative actions and linguistic means or the realization of a set of goals in the structure of communication. Communication strategies directly correlate with intentions of communicants, if intentions are global in nature, then we have in mind the strategies of discourse proper. If we are talking about the achievement of private goals within a particular genre of a certain type of discourse, then we talk about either local strategies or communicative tactics.

The behavioral characteristics of the linguistic personality are traced in those presuppositions in the basis of the interpreted and sense meanings. Makarov M.L. convincingly proves that in contemporary pragmalinguistics the notion of communicative strategies reveals a very wide variability in the works of various scientists: they speak of strategies for the coherence of the text, propositional, productional strategies, and besides scenario and stylistic strategies (Макаров 1998, p.138).

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, discourse personality is the middle link linguistic consciousness and speech behavior. Typology of discourse personalities can be built on the basis of various criteria, the most developed criteria are psychological and sociological. The discourse personality in the condition of communication – communicative personality- is characterized by a lot of features that can be considered in the value, conceptual and behavioral aspects.

REFERENCES

- Berne E. (1988). *The Games in which people play: psychology of human relationship. People who play games*, Moscow, Progress.162 pp.
- Cameron D. (Ed) (2001). *Working with spoken discourse*, London: Sage, 206 pp.
- Gee J. P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse analysis: Theory and method*, London, Routledge, 169 pp.
- Halliday M. A.K., & Hasan R (1976). *Cohesion in English*, London, Longman, 383 pp.
- Harris Z. (1952). Discourse analysis, *Language*, 28 (1), 1-30.
- Horney K (1993). *Neurotic person of present days, /translated from English/Moscow Progress Universe*
- Hyland K. (2009). *Academic Discourse: English in a Global Context*, Continuum, London, 215 pp.
- Karasik V.I. (2004). *Language circle, personality, concepts, discourse*, Moscow, Gnozis, 331 pp.
- Karasik V.I. Gillespie D. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 154, (2014), pp.23-29
- Klapp O.E. (1964). *Symbolic Leaders. Public Dramas and Public Men*, Chicago: Aldine, 272 pp.
- Potter J. (2004). Discourse analysis. In M.Hardy and A. Bryman (Eds), *Handbook of data analysis* (pp 607-624).
- Sedov K.F. (1999). *Formation of discursive thinking of language person: psycho and sociolinguistic aspects*, Saratov: Publishing House of Saratov University.
- Караулов Ю Н. (1987). *Русский язык и языковая личность*, Москва, Наука, 264 стр.
- Макаров. М.Л.Интерпретативный анализ дискурса в малой груп-пе, Тверь, Издательство ТверскогоУниверситета,1998, 200 стр.
- <https://albertweideman.wordpress.com/whatisacademicdiscourse>