ISSN:2828-6235
Impact factor:13.77

International Journal of Literature and Language Studies(IJLLS)

LINGUOCOGNITIVE SHIFTS IN ACADEMIC TRANSLATION: TRANSFORMING PASSIVE CONSTRUCTIONS OF UZBEK SCIENTIFIC DISCOURSE INTO ENGLISH ACTIVE MODELS (BASED ON APA 7 STANDARDS)

Baxtigul Ubaydullayeva
PhD student of Andijan State Institute of Foreign Languages
E-mail: baxtigulubaydullayeva025@gmail.com
Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.22900505

Abstract: Integrating Uzbek scholars into the global scientific community requires aligning local academic writing conventions with international publication standards. This article examines the linguocognitive and functional-stylistic shifts necessary when translating Uzbek scientific discourse into English, with a specific focus on the transition from traditional passive constructions to the active models mandated by the APA 7 guidelines. Rooted in the post-Soviet academic tradition, Uzbek scientific texts heavily rely on de-agentization, nominalization, and the "authorial we" (pluralis modestiae) to ensure objectivity, collective scientific identity, and academic modesty. Conversely, contemporary English academic discourse increasingly values explicit authorial stance, intellectual responsibility, and transparency, often prioritizing the active voice and the first-person singular pronoun "I" in single-authored papers. Through a comparative functional analysis, this study identifies key strategies for overcoming syntactic asymmetry during translation. These strategies include activating inanimate agents, de-nominalizing abstract processes, and adapting hedging mechanisms to preserve scientific politeness without sacrificing clarity. The findings suggest that translating academic texts is not merely a linguistic exercise but a complex cognitive and cultural adaptation. Practical recommendations are provided to help researchers effectively reconstruct their academic identity and meet the rigorous readability demands of international peer-reviewed journals.

Keywords: Academic discourse, linguocognitive shift, passive voice, authorial stance, academic translation, English for Academic Purposes (EAP), APA 7.

Introduction

The globalization of scientific research and the increasing imperative to disseminate localized academic findings to the broader international community have placed unprecedented demands on non-native English-speaking scholars. For researchers operating within the Uzbek academic paradigm, publishing in high-impact databases such as Scopus and Web of Science necessitates more than linguistic proficiency; it requires a profound adaptation to the rhetorical and epistemological conventions of international academic discourse. However, directly translating Uzbek scientific texts into English often encounters significant stylistic and cognitive barriers. These barriers stem from the fundamental syntactic and linguocognitive asymmetry between the two academic traditions, particularly concerning the expression of authorial stance, objectivity, and epistemic responsibility.

The Uzbek scientific discourse, heavily influenced by the post-Soviet academic tradition, operates on a principle of strict objectivism and depersonalization. In this paradigm, scientific validity is constructed by systematically removing the researcher from the text. This is syntactically realized through the pervasive use of passive voice morphology, impersonal-modal constructions, and heavy nominalization. Conversely, contemporary Western academic writing, particularly as codified by the American Psychological Association (APA 7) guidelines, advocates for textual transparency, explicit authorial presence, and intellectual accountability (American Psychological Association, 2020). The APA 7 manual explicitly discourages the overuse of

passive constructions and artificial impersonality, urging scholars to utilize the active voice to clearly demarcate who conducted the research and who is making the claims.

This fundamental divergence creates a translation conflict. When Uzbek academic texts, characterized by their hidden authorship and dense passive chains, are translated directly into English, they produce "syntactic heaviness" and what international reviewers often term "zombie nouns" or "zombie sentences"—where the agent of the action is entirely obscured. Furthermore, the translation of self-mention pronouns highlights a deep cultural-pragmatic divide.

This article aims to conduct a comprehensive functional-stylistic and linguocognitive analysis of the asymmetry between Uzbek and English scientific discourses. Specifically, it aims to investigate the cultural and syntactic underpinnings of impersonality in Uzbek academic writing and to formulate practical, linguocognitively grounded transformation strategies for converting these structures into the active, transparent models required by international publication standards.

Theoretical Background

Academic writing is not a neutral conduit for objective facts; rather, it is a socially situated practice that reflects the epistemological values and cultural norms of a specific scientific community (Hyland, 2012; Safarov, 2006). The conceptualization of the "author" and the manifestation of authorial presence in scientific discourse vary drastically across linguistic and cultural boundaries, creating profound translation challenges.

In Uzbek linguistics and academic writing, subordinating the researcher's individual identity to the collective scientific endeavor is considered a paramount virtue. Prominent Uzbek translation theorists and linguists, such as Salomov (1983) and Musayev (2005), have extensively documented the structural and stylistic asymmetry between Western and Uzbek textual traditions. In the Uzbek paradigm, objectivity is linguistically achieved by erasing the individual first-person singular pronoun *I* (*men*) from the narrative. As Nurmonov (1993) highlights in his works on Uzbek syntax, the pervasive use of passive voice and impersonal structures in Uzbek is not merely a syntactic preference but a deep-seated linguocognitive model designed to foreground the action and the resulting data rather than the agent.

One of the most prominent manifestations of this model is the use of the "authorial we" (*pluralis modestiae*). In Uzbek scientific texts, the restriction of the author's personal identity is frequently achieved through the active employment of the first-person plural pronoun *we* (*biz*). Within the Uzbek cultural and academic context, the use of *we* does not denote a literal plurality of authors; instead, it serves to soften the individual *I*, linking the solitary researcher to the broader scientific community. Safarov (2006), analyzing the pragmalinguistic features of communication, notes that discourse is inherently tied to cultural cognition; in the Uzbek context, this means maintaining a polite, respectful distance. Consequently, the pronoun *we* acts not as a tool for complete impersonality, but as a mechanism to express the authorial position indirectly and in accordance with established academic politeness norms.

Crucially, the Uzbek *we* carries profound cultural connotations. It is a reflection of academic modesty, an acknowledgment of belonging to a school of mentors, a sign of respect for previous researchers, and a marker of integration into a continuous scientific tradition. The author deliberately avoids positioning themselves as a solitary, authoritative figure dictating absolute truths. Therefore, utilizing *we* in single-authored papers remains a standard, deeply ingrained cultural-academic norm in Uzbek discourse. This closely mirrors similar depersonalization practices historically found in Russian and other post-Soviet academic traditions, where the collective voice validates the research (Kuznetsova & Suchkova, 2015).

In sharp contrast, the attitude toward authorial presence in modern English academic writing has undergone a significant evolution. While historically English scientific journals also preferred impersonal passive forms as the gold standard of objectivity, contemporary perspectives prioritize absolute clarity and intellectual ownership. In modern English academic discourse, the pronoun *we*

is predominantly utilized as a calculated rhetorical and pragmatic strategy rather than a marker of modesty. As Harwood (2005) categorizes, it functions either as an *inclusive we* to directly engage the reader in the analytical process, or an *exclusive we* to represent a distinct, multi-authored research team.

However, in the context of single-authored manuscripts, international journals and authoritative style guides generally consider the use of *I* to be significantly more accurate and intellectually honest than the artificial use of *we*. The Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (APA, 2020) explicitly mandates that authors attribute actions precisely, advising against the "editorial we." In contemporary English academic writing, particularly within the humanities, social sciences, and linguistics, it is entirely normal and expected for a single author to state their epistemic position explicitly using active forms such as "I argue," "I suggest," or "I propose" (Hyland, 2001). Concealing the researcher behind vague passive constructions is increasingly criticized by modern editorial boards as a deflection of intellectual responsibility.

Thus, a stark comparative dichotomy emerges: while modern English scientific discourse exhibits a growing tendency to openly express the author's individual epistemic position and take ownership of claims, the collective nature of knowledge, academic modesty, and passive de-agentization remain dominant, functional linguocognitive models in Uzbek scientific discourse. Bridging this epistemological dichotomy is not a matter of abandoning one's native academic heritage, but rather a process of pragmatic adaptation for a target audience. When Uzbek scholars prepare manuscripts for international databases, they must navigate the complex space between the pragmatics of respectful distance (Safarov, 2006) and the Western demands for explicit authorial visibility (Hyland, 2001). Consequently, the translation process must move beyond mere syntactic restructuring to address the deeper functional asymmetry identified by translation theorists like Salomov (1983) and Musayev (2005). To achieve this, the theoretical clash between collective modesty and individual accountability must be operationalized into concrete writing techniques.

Practical Transformation Strategies

Translating academic texts from a highly impersonal paradigm (Uzbek) to a rhetorically transparent one (English) requires significantly more than syntactic rearrangement; it demands a fundamental linguocognitive shift (Musayev, 2005). To comply with the publication standards of high-impact international journals and the specific mandates of the APA 7 guidelines, translators and authors must systematically dismantle traditional de-agentization structures. The following transformation strategies demonstrate how to transition from Uzbek passive and impersonal models to English active and author-driven constructions, focusing on functional-stylistic equivalence and causality mechanisms.

Shifting from Collective Modesty to Individual Responsibility

The most immediate challenge in translating Uzbek scientific discourse is the pervasive use of passive voice paired with the cultural *pluralis modestiae*. In the Methodology and Results sections, Uzbek authors traditionally obscure their direct involvement to maintain the culturally expected distance and objectivity (Safarov, 2006). However, APA 7 specifically instructs authors to avoid ambiguity regarding who experimented, collected the data, or performed the analysis (American Psychological Association, 2020). The translator must execute a pragmatic shift from collective academic modesty to individual intellectual responsibility, effectively giving the text an active human agent.

Example 1: Methodological Action

A)Uzbek Original (Impersonal/Passive): *Tadqiqot doirasida maqsadli auditoriyadan intervyular olindi va tizimlashtirildi.*

B)Literal Translation (Awkward/Passive): *Within the framework of the research, interviews from the target audience were taken and systematized.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation (Active): *I conducted and systematized interviews with the target audience.*

Analysis*:* The passive morphology is stripped away. The single author claims intellectual ownership of the data collection process, eliminating syntactic ambiguity.

Example 2: Formulating Conclusions

A)Uzbek Original (Authorial 'We' + Passive): *Maqolada diskursiv xususiyatlar tahlil qilinib, tegishli xulosalarga kelindi.*

B)Literal Translation (Awkward English): *In this paper, discursive features are analyzed by us, and conclusions are drawn.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation (Active): *I analyzed the discursive features and drew relevant conclusions.*

Analysis*:* As Chen (2020) notes, single authors in contemporary English linguistics frequently utilize *I* to mark their individual contribution. This aligns the text with the rhetorical transparency expected by international editorial boards**.**

Activating Inanimate Agents via Cognitive Metonymy

While explicit authorial stance (*I/We*) is vital, English academic discourse does not rely solely on personal pronouns to maintain the active voice. To avoid the repetitive and overly subjective overuse of *I*, modern English for Academic Purposes (EAP) frequently employs cognitive metonymy. This involves elevating inanimate objects (e.g., the study, the article, the table, the results) to the position of grammatical subjects that perform active verbs (Master, 1991). Uzbek discourse, conversely, tends to treat these inanimate entities as spatial locatives (places where the action happens) alongside a passive main verb, a feature deeply rooted in Uzbek syntactic structures (Nurmonov, 1993).

Example 1: Research Objectives

A) Uzbek Original (Locative + Passive): *Ushbu tadqiqotda kognitiv yuklamaning ta'siri o'rganiladi.*

B)Literal Translation: *In this research, the impact of cognitive load is studied.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation: *This research investigates the impact of cognitive load.*

Analysis*:* The spatial concept (*tadqiqot-da* / in the research) is metonymically transformed into an active agent (*This research investigates*). This grammatical metaphor propels the narrative forward without requiring the first-person pronoun.

Example 2: Presenting Data

A)Uzbek Original (Locative + Passive): *1-jadvalda respondentlarning yosh ko'rsatkichlari keltirilgan.*

B)Literal Translation: *In Table 1, the age indicators of the respondents are provided.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation: *Table 1 presents the respondents' age demographics.*

Analysis*:* Activating the inanimate object (*Table 1 presents*) satisfies the English preference for active syntax and drastically reduces lexical density.

De-nominalization of Abstract Processes

Uzbek scientific discourse frequently employs nominalization (the conversion of verbs into abstract nouns, typically using suffixes like *-ish, -uv*) combined with generalized auxiliary verbs (*amalga oshirildi, olib borildi, ta'minlandi*) to present actions as static facts. While this de-

agentization strategy increases the formal weight of an Uzbek text, it creates heavy, convoluted syntactic structures that violate the conciseness prioritized by APA 7 standards. Translators must perform "de-nominalization"—unpacking the abstract noun back into its core transitive verb to restore dynamic causality to the sentence (Halliday, 2004).

Example 1: Analytical Processes

A)Uzbek Original (Nominalization + Auxiliary): *O'zgaruvchilar o'rtasidagi korrelyatsiyani aniqlash amalga oshirildi.*

B)Literal Translation: *The determination of the correlation between the variables was performed.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation: *I determined the correlation between the variables.*

Analysis*:* By transforming the nominalized phrase (*aniqlash* / determination) back into an active verb (*determined*), the translator clarifies the cause-and-effect relationship. The action is no longer an abstract entity floating in the text.

Example 2: Comparative Methodology

A)Uzbek Original (Nominalization + Auxiliary): *Ikki tilning leksik qatlamlari ustida qiyoslash olib borildi.*

B)Literal Translation: *A comparison was carried out on the lexical layers of the two languages.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation: *I compared the lexical layers of the two languages.* (Alternatively: *The study compared...*)

Analysis*:* Removing the auxiliary "carried out" and converting the noun "comparison" to the active verb "compared" creates a lean, highly readable academic sentence.

Adapting Hedging Mechanisms

A critical concern when shifting from passive to active models is the risk of sounding overly dogmatic or aggressive. If a translator systematically converts every impersonal Uzbek construction into a direct "I prove" or "I demonstrate," the resulting English text may violate the norms of scientific politeness (mitigation). The shift to an active authorial presence must be carefully balanced with appropriate hedging devices and epistemic modality. English academic writing demands explicit authorial presence, but it simultaneously requires cautious, defensible claims (Salager-Meyer, 1994).

Example 1: Making Assertions

A)Uzbek Original (Impersonal Modal): *Ta'kidlash joizki, ushbu yondashuv pedagogik jihatdan samaralidir.*

B)Literal Translation: *It should be noted that this approach is pedagogically effective.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation: *I suggest that this approach is pedagogically effective.* (Alternatively: *The findings indicate that...*)

Analysis*:* Instead of relying on the impersonal "It should be noted," which deflects responsibility, the English translation uses an active subject (*I* or *The findings*) combined with a lexical hedge (*suggest, indicate, propose*).

Example 2: Interpreting Results

A)Uzbek Original (Passive Assumption): *Taxmin qilinadiki, bu hodisa madaniy tafovutlar bilan bog'liq.*

B)Literal Translation: *It is assumed that this phenomenon is related to cultural differences.*

C)APA 7 Compliant Transformation: *I argue that cultural differences likely drive this phenomenon.*

Analysis: The author claims ownership of the idea ("I argue") while leaving room for alternative interpretations through the hedging adverb ("likely"). This synthesis perfectly mirrors the pragmatics of the original Uzbek modesty without violating English syntactic expectations.

Discussion and Conclusion

The transition from the traditional Uzbek scientific style to the active, transparent models of contemporary English academic discourse produces a profound pragmatic impact on the text. By systematically applying the transformation strategies, Uzbek scholars can significantly enhance the readability and international competitiveness of their research.

When an author shifts from the culturally ingrained *biz* or *we* to the individual *I*, they cross a critical epistemological threshold. The Uzbek scientific paradigm views this transition as a departure from academic modesty and collective identity (Kuznetsova & Suchkova, 2015). In contrast, the contemporary English paradigm interprets this explicit self-mention as a hallmark of intellectual responsibility and clarity (Hyland, 2001). In English academic writing, identifying the exact source of a scientific claim or methodological action is paramount, and concealing the researcher behind an artificial *authorial we* is increasingly viewed by modern editorial boards as a deflection of this responsibility (Chen, 2020). Consequently, utilizing the first-person singular pronoun in single-authored papers is not a manifestation of arrogance but a functional requirement for academic accountability.

To illustrate the comprehensive impact of these linguocognitive shifts across different sections of a research article, one must observe how traditional Uzbek models are restructured into compliant English prose. When stating a research aim, the Uzbek original often employs a passive structure, such as *ushbu maqolada somatik frazeologizmlarning semantik maydoni tadqiq etiladi*. By applying a linguocognitive shift, the inanimate noun becomes the active agent, yielding the compliant form *this article investigates the semantic field of somatic phraseologisms* (Master, 1991). This eliminates the passive verb and immediately reduces structural heaviness. Similarly, when describing methodology, the Uzbek text frequently utilizes nominalization paired with passive auxiliaries, exemplified by *ingliz va o'zbek tillaridagi ilmiy matnlar qiyosiy tahlilga tortildi*. The pragmatically appropriate transformation requires the explicit authorial stance to take intellectual ownership of the methodology. Thus, the nominalized phrase is collapsed into a strong transitive verb, resulting in the active construction *I comparatively analyzed the English and Uzbek scientific texts*.

Furthermore, the presentation of claims and arguments necessitates a careful balance of authorial presence and epistemic hedging. The Uzbek discourse often relies on the *authorial we* combined with impersonal passives, such as *bizningcha, ilmiy diskursdagi bu hodisa muallifning kognitiv strategiyasi bilan bog'liq deb hisoblanadi*. The compliant English transformation eliminates these cultural modesty markers, allowing the author to directly assert the claim: *I argue that this phenomenon reflects the author's cognitive strategy*. This actively balances a strong authorial presence with an appropriate academic hedge, preserving scientific politeness without sacrificing clarity (Salager-Meyer, 1994). Finally, when formulating conclusions, Uzbek scholars frequently deploy impersonal modals like *shuni xulosa qilish mumkinki*. Instead of carrying over the impersonal modal into English, the translated text can activate the data itself as the evidence provider, yielding a dynamic, cause-and-effect rhetorical structure such as *the findings demonstrate that passive constructions ensure textual objectivity*.

Ultimately, the translation of academic discourse from Uzbek to English transcends the mere substitution of lexical items. It constitutes a complex process of cultural, rhetorical, and linguocognitive adaptation. The traditional Uzbek scientific discourse is fundamentally built upon principles of depersonalization, collective academic identity, and modesty. Conversely, modern international standards demand explicit authorial presence, active syntax, and clear intellectual

accountability (American Psychological Association, 2020). To bridge this gap, scholars must embrace functional-stylistic transformations, transitioning from the culturally safe *we* to the intellectually responsible *I* in single-authored publications (Harwood, 2005). Mastering these linguocognitive shifts empowers non-native scholars to effectively negotiate their epistemic identity and communicate their research with authority on the global scientific stage.

References:

1. American Psychological Association. (2020). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (7th ed.). https://doi.org/10.1037/0000165-000
2. Chen, X. (2020). Authorial stance in academic writing: A corpus-based study of the use of first-person pronouns in linguistics research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 45*, 100854. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2020.100854
3. Halliday, M. A. K. (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Hodder Arnold.
4. Harwood, N. (2005). 'We do not seem to have a theory… The theory I present here attempts to fill this gap': Inclusive and exclusive pronouns in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics, 26*(3), 343–375. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami012
5. Hyland, K. (2001). Humble servants of the discipline? Self-mention in research articles. *English for Specific Purposes, 20*(3), 207–226. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(00)00012-0
6. Hyland, K. (2012). *Disciplinary identities: Individuality and community in academic discourse*. Cambridge University Press.
7. Kuznetsova, L. B., & Suchkova, S. A. (2015). Active or passive? "I" or "we?". *Vysshee Obrazovanie v Rossii = Higher Education in Russia, 8-9*, 143–148.
8. Master, P. (1991). Active verbs with inanimate subjects in scientific prose. *English for Specific Purposes, 10*(1), 15–33. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(91)90014-G
9. Musayev, Q. (2005). *Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari* [Fundamentals of translation theory]. Fan.
10. Nurmonov, A. (1993). *O'zbek tilining sintaktik qurilishi* [Syntactic structure of the Uzbek language]. Universitet.
11. Safarov, Sh. (2006). *Pragmalingvistika* [Pragmalinguistics]. O'zbekiston milliy ensiklopediyasi.
12. Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. *English for Specific Purposes, 13*(2), 149–170. https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(94)90013-2
13. Salomov, G'. (1983). *Tarjima nazariyasi asoslari* [Fundamentals of translation theory]. O'qituvchi.