

DIFFERENT GENRES: EVALUATING TYPES OF SOURCES

Jabborova Dildora Zokirjanovna

Department of English language theoretical aspects senior teacher PhD
Uzbekistan State World Languages University
dilyacity89@gmail.com

Shomirzayeva Xabibaxon Shuxrat qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages university First English faculty
Foreign language and literature
habibashomirzayeva@gmail.com

Annotatsiya. Ushbu maqola genre tahlili va akademik diskursda turli xil manba turlarini baholash o'rtasidagi munosabatni o'rganadi. Bhatia (1993), Evans (1994), Uzun (2017) va Tardy (2009) ning asosiy ishlariga tayanib, tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, manbalarni baholash umumiy, kontekstga bog'liq bo'lmagan ko'nikma emas, balki genrega xos kompetensiyadir. Maqola uchta asosiy da'voni sintez qiladi: birinchidan, turli akademik janrlar (masalan, adabiyot sharhi, tizimli sharh, nazariy insho, annotatsiyalangan bibliografiya) tubdan farqli baholash mantiqini talab qiladi; ikkinchidan, genre bilimi va manbalarni baholash o'zaro mustahkamlovchi xususiyatga ega, chunki chuqur genre tushunchasi yanada aniqroq baholash imkonini beradi va tanqidiy baholash genre kompetensiyasini chuqurlashtiradi; uchinchidan, genre bilimining rivojlanish trayektoriyasi (ta'lim darajasi va turli akademik tajribalar ta'sirida shakllanadi) magistratura va doktorantura ta'limi uchun bevosita pedagogik ahamiyatga ega. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, genrega asoslangan manba baholash bo'yicha aniq, fanga xos ta'lim ilg'or akademik savodxonlikni rivojlantirish uchun zarurdir, ayniqsa raqamli va ochiq kirish manbalarining ko'payishi yangi baholash muammolarini keltirib chiqarmoqda.

Kalit so'zlar: genre tahlili, genre bilimi, manbalarni baholash, akademik diskurs, akademik maqsadlar uchun ingliz tili, fanlararo o'zgaruvchanlik, akademik savodxonlik, magistratura va doktorantura ta'limi.

Аннотация. В данной статье рассматривается взаимосвязь между жанровым анализом и оценкой различных типов источников в академическом дискурсе. Опираясь на основополагающие работы Бхатиа (1993), Эванса (1994), Узуна (2017) и Тарди (2009), в анализе утверждается, что оценка источников является не общим, контекстно-независимым навыком, а жанрово-специфической компетенцией. В статье синтезируются три ключевых тезиса: во-первых, разные академические жанры (например, обзоры литературы, систематические обзоры, теоретические эссе, аннотированные библиографии) требуют принципиально разной оценочной логики; во-вторых, жанровое знание и оценка источников взаимно усиливают друг друга, поскольку развитое жанровое осознание позволяет проводить более дифференцированную оценку, а критическая оценка углубляет жанровую компетенцию; в-третьих, траектория развития жанрового знания, которая формируется под влиянием уровня образования и разнообразного академического опыта, имеет прямое педагогическое значение для послевузовского образования. Анализ показывает, что явное, дисциплинарно-специфическое обучение оценке источников на основе жанрового подхода необходимо для развития продвинутой академической грамотности, особенно по мере того, как распространение цифровых источников и источников открытого доступа создает новые оценочные задачи.

Ключевые слова: жанровый анализ, жанровое знание, оценка источников, академический дискурс, английский для академических целей, дисциплинарная вариативность, академическая грамотность, послевузовское образование.

Annotation. This paper examines the relationship between genre analysis and the evaluation of different source types within academic discourse. Drawing on foundational works by Bhatia (1993), Evans (1994), Uzun (2017), and Tardy (2009), the analysis argues that source evaluation is not a generic, context-independent skill but a genre-specific competency. The paper synthesizes three key claims: first, different academic genres (e.g., literature reviews, systematic reviews, theoretical essays, annotated bibliographies) demand fundamentally different evaluative logics; second, genre knowledge and source evaluation are reciprocally reinforcing, as sophisticated genre awareness enables more discerning evaluation, and critical evaluation deepens genre competence; third, the developmental trajectory of genre knowledge, which is shaped by educational level and diverse academic experiences, has direct pedagogical implications for graduate education. The analysis concludes that explicit, discipline-specific instruction in genre-based source evaluation is essential for developing advanced academic literacy, particularly as the proliferation of digital and open-access sources introduces new evaluative challenges.

Keywords: genre analysis, genre knowledge, source evaluation, academic discourse, English for Academic Purposes, disciplinary variation, academic literacy, graduate education.

Introduction

The study of academic discourse has increasingly converged around genre analysis as a multidisciplinary method for examining how texts within specific discourse communities are structured, stylized, and functionally organized. As Bhatia (1993) contends, the principal strength of genre analysis lies in its applied linguistic orientation, which demands that theoretical constructs remain accessible to practitioners of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and English for Academic Purposes (EAP). This accessibility ensures that genre theory translates into actionable tools for those who teach, learn, and produce professional and academic texts.

The standardization of research genres is particularly evident in academic writing. Evans (1994) observes that research papers exhibit "a standardized layout, form, and stylistic standards to an excessive degree." This standardization, however, does not imply rigidity. Rather, genres provide a flexible framework within which writers exercise disciplinary agency. Central to this understanding is the concept of genre knowledge. Uzun (2017) defines genre knowledge as the cognitive and linguistic resources required to respond appropriately to the recurring communicative demands of a discourse community. Tardy (2009) extends this view by arguing that genre knowledge is developmental: as writers encounter diverse rhetorical situations and incorporate multiple knowledge sources, their genre competence evolves. This developmental trajectory is reflected most clearly in extended academic projects, particularly master's theses and doctoral dissertations.

The present discussion extends these foundational insights to a related but distinct domain: the evaluation of different source types as a genre-specific practice. While genre analysis has traditionally focused on structural features of research papers, less attention has been devoted to how writers evaluate various source types—monographs, peer-reviewed articles, conference proceedings, preprints, and digital materials—as a distinct generic activity. Evaluating sources is not a content-neutral skill but a genre-embedded practice. The criteria, depth, and rhetorical presentation of source evaluation vary systematically across disciplines

and genres. For instance, a literature review in the humanities privileges interpretive synthesis of monographs, whereas a systematic review in the health sciences requires hierarchical appraisal of randomized controlled trials using standardized checklists.

Thus, the intersection of genre analysis and source evaluation constitutes a theoretically rich area of inquiry. The purpose of the present analysis is threefold: to synthesize theoretical perspectives on genre knowledge as applied to source evaluation, to propose a preliminary framework for understanding how different genres demand distinct evaluation strategies, and to consider pedagogical implications for graduate education. By integrating Bhatia's applied orientation, Tardy's developmental model, and emerging research on source-based writing, this analysis argues that the ability to evaluate different source types is not a generic transferable skill but a genre-specific competency that must be taught and assessed within disciplinary frameworks.

Conclusion

In summary, the foregoing analysis has established a conceptual bridge between genre analysis and source evaluation as a genre-specific practice. The multidisciplinary foundation of genre analysis, articulated by Bhatia (1993), provides the theoretical flexibility to examine how writers across discourse communities adapt their evaluative practices to different source types. Evans' (1994) observation of standardization in research papers is not a limitation but an affordance: because genres are conventionalized, writers can efficiently signal the status and relevance of the sources they cite.

The concept of genre knowledge, as defined by Uzun (2017) and elaborated by Tardy (2009), proves indispensable for understanding source evaluation competence. Tardy's insight that genre knowledge develops through diverse academic experiences and is reflected in theses and dissertations highlights the importance of graduate education for cultivating advanced evaluative competencies.

Several key conclusions emerge. First, source evaluation is not a monolithic skill. Different genres require fundamentally different evaluative logics. Second, genre knowledge and source evaluation are reciprocally reinforcing: sophisticated genre knowledge enables better evaluation, and critical evaluation deepens genre knowledge. Third, the developmental trajectory of genre knowledge has direct pedagogical implications. Instruction should be discipline-specific, genre-conscious, and progressively scaffolded. Undergraduate students might begin by recognizing basic source types; graduate students should engage with nuanced assessments accounting for disciplinary variation and rhetorical purpose.

References

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
- Evans, T. D. (1994). Genre analysis of research papers in academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(2), 155–172.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Tardy, C. M. (2009). *Building genre knowledge*. Parlor Press.
- Uzun, K. (2017). Genre knowledge and its role in academic writing. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 13(2), 322–335.