

RESEARCH REVIEW: INTEGRAL APPROACH

T.N. Khomutova, E.V. Kravtsova

South Ural State University (Chelyabinsk, Russian Federation)

E-mail: khomutovtn@susu.ac.ru; ayo-tech@rambler.ru

Abstract. The novelty of our research is defined by the necessity of further theoretical consideration of integral nature of the scientific text using the material of texts of research reviews. The purpose of the article is yet further development of integral theory of the scientific text using the material of texts of research reviews and the construction of an integral model of the research review text. The basic integral model of the research review is presented. The perspectives of further research are outlined.

Keywords: integral approach; scientific text; research review; integral model.

Analysis of the scientific text increasingly acquires special importance. In the conditions of globalization it is the scientific text that becomes the major unit of communication both for the scientists and for those who use their works. However, as practice shows, stereotypic perception of the scientific text as an unambiguous object does not correspond to its multidimensional integral essence and the real dependence of its characteristics from a number of factors including those which are culturally specific. This contradiction may be viewed as the sign that the scientific text is to be studied from new integral positions. The integral approach gives the opportunity to analyze the scientific text and units that comprise it in their global unity and interdependence [1].

The novelty of our research is defined by the necessity of further theoretical consideration of integral nature of the scientific text using the material of texts of research reviews. The research review has never been thoroughly analyzed in this particular aspect.

The purpose of the article is the further development of integral theory of the scientific text using the material of texts of research reviews and the construction of an integral model of the text of research review. The intermediate aims of the research are:

1. To research the research review as an integral object.
2. To specify the definition of the research review in the integral aspect.
3. To develop an integral model of the text of the research review.
4. To define prospects for further research.

The research object of this paper is the text of the research review.

The research subject is the integral character of the text of the research review.

The work comprises various general scientific, linguistic, linguoculturological and other methods and analysis methods, such as integral, logi-

cal, descriptive, etc. Traditionally the research review which is the object of our research is studied from the position of functional stylistics. The review is understood as a type of scientific, literary and literary criticism, the literary critique that gives the analysis, an assessment to the scientific work or to a work of art – a book, a picture, a performance, etc. The research review is a kind of evaluative and critical type of a text. It combines the characteristics relating to those functional styles the main feature of which is that the assessment is a dominating communicative purpose [2: 23, 24]. It is obvious that the functional approach to the scientific text in general and to the research review in particular considers this object point wise, without capturing its multilateral and many-sided essence.

Within a modern paradigm of scientific linguistic knowledge we consider it optimal to view the scientific text, including the research review, as an integral object: fragment of the act of scientific speech communication, fragment of scientific knowledge, fragment of special sublanguage, fragment of national culture, fragment of social professional space in global unity and interdependence of units that comprise it. Such approach allows to consider the organization of the scientific text as the unity of four sectors: cognitive, linguistic, cultural and social. Each sector consists of its own special units combined with the help of a certain structure into a complete system [3: 39, 40].

The text of the research review which is the object of our research, wasn't exposed earlier to detailed consideration from the point of view of integral approach. Following the integral approach, we have specified definition of the scientific text in relation to the research review and came to a conclusion that the research review is an integral object: fragment of the act of scientific speech based on the assessment of scientific activity of the author of the original text by the authoritative scientist (i.e. one imposing much influence on the scientific community); fragment of scientific knowledge of the author of the original text and reviewer; the fragment of special sublanguage, in which evaluative words play a special role; fragment of national culture, including corporate; fragment of the social professional space where the most authoritative members estimate scientific activity of other members, in global unity and interdependence of units comprising it.

Contents of the research review are the scientific facts the semantic structure of which reflects the essence of an epistemic situation of the given text, and also an assessment of its scientific character.

The concept of “epistemic situation” was introduced by M.P. Kotyurova and further employed in stylistics of the scientific speech. This concept is used for justification of determinacy of formal and inclusive structure of the scientific text by a complicated set of the subject and object relations of scientific cognitive activity and its product – the scientific knowledge [4: 343].

The process of formation of scientific knowledge (on the basis of gno-seological and psychological researches of specifics of scientific activity)

represents a sequence of the following stages: the problematic situation (more than a problem, can include several problems) – the problem (the central question containing the further program of researches) – the idea (the fundamental element of the theory, not all researchers allocate it) – the hypothesis (the presumable formulation of the answer to the question posed) – the hypothesis proof (logical justification of the answer to a problem question, construction of the theory) – the law, the conclusion (the final decision of a problem, the logical statement containing new knowledge) [5: 158-171]. Thus, the evolution of knowledge represents a dynamic process, change of various states, movement from essence to essence, from ignorance to knowledge.

The research review belongs to secondary texts. The object of an assessment in the research review are the phenomena and the facts taken from primary scientific research or a material. As a rule, these are the texts that give primary scientific data, received in the course of original scientific researches. Such texts are turned directly to object of cognizable, researchable reality. These are the texts of thesis, monographs, articles, etc. Secondary texts contain the knowledge gained after analytic and synthetic processing of primary text. These are the texts of papers, summaries, reviews, comments etc., studying the other text with the completed result of scientific knowledge [6: 39-41]. Thus, texts belonging to genres of a monograph and an article we should relate to the primary category, while texts of a summary, a paper and a review – to the secondary.

One of the features of the research review is the intertextuality. The research review possesses specific form and content. On the one hand, the research review as an independent scientific work is aimed at transfer of results of scientific knowledge of the real-life phenomena and reality processes. On the other hand, its object is not a group of direct facts, but the phenomena already studied and comprehended by another subject of the phenomenon, embodied in a certain text as a result of acquiring certain scientific knowledge. It is the other text becomes the direct object of studying in the review. The reviewer inevitably includes in the field of his vision the other subject of knowledge – the author of primary text. In the review there is a comparison of two individual pictures of the world, two outlooks and meanings. Interpreting primary text, the reviewer adds his own knowledge to the results of the activity of the other subject. Thereby, the critical text exists in indissoluble intertextual communication with primary, reviewed work [7].

The next distinctive feature of the research review is the dialogue. The review is a reciprocal remark of the interpreter in the dialogue with another author.

Owing to this fact the text of the research review is both subjectival and subjective. The author of primary text considers scientifically cognizable reality acts as an object, for the reviewer the object consists of two concepts:

1) the objectival reality and 2) the primary text that reflects it [Ibid]. It means that the reviewer has to follow strictly the other subject of knowledge, recreating precisely and authentically the logic of a reasoning of the original author. However, he is to be concentrated on himself, his own agenda with his reflections, his ideas providing penetration into the essence of the object being cognized.

In this paper we have developed basic integral model of the research review on the basis of basic integral model of the scientific text (table) [1].

Basic integral model of the research review

Cognitive sector	Linguistic sector
1. Secondary text as the knowledge fragment (knowledge of subject domain): ➤ declarative knowledge (concepts, ontologies) ➤ procedural knowledge (as a rule, with a higher level of thinking of the reviewer, than the author of primary text). 2. Special knowledge (knowledge of experts in the field). 3. Scientific knowledge (detection of scientific character of research)	1. Secondary text as a language fragment as subject (sublanguage fragment): ➤ sublanguage lexicon, estimated lexicon, semantics, grammar of the text; ➤ structure of the secondary text: ▪ macrostructure – the main contents of the text; ▪ microstructure – local structure of the text, its minimum components; ▪ superstructure – the structural diagram 2. Special sublanguage (terminological dictionary, keywords, text superstructure). 3. Scientific style (from the linguistic point of view)
Cultural sector	Social sector
1. Secondary text as culture fragment: ➤ Cultural concepts and values (relation to time, to space, to authorities, etc.) ➤ Culture-based type of thinking 2. Detection of scientific character of research (special role of the reviewer)	1. Secondary text as fragment of social space: ➤ Social concepts and events (scientific community, level of development of science, priority directions of development of science, etc.) ➤ Socially dependent communicative behavior (typical structures of special communication: functional style, the genre which is revealed in special superstructure of the text) 2. Research review as institutional type of scientific discourse

In cognitive sector of integral model the research review represents a fragment of special scientific knowledge of a certain subject domain. The declarative knowledge represents concepts, conceptual systems and knowledge ontologies. The procedural knowledge (abilities to operate concepts) represents the level of thinking peculiar to scientific community. The special knowledge is a knowledge and experience of experts in this subject domain. In this sector it has subjective character. The scientific knowledge is true knowledge, systemic and intersubjective. The research review is represented by different levels of thinking of the author of primary text and the reviewer. As a rule, the reviewer's level of thinking is higher, than the author's. Reviewers of scientific works have to be more skilled and influential

people in the area. The research review gives the chance to look at primary text from new positions, to interpret the information through a personal vision and understanding of a problem. The reviewer adds his own knowledge and reflections to the results of scientific activity of the other subject, at the same time estimating the material and revealing its scientific character. As a result of such reconsideration of a source text new meanings may emerge, supported by the reviewer's own knowledge.

In social sector the research review represents a fragment of social space in the form of a social context of the act of special scientific communication – a discourse, which due to the effort by E.V. Sidorov is now treated as “the separate act of speech communication in the course of which the text appears in a sociocultural context” [8: 147]. The participants of communication organized in scientific community, the level and the priority directions of development of science in the community, and also social structures of scientific communication, such as a genre and functional style can be referred to the social sector of the scientific text.

As the research review belongs to institutional type of discourse, its main audience of readers and users is a scientific community, experts with high-quality professional training. Reviews are published in scientific journals and are found, as a rule, in the section “Book Reviews”. The research review has a characteristic of the communicative and pragmatical relations. The reviewer acts as some kind of an intermediary in the communication between the author of primary text and the reader. Thus the reviewer differs from any other potential reader by the creative activity, as the creating subject he turns the process of perception of scientific ideas into consciousness of the new text. Authors of primary scientific texts - research associates, graduate students, Candidates of Science for whom it is important to receive criticism and an assessment of their works for further researches. For an objective assessment and the analysis of new achievements in science the authoritative scientists in the areas of knowledge act as reviewers. As it was specified earlier, the level of thinking of the reviewer is, as a rule, higher, than the one of the author of primary text, therefore the reviewer interprets the source text with his knowledge and understanding of the subject.

In cultural sector the research review acts as the fragment of culture which is based on cultural values of the people. Cultural values, in turn, are closely connected with language, society, thinking and, thereby, shape the type of the latter [9]. Culturally based type of thinking is expressed, in particular, by national specific models of semantic and grammatical structures of the text. Matters of corporate culture and scientific ethics are an integral part of cultural aspect of the scientific text. The cultural sector of the research review is presented by the cultural values put in mental structures of the individual. Following G. V. Yelizarova, we understand cultural values as ‘cultural propositions’ – cultural concepts and the relations connecting them

[10: 20, 21]. For each culture the types of thinking are unique. The types which are caused by social and cultural factors are allocated. Different types of thinking get the linguistic expression in the relevant structure of the text, where a certain variability is observed. Distinctions in structures of the text are caused by distinctions in thinking types which, in turn, is affected by the system of basic cultural values. It is confirmed by written texts in non-native language where communicants prefer to use the structure of the text in native language, familiar to them. Identification of valuable orientations is not carried out without taking into account the relation of representatives of the culture to the nature, time, space, activity, nature of communication, to character of the argument during communication, to the nature of thinking, personal liberty and autonomy of the personality, rivalry, authority and power, human nature etc. [Ibid: 25-35].

In language sector the research review represents a language fragment as the subject (language system and language material), namely: fragment of special sublanguage in which the declarative and procedural knowledge, cultural values, social concepts and events are expressed by means of language units (lexicon, estimated lexicon and grammar of the text). This sublanguage is scientific and is expressed in category of scientific style. The language sector of the research review is presented by micro-, macro- and the super-structure of the text representing the cognitive, social and cultural aspects.

As a part of communication the text of the research review represents a fragment of the communicative act – a discourse, a material embodiment of the interfaced communicative activities of representatives of scientific society: the author of primary text and the reviewer, verbalization of fragments of the scientific knowledge, special sublanguage, national culture and professional social space in their global unity and interdependence.

Thus, the integral approach allows us to track close interrelation of all four sectors of the research review and to use it to reveal deep mechanisms which are the basis of scientific communication.

The contrastive analysis of the structure of the research review on the material of several languages for the purpose of detection of its universal and culture-specific characteristics may become a highly promising direction of further research of the integral nature of the research review.

Literature

1. HOMUTOVA, T., 2010. *Scientific text: integral approach*. Chelyabinsk: Publishing center "JuUrGU", pp. 21, 22.
2. TROYANSKAYA, E., 1985. *Scientific paper assessment from the reviewer point of view*. Scientific literature: Language, style, genres, Moscow: Publishing house "Nauka", pp. 23-24.
3. HOMUTOVA, T., 2012. *Scientific text: variation analysis*. Chelyabinsk: Publishing center "JuUrGU", pp. 39, 40, 71, 72.

4. KOTYUROVA, M., 1996. *Expression of the epistemic situation in marginal texts of the whole work*. M.P. Kotyurova, Sketches of history of scientific style of the Russian literary language of the XVII-XX centuries, under the editorship of M.N. Kozhina; in 3 volumes, (II), Stylistics of the scientific text (the general parameters), Perm: Publishing house of Perm University, (I), pp. 341-370.
5. BAZHENOVA, E., 1996. *The peculiarities of the semantic structure of the scientific text and its composition*. E.A. Bazhenova, Sketches of history of scientific style of the Russian literary language of the XVII-XX centuries, under the editorship of M.N. Kozhina; in 3 volumes, (II), Stylistics of the scientific text (the general parameters), Perm: Publishing house of Perm University, (I), pp. 158-235.
6. CHERNYAVSKAYA, V., 2004. *The scientific text interpretation*. V.E. Chernyavskaya, Saint-Petersburg: Publishing house "Nauka", pp. 22, 23.
7. GRISHECHKINA, G., 2002. *Correlation of genre specific factors and research review objective spheres*. thesis... candidate of philology, G.Yu. Grischechkina, Orel: Orel State University, pp. 35-47.
8. SIDOROV, E., 1987. *Problems of speech systematic*. E.V. Sidorov, Moscow: Publishing house "Nauka".
9. KAPLAN, R., 1966. Cultural thought patterns in inter-cultural education. *Language learning*, (16), pp. 1-20.
10. YELIZAROVA, G., 2001. *Culture and learning of foreign languages*. G.V. Yelizarova, Saint-Petersburg: Publishing house "Sojuz".