– Іменники збагачують лексичний склад німецької розмовної мови новими лексемами, яким притаманні специфічні для розмовної мови значення.

– Словотворення іменників німецької літературної та розмовної мови мають схожі тенденції та риси. Найпродуктивнішими способами словотворення розмовної мови є утворення складних та похідних іменників.

– Більшість досліджених іменників креативні та експресивні, які вживаються тільки в розмовній мові.

Література:

1. Девкин В. Д. Немецко-русский словарь разговорной лексики / Девкин В. Д. – М.: Русский язык, 1994. – 768 с.

2. Ладченко М. М. Тенденції розвитку лексичних та граматичних форм сучасної німецької розмовної мови / Ладченко М. М. // Acta Hungarica, 2001. – Ужгород – Ungvar, 2004. – С. 47-51.

3. Німецька граматика. Малий Дуден / Переклав з німецької та впорядкував Оленич В. – Ужгород: Мистецька Лінія, 2008. – 438 с.

4. Duden. Deutsches Universalwörterbuch. – Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut & F. A. Brockhaus AG, 2015. – 2128 S.

5. Hinka B. I. Lexikologie der deutschen Sprache: Vorlesungen und Seminare / B. I. Hinka. – Тернопіль: Редакційно-видавничий відділ Тернопільського національного педагогічного університету імені В. Гнатюка, 2005. – 220 S.

6. Ladtschenko M. M. Deutsche Substantive onomatopoetischer Herkunft / Ladtschenko M. M. // Мова та культура : сучасні аспекти співвідношення: Матеріали міжнародної науково-практичної конференції, м. Одеса, 20-21 листопада 2015 р. – Одеса: Міжнародний гуманітарний університет, 2015. – С. 89-92.

MODERN GENRE CONVENTIONS OF ENGLISH RESEARCH ARTICLE

Maslova T. B.
Lecturer of the Faculty of Linguistics,
Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute,
Kyiv, Ukraine

Research discourse is considered part of academic discourse that involves producing knowledge rather than transferring it into university environment. In doing so, researchers are required to present their findings at international conferences and publish academic papers in peer-reviewed journals. For that reason, the research article remains the dominant genre of the academy, being

shaped to comply with the specific cognitive and rhetorical frameworks of a certain disciplinary community. It is thus essential for newcomers to a discipline to integrate their scientific claims into the disciplinary relevance and prior work, and become the extension of an ongoing conversation. In this respect, writing a research article involves a tension between originality and deference to the community. The objective of the present paper is to consider the established conventions of the research article written in the English language, which is currently used as a means of professional communication around the globe, and the way these may vary across disciplines.

Most research articles are of IMRD structure, in other words, made up of such sections as Introduction, Methods, Results, and Discussion [Swales, 1990]. These section labels can be conventional and immediately recognizable, or unconventional, relying upon the author's terminology and pragmatic function performed [1, p. 15].

The purpose of the Introduction is to present the subject of the paper to the reader and attract interest [2, p. 105]. In analyzing the typical structure of research article introduction J. M. Swales developed a top-down approach to marking a stretch of text that serves a particular communicative function as a «move», formed by a number of rhetorical strategies, or steps, which can be either obligatory or optional. A four-move structure to describe the schematic pattern of the introductions in research articles is referred to as «Create a Research Space» (CARS) model, and comprise the following steps:

- Move 1 «Establishing a research territory» reviews previous research done in the area, and highlights the importance of the present research.
- Move 2 «Establishing a niche» indicates a gap in the previous research and brings up the issue to be studied.
- Move 3 «Occupying the niche» outlines the structure of the research article and anticipates the results to yield.

In general, this prototypical model, initially based on texts from a wide range of disciplines, reflects only the main features of the introduction section, which can be affected by the disciplinary area, the nature of the research subject, the guidelines of the particular journal as well as individual writing style of the author [2]. Note, for example, that the length of the moves and steps may range from a sentence to a few paragraphs, and in empirical research articles of some engineering and social science disciplines there is the independent Literature review between the Introduction and Methods sections (e. g. in industrial and systems engineering, civil and structural engineering, electronic and information engineering, accounting and finance, management, marketing, law, applied linguistics, and logistics) [1, p. 18; 3, p. 156].

The Methods section is to convince the reader on the validity of the methods, procedures, and materials used in the research under consideration, and as the range of applicable tools and techniques vary from one field of science to another, it is believed that rhetorical structures of the Methods display even

wider deviation both between disciplines and within sub-disciplines than any other research article section [4, p. 7; 5, p. 283]. For instance, the Methods sections in social sciences, education and public health are reported to be much more detailed and elaborated than in engineering, biological and medical research, where standard practices and methods are usually well-known, and do not require much explanation. Still, this section constitutes the body of most research articles and can be omitted only in archaeology and history papers, which are rarely empirical in nature [1, p. 155].

There are three major moves that can be distinguished in the Methods section:

- Move 1 describes the data collection procedure(s).
- Move 2 features the methodology of the experiment.
- Move 3 presents the data analysis [Kanoksilapatham, 2015].

In the Result section of the research paper, the author puts forward the new knowledge claims through the demonstration, explanation, and interpretation of the findings, commenting on the results obtained in order to provide a timely response to any critical remarks. In some cases a cyclic pattern of reporting and commenting may occur [6, p. 367]. This presentation of the results is typically followed by the Discussion section, but some recent studies of the conventional IMRD framework indicate a growing tendency to include a blended section of Results and Discussion, particularly in the research articles of such disciplines as building services engineering, land surveying, civil and structural engineering. The probable reason is that the function of Discussion section is somewhat blurry and can encompass any of the closing sections of the research paper, which comment on the future implications, limitations, and applications of the research [1, p. 156].

The three dominant moves of the Results sections, for example in sociology, applied linguistics and computer science, are

- metatextual Move 1 «Summarizing procedures», which provides relevant information for the presentation of the results and serves as a reminder and connector between sections.
- Move 2 «Reporting results», which normally contains statistics and examples.
- Move 3 «Commenting on results», which includes some interpretations that establish the value of research results in relation to the relevant field of science.

In the medical research articles, however, one can find a different scheme, consisting of only two Moves: «Indicating consistent observations», that is the most significant observations focused on the objectives of the research, and «Indicating non-consistent observations», containing those that do not conform with expected outcomes [7]. The use of «observations» instead of «results» also reflects the specific nature of this discipline.

As has been already stated, the Results and Discussion sections are often combined into one, and it is mostly due to the overlapping move of commenting. The difference

is that the Discussion section is meant to interpret the outcomes of the research so that it is most expected to relate the final results and the initial hypotheses of the study, and for that reason it contains much more comments [6, p. 376].

There have been proposed a few frameworks for the Discussion section, each being made up of three to eleven moves, but the most interesting approach is to treat it as a mirror image of the Introduction in the sense that it proceeds from particular to general, and may consist of a reversed series of CARS model moves. It follows then that Discussion Move 1 «Summarizing the study» resembles Introduction Move 1 «Occupying the niche» as it is typically a statement of principal findings. Discussion Move 2 «Evaluating the study» involves comparing the present results and the ones obtained by other researchers, thus «re-establishing the niche». Finally, Discussion Move 3 «Deductions from the research» presents commentary about the implications of the study or directions of future research; in other words, it has to «establish an additional territory» [8, p. 481].

At present the ideal IMRD pattern is said to be most common in research articles of applied science disciplines (e.g. health technology, applied biology, chemical technology) and some social science disciplines (psychology, political science, education), but is rarely used in engineering and humanities disciplines, where this model gets modified and becomes ILM [RD] C, standing for Introduction, Literature review, Methods, Results combined with Discussion, and Conclusion [3].

In practice, Discussion and Conclusion are sometimes presented as alternative equivalent sections in the IMRD framework, and if Conclusions is a separate part of the research paper it consists of the three moves that are very similar to the ones encountered in the Discussion section, namely summary of the results, theoretical and/ or practical implications, and possible further research in the area [2, p. 127].

In general, the growing complexity and length of today's research articles give rise to the blended Results and Discussion section followed by Conclusions as the final section. As the matter of fact, Conclusions is found in three-quarters of the research papers, fulfilling the author's self-promotion strategy to highlight the contribution made by the present research [3, p. 155].

As you can see, neither the IMRD model itself, nor the moves of each research article section, are commonly conventional across different disciplines. This holds for sub-disciplines as well. The move analysis of engineering research articles, for example, concludes that due to the diversity of engineering practice, ranging from observational experimentation to mathematical simulation, no common move patterns can be revealed in all the research papers of the same sub-discipline [4]. Thus, we need to continue investigating discursive practices and conducting genre analysis in specific institutional and disciplinary contexts.

References:

1. Tessuto G. (2015). Generic structure and rhetorical moves in English-language empirical law research articles: Sites of interdisciplinary and interdiscursive cross-over. English for Specific Purposes 37, 13-26.
2. Yakhontova T. (2003). English academic writing for students and researchers. Lviv: PAIS, 1-220.
3. Lin L., Evans S. (2012). Structural patterns in empirical research articles: A cross-disciplinary study. English for Specific Purposes 31, 150-160.
4. Maswana S., Kanamarub T., Tajino A. (2015). Move analysis of research articles across five engineering fields: What they share and what they do not. Ampersand 2, 1-11.
5. Lim J. (2006). Method sections of management research articles: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study. English for Specific Purposes 25, 282-309.
6. Ruiying Y., Allison D. (2003). Research articles in applied linguistics: moving from results to conclusions. English for Specific Purposes 22, 365-385.
7. Nwogu K. N. (1997). The medical research paper: Structure and functions. English for Specific Purposes 16 Issue 2, 119-138.
8. Peacock M. (2002). Communicative moves in the discussion section of research articles. System Volume 30, Issue 4, 479-497.

ФОРМАЛЬНО-ГРАМАТИЧНІ МОДЕЛІ ДЕТЕРМІНАТИВНИХ РЕЧЕНЬ У СУЧАСНОМУ МЕДИЧНОМУ АНГЛОМОВНОМУ ДИСКУРСІ

Олексієнко А. В.
кандидат філологічних наук
викладач кафедри іноземних мов
Запорізький державний медичний університет
м. Запоріжжя, Україна

Речення – це складний та багатоаспектний мовний знак, в якому взаємодіють номінативний та комунікативний рівні. Номінативна організація складного речення маніфестує діалектику формально-граматичного та лексико-семантичного аспектів. При дослідженні гіпотаксису англійської мови увагу слід приділити особовому типу детермінативних підрядних речень (дПР), а саме сентенціальному означальному підрядному реченню (sentential relative clause) [10, p. 66]. Головними ознаками таких дПР виступають їх нерестриктивність, введення ними додаткової інформації та факультативність, що означає здатність