WRITTEN DISCOURSE: INTERCULTURAL RHETORIC IN THE PROCESS OF EDUCATION

Ibadullayeva Umida Xabibullayevna
Lecturer of the department of foreign languages,
Journalism and Mass Communications University of Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

In today's linguistic world, one of the most long attracted and arguable subjects is intercultural rhetoric which is simply defined as the study of text patterns or written discourse which varies with structural and cultural backgrounds between or among different languages [Ula Connor, 2011]. For that reason, this paper explains the significance of intercultural rhetoric in both teaching and learning a foreign language, in particular, English as a second language. It is essential to mention that though this paper includes problematic sides of written discourse, it is one of the primary aspects to form communicative competence in language learners.

Keywords. *Intercultural rhetoric, written discourse, skills and abilities, communicative competence, cultural backgrounds, assimilation.*

According to Ulla Connor (1996), learning to write in a second language is not just idiosyncratic variation while writing is a cultural phenomenon. However, it involves recurring patterns of organization and rhetorical conventions from the students' native language and culture. Therefore, arguably it is the most challenging mode for the second language learners as discourse is obviously not by any means limited to oral-aural interchange, but permanently powerful premeditated structuring

A person beginning to learn a foreign language understands that the purpose of his learning is to learn to master the language correctly, use it for his own purposes and, of course, communicate not only orally, but also in written way through exchanging information, experience, knowledge, skills and results of activity. As a result, a learner comes across with a long gap between oral and written discourse and interaction competence. Thus, teachers face a new challenge that is how easily to teach them to write properly in a foreign language, when intercultural discourse in writing is not the same as spoken discourse.

Connor (2011) states "intercultural rhetoric" as the term that identifies cross-cultural studies by comparing the same concept in one culture with another one. In other words it studies interactions in which writers from a variety of linguistic, social and cultural backgrounds negotiate through speaking and writing [Atkinson, 2004].

Robert Kaplan started to explain contrastive rhetoric in 1966 as an area of research in second language acquisition which defines problems in composition encountered by second language writers and oppositely, Connor (1996) attempts to explain it referring to rhetorical strategies of the first language. Moreover, intercultural rhetoric cannot be fully explained without mentioning text analysis methodologies. They are contextualized text analysis and ethnographic and other naturalistic approaches [Douglas, 2014].

According to G.V. Horn and I.N. Vereshchagina (2000), for the development of students' written speech in the classroom, many teachers in foreign language lessons use narrative and situational training, which involves great opportunities to develop brain storm thinking. One of the means of creating such a communication is the use of clarity. In the explanatory dictionary of methodological terms, visibility is considered as a support in the learning process on the didactic principle of visibility, according to which learning is based on specific images directly perceived by students, as well as a specially organized display of language and extra linguistic material in order to facilitate its explanation, assimilation and use in writing. Thus, by presenting a specially developed form of external clarity, we can ensure the creation of communicative competence among learners. They will be able to learn how to express their opinion on a given topic, fix vocabulary and practice writing skills.

REFERENCES

1. Atkinson, D., 2004. Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: Why contrasting rhetorics needs conceptualization of culture. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes: Special Issue on Contrastive Rhetoric In EAP,* 3(4), pp. 277-289.
2. Connor, U., 1996. *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge university Press.
3. Connor, U. a. A. A., 2011. Review of Intercultural Rhetoric in the Writing Classroom. *Rhetoric, Professional Communication and Globalization (RPCG),* December, Issue 2, pp. 2153-9480.
4. Douglas, H. B., 2014. *Principals of Language Leaning and Teaching. A course in second language acquisition.* Pearson Pducation Inc ed. s.l.:six edition.

5. Rubtsova A. Socio-linguistic innovations in education: Productive implementation of intercultural communication. IOP Conf. Ser. Mater. Sci. Eng. 2019, 497, 012059. [CrossRef]

6. Khasanova, G. K. (2022). THE ESSENCE AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CASE-STUDY METHOD IN THE EDUCATIONAL PROCESS. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, *2*(Special Issue 20), 778-782.

7. Khasanova, G. K. (2022). THE NEED FOR TECHNOLOGY IN THE DESIGN OF THE PEDAGOGICAL PROCESS. *Oriental renaissance: Innovative, educational, natural and social sciences*, *2*(Special Issue 20), 95-100.