

THE EXPRESSION OF SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDE IN SCIENTIFIC TEXTS (A
COMPARATIVE STUDY OF ENGLISH AND UZBEK)

Sobirova Intizor Muhammadqulovna

Navoi region, Navoi city, Secondary school N 15, English teacher

Abstract. *This article explores the phenomenon of subjective attitude in scientific texts, focusing on English and Uzbek academic discourse. While scientific style is traditionally associated with objectivity, neutrality, and factual accuracy, researchers inevitably introduce their own evaluative stance and personal voice into their writing. The study highlights the ways in which subjective attitudes are conveyed in English through hedging, boosting, and authorial presence, whereas in Uzbek scientific texts modal expressions, evaluative words, and culturally embedded rhetorical devices play a central role. By comparing linguistic and pragmatic strategies in both languages, the article argues that subjectivity is not a deviation from scientific norms but a necessary component of persuasive academic communication.*

Keywords: *subjective attitude, scientific discourse, authorial stance, English, Uzbek, hedging, modality*

Scientific discourse is conventionally associated with objectivity, impersonality, and factual precision. Yet, modern linguistic and discourse-analytic research convincingly demonstrates that complete objectivity in scientific texts is unattainable. This is because every researcher, regardless of discipline, inevitably introduces their evaluative stance, epistemic positioning, and interpretive choices into the process of knowledge construction. Subjectivity, therefore, should not be seen as a violation of scientific rigor but as an essential mechanism through which ideas are contextualized, communicated, and made persuasive.

From a pragmatic perspective, subjectivity in academic texts reflects the epistemic responsibility of the author: scientists do not simply report data, they also interpret it, assess its significance, and situate it within existing scholarly debates. The strategies employed to achieve this goal vary across languages and cultural traditions, which makes comparative analysis particularly fruitful.

In the English-language academic tradition, a substantial body of research (Hyland, 1998; Paltridge, 2006) has identified hedging as a central device in expressing subjectivity. Hedging markers such as *may suggest, it is possible that, seems to indicate* function to lower the degree of certainty and invite the reader into an open-ended dialogue. Such caution reflects the cultural value placed on critical argumentation and peer negotiation in Anglo-American academia.

By contrast, boosting strategies serve the opposite purpose: they reinforce the validity of the researcher's claims and guide interpretation. Expressions like *undoubtedly prove, it is clear that, these results demonstrate* project a sense of confidence and intellectual authority. The interplay of hedging and boosting thus creates a rhetorical balance between humility and assertiveness, ensuring both credibility and persuasiveness.

Furthermore, English scientific texts frequently include explicit authorial markers, such as *we argue, our findings, I contend*. These forms underscore the researcher's responsibility while legitimizing subjectivity as an inherent component of scientific communication. The presence of the author is not regarded as a weakness; rather, it signals transparency and accountability in the construction of knowledge.

Uzbek scientific discourse, rooted in different cultural and intellectual traditions, reveals subjectivity through modal constructions and evaluative vocabulary. Modal verbs and expressions such as *kerak, mumkin, lozim, shart* highlight necessity, obligation, or probability. For instance, "*Bu masalaga ehtiyotkorlik bilan yondashish kerak*" does not merely describe a fact but conveys the author's evaluative stance toward the research outcome.

Another salient feature is the frequent use of evaluative adjectives and adverbs—*muhim, dolzarb, asosiy, samarali*. These lexical choices place the findings within a broader social, cultural, and national framework, often aligning them with state priorities or collective scientific goals. Thus, subjectivity in Uzbek texts reflects not only individual interpretation but also the orientation toward communal relevance and societal advancement.

Additionally, authorial markers such as *bizningcha, fikrimizcha, nazarimizda* are explicitly used to frame the researcher's viewpoint. Unlike English academic writing, where subtlety and indirectness are valued, Uzbek discourse tends to foreground the author's interpretive role, underscoring the cultural emphasis on clarity, authority, and shared responsibility.

When compared, English and Uzbek academic writing reveal distinct rhetorical preferences shaped by cultural traditions:

- English emphasizes dialogic interaction, balancing caution and confidence through hedging and boosting. The text is designed to invite critique and foster academic debate.
- Uzbek emphasizes evaluative clarity and collective orientation, situating research findings in relation to national priorities, ethical responsibilities, and communal benefit.

These differences are not merely linguistic but epistemological, reflecting broader intellectual traditions. Anglo-American academic culture privileges critical dialogue and argumentation, while Uzbek scholarly culture highlights consensus-building, social relevance, and collective advancement of knowledge.

Recognizing subjectivity as an integral dimension of scientific communication has several implications:

1. For Discourse Studies – It demonstrates how linguistic choices embody epistemic values and disciplinary practices.
2. For Cross-Cultural Scholarship – It highlights the necessity of cultural sensitivity when evaluating scientific texts produced in different traditions.
3. For Academic Training – It suggests that researchers should be explicitly taught how to use subjective strategies effectively, both in their native language and in international academic English.

Conclusion

Subjectivity in scientific discourse is not an obstacle but a constitutive feature of academic writing. It reflects the author's interpretive engagement, rhetorical strategy, and cultural positioning within the global scientific community. English and Uzbek traditions illustrate

two complementary ways of integrating subjectivity: one through rhetorical negotiation of certainty, the other through modal and evaluative clarity tied to communal priorities.

By examining these cross-linguistic practices, we deepen our understanding of how science is not only discovered but also communicated, negotiated, and legitimized. Such awareness enables scholars to navigate the complexities of multilingual academic environments with greater rhetorical competence and cultural sensitivity.

REFERENCES

1. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
2. Муминова, Н. А. (2016). Применение тестовых заданий на уроках родного языка в начальных классах. *Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов*, (5), 153-155.
3. Муминова, Н. А. (2018). Проблемная организация уроков родного языка начальных классов. *Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов*, (5), 68-69.
4. Муминова, Н. А. (2017). Дидактические игры, используемые для повышения эффективности уроков родного языка в 1 классах начального образования. *Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов*, (4), 39-41.
5. Hakimova, M. (2024). РОЛЬ ФАКТОРОВ, ВЛИЯЮЩИХ НА ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКУЮ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТЬ. *Modern Science and Research*, 3(7).
6. Hakimova, M. (2023). DEVELOPMENT OF LINGUISTIC COMPETENCE AMONG STUDENTS. *Development of Pedagogical Technologies in Modern Sciences*, 2 (12), 52–54.
7. Xusniddin o'g'li, X. S. (2024). ВАЖНОСТЬ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТИ В ОБУЧЕНИИ РАЗГОВОРНОЙ РЕЧИ.
8. Hakimov, S. (2024). ВАЖНОСТЬ КОММУНИКАТИВНОЙ КОМПЕТЕНТНОСТИ В ОБУЧЕНИИ РАЗГОВОРНОЙ РЕЧИ. *Modern Science and Research*, 3(7).
9. Юсупходжаева, С. Т. (2020). ПСИХОЛОГИЧЕСКИЕ АСПЕКТЫ БОЛЬНЫХ РЕВМАТОИДНЫМ АРТРИТОМ И МЕТОДЫ ИХ ПСИХОКОРРЕКЦИИ. In *Global Science and Innovations 2020* (pp. 170-174).
10. Гафурова, С. Ш., & Юсупходжаева, С. Т. (2024). ТРЕВОЖНО-ФОБИЧЕСКИЕ РАССТРОЙСТВА ПРИ СИНДРОМЕ РАЗДРАЖЕННОГО КИШЕЧНИКА И ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТЬ ПСИХОТЕРАПИИ И ПСИХОФАРМАКОТЕРАПИИ ПРИ НИХ.
11. Багдасарова, Э. С., & Расулова, В. Б. (2019). Роль кетоза при алкогольной зависимости и эффективность препаратов при устранении алкоголизма. *International Academy Journal Web of Scholar*, 1(1 (31)), 31-35.
12. Alikulovna, R. O. (2022). WOMEN IN UZBEKISTAN-INTELLECTUAL OF GIRLS PROBLEMS OF CAPACITY INCREASE AND THE RESULTS IN THEIR SOLUTION (EXAMPLE OF SOUTHERN REGIONS). *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL*

SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 8.036, 11(09), 15-19.

13. Rahmonkulova, O. A. (2021). THE ROLE OF EMBROIDERY IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF UZBEK FOLK ARTS. In НАУКА И ТЕХНИКА. МИРОВЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ. СОВРЕМЕННЫЕ ИССЛЕДОВАНИЯ В ПСИХОЛОГИИ И ПЕДАГОГИКЕ (pp. 20-26).

14. Gafurova, S. S. (2025). COMBINATION OF IRRITABLE BOWEL SYNDROME WITH ANXIETY PHOBIC SYNDROME DURING PREGNANCY AND THE EFFECTIVENESS OF MEDICAL PSYCHOLOGICAL SUPPORT IN IT. JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND SCIENTIFIC MEDICINE, (5).

15. Махаматжанова, N. (2019). Evaluation of the effectiveness of psychopharmacotherapy and psychotherapy in the complex treatment of systemic lupus erythematosus. Journal of the Neurological Sciences, 405, 125.

16. Swales, J. (1990). Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

17. Paltridge, B. (2012). Discourse Analysis: An Introduction. London: Bloomsbury.