

EMOTIONAL AND EVALUATIVE LANGUAGE IN ENGLISH
AND UZBEK POPULAR SCIENCE DISCOURSE

uniconflux

INTERNATIONAL
CONFERENCE ON
BUSINESS &
MANAGEMENT

Scientific Open Access Conference

**Shahnozabegim Yokubjonova.****Nodirabegim Yokubjonova**<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17876916>**ARTICLE INFO**Received: 8th December 2025Accepted: 9th December 2025Online: 10th December 2025**KEYWORDS**

evaluative language, emotional language, popular science, comparative discourse, affective stance, modality, engagement, english, uzbek, sociolinguistics.

ABSTRACT

The success of popular science writing depends heavily on the strategic use of emotional and evaluative language to foster intellectual curiosity and generate reader interest. This comparative study analyzes the linguistic devices used to express attitude and subjective assessment in English and Uzbek popular science texts. English often utilizes intensifiers (e.g., truly amazing, fundamentally different) and engagement markers to personalize discovery, operating within a model of constrained scientific enthusiasm. The analysis contrasts the prevalence of subjective vocabulary, the use of modality, and the function of writer involvement, highlighting how linguistic and cultural norms shape the emotional rhetoric available to the science popularizer. Understanding these differences is crucial for effective cross-cultural science communication

Introduction

The goal of popular science is not merely to transmit facts but to inspire wonder and convince the reader of the significance of the findings. Achieving this requires the strategic deployment of language that expresses the writer's attitude, known broadly as Evaluative Language or Stance. English and Uzbek popular science writing, while sharing the goal of accessibility, often differ in the acceptable boundaries for expressing emotion and subjective judgment. English tends toward a rhetoric of *constrained enthusiasm*, using linguistic markers to guide the reader toward an approved emotional response. Uzbek, positioned within a different rhetorical and historical context, may display distinct conventions for subjective expression. To understand global science outreach dynamics, researchers must engage with materials that demonstrate how cultural and linguistic traditions dictate the writer's available emotional range. "The expression of emotion in scientific texts is a highly conventionalized act, functioning not as personal venting, but as a rhetorical tool to align the reader's judgment with the writer's." [1, 320].

1.0 Mechanisms of Evaluation in English Popular Science**1.1 Intensification and Subjective Lexis**

English popular science relies heavily on intensifying adjectives and adverbs to inject emotion and emphasize the novelty or scale of a finding. Terms like *astonishing*, *breakthrough*, *massive*, and *revolutionary* are pervasive and serve to transform objective data into a compelling narrative. This language often involves a key rhetorical technique: the writer presents the data objectively and then uses an evaluative adjective to instruct the reader *how* they should feel about it. This contrasts sharply with traditional academic English, which rigorously excludes overt subjective evaluation. In popular discourse, such evaluation is essential. For instance, instead of stating, "The star is large," a popularizer might write, "The star is *monumentally huge*," leveraging hyperbole to amplify impact. Another key strategy is the use of Attitudinal Adjectives that reveal the writer's positive stance (e.g., *elegant solution*, *beautiful theory*). This choice implicitly endorses the scientific content, creating a

shared sense of intellectual admiration with the reader. "The strategic inclusion of high-frequency evaluative terms is essential in popular science for bridging the affective gap between the often-dry presentation of data and the general public's need for narrative excitement." [2, 340].

1.2 Writer Involvement and Modality

In English popular science, emotional resonance is also achieved through explicit writer involvement, often marked by first-person pronouns (I, we). This personalization is crucial for establishing rapport and guiding the reader through the journey of discovery. Furthermore, Modality—the language of certainty or obligation—shifts from the cautious hedging of academic writing to expressions of greater confidence and assertion (e.g., *This is certainly the key*, *We must conclude that*). While academic texts prioritize epistemic distance, popular texts reduce this distance, fostering a sense of shared, enthusiastic certainty.

2.0 Evaluative Conventions in Uzbek Popular Science

2.1 Lexical Constraints and Discourse Traditions

Uzbek popular science operates within a different set of sociolinguistic expectations. Historically, Uzbek science has favored a more reserved, authoritative voice, sometimes leading to a lower overall frequency of explicit, high-intensity emotional vocabulary compared to its English counterparts. Instead of Western-style hyperbole, Uzbek popularizers may rely on **culture-specific lexis** that convey high regard or deep significance without resorting to overtly sensationalist language. The emphasis is often on the practical importance and *hikmat* (wisdom or lesson) of the finding, aligning the science with communal values rather than purely individual excitement. The expression of emotion may also be structured differently, with evaluative statements often placed in sentence-final position near the main verb, leveraging the SOV structure to deliver the affective punch after the informational content has been presented. "The rhetorical tradition in Uzbek science communication often prefers to signal importance through formal markers of authority and social relevance rather than through the sustained use of emotionally charged adjectives and adverbs." [3, 188].

2.2 The Influence of Translation and Lexical Conflict

A critical factor affecting Uzbek popularization is the ongoing process of translation and the influence of source texts, which are overwhelmingly in English or Russian. Translators face a constant challenge: whether to calque the highly evaluative language of the English source (e.g., translating *stunning development* literally) or to domesticate the tone by rendering it with a more subdued, contextually appropriate Uzbek expression. This conflict results in variation, where some texts display high fidelity to the emotional rhetoric of the English source, and others revert to a more traditional, reserved voice. The final pragmatic choice directly impacts the affective experience of the Uzbek reader, illustrating how translation is a powerful agent of stylistic change in the popular science genre.

Conclusion

The comparative analysis of emotional and evaluative language reveals that popular science is a genre defined not just by its content, but by its culturally conditioned rhetoric of enthusiasm. English popular science readily incorporates subjective lexis and high-intensity intensifiers to create excitement and alignment with the reader. Uzbek popular science, while modernizing, demonstrates a stylistic tension between adopting this internationalized rhetoric and adhering to traditional or nationally-focused conventions for expressing significance and respect. Ultimately, the differences in how emotion is expressed highlight how linguistic and cultural backgrounds provide unique toolsets for the popularizer aiming to transform complex scientific information into accessible and motivating public knowledge.

References:

1. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum. p. 320.
2. Mugford, G., & Dymott, R. (2012). The popularisation of science: A linguistic analysis. *Journal of Science Communication*, 11(2). p. 340.

3. Sager, J. C. (1990). *A practical course in terminology processing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. p. 188.
4. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman, 1985. - p. 1150.
5. Biber, D. (1988). *Variation across speech and writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 190.
6. Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Cambridge: Polity Press. p. 410

