HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

EVALUATIVE ADJECTIVES IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK POPULAR SCIENCE MAGAZINES

Nodirabegim Yokubjonova

Associate Teacher at "Oriental" university

Doi: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23986482

Abstract. Evaluative adjectives help science writers explain why a finding deserves attention, yet they can also blur the distinction between an interesting result and a well-supported conclusion. This conceptual article examines their semantic and pragmatic functions in English and Uzbek popular science discourse. A qualitative contrastive analysis uses eight author-constructed pairs to investigate evaluative meaning, grammatical position, attribution, and the scope of a judgment. The examples show how assessments of interest, importance, evidential strength, and future usefulness require different contextual support. They also illustrate why translation should preserve the basis and limits of an evaluation rather than reproduce an adjective mechanically. The article proposes reading each evaluative expression in relation to its target, source, and supporting explanation.

Keywords: evaluative adjectives, popular science, English–Uzbek comparison, appraisal, authorial stance, scientific communication

1. Introduction. Calling a discovery "remarkable" does not tell a reader what was discovered. It tells the reader how to regard it. The adjective may be justified by an unexpected observation, a methodological advance, or an unusually clear result; it may also appear before any such reason is supplied. Popular science writing must therefore manage two related tasks: explaining the scientific content and making its relevance intelligible. Evaluative adjectives sit at the point where those tasks meet.

Evaluation is part of the writer's position toward a subject, not simply an ornamental layer added to information (Hunston & Thompson, 2000). In science communication, its interpretation also depends on the relationship constructed with the audience. Accounts of proximity connect the display of expertise with the way writers involve readers in scientific explanation (Hyland, 2010). Describing a process as "simple," for example, can refer to the process itself or to how easily a particular audience is expected to understand it. These are different judgments.

The present article asks how evaluative adjectives function in comparable English and Uzbek examples, what changes when an evaluation is translated, and how its grammatical packaging affects the visibility of the judgment.

2. Theoretical Framework and Method

2.1. Evaluation as a contextual judgment

An adjective is treated here as evaluative when, in context, it assesses an entity or proposition against a standard of value, expectation, adequacy, or credibility. *Important* and *muhim* invite a judgment of relevance; *surprising* and *hayratlanarli* signal a departure from expectation. However, a word cannot

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

always be assigned a stable evaluative status outside its phrase. “A large sample” can report size relative to a stated benchmark, whereas “a great discovery” commonly introduces an appraisal of value.

The appraisal framework provides resources for examining attitudes, the handling of alternative voices, and the strength of evaluation (Martin & White, 2005). The present analysis uses these distinctions selectively. It does not equate every adjective with a separate appraisal category. Instead, it asks how an adjective works with the noun it qualifies and with modifiers, attribution, and explanation. The relationship between stance and reader involvement is relevant here, but the two should not be collapsed (Hyland, 2005).

2.2. Materials and analytical procedure

The material consists of eight English–Uzbek pairs constructed for this article. They cover interest, importance, credibility, prospective usefulness, explanatory simplicity, unexpectedness, effectiveness, and statistical terminology. The pairs are analytical models, not quotations from magazines, a representative sample, or a translation corpus. Their purpose is to expose distinctions that can subsequently be tested in authentic material. No numerical claim about actual magazine usage follows from their number or distribution.

The analysis includes adjective phrases because a bare-word comparison would remove crucial distinctions. “Effective,” “more effective,” and “effective under controlled conditions” do not make the same claim. Likewise, *samarali*, *samaraliroq*, and *nazorat qilinadigan sharoitda samarali* locate the evaluation differently. Participial and phrase-level equivalents are retained where they express a natural Uzbek meaning, but they are not treated as proof that English and Uzbek use identical grammatical categories. The comparison is functional before it is lexical.

3. Results

3.1. Different adjectives require different grounds

Table 1 distinguishes the main types of evaluation represented in the constructed material. The final column identifies information needed to interpret each judgment. The categories are practical distinctions for this analysis rather than an exhaustive classification of adjectives.

Table 1. *Evaluative meanings in constructed English–Uzbek pairs*

Dimension	English expression	Uzbek equivalent	Interpretive question
Interest	a fascinating pattern	qiziqarli qonuniyat	What makes the pattern worth examining?
Importance	an important finding	muhim topilma	Important for which problem or decision?

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

Dimension	English expression	Uzbek equivalent	Interpretive question
Credibility	a reliable method	ishonchli usul	Which validation supports reliability?
Prospect	a promising approach	istiqbolli yondashuv	What remains untested or unresolved?
Simplicity	a simple explanation	sodda izoh	Simple in form, mechanism, or presentation?
Expectation	a surprising result	hayratlanarli natija	Whose expectation has been challenged?
Performance	a more effective method	samaraliroq usul	Compared with what, for which task?
Technical boundary	a statistically significant difference	statistik jihatdan ahamiyatli farq	Is a technical result being confused with practical importance?

Note. All pairs are author-constructed. Equivalents preserve the intended function in these examples; they are not interchangeable translations in every context.

3.2. Grammatical position can change what is foregrounded

Compare “This important finding explains the pattern” with “This finding is important because it challenges the earlier explanation.” The first incorporates the judgment into the noun phrase; the second makes the evaluation itself a claim and supplies a reason. A similar contrast is available between “Bu muhim topilma qonuniyatni izohlaydi” and “Bu topilma muhim, chunki u avvalgi izohni shubha ostiga qo‘yadi.” Neither construction is intrinsically misleading. The difference is where the reader encounters the judgment and whether its basis is made explicit.

4. Discussion

4.1. The Role of Translation in preserving the kind of evaluation

An English adjective may suggest several Uzbek equivalents, each carrying a different emphasis. In the first pair, *qiziqarli* preserves the orientation toward interest but may express less intensity than *fascinating*. *Hayratlanarli* would introduce a stronger implication of surprise, while *diqqatga sazovor* would emphasise deserving attention. The choice depends on what the paragraph explains next. If it describes an unexpected pattern, surprise may be warranted; if it merely identifies an unresolved question, a more restrained formulation may fit better. A dictionary match alone cannot settle this choice.

The phrase “a promising approach” points toward possible future value. Rendering it as *samarali yondashuv* would shift the emphasis toward effectiveness already attributed to the approach. *Istiqbolli yondashuv* better preserves the prospective orientation in the constructed pair, although the

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

surrounding paragraph still needs to state what has been demonstrated. This is a change in the status of the claim, not merely its emotional force. A translation can remain positive while becoming more certain than its source.

4.2. How Evaluation can spread beyond its original target

A particularly useful object of analysis is the movement from a limited result to an unrestricted assessment. Consider "The method was reliable in this image-classification task." A later sentence calling it "this reliable technology" may detach the adjective from the task in which reliability was assessed. In Uzbek, the movement from "Usul ushbu tasniflash vazifasida ishonchli natija berdi" to "bu ishonchli texnologiya" creates a comparable problem. The second formulation may be justified, but the first sentence alone does not provide that justification.

This article proposes tracing the continuity of the evaluation target across a paragraph. An assessment should be checked again when its noun changes from *result* to *method*, or from *method* to *technology*. Such changes can quietly enlarge the scope of praise without adding evidence. The proposal is an analytical extension developed here, not a measured tendency in either language. It offers a concrete question for corpus research: when an adjective recurs, does its original limitation remain accessible?

4.3. How Qualification can improve an explanation

Gradation allows writers to strengthen or soften an assessment, but greater intensity does not supply stronger grounds (Martin & White, 2005). "A very important result" intensifies *important*; "important for distinguishing the two models" specifies its relevance. Similarly, *juda muhim natija* and *ikki modelni farqlash uchun muhim natija* perform different work. The latter tells readers where the value lies. A useful editorial test is therefore to ask whether an intensifier can be replaced by a criterion without losing the intended meaning.

References to earlier research can help explain why a finding is surprising or consequential. Intertextuality has been discussed as a resource for connecting scientific explanation with prior knowledge and for constructing authority (Yoqubjonova & Yoqubjonova, 2026). In the present context, however, a famous name cannot by itself justify *revolutionary* or *inqilobiy*. The passage must identify what the new claim changes. This approach treats popularization as an interpretive activity rather than a one-way reduction of specialist knowledge (Myers, 2003).

5. Conclusion. The analysis identifies possible contrasts rather than patterns of actual magazine use. The examples have not been independently rated for translation equivalence, and no reader responses were collected. A corpus study would need comparable topics, publication periods, intended audiences, and distinctions between original and translated articles. It should also separate scientific uses of words such as *significant* from everyday evaluations, and identify whether adjectives belong to the journalist, an interviewee, or a quoted source. These controls are necessary before drawing cross-language conclusions.

References

HSR (LONDON),
HOUGHTON STREET REVIEW JOURNAL
ISSN: 2058-5519|Impact factor-15.9
http://houghtonstreetreview.com/index.php/hsr

1. Hunston, S., & Thompson, G. (Eds.). (2000). Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198238546.001.0001
2. Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. Discourse Studies, 7(2), 173–192. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365
3. Hyland, K. (2010). Constructing proximity: Relating to readers in popular and professional science. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9(2), 116–127. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.02.003
4. Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910
5. Myers, G. (2003). Discourse studies of scientific popularization: Questioning the boundaries. Discourse Studies, 5(2), 265–279. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445603005002006
6. Yoqubjonova, S., & Yoqubjonova, N. (2026). The pragmatic role of intertextual references in science magazine narratives. Research Focus International Scientific Journal, 5(1), 104–106. https://doi.org/10.66073/researchfocus.v5i1.1968