

Obilov Muzaffar Odiljon o'g'li

University of Business and Science.

Senior Lecturer, PhD.

Email: m-obilov@mail.ru

SUBJECTIVITY PARADIGMS IN ANGLO-AMERICAN ACADEMIC TRADITIONS

Abstract. The article analyzes the formation and development of subjectivity paradigms in Anglo-American academic traditions. The study examines mechanisms of expressing authorial identity in academic writing, epistemic modality, evidentiality, and interpersonal strategies. Based on Appraisal theories of scholars such as J.Martin, P.White, and K.Hyland, the rhetorical functions of subjective expressions are analyzed.

Keywords: Anglo-American traditions, subjectivity paradigms, Appraisal theory, epistemic modality, academic rhetoric, evidentiality.

Obilov Muzaffar Odiljon o'g'li

University of Business and Science.

Katta o'qituvchi, PhD.

Email: m-obilov@mail.ru

ANGLO-AMERIKA AKADEMIK AN'ANALARIDA SUBYEKTIVLIK PARADIGMALARI

Annotatsiya. Maqolada anglo-amerika akademik an'analarida subyektivlik paradigmalarining shakllanishi va rivojlanishi tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqotda akademik yozuvda muallif shaxsiyatini namoyon etish mexanizmlari, epistemik modallik, evidentsiallik va interpersonal strategiyalar ko'rib chiqilgan. J.Martin, P.White, K.Hyland kabi olimlarning Baholash nazariyalari asosida subyektiv ifodalarning ritorik funksiyalari tahlil etiladi.

Kalit so'zlar: anglo-amerika an'analari, subyektivlik paradigmalari, Baholash nazariyasi, epistemik modallik, akademik ritorika, evidentsiallik.

Обилов Музаффар Одилжон угли

University of Business and Science.

Старший преподаватель, PhD.

Email: m-obilov@mail.ru

ПАРАДИГМЫ СУБЪЕКТИВНОСТИ В АНГЛО-АМЕРИКАНСКИХ АКАДЕМИЧЕСКИХ ТРАДИЦИЯХ

Аннотация. В статье анализируется формирование и развитие парадигм субъективности в англо-американских академических традициях. В исследовании рассматриваются механизмы выражения авторской идентичности в академическом письме, эпистемическая модальность, эвиденциальность и интерперсональные стратегии. На основе теорий Оценки Дж.Мартина, П.Уайта и К.Хайланда анализируются риторические функции субъективных выражений.

Ключевые слова: англо-американские традиции, парадигмы субъективности, теория Оценки, эпистемическая модальность, академическая риторика, эвиденциальность.

Introduction

Anglo-American academic traditions constitute the dominant paradigm of contemporary global scholarly discourse, and the issue of subjectivity assumes particular significance in this context. Historically, British and American academic writing traditions accepted objective and depersonalized scientific texts as the ideal, but fundamental shifts in attitudes toward subjectivity occurred in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries [2]. The subjectivity paradigm refers to the culturally and historically formed system of expressing authorial stance, indicating knowledge level, and establishing reader relationships in academic discourse.

In the Anglo-American academic context, subjectivity is not merely a linguistic phenomenon but a cultural phenomenon closely connected with epistemological and rhetorical traditions. D.Biber and S.Conrad, in their corpus

studies, analyzed register variations in English academic writing and identified significant differences in levels of subjectivity across disciplines and genres [1]. These differences reflect not only the characteristics of the field but also the rhetorical norms of the Anglo-American academic community.

Literature Review

The Appraisal theory developed by J.Martin and P.White represents one of the most influential theoretical frameworks for studying subjectivity in Anglo-American academic discourse [5]. Appraisal theory distinguishes three main subsystems of evaluative language: Attitude, Engagement, and Graduation. The Attitude subsystem divides into categories of affect (emotion), judgement, and appreciation (evaluation). This system reveals the complexity and multifaceted nature of authorial evaluative stance in academic texts.

The Engagement subsystem encompasses mechanisms of dialogic expansion and dialogic contraction. Dialogic expansion operates through strategies that open space for alternative positions—hedging, acknowledging alternatives, entertaining possibilities [5]. Dialogic contraction, conversely, strengthens the author's position and limits alternative views through proclaim, pronounce, and concur strategies. Finding balance between these two strategies represents an important skill in Anglo-American academic writing.

K.Hyland further developed the concept of metadiscourse, proposing five main categories of interactional metadiscourse: hedges, boosters, attitude markers, self-mentions, and engagement markers [3]. His extensive corpus research demonstrates that the frequency and strategies of using these categories vary significantly across disciplines. For instance, hedging occurs at considerably lower levels in natural sciences compared to humanities and social sciences.

G.Myers, analyzing academic writing from a rhetorical theory perspective, proposes the concept of scientific politeness [6]. According to him, hedging and other mitigation strategies serve not only as epistemic caution but as means of ensuring face-work and maintaining positive relationships within the academic community. Myers analyzed biology articles demonstrating how authors present

their claims in forms acceptable to the scientific community.

S.Hunston and G.Thompson, in Evaluation theory, propose four parameters of evaluative devices in academic texts: status (source of knowledge), value (positive-negative evaluation), relevance (significance), and unexpectedness [4]. Through these parameters, authors express not only propositional information but their stance toward it. Evaluative devices constitute a fundamental component of academic argumentation, through which authors attempt to persuade readers.

C.Bazerman, within genre theory, analyzed the rhetorical structure of academic articles, demonstrating that subjectivity levels differ across sections [7]. Subjective markers appear more frequently in introduction and discussion sections, less prominently in methodology and results sections. This distribution reflects the accepted balance of objectivity and subjectivity in Anglo-American academic traditions.

Research Methodology

The research was conducted based on corpus-linguistic, discourse-analysis, and genre-analysis methods. Two hundred academic articles from the Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers (MICUSP) and British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpora were selected as empirical material. Articles belonged to four main disciplinary areas: humanities (literature, history—50 articles), social sciences (sociology, psychology—50 articles), natural sciences (biology, chemistry—50 articles), and technical sciences (engineering, computer science—50 articles). A balanced corpus totaling 650,000 words was compiled.

UAM CorpusTool, Sketch Engine, and AntConc software were employed for corpus analysis. UAM CorpusTool was particularly used for annotating Appraisal theory categories. The following methods were applied during analysis: quantitative corpus analysis (identifying frequency of subjectivity markers), Appraisal annotation (according to Martin and White's system), genre analysis (distribution across article sections), comparative analysis (differences between disciplines and corpora), and functional-rhetorical analysis (studying persuasive functions of subjective expressions).

Analysis and Results

According to research results, several important characteristics of subjectivity paradigms in Anglo-American academic traditions were identified. First, epistemic modality represents a central element of Anglo-American academic discourse. Epistemic modality serves as a means of expressing the author's confidence level regarding their claims and manifests through various linguistic devices [1]. Corpus analysis revealed the following distribution of epistemic modality markers: modal verbs (may, might, could, would, should—42%), epistemic adverbials (probably, possibly, perhaps, apparently, presumably—28%), epistemic verbs (seem, appear, suggest, indicate, tend—19%), and epistemic adjectives (probable, possible, likely, unlikely—11%).

Epistemic modality shows significant variation across disciplines. In humanities, epistemic markers appeared on average once per 80 words, while in natural sciences they were observed once per 150 words. This difference relates to the epistemological nature of the field: interpretation and argumentation play the primary role in humanities, whereas empirical evidence dominates in natural sciences. In Anglo-American traditions, epistemic caution represents an important virtue of academic writing, and authors are expected to avoid excessive categoricity.

Evidentiality—strategies for indicating knowledge sources—constitutes another important paradigm of Anglo-American academic discourse. Evidential strategies perform two main functions: connecting authorial claims to accepted knowledge of the scientific community and strengthening the reliability of one's claims [7]. Corpus analysis identified the following types of evidential strategies: direct reporting (Smith argues that, Jones claims that—35%), indirect reporting (research shows, studies indicate—28%), according to constructions (according to recent findings—22%), and integral citations (as noted by several scholars—15%).

In Anglo-American traditions, citation practices serve not only to convey propositional information but also as rhetorical strategy. Integral citations (author name incorporated into syntactic structure) perform discursive functions—

introducing readers to scholarly debate, distinguishing positions. Non-integral citations (author name in parentheses) primarily serve information-giving functions. Integral citations predominate in humanities and social sciences, while non-integral citations dominate in natural sciences.

Analysis by Appraisal theory categories demonstrated that Appreciation (evaluating intellectual processes and outcomes) occupies a dominant position in Anglo-American academic discourse. Appreciation expressions constituted 68% of all evaluative expressions, Judgement (evaluating researchers' activities) 22%, and Affect (emotional attitude) only 10%. This distribution confirms the predominance of intellectual and rational evaluation in Anglo-American academic traditions. Appreciation markers such as significant, important, interesting, remarkable, and valuable possessed the highest frequency.

Analysis of Engagement strategies revealed that dialogic expansion strategies are used 2.5 times more frequently than dialogic contraction strategies in Anglo-American academic writing [5]. This ratio reflects the open, pluralistic character of Anglo-American academic discourse, where respect for alternative positions and intellectual deliberation represent important values. Among dialogic expansion strategies, entertain (showing possibility through may, might, perhaps) was most widespread (45%), followed by attribute (citing other authors—32%), acknowledge (recognizing alternative views—15%), and distance (distancing from certain positions—8%).

Self-mention strategies (I, we, my, our) have undergone historical changes in Anglo-American academic writing. While passive voice and impersonal constructions were considered preferential in the 1980s-90s, first-person pronouns have become more accepted in contemporary traditions [3]. However, their use remains regulated: corpus analysis showed “we” being used five times more frequently than “I.” The predominance of “we” relates to several factors: prevalence of multi-authored articles, academic we (including author in academic community), and inclusive we (engaging reader) strategies.

Conclusion

Subjectivity in Anglo-American academic discourse represents a sophisticated and multifaceted phenomenon that transcends the simple objectivity-subjectivity dichotomy. Subjectivity is organized based on principles of epistemic caution, evidential transparency, rhetorical balance, and intellectual openness [2]. These principles reflect the cultural values and epistemological beliefs of the Anglo-American scientific community. Subjectivity paradigms show significant variation across disciplines, although certain general tendencies exist. While epistemic modality, dialogic expansion strategies, and concession-counter rhetoric are present across all fields, their intensity differs [5]. Humanities and social sciences employ more explicit subjectivity markers, whereas natural and technical sciences prefer relatively implicit strategies. These differences relate to the epistemological foundations and evidential methodologies of disciplinary fields.

References

1. Biber D., Conrad S. Register, Genre, and Style. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 344 p.
2. Harwood N. An interview-based study of the functions of citations in academic writing across two disciplines // Journal of Pragmatics. – 2009. – Vol. 41, No. 3. – P. 497-518.
3. Hyland K. Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing. – London: Longman, 2000. – 211 p.
4. Hunston S., Thompson G. Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000. – 227 p.
5. Martin J.R., White P.R.R. The Language of Evaluation: Appraisal in English. – London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2005. – 278 p.
6. Myers G. The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles // Applied Linguistics. – 1989. – Vol. 10, No. 1. – P. 1-35.
7. Bazerman C. Shaping Written Knowledge: The Genre and Activity of the Experimental Article in Science. – Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1988. – 356 p.