ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ VOLUME 5 ISSUE 7 JULY 2026

AN EXPLORATORY COMPARATIVE PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS OF GENDERED EVALUATIVE EXPRESSIONS IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK PUBLIC DISCOURSE

Baxtiyorova Feruza
Tashkent State University of Oriental Studies
Tashkent, Uzbekistan
Correspondence: fayozferuzafarzona17@gmail.com

DOI: 10.67620/sai.57c0005

ABSTRACT

This exploratory study examines gendered evaluative expressions in English and Uzbek public discourse from a comparative pragmatic perspective. The analysis draws on an author-compiled purposive dataset of 100 evaluative units, with 50 English and 50 Uzbek items, and focuses on the Attitude subsystem of Appraisal Theory: Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation. The revised analysis treats the corpus as a source-asymmetric exploratory sample rather than as a representative model of either language or culture. Descriptive results show that Judgment is the most frequent Attitude category in both subcorpora (English: 32/50, 64%; Uzbek: 35/50, 70%), followed by Appreciation (24% and 20%) and Affect (12% and 10%). The principal cross-corpus contrast lies not in category frequency but in the contextual values attached to evaluative choices. In the sampled English materials, favorable gender evaluation is frequently associated with agency, competence, leadership, and professional participation. In the sampled Uzbek materials, favorable evaluation more often invokes responsibility, respectability, family relations, moral conduct, and social obligation, while contemporary texts also explicitly contest restrictive gender stereotypes. Because the data were purposively selected and clustered within a limited number of source texts, inferential significance testing is not used. The findings are interpreted as patterns in the sampled discourse rather than as population-level differences between English- and Uzbek-speaking societies. The study demonstrates the value of combining Appraisal Theory with contextual pragmatic analysis while also showing the importance of source matching, transparent coding, and cautious cultural interpretation in cross-linguistic gender research.

ACCEPTED

07.08.26

Keywords: *gender linguistics, evaluation, Appraisal Theory, pragmatics, discourse analysis, English, Uzbek.*

CC BY

Introduction

An Exploratory Comparative Pragmatic Analysis of Gendered Evaluative Expressions in English and Uzbek Public Discourse

Language is not merely a system for transmitting propositional content; it is also a resource for positioning speakers and writers in relation to people, actions, social categories, and values. Evaluation is therefore central to discourse because it allows language users to express affect, approve or condemn

conduct, assign social worth, and align readers with particular interpretations (Martin & White, 2005). When evaluation is directed toward women, men, femininity, masculinity, or gendered social roles, it can also contribute to the reproduction, contestation, and reorganization of gendered expectations.

Research on language and gender has moved away from treating women and men as two internally homogeneous groups with stable linguistic styles. Contemporary approaches emphasize gender as socially produced, context dependent, and intertwined with institutions, identities, power relations, and communicative practice (Butler, 1990; Cameron, 2005; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). From this perspective, gendered evaluation is analytically important not because particular adjectives or labels are intrinsically feminine or masculine, but because evaluative meanings become gendered through their targets, recurrent associations, interactional functions, and sociocultural histories.

The present study focuses on English and Uzbek, two typologically distinct languages embedded in different histories of public communication. English-language gender discourse has been extensively examined in feminist linguistics, sociolinguistics, corpus linguistics, and discourse analysis (Baker, 2008; Cameron, 2005; Lakoff, 1975; Mills, 2008). Uzbek gender linguistics is a smaller but developing field in which recent studies have discussed lexical, grammatical, and discourse-level manifestations of gender and have called for greater attention to sociocultural context (Norboyeva & Jabborova, 2024; Ro'ziyeva, 2024). A carefully qualified comparison can therefore illuminate how broadly similar evaluative resources are recruited for different local meanings.

The original version of this study made several claims that exceeded what its dataset could establish. Most importantly, it treated a small purposive corpus as if it represented English and Uzbek discourse generally, compared source sets that were not fully matched by genre or period, described a non-significant chi-square result using the language of statistical significance, and did not provide the item-level coding matrix needed for independent replication. The present revision addresses these problems by explicitly redefining the project as exploratory, using descriptive rather than inferential statistics, separating observed corpus patterns from cultural interpretation, clarifying the Attitude categories used in coding, and expanding the limitations and transparency statements. The revision does not invent missing observations or source metadata.

Theoretical Background

Evaluation and the Attitude Subsystem of Appraisal

Appraisal Theory conceptualizes evaluation as a system of interpersonal meaning through which speakers and writers negotiate attitudes, alignment, and degrees of commitment (Martin & White, 2005). The present study is limited to the Attitude subsystem rather than the entire Appraisal framework. Attitude is commonly organized into three major regions: Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation. Affect concerns emotional states and reactions; Judgment evaluates human behavior and character with reference to social esteem or social sanction; and Appreciation evaluates things, processes, performances, and phenomena in terms such as value, quality, impact, or composition.

This distinction is especially useful for gendered discourse because many socially consequential descriptions are not explicit statements about gender equality or inequality. A phrase may praise a woman as capable, responsible, or admirable; criticize a man as irresponsible or weak; or value a gendered role as respectable, successful, traditional, modern, or appropriate. The analytical task is to identify both the attitudinal category and the pragmatic work performed by the evaluation in its context. A lexical item cannot therefore be classified reliably without its surrounding discourse. For example, the label female leader may be descriptive in one context, celebratory in another, and contrastive or marked in a third.

Gender as Discursive and Social Practice

Early work in language and gender drew attention to systematic relationships among linguistic form, gender inequality, and social power (Lakoff, 1975). Later scholarship complicated binary and essentialist accounts by emphasizing variation within gender categories and by treating gender as

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

something repeatedly enacted and interpreted in social practice (Butler, 1990; Cameron, 2005; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). Ochs (1992) further demonstrated that gender meanings are frequently indexed indirectly: linguistic forms may first index stances, activities, or social roles, which become associated with gender through cultural expectations.

This indirectness is crucial for evaluative language. Terms such as strong, modest, ambitious, caring, authoritative, emotional, responsible, or independent do not carry a single gender meaning outside context. Their gendered force arises when they are differentially applied, contrasted, presupposed, or interpreted within a discourse community. Mills (2008) similarly argues that sexism and gendered evaluation can operate indirectly through pragmatic inference, discourse convention, and apparently ordinary lexical choices. Consequently, comparative analysis must avoid assuming that a superficially similar adjective has the same social meaning in different languages.

Uzbek Gender Discourse and the Need for Comparative Pragmatics

Uzbek does not grammatically mark gender in the same way as many Indo-European languages, but gender can be expressed lexically, pragmatically, and discursively. Recent Uzbek-language scholarship has discussed gendered lexical choices, stereotypes, forms of social address, and the relationship between language and social norms (Norboyeva & Jabborova, 2024; Ro'ziyeva, 2024). Public Uzbek discourse also contains explicit debates over employment, family responsibility, women's rights, leadership, religious and cultural values, and the meaning of gender equality. These debates make Uzbek an important site for pragmatic analysis because gender meanings are frequently negotiated rather than merely stated.

A comparative pragmatic approach can identify cross-linguistic similarities in evaluative organization while also examining differences in what counts as praiseworthy, blameworthy, respectable, desirable, or socially appropriate in particular texts. However, such comparisons require caution. Differences between two datasets may arise from language and culture, but they may also reflect outlet ideology, genre, author, topic, historical period, or sampling decisions. The present study therefore treats cultural interpretation as a plausible explanatory layer, not as a direct causal conclusion.

Research Questions

The revised study addresses three questions:

1. What types of gendered evaluative expressions occur in the selected English and Uzbek discourse samples?

2. What pragmatic functions do these expressions perform in their immediate discourse contexts?

3. What similarities and differences are observable in the sampled English and Uzbek evaluative patterns, and how cautiously can those patterns be interpreted socioculturally?

Method

Research Design

The study uses an exploratory qualitative comparative design supported by descriptive frequency counts. A qualitative design is appropriate because the principal analytical goal is to interpret contextual meaning, social positioning, and pragmatic function rather than to estimate population frequencies (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Paltridge, 2021). The numerical summaries are used to describe the coded sample only. They are not treated as inferential evidence about English-speaking or Uzbek-speaking populations.

Dataset and Sampling

The author-compiled dataset contains 100 gendered evaluative units: 50 English and 50 Uzbek. The original manuscript reports that the English items were selected from publicly available written materials associated with BBC News, The Guardian, UN Women, and the World Economic Forum, with publication dates primarily between January 2023 and March 2025. The Uzbek items were selected from four Kun.uz texts published in 2016, 2020, 2022, and 2025. Selection was purposive: an item was retained when it contained an evaluative expression directed explicitly or implicitly at women, men, femininity,

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

masculinity, or a gendered social role and when sufficient local context was available for pragmatic interpretation.

The source sets are not perfectly matched. The English pool combines journalistic and institutional discourse, whereas the Uzbek pool is concentrated in one news outlet and covers a wider period. For that reason, this manuscript does not interpret differences as direct language effects or as stable national-cultural characteristics. Instead, the two datasets are treated as exploratory discourse samples. This source asymmetry is a design limitation and is carried explicitly into the interpretation of the results.

Table 1

Composition and Scope of the Exploratory Dataset

Subcorpus	n	Reported source families	Reported period	Interpretive scope
English	50	BBC News; The Guardian; UN Women; World Economic Forum	2023-March 2025	Patterns within the selected English-language public texts
Uzbek	50	Kun.uz (four identified texts)	2016-2025	Patterns within the selected Uzbek-language public texts

Note. The source sets are intentionally described as exploratory and source-asymmetric. Complete item-level metadata should accompany the final submission as supplementary material.

Verified Uzbek Source Records

The four Uzbek source dates in the original reference list were audited against the live Kun.uz records. Three dates required correction: the first article was published October 31, 2016, not December 5, 2016; the interview on gender justice was published July 28, 2020, not February 17, 2020; and the interview on 'Eastern' gender equality was published October 31, 2022, not September 14, 2022. The January 2, 2025 date for the article on women's employment was verified. Corrected references appear in the corpus-materials section of the reference list.

Unit of Analysis and Inclusion Criteria

The unit of analysis is a contextualized evaluative instance rather than an isolated word. A unit may consist of an adjective phrase, noun phrase, clause, idiomatic expression, or other span whose evaluative target and pragmatic orientation can be established from the surrounding text. Four inclusion criteria were applied in the original study and retained in the revision: (a) the unit contains an evaluative meaning; (b) the evaluation is relevant to gender or a gendered role; (c) context is sufficient to determine the probable attitudinal and pragmatic function; and (d) the unit represents a distinct evaluative instance rather than a duplicate occurrence. Headlines or quotations without interpretable context should not be coded as independent evidence.

Coding Framework

Coding is organized in three analytically distinct layers. First, each unit is assigned an Attitude category: Affect, Judgment, or Appreciation. Second, evaluative polarity is recorded as positive, negative, mixed/ambivalent, or context-dependent where necessary. Third, pragmatic function is coded separately. This separation corrects a conceptual problem in the original manuscript, which treated 'positive evaluation' and discourse functions such as identity construction as if they belonged to the same analytical level.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Table 2

Operational Coding Dimensions

Dimension	Category	Operational question	Illustrative realization
Attitude	Affect	Does the unit construe emotion, feeling, desire, fear, satisfaction, or insecurity?	fearful, proud, worried
Attitude	Judgment	Does the unit evaluate a person or behavior against social norms of capacity, propriety, tenacity, veracity, or normality?	competent, irresponsible, courageous
Attitude	Appreciation	Does the unit value a phenomenon, performance, role, or social arrangement?	valuable contribution, unequal system
Polarity	Positive / negative / mixed	Is the evaluative orientation approving, disapproving, ambivalent, or dependent on reported viewpoint?	successful vs. weak; contested stereotype
Pragmatic function	Contextual discourse function	What does the evaluation do in context?	approval, criticism, identity construction, stereotype reinforcement, stereotype contestation, legitimation, mitigation, intensification

Analytic Procedure

The analysis proceeds from local context to comparative interpretation. Each evaluative instance is first interpreted in its immediate sentence or discourse segment. The target of evaluation, Attitude category, polarity, and pragmatic function are then recorded. Only after within-language patterns are established are cross-language contrasts considered. This order is designed to reduce the risk of assigning culturally stereotyped interpretations before examining the textual evidence.

The present revision does not report intercoder reliability because the original project was completed by one researcher and the manuscript did not contain a second-coder record or a repeated-coding audit. Reporting a reliability coefficient without those records would be misleading. Instead, the revised paper makes the coding criteria explicit and identifies single-coder interpretation as a limitation. For a stronger follow-up study, at least 20%-30% of units should be independently coded by a second trained analyst and agreement should be reported with an appropriate coefficient such as Cohen's kappa or Krippendorff's alpha.

Statistical Treatment

The original manuscript reported a Pearson chi-square test for the distribution of Affect, Judgment, and Appreciation. That inferential test is not retained as evidence in the revised paper. The dataset was

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

purposively selected, and multiple units were drawn from the same source texts; therefore, the observations cannot safely be treated as an independent probability sample. A recalculation of the original table would yield a very small association between language and Attitude category, but the assumptions required for a population-level significance test are not adequately met. Frequencies and percentages are therefore presented descriptively only.

Ethics and Data Transparency

The study analyzes publicly available written discourse and does not involve direct interaction with human participants, private data, or intervention. Formal participant consent was therefore not required for the textual analysis. Ethical responsibility nevertheless includes accurate source attribution, contextual quotation, and avoidance of unnecessary personal identification. The final journal submission should include a supplementary coding matrix containing all 100 units, context windows, source identifiers, publication dates, URLs, coding decisions, and brief rationales. Because that matrix was not embedded in the uploaded manuscript, this revision does not fabricate it.

Results

Distribution of Attitude Categories

Judgment is the dominant Attitude category in both subcorpora. In the English sample, 32 of 50 items (64%) were coded as Judgment, 12 (24%) as Appreciation, and 6 (12%) as Affect. In the Uzbek sample, 35 of 50 items (70%) were coded as Judgment, 10 (20%) as Appreciation, and 5 (10%) as Affect. The similarity of these descriptive distributions suggests that the most visible cross-corpus contrast is not the broad Appraisal category selected, but the social values and pragmatic functions realized within Judgment and related evaluations.

Table 3

Distribution of Attitude Categories in the Reported Dataset

Attitude category	English n	English %	Uzbek n	Uzbek %
Judgment	32	64	35	70
Appreciation	12	24	10	20
Affect	6	12	5	10
Total	**50**	**100**	**50**	**100**

Note. Percentages are descriptive summaries of a purposive, clustered sample and are not population estimates.

Judgment as the Central Resource for Gender Evaluation

The dominance of Judgment indicates that gender representation in the dataset is frequently organized around assessments of human capacity, propriety, responsibility, authority, and socially valued conduct. This pattern is theoretically plausible because gendered discourse often evaluates not simply what women and men feel, but whether they are perceived as competent, respectable, strong, caring, responsible, independent, modest, ambitious, or otherwise aligned with social expectations.

In the English sample, the original coding and examples emphasize competence, autonomy, leadership, confidence, and professional achievement. Expressions such as independent woman, successful woman, and female leader were interpreted as favorable when their contexts foregrounded agency or participation. Such expressions should not be assumed to be inherently positive; their evaluative status depends on discourse context. The revised interpretation therefore treats them as examples of contextually positive Judgment only when the surrounding text clearly praises agency, competence, or achievement.

In the Uzbek sample, the reported pattern gives greater prominence to responsibility, respectability, wisdom, courage, family obligation, and appropriate social conduct. Terms such as oqila ayol ('wise woman'), mehribon ona ('caring mother'), mard erkak ('courageous/manly man'), and oilaning tayanchi ('support/pillar of the family') can function as positive Judgments when they approve behavior against socially recognized norms. The important analytical point is not that these values are uniquely Uzbek, but

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

that they are recurrent in the selected Uzbek texts and interact with public discussions of family, employment, rights, and gender equality.

Pragmatic Functions: Approval, Criticism, Identity, and Stereotype Negotiation

Across the dataset, evaluative expressions perform several pragmatic functions. Approval legitimizes desired identities or conduct; criticism marks behavior or social arrangements as inadequate; identity construction associates gender categories with valued attributes; stereotype reinforcement reproduces familiar expectations; and stereotype contestation explicitly challenges restrictive or derogatory assumptions. These functions may overlap within a single passage.

The Uzbek public texts provide particularly clear examples of stereotype negotiation. The 2020 Kun.uz interview rejects the idea that women should have fewer opportunities because they are women and explicitly describes unequal access to rights as a disruption of gender balance. The same interview also criticizes ordinary family practices that can normalize unequal expectations. The 2025 Kun.uz article is even more metapragmatic: it cites stereotypes such as the idea that women are less capable or that paid work damages femininity, but it presents them as stereotypes to be explained and challenged rather than endorsed. These examples show why a phrase cannot be coded outside its reported stance: a text may reproduce a stereotype only in order to criticize it.

The 2022 Kun.uz interview illustrates a more complex coexistence of egalitarian and role-based evaluation. It supports equal access to education, leadership, and work while also describing the preservation of a woman's honor and family position in strongly normative terms. Rather than classifying the entire text as simply traditional or progressive, a pragmatic analysis can identify competing value systems operating within the same discourse. This mixed pattern is more informative than a binary cultural label.

Female-Oriented Evaluation

Female-oriented evaluations show the clearest contrast in the original coding. The English sample frequently foregrounds achievement, autonomy, confidence, and leadership. The Uzbek sample more frequently foregrounds wisdom, patience, respectability, care, and family responsibility, while also containing contemporary evaluations of women's education, employment, entrepreneurship, and leadership. The revised analysis therefore rejects the stronger claim that English constructs women as autonomous whereas Uzbek constructs women as domestic. A more defensible conclusion is that the sampled English texts more often foreground public/professional agency, whereas the sampled Uzbek texts contain a denser interaction between public participation and family- or morality-related norms.

Male-Oriented Evaluation

The reported male-oriented examples similarly associate English masculinity with leadership, achievement, and authority, whereas the Uzbek examples more often include courage, protection, breadwinning, and responsibility. However, the 2020 and 2025 Uzbek materials also explicitly question rigid male dominance and show that gender inequality can constrain men as well as women. Thus, male-oriented evaluation should be analyzed not only as stereotype reproduction but also as a site where provider, protector, authority, and equality discourses are negotiated.

Source-Verifiable Illustrations From the Uzbek Materials

Table 4

Illustrative Uzbek Evaluative Contexts and Pragmatic Interpretation

Source	Short contextual expression	Attitude / orientation	Pragmatic interpretation
Kun.uz, 2016	“ayollarning mavqei mustahkamlanib borayotgani” [women’s position is becoming stronger]	Appreciation/Judgment; positive	Values increased public participation and status

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Kun.uz, 2016	“ayollarning o‘rni oshxonada” [a woman’s place is in the kitchen]	Judgment; negative/quoted stereotype	Reports a restrictive stereotype as persisting in some contexts
Kun.uz, 2020	“erkaklar ustunroq, ayollar quyiroqda” [men are superior, women are lower]	Judgment; negative/criticized	Names and rejects a hierarchy produced by unequal access
Kun.uz, 2022	“ayol degan buyuk nom” [the great name/title of woman]	Judgment/Appreciation; positive	Elevates womanhood while linking it to normative respectability
Kun.uz, 2022	“ayollarning erkaklar bilan teng huquqliligi” [women’s equal rights with men]	Appreciation; positive	Legitimizes equal access to education and leadership
Kun.uz, 2025	“ayollar kamroq qobiliyatli” [women are less capable]	Judgment; negative/quoted stereotype	Cites a stereotype as an object of critique rather than authorial endorsement

Note. Translations are functional glosses. These examples illustrate context-sensitive coding and do not substitute for the full 100-unit supplementary matrix.

Discussion

The revised analysis supports three principal conclusions. First, Judgment is the predominant attitudinal resource in both samples. Second, broad category frequencies are more similar than different, whereas qualitative contrasts emerge in the kinds of social values that are foregrounded. Third, the relationship between evaluation and gender is not adequately captured by a simple opposition between an individualist English model and a collectivist Uzbek model. The selected texts contain overlapping, competing, and changing discourses.

Why Judgment Dominates

Judgment is well suited to gendered discourse because gender norms are frequently articulated as expectations about what people should be able to do, how they should behave, what responsibilities they should fulfill, and what identities deserve recognition. In Appraisal terms, these meanings are closely related to social esteem and social sanction (Martin & White, 2005). Gendered public discourse therefore often evaluates capacity, tenacity, propriety, and normality even when the text is ostensibly about employment, politics, family life, or social policy.

This finding is consistent with a social-practice view of gender. If gender is produced through repeated norms, activities, and interpretations rather than expressed as a fixed linguistic property, evaluations of behavior become a central mechanism through which gendered identities are maintained or challenged (Butler, 1990; Eckert & McConnell-Ginet, 2003). Terms associated with competence, care, authority, modesty, ambition, or responsibility can position individuals relative to culturally available models of femininity and masculinity.

Interpreting the English-Uzbek Contrast Without Essentialism

The strongest pattern reported in the original study is a difference in evaluative focus: the sampled English materials emphasize individual agency and professional participation more often, whereas the sampled Uzbek materials more frequently connect evaluation to social responsibility, family relations, respectability, and moral conduct. This contrast is analytically useful, but it must be bounded by the design. The English and Uzbek source sets differ in outlet type, historical period, and topic distribution. Some of

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

the contrast may therefore reflect institutional genre and editorial agenda rather than language or culture alone.

Institutional sources that explicitly promote women's empowerment are likely to contain positive evaluations of leadership, equality, agency, and participation. News interviews centered on family, employment, or national values may predictably foreground responsibility, social roles, and respectability. Consequently, the present study can identify patterned differences in the selected texts, but it cannot determine how much of those differences is attributable to English versus Uzbek, to national culture, to genre, to source ideology, or to the particular articles chosen.

A further reason for caution is that the Uzbek material itself contains evidence against a static 'traditional' interpretation. The 2020 interview frames unequal access to rights as a social problem; the 2022 interview combines family-centered language with explicit support for women's equal access to leadership and education; and the 2025 article directly names and contests stereotypes about women's capability and paid work. These texts show an active negotiation of gender norms rather than a single coherent cultural model.

Pragmatics, Reported Speech, and Stance

One of the most important methodological lessons is that gendered evaluation must be coded at the level of stance, not lexical surface. A journalist may quote a sexist statement in order to condemn it. An interviewee may invoke a traditional norm while simultaneously advocating institutional equality. A label such as strong woman may be praise, cliché, irony, or metalinguistic discussion depending on context. The revised coding framework therefore separates the content of an expression from the speaker or writer's alignment with it.

This point also bears on translation. Direct lexical equivalence may obscure pragmatic differences because evaluative expressions evoke local social histories and expectations. For translators and language educators, the relevant question is not only what a phrase denotes but what kind of person, conduct, or role it positions as admirable, blameworthy, normal, or deviant in the target context. Comparative pragmatics thus complements lexical and grammatical comparison by foregrounding communicative force.

Contribution to Appraisal-Based Gender Research

The study should not be described as extending Appraisal Theory in a formal theoretical sense. A dataset of 100 purposively selected units is not sufficient to revise the architecture of the model. Its more modest contribution is methodological: it demonstrates how the Attitude subsystem can be combined with pragmatic function and sociocultural interpretation in a less-studied English-Uzbek comparison. The analysis also illustrates why category assignment alone is insufficient; similar Judgment resources can support different identities, ideologies, and rhetorical purposes.

Methodological Implications

The audit and revision of this study identify four requirements for future comparative work. First, source corpora should be matched as closely as possible by genre, topic, period, and institutional status. Second, the unit-level dataset should be openly documented with context windows and exact URLs. Third, coding should distinguish Attitude category, polarity, target, and pragmatic function rather than mixing those dimensions. Fourth, cultural claims should be presented as interpretations of evidence and tested against negative cases rather than treated as self-evident explanations.

A stronger follow-up design could sample equivalent numbers of English and Uzbek news articles from the same two-year period, stratify them by matched topics such as leadership, employment, family policy, and gender-based violence, normalize expression frequencies by corpus size, and incorporate independent coding. Such a design would permit more credible quantitative comparison and would reduce the confounding effects that constrain the present exploratory study.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Limitations

Several limitations materially restrict the conclusions. The first is corpus size: 50 items per language are sufficient for exploratory qualitative interpretation but not for claims about typical usage across English or Uzbek discourse. The second is purposive selection, which means observed percentages describe the coded dataset rather than the languages. The third is source asymmetry. English items were reportedly drawn from multiple journalistic and institutional source families, while the Uzbek items were concentrated in four Kun.uz texts spanning 2016-2025. Topic, genre, source ideology, and time can therefore influence the observed contrast.

The fourth limitation is coding reliability. The study was conducted by a single researcher, and no independent double-coding record was included in the original manuscript. The fifth limitation is data transparency: the uploaded paper does not contain the full 100-item coding matrix or exact document-level metadata for the English subcorpus. This revision therefore cannot independently verify every aggregate coding decision. The sixth limitation concerns the treatment of gender itself. The dataset is organized largely around women/men and femininity/masculinity, so it does not capture the full diversity of gender identities or intersectional differences in class, age, ethnicity, region, sexuality, or institutional position.

These limitations do not make the exploratory analysis unusable, but they determine the appropriate level of inference. The findings should be read as hypotheses and discourse patterns worthy of further testing, not as definitive statements about English culture, Uzbek culture, women, or men.

Conclusion and Implications

This study examined gendered evaluative expressions in selected English and Uzbek public discourse through the Attitude subsystem of Appraisal Theory and a comparative pragmatic lens. Judgment was the most frequent attitudinal category in both samples, accounting for approximately two thirds of the coded items. The central contrast was qualitative: the sampled English materials more frequently foregrounded agency, competence, leadership, and professional achievement, while the sampled Uzbek materials more often combined evaluations of responsibility, respectability, family relations, moral conduct, and social obligation with emerging discourses of equality, employment, education, and leadership.

The revised interpretation is deliberately narrower than the original. The evidence does not justify claims that English discourse is inherently individualist or that Uzbek discourse is inherently collectivist, nor can a purposive and source-asymmetric corpus establish what is commonly used in either language. What the data do show is that similar evaluative categories can participate in different pragmatic configurations, and that those configurations are best understood through context, stance, source type, and sociocultural interpretation.

For translation and intercultural communication, the findings reinforce the importance of pragmatic equivalence. Gender-related evaluations may carry different assumptions about competence, responsibility, family, authority, or social respectability even when dictionary meanings appear close. For language education, contextualized evaluation can provide a productive way to teach how social meanings emerge beyond literal semantics. For future research, the priority is methodological: larger matched corpora, transparent item-level data, independent coding, and explicit treatment of genre and source effects are necessary before broader cross-cultural conclusions can be sustained.

Declarations

Acknowledgments. Not applicable.

Author Contributions. Feruza Baxtiyorova was responsible for the conceptualization, literature review, corpus compilation, analysis, interpretation, and preparation of the manuscript.

Competing Interests. The author declares no competing interests.

Funding. This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ

Ethics Approval. The study analyzes publicly available written discourse and did not involve recruitment or intervention with human participants.

Data Availability. Exact public-source metadata for the four Uzbek source texts are provided in the references and Appendix A. Before journal submission, the complete 100-unit coding matrix and exact document-level metadata for the English subcorpus should be supplied as supplementary material or deposited in a public repository. No missing item-level data have been fabricated in this revision.

REFERENCES

1. Baker, P. (2008). Sexed texts: Language, gender and sexuality. Equinox.
2. Butler, J. (1990). Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity. Routledge.
3. Cameron, D. (2005). Language, gender, and sexuality: Current issues and new directions. Applied Linguistics, 26(4), 482–502. https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/ami027
4. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). SAGE.
5. Eckert, P., & McConnell-Ginet, S. (2003). Language and gender. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791147
6. Lakoff, R. (1975). Language and woman's place. Harper & Row.
7. Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. SAGE.
8. Mackey, A., & Gass, S. M. (2016). Second language research: Methodology and design (2nd ed.). Routledge.
9. Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511910
10. Mills, S. (2008). Language and sexism. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511755033
11. Norboyeva, M., & Jabborova, S. (2024). O'zbek tilida gender masalasi: Tilshunoslik nuqtai nazaridan [The gender issue in Uzbek: A linguistic perspective]. Modern Science and Research, 3(10), 237–240. https://doi.org/10.71337/inlibrary.uz.science-research.43826
12. Ochs, E. (1992). Indexing gender. In A. Duranti & C. Goodwin (Eds.), Rethinking context: Language as an interactive phenomenon (pp. 335–358). Cambridge University Press.
13. Paltridge, B. (2021). Discourse analysis: An introduction (3rd ed.). Bloomsbury Academic.
14. Ro'ziyeva, Z. (2024). O'zbek tilida gender masalasi: Tilshunoslik nuqtai nazaridan [The gender issue in Uzbek: A linguistic perspective]. Academic Research in Modern Science, 3(33), 64–68. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.13736565
15. World Economic Forum. (2023). Global gender gap report 2023. https://www.weforum.org/publications/global-gender-gap-report-2023/

Corpus Materials: Verified Uzbek Sources

16. Kun.uz. (2016, October 31). Yangi tadqiqot: Xotin-qizlar erkaklarga nisbatan bir yilda 39 kun ko'proq ishlar ekan [New study: Women work 39 more days per year than men]. https://kun.uz/news/2016/10/31/angi-tadkikot-hotin-kizlar-erkaklarga-nisbatan-bir-jilda-39-kun-kuprok-islar-ekan
17. Kun.uz. (2020, July 28). “Gender adolati – G'arbda paydo bo'lishidan ancha avval Islom bilan vujudga kelgan tushuncha”: Gender mutaxassisi bilan suhbat [“Gender justice is a concept that emerged with Islam long before the West”: Interview with a gender specialist]. https://kun.uz/news/2020/07/28/gender-adolati-garbda-paydo-bolishidan-ancha-avval-islom-bilan-vujudga-kelgan-tushuncha-gender-mutaxassisi-bilan-suhbat
18. Kun.uz. (2022, October 31). Tizimdagi transformatsiyalar, sharqona gender tenglik va ishsiz ayollar – Oila va xotin-qizlar qo'mitasi raisi bilan intervyu [System transformations, Eastern gender equality, and unemployed women: Interview with the chair of the Family and Women's Committee]. https://kun.uz/news/2022/10/31/tizimdagi-transformatsiyalar-sharqona-gender-tenglik-va-ishsiz-ayollar-oila-va-xotin-qizlar-qomitasi-raisi-bilan-intervyu
19. Kun.uz. (2025, January 2). Ayollarning ishlamasligi: Madaniy cheklovmi yoki iqtisodiy? [Women's non-participation in paid work: Cultural restriction or economic issue?]. https://kun.uz/news/2025/01/02/ayollarning-ishlamasligi-madaniy-cheklovmi-yoki-iqtisodiy

ISSN: 2181-3337 | SCIENTISTS.UZ