Advances in Science and Humanities



Advances in Science and Humanities, 2026, 48–55

doi: 10.70728/human.v02.i04.013
Volume 02, Issue 04
ISSN: 3060-5393
Paper

PAPER

THE CATEGORY OF SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDE IN MODERN LINGUISTICS: THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS AND ANALYTICAL MODELS

A'zamjon Ikhtiyorov [1,*]

[1]Kokand State University, Uzbekistan

* azamxon93pro@gmail.com

Abstract

This study examines subjective attitude as a multidimensional linguistic category integrating semantic, pragmatic, and discourse perspectives. The research aims to develop a theoretical framework and analytical models for understanding subjective meaning in language. A qualitative conceptual analysis of scholarly literature was conducted. The results show that subjective attitude is expressed through evaluative semantics, stance marking, and discourse interaction. The study contributes to linguistic theory by providing an interdisciplinary interpretation of subjectivity and suggesting directions for future empirical research.

Key words: Subjective attitude, subjectivity, linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, discourse analysis.

INTRODUCTION

Subjective attitude is considered one of the fundamental concepts in modern linguistic theory, representing the relationship between language, cognition, and speaker perspective. In contemporary linguistics, subjective attitude refers to the expression of evaluation, stance, and internal cognitive orientation within linguistic communication. Language functions not only as a system for describing objective reality but also as a tool for expressing speaker judgment, emotional response, and epistemic positioning. From a semantic perspective, subjectivity is closely related to the representation of opinion and evaluative meaning in linguistic structures. Speaker attitude toward propositions and real-world phenomena is often encoded through lexical, grammatical, and discourse mechanisms. Modern semantic research emphasizes that meaning construction is influenced by perspective-dependent interpretation, demonstrating that linguistic expressions often reflect subjective cognitive processes (Lyons, 1977). The development

Compiled on: March 2, 2026.
Copyright:©2026 by the authors. Submitted to Advances in Science and Humanities for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) 4.0 license.

of cognitive and functional linguistics has further expanded the understanding of subjectivity. Language is now viewed as a dynamic system reflecting human conceptualization, experiential interpretation, and communicative intention (Langacker, 2008). In this context, subjective attitude is recognized as a multidimensional linguistic category integrating semantic, pragmatic, and discourse features. Although subjectivity has been widely studied in linguistics, many existing works focus on isolated aspects such as modality, reported speech, or evaluative vocabulary. These studies provide important insights but do not fully address subjective attitude as an integrated theoretical category.

Current research lacks a unified analytical framework that simultaneously incorporates semantic evaluation, pragmatic stance marking, and discourse interaction. In particular, there is insufficient theoretical consolidation regarding how subjective attitude operates across different levels of linguistic structure. Therefore, developing a comprehensive model of subjective attitude remains an important academic challenge. The main purpose of this study is to investigate the theoretical foundations of subjective attitude in modern linguistics and to develop analytical models for its systematic identification and classification.

Research Questions

The study is guided by the following research questions:

1. What theoretical principles define subjective attitude in linguistic meaning construction?

2. How can subjective attitude be systematically analyzed across semantic, pragmatic, and discourse levels?

3. What linguistic indicators can be used to operationalize subjective attitude in textual and communicative analysis?

Significance of the Study

This research contributes to the development of modern linguistic theory by establishing a structured interdisciplinary framework for studying subjective attitude.

The study is significant because it:

Provides a theoretical foundation for cross-linguistic analysis of subjective meaning.

Supports discourse and communication studies focusing on evaluative language.

Offers methodological tools for future empirical research, including corpus linguistics and computational stance detection.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Subjectivity is a fundamental concept in modern linguistic theory that refers to the encoding of speaker perspective, evaluation, and internal cognitive states within language structure. In linguistic semantics and pragmatics, subjectivity is generally associated with the expression of personal opinion, emotional stance, and epistemic judgment. Early linguistic scholarship emphasized the role of subjectivity in meaning construction, arguing that language does not function as a purely objective representational system but reflects the speaker's mental and evaluative orientation (Lyons, 1977).

Subjectivity is closely connected with the notion of stance and attitude in communication. It reflects how speakers position themselves toward propositions, interlocutors, and discourse content. Modern linguistic research increasingly treats subjectivity as a dynamic category that integrates cognitive, communicative, and social dimensions of language use (Langacker, 2008).

Theoretical Approaches

From a semantic viewpoint, subjective meaning is often considered part of evaluative semantics and propositional attitude representation. Evaluative meaning refers to linguistic expressions that convey positive or negative assessment of entities, events, or propositions. One of the central debates in semantic theory concerns the relationship between perspective-dependence and truth-conditional meaning. Subjective expressions are frequently context-sensitive and may not be evaluated using classical objective truth criteria. For example, predicates of personal taste and evaluative adjectives often depend on the speaker's experiential perspective. This phenomenon has been discussed in contemporary semantic

philosophy, particularly in studies of perspective-sensitive meaning (Lasersohn, 2005).

Expressive meaning also plays a significant role in semantic subjectivity. Potts (2007) distinguishes expressive content from at-issue propositional content, demonstrating that certain linguistic elements encode speaker attitude without contributing directly to truth-conditional semantics.

Pragmatic approaches emphasize the communicative and interactional nature of subjectivity. Subjectivity in pragmatics involves perspective-taking, epistemic evaluation, and affective expression in discourse. Epistemic modality is one of the primary linguistic mechanisms for representing subjective attitude. Modal expressions indicate the speaker's level of certainty, possibility assessment, or inferential judgment. Pragmatic subjectivity also includes stance marking, which reflects the speaker's alignment with or distance from the communicated proposition (Kärkkäinen, 2003).

Interactional linguistics further demonstrates that subjective attitude functions as a tool for managing interpersonal communication. Speakers use evaluative markers to negotiate meaning, express solidarity, or maintain social relations during interaction. In discourse studies, subjectivity is considered a socially situated linguistic phenomenon. Discourse subjectivity includes speaker intention, argumentation structure, and communicative strategy.

Evaluative language is a central mechanism through which subjective attitude is realized in discourse. The Appraisal Theory framework explains how evaluation operates through three main subsystems: attitude, engagement, and graduation. These subsystems allow systematic analysis of interpersonal meaning in textual communication (Martin White, 2005).

Speaker intention plays a crucial role in shaping subjective meaning. Communication is not only information transfer but also an interactional process where speakers express ideological positioning, emotional orientation, and social evaluation.

Despite significant advances in the study of subjectivity, several research gaps remain. First, many studies analyze subjectivity in isolated linguistic domains such as reported speech structures, modal systems, or specific lexical categories. Although these studies provide valuable insights, they do not sufficiently integrate subjectivity into a unified theoretical category.

Second, cross-linguistic and interdisciplinary models of subjective attitude are still underdeveloped. Most existing research focuses on individual languages or specific discourse environments.

Third, there is a lack of comprehensive analytical models that simultaneously incorporate semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-level representations of subjective attitude. Therefore, further research is needed to construct integrative theoretical frameworks capable of explaining subjectivity as a systemic linguistic category.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative conceptual research design aimed at synthesizing theoretical interpretations of subjectivity as a linguistic category. Conceptual analysis was selected because the research focuses on abstract linguistic phenomena rather than empirical measurement.

The study follows a theory-building approach commonly used in modern linguistic philosophy and functional linguistics.

The research methodology is grounded in qualitative meta-synthesis, which allows integration of multiple theoretical perspectives on subjectivity in language. This approach is appropriate for exploring complex linguistic constructs such as evaluative meaning, stance expression, and speaker perspective (Crotty, 1998).

The study is based on secondary data collected from reputable academic publications, including peer-reviewed journal articles, monographs, and theoretical works in linguistics. Primary literature sources were selected from recognized academic databases and authoritative linguistic research publications. The main thematic areas of data collection included semantics, pragmatics, cognitive linguistics, and discourse analysis. Key theoretical contributions were drawn from foundational and contemporary linguistic scholars who have studied subjectivity, evaluation, and

stance expression in language, such as Lyons (1977), Langacker (2008), Martin and White (2005), and Potts (2007).

Analytical Procedure

The analytical process was conducted through a structured thematic synthesis of theoretical materials. First, linguistic theories related to subjectivity were identified and extracted from the selected literature. The extracted information was then categorized into three principal analytical domains:

Semantic subjectivity, which includes perspective-dependent meaning, evaluative predicates, and propositional attitude representation.

Pragmatic subjectivity, which covers epistemic modality, speaker commitment, and interactional stance.

Discourse subjectivity, which involves evaluative discourse structure, communicative intention, and interpersonal alignment.

After thematic coding, comparative analysis was conducted to examine similarities and differences among theoretical frameworks. The goal of comparative analysis was to identify common conceptual foundations and integrate them into a unified model of subjective attitude.

To maintain theoretical rigor, the study employed triangulation across semantic, pragmatic, and discourse linguistic frameworks. Only widely cited and academically recognized sources were prioritized. Conceptual consistency was checked by comparing definitions, analytical constructs, and theoretical assumptions across different schools of linguistic thought.

RESULTS

The analysis of the theoretical literature reveals that subjective attitude functions as a complex linguistic category integrating semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-level components of meaning construction.

From the semantic perspective, subjectivity is closely associated with speaker-oriented interpretation and evaluative meaning. Language is not limited to describing objective reality but also reflects cognitive and emotional evaluation. Subjective meaning is often realized through perspective-dependent expressions that encode personal judgment, preference, or experiential interpretation.

The pragmatic dimension emphasizes the role of communicative context in shaping subjective attitude. Perspective-taking is a fundamental mechanism through which speakers express certainty, uncertainty, belief, or emotional orientation. Affective evaluation is also an essential component, allowing speakers to transmit interpersonal meaning and social positioning during communication.

Within discourse analysis, subjectivity is understood as a dynamic interactional phenomenon. Subjective attitude is constructed through communicative intention, argumentative organization, and speaker alignment strategies. Discourse subjectivity reflects not only individual cognition but also social and pragmatic interaction between participants.

oDISCUSSION

The findings of this study demonstrate that subjective attitude can be interpreted as an integrative linguistic category that unifies semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-based approaches to meaning construction. The proposed models provide a theoretical synthesis that contributes to the systematic understanding of subjectivity in modern linguistic theory.

The integration of semantic, pragmatic, and discourse perspectives reflects the interdisciplinary nature of contemporary linguistics. Subjective attitude is not restricted to lexical evaluation or emotional expression but represents a complex cognitive-communicative phenomenon. Semantic mechanisms provide the foundational level of meaning representation through perspective-dependent interpretation and evaluative predicates. Pragmatic mechanisms regulate speaker commitment, epistemic certainty, and contextual inference. Discourse mechanisms extend subjectivity beyond sentence-level structures into interactional communication.

The proposed models also support the theoretical view that linguistic meaning is dynamically

constructed through interaction between cognitive interpretation and social communication. Subjectivity is therefore understood as a multi-layered phenomenon involving individual cognition, communicative intention, and discourse organization. The results of this study are consistent with classical semantic theories that emphasize the role of speaker perspective in meaning formation. Lyons (1977) argued that subjectivity is inherently embedded in linguistic expression, particularly in modal and evaluative structures. The present study extends this perspective by integrating pragmatic and discourse dimensions into a unified analytical framework.

Cognitive linguistic theory also supports the perspective-dependent nature of meaning construction. Langacker (2008) proposed that linguistic expressions reflect conceptualization processes shaped by human experience and cognitive interpretation. The current research builds upon this idea by demonstrating that subjective attitude emerges from interaction between conceptual structure and communicative context.

Pragmatic research further confirms that stance expression plays a central role in interpersonal communication. Interactional linguistics shows that speakers use evaluative and epistemic markers to negotiate social meaning, express alignment, and manage communicative relationships. The Appraisal framework developed by Martin and White (2005) provides additional support for analyzing evaluative discourse structures as manifestations of subjective meaning.

Strengths and Limitations

One of the major strengths of this study lies in its interdisciplinary synthesis of linguistic subfields. By integrating semantic, pragmatic, and discourse approaches, the research provides a comprehensive theoretical model for understanding subjective attitude as a linguistic category.

Another strength is the development of analytical models that can be applied in future linguistic research. The operational indicators proposed in the results section offer methodological guidance for identifying subjective attitude in textual and communicative data.

However, the study has certain limitations. The research is primarily conceptual and relies on secondary theoretical literature rather than primary empirical datasets. Consequently, the proposed models require further validation through corpus-based analysis, experimental linguistic research, or computational modeling. Future research should focus on empirical testing of the proposed frameworks across different languages and communicative contexts. Cross-linguistic studies may provide additional evidence regarding universal and language-specific manifestations of subjective attitude.

CONCLUSION

This study has demonstrated that subjective attitude represents a complex and multilayered linguistic category involving semantic, pragmatic, and discourse-level features. The analysis shows that subjectivity is not limited to explicit emotional expression but functions as a broader communicative and cognitive phenomenon reflecting speaker perspective, evaluative judgment, and interactional positioning.

The results indicate that subjective attitude is realized through the integration of semantic evaluation, pragmatic stance marking, and discourse organization. At the semantic level, subjectivity is expressed through perspective-dependent meaning and evaluative lexical structures. Pragmatically, it is manifested through epistemic modality, speaker commitment, and affective interpretation. At the discourse level, subjective meaning emerges through argumentative structure, alignment strategies, and communicative intention.

The study contributes to modern linguistic theory by providing a structured interdisciplinary understanding of subjective attitude as a unified linguistic category. The proposed analytical models integrate semantic, pragmatic, and discourse perspectives, offering a comprehensive framework for analyzing evaluative and stance-related meaning.

The research also expands the theoretical interpretation of subjectivity by emphasizing its dynamic nature in communication. Subjective attitude is conceptualized not only as a lexical or

grammatical phenomenon but also as a cognitive and social communicative process.

Future research should focus on empirical validation of the proposed analytical models. Corpus-based linguistic analysis may be used to examine the distribution of subjective attitude markers across different genres and communicative contexts. Cognitive experimental studies may also contribute to understanding how subjective evaluation is processed in language perception and production.

In addition, cross-linguistic research is recommended to explore universal and language-specific mechanisms of subjective attitude expression. Comparative studies involving typologically diverse languages may provide deeper insight into the structural and functional variability of subjectivity in linguistic systems.

References

1. A’zamjon, Ixtiyorov. ”The Use of Lexemes Expressing the Meaning of Swearing in the Expression of A Subjective Relationship in the Uzbek Language.”Galaxy International Interdisciplinary Research Journal 10.11: 558-560.
2. Abdisamatov, Ahrorjon Jalolxon O‘G‘Li, and M. Solijonov. ”REKLAMA MATNLARIDA TURG ‘UN BIRIKMALARNING LINGVISTIK XUSUSIYATLAR.”Central Asian Research Journal for Interdisciplinary Studies (CARJIS) 2.3 (2022): 535-539.
3. Abdulhamidov, S. X. ”THE CONCEPTS OF “SEMANTIC CATEGORY”,“FUNCTIONAL SEMANTIC FIELD” IN THE ASPECT OF COMPARATIVE STUDIES.”Экономика и социум 6-1 (133) (2025): 35-40.
4. ABDULHAMIDOV, Sanjarbek. ”THE ROLE OF CAUSATIVE COMPOUNDS IN CREATING A LINGUISTIC PICTURE OF THE WORLD.”LTEACHIN ANGUAGE: 123.
5. Aliyevna, Yuldasheva Diloram. ”Study Of Concepts Expressing The Relationship Between New And Old Information (Theme And Rheme) Expressed In A Sentence.”Journal of Positive School Psychology 7.2 (2023).
6. Avazjon, Ziyaev, and Ixtiyorov A’zamjon. ”Expression of Subjective Attitude in Verbs in Uzbek Language.”JournalNX 8.11: 132-136.
7. Benveniste, É. (1971). Problems in general linguistics. Coral Gables, FL: University of Miami Press.
8. Crotty, M. (1998). The foundations of social research: Meaning and perspective in the research process. London: Sage.
9. Du Bois, J. W. (2007). The stance triangle. In R. Englebretson (Ed.), Stancetaking in discourse: Subjectivity, evaluation, interaction (pp. 139–182). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
10. Hasanov, E. ”ISSUES OF HISTORICAL AND MODERN FORMS OF BUSINESS TERMS.”Science and innovation 2.C11 (2023): 143-146.
11. Hasanov, Elyorjon. ”UNDERSTANDING STRESS AND INTONATION IN PHONETICS.”Multidisciplinary Journal of Science and Technology 4.10 (2024): 324-326.
12. Ikhtiyorov, A. ”National-Cultural Features of the Verbalizers of the Concept”Beauty/Ugliness”in English and Uzbek Languages.”International Journal on Integrated Education 4.6: 209-212.
13. Ikhtiyorov, A. ”REALIZATION OF SEMANTICS OF SUBJECTIVE ATTITUDE IN ENGLISH AND UZBEK LANGUAGES THROUGH SIMILES AND METAPHORS.”Science and innovation 3.C10 (2024): 46-50.
14. Исломов, Уткиржон. ”OVERCOMING FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANXIETY IN UNIVERSITY STUDENTS.”Interpretation and researches 6 (52) (2025).
15. Исломов, Уткиржон. ”UNDERSTANDING FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANXIETY AND ITS IMPACT ON LEARNING.”Свет науки 8 (43) (2025).
16. Javokhir, Komilov. ”LATIN ALPHABET EVOLUTION FROM EARLY PERIOD TO INTERNET AGE.”Advances in Science and Education 2.03 (2026): 53-56.

17. Karimova, Vasila Vakhobovna, and Dilorom Alievna Yuldasheva. "The Responsibility of a Teacher for Increasing the Probability of Advancing Student Achievement."Molodoy uchenyy (2016): 3-1.

18. Kärkkäinen, E. (2003). Epistemic stance in English conversation: A description of its interactional functions, with a focus on I think. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

19. Langacker, R. W. (2008). Cognitive grammar: A basic introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

20. Lasersohn, P. (2005). Context dependence, disagreement, and predicates of personal taste. Linguistics and Philosophy, 28(6), 643–686. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10988-005-0599-2

21. Lyons, J. (1977). Semantics (Vols. 1–2). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

22. Madinakhon, Islomova. "ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN LANGUAGE LEARNING: A CASE STUDY OF CHATGPT."Advances in Science and Education 2.03 (2026): 32-36.

23. Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

24. Muborak, Rasulova, and Solijonov Mukhammadjon. "Representation of Repetition in English and Uzbek Translated Texts."Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy and Culture 4.5 (2023): 340-344.

25. Mukhammadjon S., Lutfiya K. (2022). Linguistics in the anthropocentric paradigm methodological foundations of science. International journal of social science & interdisciplinary research ISSN: 2277-3630, 11(12), 174-177.

26. Mukhammadjon, Solijonov. "Basics of linguocultural analysis of literary text."International Journal of Early Childhood Special Education 14.07 (2022): 2197-2201

27. Odiljonovich, Hasanov Elyorjon. "Some issues of business terms borrowed from english."INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL SCIENCE & INTERDISCIPLINARY RESEARCH ISSN: 2277-3630 Impact factor: 8.036 11.09 (2022): 372-375. Potts, C. (2007). The expressive dimension. Theoretical Linguistics, 33(2), 165–198.

28. Traugott, E. C. (2010). Subjectification in grammaticalization. In B. Heine & H. Narrog (Eds.), The Oxford handbook of grammaticalization. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

29. ugli Komilov, Javokhir Kozimjon. "CHANGING INTERNET COMMUNICATION FROM VERBAL INTO GRAPHICAL."Conferences. 2021.

30. ugli Komilov, Javokhir Kozimjon. "Process Of Forming Latin Script And Its Impact On Graphic Communication Of Internet Language."Academic Leadership-Online Journal 5.21 (2020): 124-130.

31. Ugli, Javokhir Komilov Kozimjon. "Modern graphic communication in the internet discourse."Архивариус 2 (47) (2020): 47-53. Ugli, Komilov Javokhir Kozimjon. "USAGE OF GRAPHIC SIGNS IN DIGITAL COMMUNICATION OF THE

32. INTERNET."Raqamli iqtisodiyot (Цифровая экономика) 7 (2024): 415-423. Utkirjon, Islomov. "EXPLORING FOREIGN LANGUAGE ANXIETY IN TECHNICAL HIGHER EDUCATION: EVIDENCE FROM ENGINEERING STUDENTS."Advances in Science and Education 2.03 (2026): 45-52.

33. Xasanov, Elyorjon, and Marjona Bo'ronova. "SIMILARITIES AND DIFFERENCES BETWEEN ENGLISH AND UZBEK PHONETIC."Академические исследования в современной науке 4.29 (2025): 80-83.

34. Xusnitdin o'g'li, Sanjarbek Abdulhamidov. "The Role of Causative Devices in Creating Linguistic Image of the World."Central Asian Journal of Social Sciences and History 3.6 (2022): 239-242.

35. Yuldasheva, D. "INGLIZ TILIDA SUB'YEKT KATEGORIYASI KONSEPTUAL

VOQEALANISHINING FUNKSIONAL TABIATI.”Педагогика и психология в современном мире: теоретические и практические исследования 2.8 (2023): 91-94.

36. Yuldasheva, D. A. ”Innovative methods of teaching English to young children.”Molodoy uchenyy 4.2 (2017): 138-2.

37. Zokirjon o’g’li, Solijonov Mukhammadjon. ”APPLICATION OF TBLT IN DIFFERENT EDUCATIONAL CONTEXTS.”SCIENTIFIC ASPECTS AND TRENDS IN THE FIELD OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH 3.31 (2025): 48-51.