

The Interpretation of Activity of Assessment According to Metadiscursive Perspective

Sulaymanova Nilufar

DSc., Associate Professor of Samarkand State Institute of Foreign Languages

Abstract: This article emphasizes that evaluative activity is interpreted from a metadiscursive point of view, the metadiscursive event is the author's contribution to communication, and indicators representing attitude are a means of ensuring the formation of interpersonal communication.

Keywords: metadiscourse, discourse, cognitive, discursive indicators, assessment category, conceptual, linguistic tools, discursive indicators.

According to the researchers' highly attempt giving a clear explanation the assessment activity from a metadiscursive perspective having the delicate communication between the writer and the reader in the leading position, and evaluate the information-carrying discourse as "primary" and try to distinct it from interpersonal discourse. Some of them illustrate the phenomenon of metadiscourse as the author's diligent contribution to communication [Crismore, Farnsworth 1990, 119]. This means that the learner comprehends what the statement is about from the remaining linguistic material at his dispute. In this interpretation, the dials expressive the attitude are considered as a means that confirms the formation of social communication [Vande Kopple 1995, 82].

Giving another broad definition, metadiscourse is interpreted as "a linguistic tool that organizes discourse or expresses the author's attitude to the content and the reader" [Hyland, Tse 2004, 157]. These researchers differentiate two types of metadiscourse. In the initial type, the author's view is frankly expressed, and in the second, the mutual attitude of the reader-listener is clearly determined. Consequently, the author and the reader seem to be discussing the whole content of the text with each other [Hyland 2005, 39]. Discursive indicators such as "**however, therefore, in conclusion, unfortunately, I agree, and personal pronouns**" have a special role in this "discussion" [Hyland, Tse 2004, 169].

As it can be apparently seen from the perspectives above, the term "evaluation or assessment" was not simply to define in linguistic research, and in this regard, the publication of the work "Evaluation in Text" [Hunston 2000, 99, Thompson 2000, 1-27] plays an important role. In recent years, special attention has been paid to the practical importance of the study of the evaluation category in scientific institutions abroad. To be more precise the role of this linguistic category in the development of foreign language education and translation practice is mostly highlighted.

As A.Nurmonov emphasized "today, it has become clear that in the process of communication, it is highly impossible to learn the language properly and completely without the practical knowledge of the language speakers, without taking it into consideration. Consequently,

linguistics dramatically began to be studied as part of cognitive sciences. Studying the knowledge used by speakers in the process of communication is considered the main direction of cognitive sciences [Nurmonov 2008, 53]. In fact, recently, the practice of studying the evaluation phenomenon within the framework of cognitive linguistics is gaining momentum. In particular, Russian linguists are closely engaged in the study of the issues of the formation of the value in the process of conceptual activity and its place in the content of the concept. For example, L.O.Cherneyko, L.A.Sergeeva tried to shed light on the process of categorization of the value meaning, while others analyze linguistic tools that realize value concepts [Cherneyko 1996; Sergeeva 2004; Zamoreva 2007; Boldyrev 2008 and others].

Cognitive linguist N.N.Boldirev includes the evaluation among complex categories and explains this feature by its formation with the participation of different forms of knowledge, principles and factors. It is known that the researchers engaged in the research of the categorization process mainly pay attention to the objects that have the opportunity to see, and ignore the interaction of personal and collective knowledge in the context of categorization. Personal knowledge plays an important role in reflecting the objective existence in the language and forming its linguistic landscape, and ensures the creative activity of a person [Zalevskaya 1992, 28]. And the assessment appears in the same meeting of individual and collective knowledge. The assessment category is essentially individual in nature and is related to the individual's differentiation of the characteristics of reality. Therefore, N.N.Boldyrev defines the evaluation category as a structure formed as a result of the connection of an object or event with a certain category and their inclusion in one or another evaluation group in relation to certain characteristics [Boldyrev 2014, 178]. Therefore, the assessment is a separate part of the linguistic landscape of reality as a product of the activity of knowing the world. Any language reflects the system of universal and individual values that shape the worldview of its owner [Madjidova 2019,34; Nazarov 1996, 24].

In Russian linguistics, evaluation as a comprehensive phenomenon is studied using various approaches. One of such approaches has a logical-philosophical character, within which evaluation is studied from the point of view of the interaction of linguistic and axiological units. For example, A. Ivin, S. Anisimova, L. Dronova, V. Karasik [Ivin 1970, 2006; Anisimova 2001; Dronova 2005; Karasik 2004].

The researches of another group of scientists are devoted to the analysis of the performance of evaluation action and the stages of formation of evaluation content [Arutyunova 1988, 1999; Boldyrev 2002; Esenina 1991].

Additionally, it has been a separate direction that studies the evaluation category based on the functional-semantic approach has been formed [Wolf 1985; Markelova 1994; Slyshkin 2001; Miroshnikova 1994].

The issue of the pragmatic nature of the evaluation category and its realization in the system of speech acts has been consistently discussed in the field of pragmalinguistics [Golovinskaya 2005; Telia 1996; Nikitina 1996; Anikina 2000; Maksimova 1998; Mironova 1998; Tripolskaya 1999]. In the process of discursive activity, the scope of psycholinguistic research that investigates aspects related to the evaluation of content is expanding [Minina 1995; Miroshnikov 2007; Vorkachev 1993; Leontev 1999]. Also, in recent times, the axiological approach aimed at determining the factors that ensure the occurrence of the evaluation category in texts with different contents is developing sufficiently [Abdulina 2005; Chernyavskaya 2001; Burmistrova 2017; Simonyan 2001; Sinegubova 2012]. In the directions mentioned above, the researchers sought to describe the relationship of the evaluation category with other related phenomena and the factors determining its linguistic and pragmatic nature. Also, excellent research has been conducted on summarizing the evidence that proves that assessment is an integral part of human linguistic-thinking activity. Uzbek linguists have not missed the issue of speech realization of the category of value. Researches in this regard mainly date back to the second half of the last century. For example, Professor I. Rasulov published in 1974 in his book entitled "One-syllabic Sentences in Contemporary Uzbek Literary Language" Poor boy! As long as we don't know

[Chingiz Aytmatov]; "Also in these chains, he leads his son Abdu Qadir from one market to another, playing a flute and begging for bread." Poor father Israel! [Sabir Abdullah] There are many graves among the snow along the road." Analyzing speech structures such as **hazin, g'oyat hazin manzara** [from the newspaper], he calls the sentences with the words "guy", "Israel", "manzara" as "evaluative sentences". According to the scientist, "in such constructions, the subject expressed by confirming the existence of the speaker expresses his assessment of the event" [Rasulov 2015, 255].

R.Kongurov was one of the first Uzbek linguists who ever tried to reveal the linguistic nature of the phenomenon of evaluation. In a number of his works, the scientist explained in detail the semantic-stylistic features of morphological forms expressing subjective evaluation [Kongurov 1980, 69]. We note that the analysis in the same direction was carried out by S.Ravshanova [Ravshanova 1969]. A little later, studies on the semantic analysis of linguistic units with the value meaning were created [Giyosov 1982, 51; 1986, 28]. One of the detailed studies devoted to the analysis of the value category in Uzbek linguistics was G. Kambarov's candidate's dissertation on the topic "Value relation and its expression in the Uzbek language" [Kambarov 2008: 26].

S.Boymirzaeva, who studied the aspects of the evaluation category related to text modality, emphasizes that this category is based on axiological activity. According to the scientist, the subject who performs the act of evaluation becomes a person who determines the quality and value of objects and events. He often plays the role of a speaker in a communication situation. Also, the evaluation subject can be expressed in a hidden way in the text, but in any case, he performs an evaluation action based on the norms accepted in the community [Boymirzaeva 2010, 122]. The choice of the object of assessment is important when conducting assessment activities. According to the researcher, the object of assessment is mainly a person or certain events, and inanimate objects are relatively undervalued. In this case, a person's physical aspects and appearance are often evaluated: *"In the past week after the meeting in Ko'ksaroy, the master shaved himself a lot, his face has a broad forehead, the wrinkles around the edges of his lips have thickened, he has sunken into his lungs, his crooked nose was askew, only his eyes... his deeply sunken eyes had both a kind of painful pain and a kind of love that attracts a person"* (Odil Yaqubov, Ulugbek Khazinasi).

Analyzing the above-mentioned examples, S.Boymirzaeva notes that the interaction of emotion and rationality in the content of the assessment and the formation of these relations are mainly related to the pragmatic goal of the author of the text. In addition, the quality given to objects-phenomena is based on a certain model, a pattern in the imagination [Ivin 1970, 31].

So, according to S.Boymirzaeva, "the evaluation activity reflecting the attitude of the person to the perceived reality is the determination of the pragmatic value and essence of this piece of reality by the person. In the process of this activity, he compares the characteristic of a phenomenon to a selected sample or norm, measures it according to it, and identifies cases of deviation from this sample [positively or negatively]" [Boymirzaeva 2010, 136]. The scientist who describes the act of evaluation as a product of human linguocognitive activity interprets these actions as a tool that creates the axiological modality of the text. The formation of the axiological modality in this way is the activation of the linguopoetic function of the artistic work, its inner expressive possibilities [The same work, page 142].

According to Sh.Safarov, who noted that language is a means of knowing the world, a person finds his place in social and cultural reality through language. The goal is determined by comparing a certain standard. In relation to this standard, the important aspects of reality for the perceiving person are determined, and this importance serves as a basis for evaluation. "The level of evaluation based on comparison," writes the scientist, "is constantly influenced by pragmatic factors." The sphere of influence of pragmatics is so strong that even the selection of a comparison sample [standard] takes on an arbitrary tone and takes place freely" [Safarov 2008, 188].

In general, Sh.Safarov's opinions about the nature of the evaluation category and the role of the evaluation action in the expression of pragmatic content are valuable, and it is important to study the cognitive essence of human speech activity, its place in the system of interpersonal communication, the possibilities of language units to realize the pragmatic goal. has been an important methodological source and base for researchers.

Thus, the cases noted by Uzbek linguists have become one of the most urgent problems of our science to distinguish the types of factors that ensure the occurrence of the evaluation action and to determine their activating cognitive and socio-cultural mechanisms. It is worth noting that a number of linguists are looking for the possibility to determine the cognitive and linguistic-cultural features of the evaluation phenomenon based on the comparison of the Uzbek language with other languages. In particular, this topic was studied in the articles and dissertation of N.N.Panjieva [Panjieva 2003, 42; 2001, 32; 2004, 11].

The researcher prefers to refer to the comparative and cross-sectional analysis in two directions when determining the national-cultural characteristics of the valuable naming of individuals. The first of these is based on the combination of valuable names in both languages around a common concept, while the second is based on the commonality of the denotative meaning. For example, the cases of interlinguistic isomorphism and allomorphism are distinguished within the concept of "woman's beauty". It is determined by the totality of isomorphic lexical-semantic groups. At the moment, this concept is realized in the compared languages by means of lexical units with different denotative and evaluative meanings: eng. Rosebud, Pippin, Popsy, Juno, Aphrodite; Uzb. sarv, sarvinoz, sarvi ravan, pari, parizod, nightingale, angel [Panjieva 2004, 16]. N.Panjieva's observations testify that the process of categorization in English and Uzbek languages is based on similar concepts. But in the situation of naming individuals with value, there may be a difference in the standard of conceptualization actions. Therefore, in English, a person is often evaluated according to his character and behavior, intellectual ability, and professional activity, while in Uzbek, a person's appearance also attracts attention [The same work, page 15].

Especially important is the researcher's conclusion that social evaluation prevails over emotional evaluation when naming individuals. After all, the linguistic personality that is expressed in the units of assessment cannot be outside of the social environment. Accordingly, "the social conditioning of the evaluation category requires the analysis of the interaction of stylistic, pragmatic and sociolinguistic features of naming individuals" [The same work, p. 8].

It is known that in the content of paremias, the evaluation information about human characteristics, morals, behavior and objects-phenomena in reality is expressed. Also, proverbs and texts reflect the national outlook. Their meaning is directly related to the formation of knowledge about the world, and from its composition the value attitude towards this world takes place. It should be for this reason that in recent times the tradition of studying the realization of the value category by means of paremiological units in comparison with different ethnocultures is getting stronger. The recently published monograph of R.U.Madjidova occupies a special place among the studies carried out in this direction [Madjidova 2019, 199]. The relevance of this study, which aims to study the axiological possibilities of anthropocentric proverbs in the Russian and Uzbek languages, is explained by the theoretical and practical importance of analyzing the peculiarities of the evaluation part of the worldview of typologically different language and culture owners. In the course of the research, a set of linguistic indicators defining the meaning of proverbs used in the system of Uzbek and Russian languages related to human evaluation was determined. These indicators describe human behavior, thinking and interpersonal relationships within the categories of "good" or "bad" grades. In addition to the physical and spiritual-educational qualities of the person who is the object of assessment, professional activities, social and family status, age, gender, and family ties are also taken into account. In relation to this, the given assessment is manifested in moral, aesthetic, intellectual, emotional, and normative aspects. Values, which are an important goal in the process of

evaluation, determine the national-cultural identity of the mentality of each nation, and in this regard, inter-linguistic and inter-cultural differences occur [Madjidova 2019, 211-212].

In fact, the result of the evaluation activity is manifested in the framework of the relationship between the subject and the object. To determine the level of assessment, it is necessary to determine the ratio between the sample and the object in the mind. For this purpose, the conclusion-evaluation made after the act of thinking is realized by means of a linguistic unit.

The linguistic level of the evaluation activity is formed by a complex of phonetic, lexical, grammatical tools that represent it. The Farang linguist S.Bally wrote at the time that "thinking means reacting to imagination, recognizing and evaluating its existence" [Bally 2006, 43]. Scientists who support this opinion recommend the use of functional and cognitive approaches in the description of the evaluation category [Lingvistika i axiology 2011].

The recognition of the importance of the category of value, which reflects the activity and perspective of a person in relation to natural and social reality, in the activity of knowing the world, gave impetus to the formation of a new direction named "linguistic axiology" or "axiological linguistics" [Temirgazina 2015, 155]. In this field of linguistics, language is interpreted as a source of information about values. According to V.V. Melnichuk, "Value and evaluation are the central concepts of the problem of axiology and form the subject of research of axiological linguistics" [Melnichuk 2017, 8]. The development of the linguo-axiological approach in linguistics is related to the interest in the means and methods of linguistic expression of cultural categories settled in the national landscape of the world. The person appraising the object gives it the value he likes. This, in turn, indicates that the nature of the assessment should correspond to human requirements. The worldview or "abstracted model of the world" consists of the macroworld, the system of human imagination, and the microworld, that is, the thinking person [Arutyunova 1998, 348]. In this case, the linguistic expression of the assessment becomes a means of reflecting the axiological part of the world view [Khomyakova 2019, 87].

So, assessment is a multifaceted complex phenomenon, and studying its nature, nature, and characteristics is an interdisciplinary problem. In linguistics, this problem is being studied based on different approaches. These approaches serve the development of the linguistic theory of the category of evaluation by describing the types of evaluation meanings and the means that create them.

LIST OF USED LITERATURE:

1. Boymirzaeva S. Matn modalligi. – T.: Fan, 2010. – 151 b.
2. Crismore A., Farnsworth R. Metadiscourse in popular and professional science // The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse. – London: Sage, 1990. 118-136 p.
3. G'iyosov S. O'zbek tilida asliy sifatlarning ko'chma baholash ma'nosi haqida // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti, 1982. № 4. – 51-54 b.
4. Huston S., Sinclair J. A local grammar of evaluation // Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse. – Oxford: OUP, 2000. – 74-101 p.
5. Hyland K. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. – L.: - Continuum, 2005. - 287 p.
6. Hyland K. Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing. – L.: - Continuum, 2005. - 287 p.
7. Hyland K. Tse P. Hooking the reader: a corpus study of evaluative that in abstracts // English for Specific Purposes, 2005. Vol. 24. – 123-139 p.
8. Nazarov Q.N. Qadriyatlar tizimi: barqarorlik va o'zgaruvchanlik dialektikasi (aksiologiyaning ijtimoiy-falsafiy muammolar). Falsafa fan. dokt. diss. avtoreferati. - T.: 1996. – 24 b.
9. Nurmonov A. Lingvistik ta'limotning yangi bosqichi // O'zbek tili va adabiyoti, 2008. 6-sun. –14-21 p.

10. Qambarov G‘.S. Baho munosabati va uning o‘zbek tilida ifodalanishi (shaxslararo munosabat asosida). Filol.fan. nomz. diss... avtoreferati. – T.: 2008. – 26 b.
11. Qo‘ng‘urov R. Subyektiv baho formalarining semantik va stilistik xususiyatlari. – T.: Fan, 1980. - 69 b.
12. Safarov Sh. Pragmalingvistika. – T.: O‘zbekistonmilliyensiklopediyasi, 2008. – 300 b.
13. Thompson, G., & Hunston, S. (2000). Evaluation: An Introduction. In G. Thompson, & S. Hunston (Eds.), Evaluation in Text: Authorial Stance and the Construction of Discourse (pp. 1-27). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
14. Vande Kopple W. Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse // College Composition and Communication, 1995, vol. 36. – 82-93 p.
15. Абдуллина Л.Р. Функционирование глагольных фразеологических единиц и прагмасемантика (на материале французского и татарского языков), 2008. – 135 с.
16. Аникина Э.М. Анализ дискурса как отдельное направление. Сибирский государственный университет путей сообщения, Россия, г. Новосибирск, 2019. – 13 с.
17. Анисимова С.Ф. Введение в аксиологию. – М.: Современные тетради, 2001. – 128 с.
18. Арутюнова Н.Д. Об объекте общей оценки (в лингвистических исследованиях) // Вопросы языкоznания, 1985. № 3. – 13-24с.
19. Арутюнова Н.Д. Типы языковых значений. Оценка. Событие. Факт. – М.: Наука, 1988. – 339 с.
20. Арутюнова Н.Д. Язык и мир человека. – М.: Языки русской культуры, 1999. – 89 с.
21. Арутюнова Н.Д. Аксиология в механизмах жизни и языка // Проблемы структурной лингвистики. – М.: Наука, 1984. – 5-23 с.
22. Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М.: URSS, 2006. – 250 с.
23. Болдырев Н. Структура и принципы формирования оценочных категорий // С любовью к языку. – Воронеж: Изд-во ВГУ, 2002. – 103-114с.
24. Болдырев Н.Н. Оценочные категории как формат знания // Когнитивные исследования языка. Вып. III. – Тамбов, 2008. – 25-37с.
25. Вольф Е.М. Оценочное значение и соотношение признаков “хорошо / плохо” // Вопросы языкоznания, 1986. -№ 5. – 98-106 с.
26. Головинская М.Я. Оценка в составе речевого акта // Язык. Личность. Текст. – М., 2005. – 201-209 с.
27. Дронова Л.П. Картина русского мира: аксиология в языке и тексте. – Томск: Изд-во Томского у-та, 2005. – 353 с.
28. Есенина О.А. Конструкции экспрессивной оценки в современном английском языке. Автореф.дисс... канд.филол.наук. – М.: 1991. -16 с.
29. Залевская А.А. Индивидуальное знание: специфика и принципы функционирования. – Тверь: Изд-во ТГУ, 1992. – 136 с.
30. Заморева А. Репрезентация концепта “общая оценка” в современном русском языке. Автореф.дисс...канд.филол.наук. – Уфа, 2007. – 23 с.
31. Ивин А.А. Основания логики оценок. – М.: Изд-во МГУ, 1970. – 56 с.
32. Карасик В.И. Аксиологическая лингвистика: концепты и дискурс // Германистика в России. Традиции и перспективы. – Новосибирск: Изд-во НГУ, 2004. – 28-32 с.

33. Леонтьев А.А. Языковое сознание и образ мира // Язык исознание. – М.: РАН, 1993. – 16-21 с.

34. Лингвистика и аксиология: этносемиометрия ценностных смыслов (коллективная монография). – М.: ТЕЗАУРУС, 2011. – 252 с.

35. Маджидова Р.У. Аксиологическое исследование антропологических пословиц. – Т.: ВнешИнвестпром, 2019. - 244 с.

36. Максимова Е.П. Семантические и прагматические свойства высказываний оценки. Автореф. дисс.... канд. филол. наук. – Тверь, 1998. – 26 с.

37. Маркелова Т.В. Функционально–семантическое поле оценки в русском языке // Вестник МГУ. Серия 9. Филология., 1994. № 4. –12-19с.

38. Мельничук В.А. Аксиологическая динамика русской лексики (конец XVIII – начало XXVIII – начало XXIв). Дисс...канд. филол. наук. – СПб., 2017. – 211 с.

39. Миронова Н.Н.Значение дискурс-анализа для теории перевода // Вестник Московского государственного областного университета. Серия: Лингвистика, издательство МГОУ (Москва),1999. № 2, 75-79 с.

40. Мирошникова М.Г. Функционирование сложноподчиненных оценочно–изъяснительных предложений в речи. Автореф. дисс....канд. филол. наук. – СПБ, 1994. – 24 с.

41. Никитина Л.Б. Семантика и прагматика оценочных высказываний об интеллекте. Автореф. дисс... канд. филол. наук. – Омск, 1996. – 22 с.

42. Панжиева Н.Н. Когнитивный аспект оценочных антропонимов // Объединённый научный журнал. 2001. № 16. – 32-34с.

43. Панжиева Н.Н. Когнитивный аспект оценочных номинаций лица в английском и узбекском языках. Автореф.дисс....канд. филол.наук. – Т.: 2004. – 22 с.

44. Панжиева Н.Н. Новые подходы к изучению категории оценки // Филология масалалари, 2003. № 2. – 42-46с.

45. Сергеева Л.А. Оценочное значение и категоризация оценочной семантики: опыт интерпретационного анализа. Автореф. дисс....докт.филол.наук. – Уфа, 2004. – 32 с.

46. Симонян Т.А. Семантика пространственных атрибутов в свете когнитивного подхода: Прилагательные с параметром высоты. диссертация ... кандидата филологических наук. – Москва, 2001. – 184 с.

47. Синегубова К.В. Художественная аксиология Елены Гуровой. диссертация ... кандидата филологических наук. Рос. ун-т дружбы народов. - Кемерово, 2012. - 84 с.

48. Слыскин Г.Г. Аксиология языковой личности и сфера активной лингвистики // Социальная власть языка. – Воронеж: Изд-во ВГУ, 2001. – 53-64с.

49. Телия В.Н. Русская фразеология. Семантический, прагматический и лингвокультурологические аспекты. – М.: Наука, 1996. - 288 с.

50. Темиргазина З.К. Лингвистическая аксиология: оценочные высказывания в русском языке. – М.: Флинта, 2015. – 247 с.

51. Трипольская Т.А. Эмотивно - оценочный дискурс: когнитивный и прагматический аспекты. Новосибирск НГПУ. 1999. – 153-165 с.

52. Хомякова Е.Г. Ценность образования в концептуальном пространстве английского языка // Когнитивные исследования языка. – СПб, 2019. – 87-92 с .

53. Чернейко Л.О. Порождение и восприятие межличностных оценок // Филологические науки, 1996. № 6. – 42-53с.
54. Чернявская Е.А. Оценка и оценочность в языке и художественной речи (на материале поэтического, прозаического и эпистолярного наследия А.С. Пушкина). Автореф. дисс.... канд. филол. наук. – Брянск, 2001. – 25 с.