

20.Travassos P.F. *Correr uma vista de olhos, glisser une œillade, to shoot a look: Lexical variation in the slot of support verb in complex predicates of visual perception in Portuguese, French and English*. *Revista Diadorim*, 2024, vol. 25, no. 3, art. e62866. DOI: 10.35520/diadorim.2023.v25n3a62866.

Received: 03 August 2026. **Accepted:** 25 August 2026. **Published:** 30 September 2026.

Information about the author:

Балакин Сергей Владимирович* – доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой иностранных языков и межкультурной коммуникации Уральского государственного университета путей сообщения, Российская Федерация, 620034, г. Екатеринбург, ул. Колмогорова, д. 66, e-mail: SBalakin@usurt.ru, ORCID: 0000-0003-0448-4404.

Балакин Сергей Владимирович* – филология ғылымдарының докторы, профессор, Орал мемлекеттік қатынас жолдары университетінің Шет тілдер және мәдениетаралық коммуникация кафедрасының меңгерушісі, Ресей Федерациясы, 620034, Екатеринбург, Колмогорова к, 66, e-mail: SBalakin@usurt.ru, ORCID: 0000-0003-0448-4404.

Balakin Sergey Vladimirovich* – Doctor of Philological Sciences, Professor, Head of the Department of foreign languages and intercultural communication, Ural State University of Railway Transport, Russian Federation, 620034, Yekaterinburg, 66 Kolmogorov Str., 66, e-mail: SBalakin@usurt.ru, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0448-4404>.

IRSTI 16.21.54

UDC 81'42:070

<https://doi.org/10.52269/SEPT2631285>

LINGUISTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSING AXIOLOGICAL ATTITUDES IN THE KAZAKHSTAN AND ENGLISH MEDIA: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS

Ryssaeva Ye.A. – Master of Philology, Lecturer, Department of philology and practical linguistics, Akhmet Baytursynuly Regional University, Kostanay, Kazakhstan.

Fedorova M.L.* – Senior lecturer of the Department of philology and practical linguistics, Akhmet Baytursynuly Regional University, Kostanay, Kazakhstan.

The article analyzes the linguistic means of expressing axiological attitudes in modern English-language media discourse, as it is relevant in the context of globalization and the great influence of the media on the formation of public consciousness. The main research purpose is to study, identify and compare the means of expressing evaluative meaning in media texts used in various social and cultural contexts. The research objectives are to analyze explicit and implicit assessment tools and determine their role in creating value orientations. News publications from 2023-2025 from *The Guardian* (Great Britain) and *The Astana Times* (Kazakhstan) were used as a research material. The research methodology is based on discursive, linguo-semantic and comparative analysis, which allowed us to consider the estimated resources of the language at various linguistic levels. The research findings demonstrate that British and Kazakh media discourse construct distinct axiological models even when addressing the same thematic field. The British texts are focused on criticism and warning, while the Kazakh materials are aimed at legitimizing and positively interpreting social processes. The scientific value of the work consists in a comprehensive consideration of evaluability in media discourse, and the practical significance is related to the application of the results in language teaching, intercultural communication and media education.

Keywords: media text analysis, evaluative language, axiological attitudes, explicit and implicit assessment, media linguistics, comparative analysis, English-language press.

ҚАЗАҚСТАНДЫҚ ЖӘНЕ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛІНДЕГІ БАҚ-ТАҒЫ АКСИОЛОГИЯЛЫҚ ҰСТАНЫМДАРДЫ БІЛДІРУДІҢ ЛИНГВИСТИКАЛЫҚ ҚҰРАЛДАРЫ: САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ

Рысаева Е.А. – филология ғылымдарының магистрі, филология және практикалық лингвистика кафедрасының оқытушысы, Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы атындағы ҚӨУ, Қостанай қ., Қазақстан Республикасы.

Федорова М.Л. * – филология және практикалық лингвистика кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы атындағы ҚӨУ, Қостанай қ., Қазақстан Республикасы.

Мақалада қазіргі ағылшын тіліндегі медиа дискурстағы аксиологиялық көзқарастарды білдірудің тілдік құралдары талданады, өйткені бұл жаһандану жағдайында және бұқаралық ақпарат

құралдарының қоғамдық сананың қалыптасуына үлкен әсері жағдайында өзекті болып табылады. Жұмыстың негізгі мақсаты әртүрлі әлеуметтік-мәдени контексттерде қолданылатын медиа мәтіндердегі бағалау мәнін білдіру құралдарын зерттеу, анықтау және салыстыру болып табылады. Жұмыстың міндеттері бағалаудың эксплицитті және имплицитті құралдарын талдау және олардың құндылық бағдарларын құрудағы рөлін анықтау болып табылады.

Зерттеу материалы ретінде 2023–2025 жылдардағы *The Guardian* (Ұлыбритания) және *The Astana Times* (Қазақстан) басылымдарынан алынған жаңалық жарияланымдары пайдаланылды. Зерттеу әдістемесі тілдің бағалау ресурстарын әртүрлі тіл деңгейлерінде қарастыруға мүмкіндік беретін дискурсивті, лингвосемантикалық және салыстырмалы талдауға негізделген.

Зерттеу нәтижесінде тақырыптық өріс сәйкес келген жағдайда да британдық және қазақстандық медиадискурс әртүрлі аксиологиялық модельдерді қалыптастыратыны анықталды. Британдық мәтіндер сын мен ескертуге бағытталса, қазақстандық материалдар әлеуметтік үдерістерді легитимациялауға және оң тұрғыда түсіндіруге бағдарланған.

Жұмыстың ғылыми құндылығы медиа дискурстағы бағалауды жан-жақты қарастырудан тұрады, ал практикалық маңыздылығы алынған нәтижелерді тіл оқытуда, мәдениетаралық коммуникацияда және медиа білім беруде қолдану мүмкіндігімен байланысты.

Түйінді сөздер: медиамәтіндерді талдау; аксиологиялық көзқарастар; бағалау тілі; эксплицитті және имплицитті бағалау; медиалингвистика; салыстырмалы талдау; ағылшын тіліндегі баспасөз.

ЛИНГВИСТИЧЕСКИЕ СРЕДСТВА ВЫРАЖЕНИЯ АКСИОЛОГИЧЕСКИХ УСТАНОВОК В КАЗАХСТАНСКИХ И АНГЛИЙСКИХ СМИ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ

Рысаева Е.А. – магистр филологических наук, преподаватель кафедры филологии и практической лингвистики, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмета Байтұрсынұлы, г. Костанай, Республика Казахстан.

Федорова М.Л.* – старший преподаватель кафедры филологии и практической лингвистики, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмета Байтұрсынұлы, г. Костанай, Республика Казахстан.

В статье анализируются языковые средства выражения аксиологических установок в современном англоязычном медиадискурсе, что является актуальной проблемой в условиях глобализации и большого влияния СМИ на формирование общественного сознания. Главная цель работы заключается в исследовании, выявлении и сопоставлении средств выражения оценочного значения в медиатекстах, которые используются в различных социокультурных контекстах. Задачами работы являются анализ эксплицитных и имплицитных средств оценки и определение их роли в создании ценностных ориентиров.

В качестве материала исследования были использованы новостные публикации 2023-2025 годов из изданий *The Guardian* (Великобритания) и *The Astana Times* (Казахстан). Методология исследования основана на дискурсивном, лингвосемантическом и сопоставительном анализе, которые позволили рассмотреть оценочные ресурсы языка на различных языковых уровнях.

В результате исследования было выяснено, что при совпадении тематического поля британский и казахстанский медиадискурс конструируют разные аксиологические модели. Британские тексты ориентированы на критику и предостережение, тогда как казахстанские материалы направлены на легитимацию и позитивную интерпретацию социальных процессов.

Научная ценность работы состоит в комплексном рассмотрении оценочности в медиадискурсе, а практическая значимость заключена в возможности реализации результатов в процессе преподавании языка, межкультурной коммуникации и медиаобразовании.

Ключевые слова: анализ медиатекстов, оценочный язык, аксиологические установки, эксплицитная и имплицитная оценка, медиалингвистика, сопоставительный анализ, англоязычная пресса.

Introduction. Mass media play a key role in the formation of public consciousness and the dissemination of value orientations that are significant for a particular society. Through language the authors of media texts do not merely transmit information but also interpret what is happening, convey certain ideological positions and influence the audience's perception including its emotional and evaluative response. The linguistic structure of a media text often serves as a means of expressing the author's attitude toward the events, phenomena, and personalities being described. In this regard, the study of axiological attitudes as ways of representing values in media discourse gains particular significance.

In the context of globalization and intensified intercultural interaction, a comparative analysis of linguistic mechanisms for expressing values in the media discourse across various linguacultures is particularly relevant. The axiological orientations transmitted by mass media reflect the specific features of the cultural, sociopolitical

and mental space of each society, which is expressed in the peculiarities of the linguistic design of media texts, the choice of lexical units, syntactic structures and discursive strategies.

A comparative study of the Kazakhstani and English media discourse reveals how cultural, political, and social contexts influence the linguistic expression of values. Two English-language newspapers with different cultural backgrounds were selected for the analysis: The Astana Times (Kazakhstan) and The Guardian (Great Britain). While they both share a focus on a global audience, each reflects the values and characteristics of its own country in its content.

The purpose of this study is to identify and compare the linguistic means of expressing axiological attitudes in the Kazakhstani and English media texts. The work is aimed at determining the linguistic mechanisms by which evaluation is formed and value orientations are realized in media texts.

The following research objectives stem from the above: to examine the main approaches to studying axiological attitudes and evaluativeness in media discourse;

to identify explicit and implicit linguistic means of expressing evaluation;

to compare the use of evaluative vocabulary and other means in *The Guardian* and *The Astana Times* at the lexical, syntactic, stylistic, and pragmatic levels;

to identify the main similarities and differences in the axiological models of these two publications.

Translated with DeepL.com (free version)

The object of the study is media texts presented by materials of modern mass media of both countries. The core corpus of this study comprises the news articles published between 2023 and 2025 (inclusive). Their selection is methodologically justified by their dual significance: as a primary vehicle for agenda-setting and as a highly representative media format.

The subject of the study is the linguistic means of expressing axiological attitudes, including lexical, syntactic, stylistic and pragmatic elements aimed at the formation and transmission of evaluative meanings.

The methodological basis is the method of discourse analysis, linguo-semantic analysis and comparative analysis, which are comprehensively used to identify and compare axiological strategies in media discourses of Kazakhstan and the UK.

Thus, the presented study is aimed at identifying linguo-cultural differences in the ways of expressing evaluation and revealing the role of linguistic means in the formation of a value picture of the world in the English and Kazakhstani media space.

Theoretical foundations. Since the main aim of our research is to analyze how the mass media convey values through the language, it is reasonable to clearly define the basis of this process first of all. Therefore, this section will be devoted to a detailed overview of what axiological attitudes are and how they are revealed in language and discourse. The role of evaluation (i.e. explicit and implicit evaluation) in media texts will also be described in this part of our study.

Before exploring the essence of axiological attitudes, it is appropriate to briefly examine axiology as a philosophical science that studies values, their nature, hierarchy, and role in human life. Axiology demonstrates how the understanding of values has evolved (from antiquity to modern theories). From our perspective, it is necessary to systematize the key views of thinkers who have made significant contributions to the development of axiology. The origins of axiology date back to the philosophical teachings of Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle [1, p.27]. Further views on value and anti-value were reconsidered and formalized in the form of theological truths, dogmas and doctrines, to the development of which St. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas made a significant contribution. During the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant divided values into relative (material and conditional) and absolute (moral and unconditional). Later, representatives of the Baden School of Neo-Kantians (Heinrich Rickert, Wilhelm Windelband) proclaimed axiology to be the heart of philosophy, defining it as a critical science that studies generally significant values as transcendental norms [2, p.15]. Jean-Jacques Rousseau and John Locke in their philosophical works developed key social values such as law, justice, contract and property rights - considering them as integral elements and consequences of the concept of a social contract [3].

By the middle of the 20th century, axiology had emerged as an independent science, incorporating diverse philosophical views: objectivism, subjectivism, cultural relativism, and sociologism. We are very close to the views of the German philosopher Max Scheler, who proposed a hierarchy of values. This objectivist argued that values are not a chaos, but a strict ladder, at the top of which are sacred and religious values, then spiritual values (truth, beauty, goodness), below which are the vital values (health, strength), and at the very bottom are the values of pleasure [1, p.79].

Subjectivists affirmed that a value is created by human interest (as mentioned by the American philosopher Ralph Barton Perry, the founder of systemic English-language axiology) [2, p.4]. John Dewey also believed that values are dynamic guidelines that change with a person's experience and living conditions. This philosopher developed this idea, saying that our life guidelines and values are not something static. They are dynamic and constantly transform along with our life experiences and changing reality.

According to Max Weber, who adhered to the ideas of cultural relativism, society is not characterized by a single, universally shared value system. Instead, the values of various social groups oppose one another, and the need to choose between them becomes a problem for the individual due to their fundamental incompatibility [2, p.5]. Therefore, Weber's voluntarism should be understood not as an acknowledgement of

chaos, but as a demand that individuals find clarity, demonstrate determination, and assume responsibility in situations of inevitable conflict of values.

The representative of sociology was Talcott Parsons, an American social philosopher and theorist who studied the characteristics of social systems. According to his point of view values are an integrative mechanism that:

1. Sets common goals for a society;
2. Legitimizes social norms and rules;
3. Coordinates the actions of individuals, reducing the potential for conflict;
4. Is transmitted through socialization institutions (family, school, religion) [4, p.43].

Parsons views the values as "social glue" – the connecting link that integrates individuals into a coherent, functioning society. By adopting shared values, individuals coordinate their actions, allowing society to function as an entire system. This key metaphor for Parsons emphasizes his view of society as a self-regulating system, where stability is maintained through cultural consensus [5].

To describe how exactly society maintains its integrity and stability, he developed the AGIL (Adaptation, Goal-attainment, Integration, Latency) model, according to which any social system must perform four key functions. Each of these functions is responsible for a specific aspect of social order, and values in this model act as a cross-cutting regulator that permeates all levels of the social system. The first function, adaptation, is associated with the ability of society to adapt to environmental conditions and effectively use material resources. Goal-attainment involves formulating socially significant goals and mobilizing resources to achieve them; values legitimize power, management decisions, and social priorities here. The third function, Integration, ensures the coordination of actions among various social groups and the maintenance of public order; shared values act as "social glue," reducing conflict and making behavior predictable. Latency is responsible for the reproduction of cultural norms and motivational attitudes of the individual through institutions of socialization, ensuring the continuity and stability of the social system over time. Thus, the AGIL model demonstrates that values are not a secondary element of social life, but a system-forming factor that ensures adaptation, purposefulness, integration, and cultural reproducibility of society. Through the implementation of these four functions, a social system maintains its integrity, stability, and capacity for development.

We adhere to the point of view of Talcott Parsons, since his structural-functional model interprets values as the foundation of a social system, ensuring normative coordination of actions, social integration and the stability of social order, which allows us to consistently interpret axiological attitudes and dominants as key mechanisms for organizing discursive and communicative interaction.

A study of the evolution of the values reveals that values and the ways of understanding them are not universal or ahistoric. On the contrary, axiological attitudes are formed in close connection with the specific historical, cultural, social, and ideological conditions of an era. Each philosophical doctrine of values reflects not only the individual position of the thinker but also the dominant forms of consciousness, social demands, and cultural priorities of its time.

Axiological attitudes are system-forming value orientations that form the foundation of an individual's or society's worldview, determining behavioral motives, communication practices, and cultural identity. They act as a "filter" for interpreting reality and regulate social interactions.

According to S.N. Sokolova [6, p. 144], the key aspects of axiological attitudes can be represented as follows:

- 1) Formation of worldview. Axiological attitudes define an integral system of ideas about the world, human, and his role in social and cultural reality, defining the basic coordinates for understanding reality.
- 2) Motivation of behavior. They act as internal guidelines that determine the choice of goals, methods, and means for achieving them, guiding and justifying individual and collective actions.
- 3) Regulation of interaction. Value attitudes function as implicit norms and rules governing forms of communication and behavior patterns in society, ensuring the predictability and stability of social connections.
- 4) Perception filter. Events, phenomena, and actions are interpreted through the prism of axiological attitudes, which determines their evaluation and semantic significance for the subject.
- 5) The basis of culture and identity. A set of value orientations forms cultural norms, traditions and symbolic codes which are the essence of national, group and social identity.

Thus, if axiological attitudes represent a deep, potential level of the value system, then axiological dominants act as their discursively actualized form. This means that in a specific sociocultural context, those that become dominant are selected from a variety of attitudes and brought to the forefront. The functions of these actualized dominants in the structure of public discourse are becoming a key subject of research interest. As discourse studies conducted by Yu.S. Starostina, I.V. Chekulai and O.N. Prokhorova [7, p. 186] demonstrate, five key functions of axiological dominants can be identified in English-speaking society. In the English-speaking sociocultural space, values primarily perform a *social-regulatory* function, which consists of forming and reinforcing norms of socially acceptable behavior (for example, the value of tolerance in inter-ethnic communication). At the same time, being the foundation for understanding reality, values are simultaneously characterized by a significant motivational potential and act as an impelling basis for speech and communicative activity, thereby realizing a *motivational* function. People interpret their own experiences through the prism of relevant axiological attitudes, developing an individual value system that is reproduced in

interpersonal communication. As a result, socially fixed axiological dominants are integrated into the structure of the communicative personality, defining the value-based approach to reality and fulfilling the regulatory and motivational functions of verbal behavior. English-language culture as a historically established social formation possesses a specific system of axiological dominants, the *cultural and integrative* function of which consists of uniting the corresponding linguistic and cultural community among other functions. Axiological orientations form the deep foundation of personality and often operate unconsciously determining verbal behavior. Successful communication is possible only if participants share a common axiological foundation, which shapes the intellectual and emotional background of discourse. In English-language interpersonal communication, values also perform a *structure-forming* function, ensuring the axiological coordination of the speech actions of interlocutors. In addition to all the above mentioned functions the communicant's values perform a *pragma-axiological* function, having a value-evaluative influence on communication partners, shaping the content of the dialogue and facilitating potential changes in their individual linguaxiospheres. The authors believe that during communication the participants rely on their own linguaxiospheres, as well as on the value orientations of their partner, and generally accepted socio-cultural norms. Moreover, the aforementioned five key functions of axiological dominants are realized simultaneously in the English-language discursive-communicative space.

We understand that values exist directly in the language. They are materialized through our choice of words, intonation and stylistic devices. The language thus becomes not simply a means of conveying information, but a channel for the transmission of value systems. Meanwhile, a discourse is a dynamic space where these systems are formed, fixed, or brought into a question in the process of communication. In a discourse axiological attitudes become part of goal-oriented communication. Therefore, studying axiological attitudes in a language and a discourse allows us to effectively explore the map of society's values, as captured in words.

Based on this premise, the media text becomes the key object for analyzing axiological attitudes and their linguistic embodiment. It represents not simply an informational message, but a special type of discourse in which facts are intertwined with evaluations, interpretations, and emotional accents [8, p.36]. Axiological attitudes serve as the internal core of the media text, and the media text, in its turn, is the major channel for transmitting these values to the audience and fixing them in the public consciousness.

Axiological attitudes play several key roles in media texts. First and foremost, they shape public opinion [9]. Through the choice of words, quotations, and the structure of presentation, media convey not only information but also an evaluation of events. Media also often intensify existing value orientations in society. If publications regularly emphasize the importance of family, education, patriotism, and hard work, these values become established in the public consciousness as the "norm". Journalists and authors of publicistic writing are capable of changing the audience's axiological worldview by imposing new values or reinterpreting the old ones. For example, the concept of "success" can shift from "career growth" to "work-private life harmony" depending on media trends [10, p. 14]. Axiological attitudes in media texts don't always unite people – they can divide the audience into "ours" and "others", "right" and "wrong," which is especially noticeable in political or ideological discussions [9]. The educational function is especially important in media texts related to the upbringing of children and youth. At this point the value component comes to the forefront: materials not only inform parents or teachers, but also transmit a model of "correct" behavior and attitudes toward family, education, and the government [11, p.22].

Within the linguaxiological approach axiological attitudes are interpreted as a system-forming component of the communicative personality, determining the selection of speech behavior strategies, the pragmatic focus of utterances, and the specific value-evaluative impact on the addressee. Their study allows us to identify not only the substantive but also the functional characteristics of discourse, including mechanisms of social regulation, motivation, and cultural integration.

Axiological attitudes in media texts are linguistically embodied through a complex system of linguistic markers representing the value positions of the author and editorial staff, which are realized in both explicit and implicit forms of evaluation. It seems reasonable to first consider explicit evaluation, sequentially analyzing the corresponding linguistic markers at the lexical, morphological, syntactic, stylistic, and pragmatic levels, and then proceed to a description of the mechanisms of implicit evaluation.

Explicit evaluation in media texts represents a form of open axiological expression, in which the value orientations of the author and editorial staff are verbalized directly and unambiguously. Lexical means of expressing evaluation are traditionally viewed as the basic level of representation of axiological attitudes. Particularly at the lexical level that axiological attitudes are realized most explicitly, since evaluative semantics is directly fixed in the meaning of linguistic units. The problematics of lexical evaluation is thoroughly explored in the works of N.D. Arutyunova, where evaluation is considered a universal semantic category of language, associated with the opposition of the positive and the negative, the approved and the condemned [12, p. 60]. Among the main lexical means of expressing evaluation is evaluative vocabulary, which directly marks the author's attitude to the described events and objects (positive/negative evaluation adjectives and adverbs: *successful, courageous, significant, destructive, dangerous; extremely, exceptionally, doubtfully; as well as nouns and verbs: rascal, mediocrity, masterpiece, hackwork, breakthrough; enrich, decorate, ruin, spoil, improve, vulgarize. ennoble, destroy, inspire*). Special attention in media texts is given to emotionally expressive vocabulary aimed at enhancing the impact on the audience (*shocking, disturbing, outrageous*). Anna

Wierzbicka emphasizes that emotionally coloured words not only convey feelings but also set the normative evaluation of events in terms of cultural scripts [13, p.388].

Thus, lexical markers of explicit evaluation act as a key component of the axiological potential of media discourse, providing a direct expression of value attitudes and forming the direction of the interpretation of information on the part of the addressee.

Morphological markers of explicit evaluation include comparative and superlative degrees (*the worst crisis in decades; more dangerous than*), evaluative affixes (*hopeless, pointless, childish*), as well as modal forms with clearly expressed subjectivity (*must be unacceptable*), which enhance the categorical nature of the statement [14, p.142].

At the syntactic level, the evaluation is fixed through predicative constructions of direct qualification (*"It is unacceptable that such measures were introduced"*), modal-evaluative frames (*"We believe this decision is wrong"*) and emphatic structures that bring the evaluation into the focus of the message.

Stylistically explicit evaluation is expressed through hyperbole (*"I've been waiting for you for ages!"*), repetition (*"It was a terrible, terrible mistake. Terrible in its consequences..."*) and rhetorical questions (*"Is it right to behave in such way?"*), which increases the expressiveness and persuasiveness of the text.

Pragmatic means of expressing evaluation are based on strategies and tactics that have a communicative impact and attitude toward the subject of speech. As the authors note in their study [15, p. 3], these are viewed as a complex phenomenon, incorporating extralinguistic factors, i.e. knowledge of the world, sociocultural context, and the author's intentions. Explicit evaluation in pragmatic terms serves as a means of open expression of the author's value position in media discourse. It implements a strategy of direct axiological positioning in which the attitude towards events and social actors is not hidden, but formulated explicitly. Within the framework of this strategy, techniques of legitimation and delegitimation are used, when actions or decisions are presented as justified and socially significant (*"The reform is necessary"*) or, conversely, as unacceptable and incorrect (*"This policy is irresponsible"*) [16, p.94]. Strategies of accusation and justification are aimed at clearly distributing responsibility between participants in events and are implemented through direct evaluative statements, for example: *"The minister failed to act"* or *"The government was forced to make this decision"* [14, p.42]. In addition, explicit evaluation is used in the strategy of mobilizing the addressee, when the reader is encouraged to adopt a certain position or action through categorical judgments and appeals (*"This must not continue"*), which enhances the persuasive impact of the media text [17, p.62].

Implicit evaluation in media texts represents a form of hidden axiological expression, in which the author's and editorial staff's value attitudes are not directly linguistically marked but are reconstructed by the recipient during the interpretation of discourse. At the lexical level, implicit evaluation is realized through epithets, similes, phraseological units, euphemisms, and metaphors. An epithet acts through hidden comparison, weaving an evaluation into the characterization of an object. It directly indicates a quality (beauty, horror, magnificence) fixing the evaluation in the mind. The following epithets can be given as an example: *Indian summer, deathly silence, brilliant success*. As for the similes they make the evaluation objectified. The author does not seem to be making a verdict himself, but rather refers to a well-known, established image which enhances the persuasiveness: *loyal as a dog; run around like a squirrel in a cage; stubborn as a donkey; cold as ice*. Phraseological units allow us to give a concise, idiomatic assessment of an entire situation or character trait: *neither fish nor fowl, to have one's head screwed on the right way, golden hands, to twiddle one's thumbs*. Euphemisms don't just replace a rude word with a polite one. They act as a tool that alters our perception of things: they soften the sharp edges of unpleasant topics or intentionally conceal their true essence under neutral or even positive formulations [18, p.644]. Among bright examples the following euphemisms can be mentioned: *in reduced circumstances, disabled person, overweight, to be expecting a baby* and etc. Metaphor in media discourse is one of the key means of implicit evaluation, since it ensures the transmission of value attitudes not directly, but through a figurative reinterpretation of social reality (*path of progress, economic storm, threat to democracy*). As Norman Fairclough mentioned stable metaphorical models in media texts perform the role of a hidden evaluative mechanism, since they direct the addressee's interpretation without explicit axiological commentary [16, p.133].

At the morphological level implicit evaluation is manifested through grammatical categories that do not directly convey an evaluation but influence the interpretation of the message. Thus, the choice of tense-aspect forms, particularly the perfect (*has failed to address*) actualizes the idea of the failure or completion of an action with a negative outcome; nominalization (*the destruction of infrastructure*) allows to shift the focus from the agent to the event or result, weakening explicit evaluation; the use of the category of uncertainty (*a certain decision*) creates the effect of distancing and hidden criticism.

At the syntactic level implicit evaluation is realized through constructions that conceal the source of the evaluative judgment and responsibility for the events. These include passive forms (*Mistakes were made*), impersonal and nominative structures (*There were consequences*), as well as presuppositional constructions (*The minister finally admitted...*) in which the evaluation is embedded in the premise of the utterance.

Complex sentences with cause-and-effect relationships play a significant role where the evaluation is derived from the consequences described, and is not formulated directly [16, p.105].

Stylistically, the implicit evaluation is supported by the techniques of irony and sarcasm, allusions and intertextual references, metaphorization, as well as contrasting comparison of facts (juxtaposition), which enhances the hidden impact while maintaining the formal neutrality of the statement.

In pragmatic terms, implicit evaluation forms the core of media discourse's manipulative and ideological strategies, including framing, presuppositional imposition of interpretation, strategic silence, and the normalization of evaluations through repetition. These strategies allow to form stable value representations without resorting to direct evaluation, which significantly increases the effectiveness of the axiological impact of the media text [14, p. 67].

Consequently, it can be concluded that in general implicit evaluation acts as a key mechanism for implementing the interpretive function of media discourse, ensuring the formation of socially significant meanings and value orientations through an indirect, implicit expression of evaluative attitude.

Results and discussion. The transition from the analysis of linguistic means of expression and types of evaluation to the practice of their application in specific media (The Guardian / The Astana Times), representing different cultures, is a logical and necessary development of our research. This will allow us to see how universal linguistic techniques serve as a tool for expressing and promoting fundamentally different axiological attitudes in these printed publications. The choice of the topic "Education and Technology" is ideal for such a comparison, since it is a global vector of development, which acquires unique features in each country, reflecting its internal priorities and problems.

During our linguistic investigation we have noticed that while both English-language newspapers address identical themes, artificial intelligence being a prime example, their discursive positions are diametrically opposed. The narratives diverge into polarized evaluative frames: The Guardian article is fundamentally critical and precautionary, defining AI as a potential disruptor of human cognition, whereas the Kazakhstani materials are promotional and progress-oriented, presenting AI as an essential instrument of national development and personal advancement. Thus, common topics serve not as a point of convergence, but as a revealing ground for fundamentally different ideological and axiological commitments.

In The Guardian, explicit axiological attitudes are realised primarily through evaluative lexical units with negative semantics. Evaluative adjectives such as *harmful*, *dangerous*, *corrosive*, *worrying*, *dismal* and metaphorically intensified expressions like *brain-rotting videos* or *toxic crisis* do not merely describe phenomena but actively frame them as threats to human cognition, moral integrity and institutional stability. These adjectives encode judgement and emotional stance simultaneously, constructing education and AI as spaces of degradation rather than empowerment.

Evaluative nouns further reinforce this framing. Phrases such as *a crisis in education*, *cognitive decline*, *failure of the system*, and *a veneer of legitimacy* conceptualise problems as systemic, deep-rooted and structurally embedded. Importantly, the noun *crisis* signals urgency and exceptional danger, while *veneer of legitimacy* implies deliberate deception and moral hypocrisy, delegitimising institutional responses to technological change.

Evaluative verbs in The Guardian also play a crucial role in shaping explicit axiological meaning. Verbs such as *undermine*, *erode*, *weaken*, *devalue*, and *threaten* present AI not as a neutral tool but as an active agent of harm. Even seemingly descriptive verbs (*replace thinking*, *throw off course*) are evaluatively charged, as they imply loss of autonomy and cognitive regression. At the same time, occasional positive verbs (*enable*, *support*, *offer*) appear, but they function as cautious acknowledgements rather than dominant evaluative drivers, reinforcing the overall critical balance of the discourse.

Explicit evaluation is intensified through emotive lexis (*deep concern*, *alarming*, *terrifying*, *heartbroken*), which personalises abstract social processes and transforms them into experiences of fear, anxiety and moral pain. This emotional layer is further strengthened by evaluative predicative constructions (*It is worrying that students rely on AI*; *The argument is unconvincing*), which position the author as a moral judge articulating normative standards. Stylistically, The Guardian frequently employs rhetorical questions (*How will we maintain scepticism and intellectual independence?*), expressive intensification (*nothing short of a crisis*), and irony, all of which invite the reader into a shared space of doubt and critical reflection. Thus, explicit evaluation in The Guardian performs not only a descriptive but also a mobilising function, encouraging scepticism and resistance.

In sharp contrast, explicit evaluation in The Astana Times is overwhelmingly positive and legitimising. Evaluative adjectives such as *strategic*, *transformative*, *high-quality*, *unprecedented*, *leading*, and *global* construct education reform and technological innovation as unquestionably beneficial and forward-looking. These adjectives encode not only approval but also a sense of inevitability and correctness of the chosen path.

Evaluative nouns (*achievements*, *breakthroughs*, *priorities*, *global leaders*, *cutting-edge technologies*) further reinforce a success-oriented narrative. Unlike The Guardian, where nouns highlight failure and crisis, The Astana Times consistently foregrounds results, progress and recognition. Even when challenges are mentioned, they are framed as productive stimuli rather than threats, serving to legitimise further reform.

Evaluative verbs such as *strengthen*, *boost*, *promote*, *facilitate*, *seize opportunities* emphasise agency, control and strategic intentionality. These verbs depict national actors as proactive and capable of shaping their future rather than reacting to external pressures. Evaluative adverbs (*dramatically reshaped*) and emotive lexis (*thriving*, *ambitious*, *amazing opportunity*) contribute to an atmosphere of enthusiasm and confidence.

Comparative and superlative forms (*largest projects, best academic practices, most important challenges*) function as markers of leadership and competitiveness, embedding Kazakhstan symbolically within global hierarchies of success. Modal verbs (*we can strengthen, can create*) highlight collective potential and unity, contrasting sharply with the caution and conditionality typical of The Guardian.

Explicit evaluation in The Astana Times therefore performs a clear legitimising function, affirming state policies, reinforcing national pride and presenting education as a key instrument of socio-economic advancement.

Implicit evaluation in The Guardian often operates through metaphorical and structural choices rather than overt judgement. Metaphors such as *outsourcing thinking, erosion of skills, surveillance economy*, and *corrosive content* implicitly conceptualise AI as a force of decay, control and moral danger. These metaphors structure perception by framing technological change as a process of gradual destruction rather than progress.

In our opinion a thorough examination of the following example is rather essential. The expression "a golden age of stupidity" is both a metaphor and a hyperbole. It's a striking example of how these rhetorical figures combine for a maximum effect. On the one hand, the author creates a new concept, proposing to have a look at the current state (abundant ignorance, irrationality, superficiality) as a historical era characterized not by the flourishing of wisdom, but, in his ironic opinion, by the "flourishing" of stupidity. This is a classic conceptual metaphor. On the other hand, intentional exaggeration is used for emotional impact and to strengthen the author's evaluation. It's unlikely that the author literally believes that we live in a historical period that future generations will call the "golden age of stupidity." Strategic exaggeration serves to give sarcasm maximum sharpness, turning it into a weapon of shock value and provocation. Hyperbole makes the idea more memorable and emphasizes the depth of the author's pessimism and condemnation. Finally, we can conclude that this is a metaphorical hyperbole, or a hyperbolic metaphor. It uses the power of metaphor to create a new perspective on reality and the power of hyperbole to make this evaluation as sharp and uncompromising as possible. This expression was used in The Guardian as the headline of an article mocking or lamenting the state of modern society. Metaphor structures the thought, while hyperbole infuses it with emotional and evaluative energy. In this case, they create a concentrated and powerful form of critical expression.

The collection of metaphors from English-language media forms a coherent critical language for describing the digital age, where technological progress is understood through images of decline, erosion, and moral anxiety. These metaphors do not simply illustrate phenomena; they form a distinct axiological field – a system of value judgments expressing profound concerns about fundamental shifts in society, the economy, and human nature. They paint a picture of a world where the logic of efficiency and automation conflicts with the values of autonomy, equality, and authenticity. For example, the metaphors *outsourcing thinking* and *erosion of skills* convey the attitude that human thought and skill are the highest value, corroded by dependence on technology. This anxiety is strengthened by images of systemic pressure and irreversible damage. *Corrosive content* and *automation logic* depict technological systems not as neutral instruments, but as active, almost chemically aggressive forces (*corrosive*) or as a blind, fatalistic ideology (*logic*) that subjugates human decisions. *Surveillance economy* completes this picture by revealing the hidden, anti-human foundation of such a system – total control and profit-taking from data as its primary imperative. Along with criticizing internal decline, metaphors severely condemn social divides and moral compromises. *Skills chasm* is a powerful image of social inequality, where a skills gap becomes an unbridgeable chasm, threatening the integrity of society. The *fig leaf approach* shifts the critique to an ethical dimension, exposing the hypocrisy of government and corporations that cover up unacceptable practices with paltry justifications – a modern version of the biblical fig leaf. It is a language that not only describes digital transformations, but evaluates them from the perspective of threats to human dignity, democracy, and social justice, fulfilling the role of a contemporary cultural-critical mythology.

Euphemisms (*recent challenges, philanthropic gifts*) are used ironically, exposing attempts to mask structural problems or reputational manipulation. Ideologically loaded terms like *labour market* foreground power relations and inequality, while nominalisations (*dependence, displacement, erosion*) abstract responsibility and highlight outcomes over agents, intensifying the sense of systemic crisis.

Syntactically, presuppositions (*the challenges posed by AI*) and cause–effect constructions (*this has led to weaker skills*) present negative consequences as self-evident facts, discouraging alternative interpretations. Passive constructions (*standards have been lowered*) subtly assign blame without naming responsible actors, reinforcing institutional critique.

Stylistically, irony (*effortless learning*) and allusion (*brave new world of AI*) encode scepticism and dystopian anxiety, inviting readers to question overly optimistic narratives. Pragmatically, AI is framed as an ethical and social risk, while plural voices and dissenting opinions are foregrounded, constructing criticism itself as a value.

In The Astana Times, implicit evaluation performs an opposite function. Metaphors such as *academic hub, building a brand, human capital*, and *knowledge economy* conceptualise education primarily as an economic resource and a tool of geopolitical positioning. These metaphors implicitly legitimise instrumental and market-oriented approaches to education while marginalising humanistic or ethical concerns. Nominalisation (*modernisation, development, expansion*) and passive constructions (*agreements were signed, programs*

were launched) create an impression of objective, inevitable progress, backgrounding agency and potential responsibility for outcomes.

Presuppositional structures play a crucial role in shaping consensus in *The Astana Times*. The *need to adapt to global change* or the assumption that international rankings and foreign campuses inherently signify success remain largely unquestioned. Notably, implicit evaluation is reinforced through strategic silence: alternative viewpoints, risks, and potential failures are systematically underrepresented or omitted entirely. This silence itself functions as an evaluative strategy, sustaining optimism and legitimising policy through omission.

Thus, a comparative analysis of the British and Kazakhstani media discourses confirms that explicit and implicit evaluations function not as isolated linguistic devices, but as interconnected levels of axiological coding within a media text. Explicit markers ensure the direct articulation of a value position, while implicit means form a stable interpretive framework within which the reader reconstructs the "obvious" meaning of what is happening.

Conclusion. In conclusion, it should be noted that this study has examined the linguistic means of expressing axiological attitudes in English-language media discourse through a comparative analysis of *The Guardian* and *The Astana Times*, with a particular focus on explicit and implicit evaluation. The findings demonstrate that evaluation in media discourse functions not merely as a stylistic or expressive device but as a central mechanism of ideological and value construction.

The analysis reveals that *The Guardian* and *The Astana Times* embody two contrasting axiological models of social development. *The Guardian* predominantly constructs education and artificial intelligence as ethically charged, problematic and potentially risky domains. This evaluative orientation is realised through a dense network of explicitly negative lexical markers, emotive and stylistic intensification, and implicitly through metaphoric framing, presuppositions, nominalisation and irony. Together, these strategies promote critical reflection, ethical vigilance and scepticism towards narratives of technological inevitability.

In contrast, *The Astana Times* consistently frames education and digital transformation as drivers of progress, national competitiveness and global integration. Explicitly positive evaluation dominates across lexical, grammatical and stylistic levels, while implicit strategies such as legitimisation through authority, naturalisation of reform processes, presuppositional necessity and strategic silence contribute to the construction of a consensual and optimistic discourse. In this model, potential risks and contradictions are backgrounded, and progress is presented as both desirable and unavoidable.

Importantly, the study shows that identical thematic domains do not generate convergence in media representation. On the contrary, shared topics become sites of ideological divergence, where different value systems are articulated and reinforced through distinct configurations of evaluation. Explicit and implicit evaluative mechanisms interact to guide readers' interpretation of social reality, shaping attitudes towards education, technology and development in culturally and politically specific ways.

The results of this research contribute to the broader field of media linguistics and axiological studies by demonstrating the analytical value of combining explicit and implicit evaluation within a unified interpretative framework. The findings may be relevant for further comparative studies of media discourse, particularly in contexts where global themes are refracted through different national, ideological and cultural lenses. Future research could extend this approach to a wider range of media outlets, languages and socio-political settings in order to deepen understanding of how evaluative discourse participates in the construction of social values and collective worldviews.

Conflict of interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

REFERENCES:

1. Anisimov S.F. *Vvedenie v aksiologiyu* [Introduction to Axiology]. Moscow, Sovremennyy'e tetradi, 2001, 128 p. (In Russian)
2. Baryshkov V.P. *Aksiologiya* [Axiology]. Saratov, Nauka Izdatel'skij Centr, 2009, 65 p. (In Russian)
3. Abdusattarova S.F. *Features of T. Parsons' social systems*. *Modern Innovations*, 2021, no. 2 (40), pp. 42–43. (In Russian)
4. Sokolova, S.N. *Duhovnaya bezopasnost' lichnosti v informacionno-obrazovatel'nom prostranstve* [Spiritual security of the individual in the information and educational space]. Minsk, RIPO, 2025, 213 p. (In Russian)
5. Starostina Yu.S., Chekulai, I.V., Prokhorova, O.N. *Functional set of axiological dominants within English discourse-communicative space*. *Vestnik of Samara University. History, Pedagogics, Philology*, 2021, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 184–189.
6. Zhabo N.I., Avdonina, M.Yu., Chernysheva, I.B. *Axiological space of media text*. *Vestnik of Moscow City University. Philosophical Sciences*, 2021, no. 1 (37), pp. 32–39. DOI: 10.25688/2078-9238.2021.37.1.03
7. Nersesova, T.E. *Aksiologicheskaya osnova mediakontenta kak sposob formirovaniya sub"ektivnogo vospriyatiya kul'turny'h cennostej obshchestva i ix ocenki* [Axiological basis of media content as a means of forming subjective perception of cultural values]. *Media Theory*, 2011, no. 2. (In Russian)

8. Polikarpova, E.V. **Aksiologicheskie funktsii mass-media v sovremennom obshchestve** [Axiological functions of mass media in modern society]. Rostov-on-Don, IPPK pri RSU, 2002, 66 p. (In Russian)
9. Smirnova O.V., Svitich, L.G. **Axiology of journalism in academic discourse: research experience of the Faculty of Journalism of Moscow State University.** *MediaAlmanakh*, 2024, no. 5 (124), pp. 20–26. DOI: 10.30547/mediaalmanakh.5.2024.2026
10. Arutyunova N.D. **Tipy' yazykovy'h znachenii: Ocenka. Soby'tie. Fakt** [Types of linguistic meanings: Evaluation. Event. Fact]. Moscow, Nauka, 1988, 339 p. (In Russian)
11. Wierzbicka A. **Language. Culture. Cognition.** Moscow, Russkie slovari, 1996, 416 p. (In Russian)
12. Martin J.R., White, P.R.R. **The language of evaluation: appraisal in English.** London, Palgrave Macmillan, 2005, 271 p.
13. Prihodko G., Pryhodchenko O., Zaluzhna M., Moroshkina G. **Strategies and tactics of evaluative discourse.** *Proceedings of the International Scientific Conference on Innovation in Science and Education (ISC-SAI 2020)*, Atlantis Press, 2020, pp. 1–7.
14. Fairclough, N. **Critical Discourse Analysis: Critical Study of Language.** 2nd ed. London, Routledge, 2010, 608 p.
15. Wolf E.M. **Funktsional'naya semantika ocenki** [Functional semantics of evaluation]. Moscow, Editorial URSS, 2002, 280 p. (In Russian)
16. Sammany, M.H. **Semantic features of euphemisms in the Russian language.** *Young Scientist*, 2014, no. 6 (65), pp. 643–649. (In Russian)
17. Trang D. **Jean Jacques Rousseau's concept of freedom and equality in the Social Contract.** Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/trans/a/CYJ9F7tzjdsMD5Nb8vZwms/?lang=en> (accessed 15 August 2026)
17. Nickerson Ch. **Value consensus in sociology.** Available at: <https://www.simplypsychology.org/value-consensus.html> (accessed 28 August 2026)

Received: 20 August 2026. **Accepted:** 10 September 2026. **Published:** 30 September 2026.

Information about the authors:

Ryssayeva Yelena Andreevna – Master of Philology, Lecturer, Department of philology and practical linguistics, Akhmet Baytursynuly Regional University, Republic of Kazakhstan, 110000, Kostanay, tel.: 87052544888, e-mail: helena-85@bk.ru

Fedorova Marina Leonidovna* – Senior Lecturer, Department of philology and practical linguistics, Akhmet Baytursynuly Regional University, Republic of Kazakhstan, 110000, Kostanay, tel.: 87015304906, e-mail: andreyfed31@mail.ru

Рысаева Елена Андреевна – филология ғылымдарының магистрі, оқытушы, филология және практикалық лингвистика кафедрасы, Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы атындағы ҚӨУ, Қазақстан Республикасы, Қостанай қ., тел.: 87052544888, e-mail: helena-85@bk.ru

Федорова Марина Леонидовна* – филология және практикалық лингвистика кафедрасының аға оқытушысы, Ахмет Байтұрсынұлы атындағы КӨУ, Қазақстан Республикасы, Қостанай қ, тел 87015304906, e-mail: andreyfed31@mail.ru

Рысаева Елена Андреевна – магистр филологических наук, преподаватель кафедры филологии и практической лингвистики, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмета Байтұрсынұлы, Республика Казахстан, 110000 г. Костанай, тел.: 87052544888, e-mail: helena-85@bk.ru.

Федорова Марина Леонидовна* – старший преподаватель кафедры филологии и практической лингвистики, Костанайский региональный университет имени Ахмета Байтұрсынұлы, Республика Казахстан, тел.: 87015304906, e-mail: andreyfed31@mail.ru.