

Hedging in ESL: a Case Study of Lithuanian Learners

Inesa Šeškauskienė

Abstract. Recently hedging has been extensively studied in different language activities (reading, speaking and writing) with a particular focus on academic English. Its importance for generating an increasingly dialogical academic text nowadays can hardly be questioned.

The present paper focuses on the use of hedging devices by L2 users of English, more specifically, by Lithuanian undergraduate students majoring in English. The investigation draws on the data collected from the Lithuanian students' BA papers written according to Swales' IMRAD model (Swales 1990). The research has been limited to the introductions of the papers, which were subjected to peer-review before submission. The findings do not support the view that L2 users of English can hardly notice hedges in the text (see Low 1996; Hyland 2000). Even more, more advanced and proficient learners of English are able to produce texts which in terms of hedging are comparable to those produced by experienced academics.

Key words: *hedging; Lithuanian learners; ELT; ESL; Lexical Invisibility Hypothesis (LIH); research paper; academic discourse.*

Introduction

Hedging in academic discourse seems to generate enormous interest among linguists working in different areas and using different methodologies. Researchers have been particularly interested in the cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary variation of hedging. The most popular disciplines subjected to linguistic analysis include sociology, medicine, hard vs. soft sciences (Salager-Meyer 1989; Skelton 1988; Varttala 2001; Hyland 2000). The majority of researchers focus on English; those who undertake cross-linguistic research usually also depart from English. Studies into other languages (for example, Bulgarian, Russian, Lithuanian, Portuguese and German), though often performed from the point of view of English, identify quite specific problems and suggest interesting results concerning the frequency and nature of hedging (see Aloisevičienė 2007; Vassileva 1997; Namsarayev 1997; Šeškauskienė 2005; Figueiredo-Silva 2001; Kreutz and Harres 1997).

Interestingly, early research into hedging focused on spoken rather than written language; however, recent decades have witnessed an upsurge of interest in written, mainly academic discourse. Naturally, such interest has generated a variety of research frameworks ranging from speech act theory (Brown, Levinson 1987; Low 1996) to principles of categorisation (Taylor 1995) to cognitive linguistics to discourse analysis to sociolinguistics (Holmes 1995).

Background and scope of the problem. The Lexical Invisibility Hypothesis (LIH)

The research of recent decades has shifted from more general to more specific problems concerning hedging, particularly focusing on one or another area of language application, like ELT and ESP (Roldan Riejos 2004), learner language vs native speaker or learner vs specialist language. In learner language linguists seem to have taken interest in both the receptive and productive skills of

language learning/ teaching: reading (Figueiredo-Silva 2001), speaking (Low 1996) and writing (Hyland 1995).

The present research has evolved at the crossroads of several intersecting lines: interest in hedging as a discursal, socio-pragmatic phenomenon, as it is reflected in L2 English writing and cross-linguistic and cross-cultural aspects of hedging. More specifically, the present research addresses the Lexical Invisibility Hypothesis (LIH). The LIH claims that in the text intensifiers are 'invisible' whereas hedges are even more 'invisible' (Low 1996; Hyland 2000). Experiments launched with the aim of measuring the 'invisibility' of textual modifiers in L2 readers resulted in confirming the initial hypothesis (ibid.). Interestingly, Low's (1996) study focused on the language of questionnaires intended for native speakers of English, students in various fields ranging from engineering to history to English. Hyland (2000) confirmed the LIH for academic reading involving L2 learners of English.

In actual communication, either written or spoken, it seems quite natural to foreground the propositional content and background the (meta)discursal elements, like hedging, which help render 'shades of meaning' and interpersonal politeness. Also, if Low's (1996) investigation confirms the LIH for reading, a receptive skill, dismissing the interpersonal layer of the text seems to be even more likely in language production, like writing. However, the above findings seem quite contradictory in respect to language proficiency level; they contrast with the findings of other researchers, for example, Wishnoff (2000) and Lewin (2005). Both researchers studied non-native advanced speakers; however, Lewin (2005) focused more on reading, whereas Wishnoff (2000) was interested in writing. In both cases students were of sufficiently high language proficiency level to be able to understand and produce both propositional content and (meta)discursal elements of the academic text. Thus both researchers at the end of their investigation concluded that L2 students were very conscious of hedges in reading or writing scientific texts.

In this context, the present research aims at testing the LIH on non-native speakers (NNS) of English—Lithuanian students majoring in English and writing their graduation papers in linguistics or language-related areas. More specifically, for the present investigation I have formulated the following objectives: to identify whether the L2 proficiency level contributes to raising the learners' awareness of hedging when producing their own academic texts; to identify most frequent hedges and account for their usage; also to discuss the impact of L1 on the acquisition of hedges.

Hedging and ELT

The academic text is nowadays increasingly understood as dialogical where the author and the addressee are involved in an academic discourse governed by certain conventions; the author's and the addressee's 'voices' are recognisable from the use of specific techniques, including hedging. It is generally assumed that hedging and boosting "help academics gain acceptance for their work by balancing conviction with caution" (Hyland 2000: p179), and confirm the scientist's membership in the academic community. In ELT contexts, it is important that learners acquire the 'right kind of language' adequate not only for expressing their ideas in the selected field (the propositional content) but also for bearing pragmatic, cognitive and rhetorical value which contributes to the overall meaning of the text. This 'non-propositional' language manifests the degree of the confidence of the author in her/ his proposition which is, according to Crompton (1997: p281), "not only the confidence the author has, but also the confidence s/ he feels appropriate to display".

Hedging: how to define the term?

Since the pioneering work of Lakoff in 1975 or even earlier of Weinreich in 1966 (both discussed in Aijmer 1986: p1), the understanding of hedging has been considerably modified. It is now generally assumed that hedging is a characteristic feature of academic discourse, signalling a 'subdued dialogue' between the reader and the writer who are both are part of the academic community.

Each language manifests its own cultural features of interpersonal communication which clearly transcend the purely linguistic area and bring into focus a number of pragmatic issues. English as a *lingua franca* is rather flexible in adopting numerous new features, coining new terms and finding many new ways of expression. However, the international research community, writing in English, can hardly disregard well-established conventions of interpersonal communication. The English language, even when used exclusively for academic and research purposes, which seemingly prioritises the propositional content over and above the expression of interpersonal relations, has deeply ingrained strategies of dialogical communication. Hedging, as one of the most important aspects in the texture of interaction between the reader and the writer/researcher is often perceived as contributing to the subtlety and flexibility of the text as well as the persuasiveness of the ideas.

Though seemingly well-known and hardly debatable, the term *hedging* seems to be interpreted in different ways. Traditionally, it refers to the fuzziness of notions; however, in linguistic literature the term remains no less fuzzy. An array of definitions focus on different linguistic and pragmatic features of communication; many identify the textual and social function of hedging (Aijmer 1984; Holmes 1995; Hyland 1996). The social function mainly consists in helping achieve distance between a speaker and what is said (Hyland 1996). In writing, according to Hyland (1996: p435), it "helps support or establish the personal reputation of the writer". Other investigators enumerate such functions of hedging as down-toning and mitigating the argument. They relate it to the speaker's intentions, listener/ reader involvement, situation and context (see Kreutz and Harres 1997), the protection of the speaker's and the hearer's face and modification of the illocutionary force of an utterance (Namsarayev 1997).

All of the above features seem to cover the main functions of hedging in the text. However, when it comes to the actual analysis, the above definitions can hardly be of any help, since the distinction between a hedge and non-hedge becomes problematic. In this paper I adopt the most plausible and technically most viable interpretation of the term taken from Crompton (1997). He defines hedging as a linguistic strategy allowing the author to avoid committing to the truth of a proposition. This understanding does not contradict many other definitions or functions attributed to hedging, like establishing the writer's reputation in the discourse community (see, for example, Hyland 1996). Crompton also suggests a technique which helps identify hedges. He claims that a proposition is considered hedged only if the unhedged version does not change the propositional content. The definition does not limit hedging to a closed set of elements; it does, however, help identify hedges in the text.

Subjects, data, procedure

The present analysis is based on the texts produced by fourth-year undergraduate students majoring in English at the Department of English Philology of Vilnius University in 2005. The majority of them are native speakers of Lithuanian. The corpus constitutes about 40 000 words and includes 31 introductions of the students' graduation theses which they have to submit for defence by the end of their four-year studies. The first drafts of the introductions were produced for research-in-progress seminars, peer reviewed, amended and submitted to the teacher. All papers were written on linguistics or language-related areas.

It should be noted that students take academic writing courses as part of their curriculum throughout all four years of their studies. They start with essay writing; then move on to writing reports, proposals, term papers and end with writing graduation research papers. The generally adopted structure of a research paper at the Department of English Philology is Swales' IMRAD (introduction, methods, results and discussion, see Swales and Feak 1994). According to it, the introduction is the part which gives the rationale of the whole paper. It starts with giving background to the problem and the chosen field by reviewing major sources, then identifies a niche for the

research undertaken and raises a research question to be solved. This approach to writing introductions has been defined by genre specialists as the CARS model (create a research space, see Swales 1990).

In the course of their studies undergraduates get acquainted with the conventions of academic (meta)discourse. They become aware of such features of textual and interpersonal metadiscourse as connectives (e.g. *in addition, therefore*), evidentials (e.g. *according to A, X maintains*), attitude markers (e.g. *surprisingly*), hedges etc., a choice between active and passive voice, tense forms, referencing in the text, mentioning the author, a choice between paraphrase and quoting, mitigating a claim etc. Throughout their undergraduate studies they are exposed to various academic genres. They are given writing tasks and receive advice from the instructor on various aspects of academic writing, including hedge identification and use.

In the process of writing the students are also involved in peer-reviewing, which usually requires, among other things, some guidance by the instructor. When reviewing their peers' papers, students are asked to render their responses to the texts focusing on certain established points: the structure of the text, evaluation of different authors' approaches, transition between paragraphs, proper quoting and paraphrase, hedging, academic style etc. It should be noted that neither the process of teaching/ learning nor the peer review focus exclusively on hedging, but rather on a variety of features of written academic discourse including hedging. The present investigation is not seen as directly related to the intricacies of the students' learning of hedging strategies but rather to their ability to produce/ use hedges as related to their language proficiency level.

The present research has been limited to investigating only the introductions of BA papers. The limitation has been imposed due to the following reasons. Introductions are generally thought of as less hedged sections than Discussions, but more hedged than Methods (Hyland 1995: pp37-38). This understanding is quite natural since discussion requires judgements and comments more than any other section. However, the Introduction, where the author mainly gives an overview of previous research, identifies alternative frameworks for his/ her research and finds himself/ herself a niche, is not devoid of hedging. In this section the author should clearly give an evaluation of the sources and express his/ her point of view as to which framework s/ he adopts. Evaluation usually involves criticism, which, in its turn, requires caution expressed by hedging.

There is also a very practical reason. During the course which only takes several months in spring, the students are pressed for time. Therefore, their introduction, which is one of the first writing assignments in the course, is the task they can cope with. The students manage to submit their introductions for peer review and get feedback from their peers. The discussion section, however, is often written late in spring, sometimes when the course is already over. Therefore, no feedback from the student's peers is possible. So introductions are thought to be more mature than discussions. However, if seen in a larger framework of investigation, other sections of the students' papers might be treated as areas of further research.

The procedure of investigation consisted of hedge identification, frequency calculation and interpretation of results. Several sensitive points arose from this methodology. One was the use of quotations in the students' texts. Some students avoided paraphrase and tended to give preference to quotations in all possible cases. Therefore quotations were excluded from the overall count. So were lists of references.

The other point requiring clarification is concerned with calculating hedging devices (hedges). Following the procedure, hedges were only identified in utterances where their unhedged versions did not change the propositional content. The procedure excluded automatic count and involved a fairly large amount of manual work. For example, in examples (1) - (4), sentences (1) and (3) are hedged, whereas (2) and (4) are unhedged:

- (1) *The cognitive approach seems to be more valid and more helpful for the understanding of the nature of idiom (...)*
- (2) *The cognitive approach is more valid (...)*

It is particularly relevant in cases when hedges are expressed by modal verbs, e.g.

- (3) *[...] Genre properties [...] can clearly be attributed to acknowledgement texts vs. genre properties (...)*
- (4) *[...] Genre properties are clearly attributed to acknowledgement texts (...)*

It should also be noted that cases of conversion were treated as one hedge rather than two different hedges, like *attempt* used as a verb and *attempt* used as a noun. However, *might* and *could* were treated not as grammatical forms of *may* and *can* but as different hedges. The approach is based on semantic considerations as *can* vs *could* and *may* vs *might* render different meanings. This approach is in line with many modern English grammars (see, for example, CGE 2006). To sum up, hedge identification and frequency calculation was based primarily on semantic and functional criteria.

General results

The total number of hedges in the corpus of 40 000 words amounted to 574 items. The overall frequency of hedges per 100 words was 1.45. Interestingly, the same figure appeared in Hyland's plenary presentation in the BAAHE Conference (Hyland 2006). He had researched articles of competent speakers in 8 disciplines, both in soft and hard sciences. In his corpus, the frequency of hedges amounted to 14.5 per 1000 words. Soft sciences, due to their interpretative nature, manifested a higher frequency of hedges, for example, 18.5 hedges per 1000 words in philosophy or 18.02 in applied linguistics. However, Hyland (2006) did not discriminate between native and non-native writers of English, nor did he limit his research to a particular section of a research paper.

My corpus included 47 different hedges. According to the frequency of occurrence, they can be roughly divided into two frequency bands: those which occurred 9 or fewer times in the corpus (29 hedges) and those whose frequency was between 10 and 84 occurrences (18 hedges). Table 1 shows the five most frequent hedges with frequencies between 5 and 14.6 per cent in the total corpus of hedges.

They account for 42.9 per cent of the total number of hedges. Table 2 provides the results of frequency counts for the next 13 hedges (frequency between 1.8 and 5 per cent of all hedges) which account for 43.5 per cent of all hedges. The least frequent hedges included those mentioned between 1 and 9 times and thus below the frequency of 1.8 %. They include the following words and phrases: *apparently, basically, fairly, largely, possibly, seemingly, somehow, virtually, slightly, supposed to be, intends to, as if, more or less, so called* and *in a bit different way*. About half of them occurred just once. Some of them, like *basically*, are more characteristic of spoken discourse and naturally tend to be less frequent in writing. Also the least frequent hedges are either longer words or phrases; the most frequent hedges are mainly very short words.

Table 1. Most frequent hedges (over 5 % of total)

	Hedges	Items, total	% of total
1	<i>Can</i>	84	14.6
2	<i>Some</i>	51	8.9
3	<i>May</i>	47	8.2
4	<i>Try</i>	33	5.8
5	<i>Certain</i>	31	5.4
Total:		246	42.9

Table 2. Other hedges (1.8-5 % of total)

	Hedges	Items, total	% of total
6	<i>Attempt</i>	27	4.7
7	<i>Quite</i>	27	4.7
8	<i>Seem</i>	26	4.5
9	<i>Would</i>	26	4.5
10	<i>Could</i>	25	4.4
11	<i>Rather</i>	24	4.2
12	<i>Appear</i>	17	3.0
13	<i>Little</i>	17	3.0
14	<i>Tend</i>	16	2.8
15	<i>Possible</i>	13	2.3
16	<i>Kind of</i>	10	1.8
17	<i>Likely</i>	10	1.8
18	<i>Mainly</i>	10	1.8
Total:		248	43.5

Interpretation of results: *can, may, seem, appear*

My corpus has manifested a high frequency of modals, which is in conformity with the general tendency of hedging in English. Thus *can* and *may* are among the five most frequent hedges in the total corpus (see Table 1) and are used in a variety of utterances as in the following:

- (5) *The basic meaning of the verb "seem" can be defined as [...]*
- (6) *Unwillingness to answer the interviewer's questions may be explained in terms of the 'adversarial character' of contemporary journalism [...]*

From the ELT point of view, the high frequency of modals signals their fairly easy acquisition by non-native speakers. The two frequent modals *can* and *may* are unlikely to cause problems for Lithuanian speakers of English. One possible reason for that could be that *can* and *may* are

rendered in Lithuanian as one word (i.e. through the infinitive *galeti* and the inflected forms of the verb). Also the process is facilitated by the language feature that the use of the above modals in English and Lithuanian is accomplished through the same grammatical pattern (*can/may* + Infinitive). Another interesting point is that students sometimes find it rather difficult to discriminate between *can* and *may*. The problem is often resolved by giving preference to more frequent and easier *can*, which is also reflected in my findings (see Table 1).

The other two hedges, *seem* and *appear*, are synonymous; in Lithuanian they are often rendered through *atrodo* or *rodos*. If taken together, the two English hedges make up a fairly high proportion of the corpus of hedges in the students' papers: *seem* – 4.5 % and *appear* – 3 %. However, their usage is different from the Lithuanian *atrodyti*, the prototypical equivalent of *seem* and *appear*. In Lithuanian, whenever used as a hedge, *atrodyti* mainly occurs parenthetically, like in the following:

- (7) *Atrodo, jis klysta.* <[It] seems, he is wrong.>

Hence a fairly low frequency of *seem* and *appear* (the former is more frequent than the latter) can be explained by the fact that students manifesting a higher language proficiency level more aptly acquire the structure *seem to be*, whereas others tend to avoid it and either use other hedges instead or avoid using them altogether. Sometimes it may depend on individual preferences (see section 10).

Interpretation of results: *try* and *attempt*

These two words come rather close in meaning and subsequently in usage. However, the first is rather neutral whereas the second is more formal, which makes the former easier to acquire. It accounts for a slightly higher frequency of *try* in the students' texts (*try* – 5.8 %; *attempt* – 4.7 % of the total corpus of hedges). Moreover, *try* is easier in that it is mainly used as a verb, whereas *attempt* can be used as both: a noun and a verb, e.g.:

- (8) *He tries to distinguish between different types of writing found in newspapers and to determine genres [...]*
- (9) *The paper also attempts to prove the stylistic complexity of taglines which results in a poetic language as one of the main features defining this genre.*
- (10) *This paper is an attempt to identify certain trends in strategies of paying compliments and responding to them and to discover cross-cultural similarities [...]*

Thus a more formal register and different structural patterns explain the lower frequency of the hedge *appear*; therefore, preference is given to the easier *try*.

Interpretation of results: *some* and *certain*

These two determiners seem to be extremely important for Lithuanian users of English. This is attested by the high frequency of their usage: *some* makes up 8.9 %, *certain* – 5.4 % of the total number of hedges. The main reason for the high frequencies is the flexive character of the Lithuanian language. It has no articles, so Lithuanians find it very difficult to learn their proper use. Therefore, serving as determiners of indefiniteness, *some* and *certain*, for some Lithuanians seem to replace the indefinite article. So

it usually takes time to acquire the proper use of *some* and *certain* and not to confuse them as in the following:

- (11) *Predtechenskaya (2005) also expresses the idea that headlines have some certain common words.*

In some cases the two hedges are ‘overused’ blurring the main idea of the text, e. g.:

- (12) *A certain attractive idea is presented as having some relation to the advertised product [...]*

Sentence (12) is not ungrammatical; however, it is very indefinite and lacks precision.

Other results. Individual preferences

Interestingly, students prefer short hedges and stick to conventional ways of hedging, trying to use modal verbs, markers of indefiniteness, quantifiers (*quite, little*), structures with *seem to, tend to* etc. However, such structures as *the results imply* or *the investigation seeks to* (...) are usually avoided. The former has not been found at all and the latter had only 2 tokens. One of possible reasons for that could be fairly low frequency of the so-called ‘middle-voice’ structures in Lithuanian in general, whereas English is very productive in it (see Kemmer 1993).

An awareness of academic conventions also involves the awareness of register, which for some students seems to be difficult to attain. Therefore elements from spoken language sometimes find their way into the students’ written discourse, e.g. *as if, kind of, more or less* etc. These elements usually serve as hedges; however, cases of inappropriate register in my corpus were rather rare.

Another interesting feature is concerned with individual preferences. In Table 3 below 4 frequency bands are given. They show that the majority of students in the collected corpus tend to use from 1 to 1.5 hedges per 100 words.

Table 3. Distribution of hedges in the collected corpus

Frequency bands (FB): no hedges/ 100 words	FB 1 0-0.5	FB 2 0.51-1.0	FB 3 1.0-1.5	FB 4 1.51>
No of papers (Total: 31)	3	9	11	8

However, the variation in the frequency of hedges across the papers of approximately 1700 words is remarkable. In one paper of slightly over 1700 words there were just five hedges (frequency 0.294 hedges per 100 words; cf. 1.45 hedges per 100 words in the total corpus). In another paper the frequency of hedges reached 2.5 per 100 words. In still another paper there were 27 hedges found with *can* used just once (the most frequent hedge in the total corpus), and *seem* and *appear* occurring five and four times, respectively.

Conclusions

This investigation has shown that the LIH does not work in the texts produced by more advanced and proficient non-native users of English. Moreover, the present investigation has established that hedging in L2 of proficient users of English has not been less frequent than the average frequency of hedging in the papers of competent users of

English and acknowledged researchers in both hard and soft sciences (cf. Hyland 2006). Quite surprisingly, the figures seem to coincide: 1.45 hedges per 100 words in the present investigation and 14.5 per 1000 words in Hyland’s study. However, when the frequency of hedging is compared between fairly proficient L2 students of English writing research papers in linguistics, one of the ‘soft’ sciences, and competent users of English writing papers in applied linguistics, the latter appear to use hedging more frequently (see Hyland 2006).

The results may have been affected by several factors, namely the choice of texts and the choice of subjects. First, research paper introductions are generally thought of as less hedged than discussions. Since Hyland did not limit his investigation to a particular section of a research paper but took whole papers, the frequency of hedging in the present research seems sufficiently high.

Second, Hyland did not indicate whether he dealt with native or non-native speakers of English. Presumably, there were both. Therefore the findings based on the language used by L2 users might be compared to Hyland’s findings only with certain reservations. Still the comparison would interestingly point out at the fact that proficient L2 users tend to master academic language conventions sufficiently well and are rather sensitive to both – positional and non-propositional content of the text. In passing, it could also be noted that conscious teaching of hedging and/ or the choice of post-graduate students might have resulted in a higher frequency of hedges and thus would have confirmed the hypothesis even more.

In this context, linguists (see Hyland 1995: p39 and his overview of other authors’ ideas) often discuss the factor of the socio-pragmatic background of subjects. It is mainly concerned with the need to hedge in a particular linguistic community. Hyland claims (1995: p39) that hedging represents a major “rhetorical gap” for L2 students and that they often transfer hedging strategies from their L1 irrespective of language proficiency level. However, the present study has revealed slightly different tendencies. The students chosen for this study major in English and are influenced by both English conventions of interpersonal communication coming through English texts and Lithuanian conventions in every-day life. The results of the present investigation show that the interference of the socio-pragmatic background has been largely overestimated. Even assuming that discourse features of academic writing are culture specific, the present investigation could be seen as a proof to the claim that when acquiring a language, many NNS also acquire many of its textual and (meta)discoursal features, including hedging, boosting, person and attitude markers, connectives etc. At an advanced level of language proficiency, L2 users are able to say what they mean and adopt strategies of how best to do that. Hedging is one of the strategies they have mastered fairly well.

References

- Aijmer, K. (1986) Discourse Variation and Hedging, *Costerus (Corpus Linguistics II)* 57.
- Alosevičienė, E. (2007) Hedžingo priemonės politiniame diskurse (lyginamoji vokiečių ir lietuvių kalbų analizė), daktaro disertacijos santrauka, Kaunas.
- Brown, P., Levinson, S. (1987) Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage, CUP, Cambridge.
- Carter, R., McCarthy, M. (2006) Cambridge Grammar of English, CUP, Cambridge.
- Crompton, P. (1997) Hedging in Academic Writing: Some Theoretical Problems, *English for Specific Purposes*, no. 16.4.
- Figueiredo-Silva, M. (2001) Teaching Academic Reading: Some Initial Findings from a Session on Hedging, *Proceedings of the Post-graduate Conference 2001*, Edinburgh. [Retrieved January 2006, from www.ling.ed.ac.uk/~pgc/archive/2001/Isabel-Figueiredo-Silva01.pdf].
- Holmes, J. (1995) Women, Men and Politeness, Longman.
- Hyland, K. (1995) The Author in the Text: Hedging Scientific Writing, *Hong-Kong Papers in Linguistics and Language Teaching*, no. 18.
- Hyland, K. (1996) Writing without Conviction? Hedging in Science Research Articles, *Applied Linguistics*, no. 17.4.
- Hyland, K. (2000) Hedges, Boosters and Lexical Invisibility: Noticing Modifiers in Academic Texts, *Language Awareness*, no. 9-4.
- Hyland, K. (2006) Disciplinary Voices: Interactions in Research Writing, Plenary presentation at the 3rd International BAAHE Conference, Leuven, 7-9 December 2006.
- Kemmer, S. (1993) The Middle Voice, John Benjamins.
- Kreutz, H., Harres, A. (1997) Some Observations on the Distribution and Function of Hedging in German and English Academic Writing, *Culture and Styles of Academic Discourse*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Lewin, B., A. (2005) Hedging: Authors' and Readers' Identification of 'Toning Down' in Scientific Texts, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, no. 4.
- Low, G. (1996) Intensifiers and Hedges in Questionnaire Items and the Lexical Invisibility Hypothesis, *Applied Linguistics*, no. 17.
- Myers, G. (1989) The Pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles, *Applied Linguistics*, no. 10.1.
- Namsarayev, V. (1997). Hedging in Russian Academic Writing in Sociological Texts, *Hedging and Discourse: Approaches to the Analysis of a Pragmatic Phenomenon in Academic Texts*, Mouton de Gruyter.
- Roldan Riejos, A., M. (2004) Strategic Features of ESP from a Socio-cognitive Perspective, *Iberica*, no. 7. [Retrieved January 17, 2007, from <http://labs.genos.accio.com/documents/text7-Roldan.pdf>].
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1998) Language is not a Physical Object, *English for Specific Purposes*, no. 17.
- Šeškauskienė, I. (2005) Hedging in English and Lithuanian Academic Discourse, *Innovation and Tradition. Selected Papers of the 2nd International Conference*, Vilnius University Press, Vilnius.
- Skelton, J. (1988) The Care and Maintenance of Hedges, *ELT Journal*, no. 42.1.
- Swales, J. (1990) Genre Analysis: English in Academic and Research Settings, CUP, Cambridge.
- Swales, J., Feak, Chr. (1994) Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills, The University of Michigan Press, Michigan.
- Taylor, J., R. (1995) Linguistic Categorization: Prototypes in Linguistic Theory, OUP, Oxford.
- Varttala, T. (2001) Hedging in Scientifically Oriented Discourse, (Electronic doctoral dissertation), *Acta Electronica Universitatis Tampereensis*, no. 138. [Retrieved January 31, 2007, from <http://acta.uta.fi/pdf/951-44-5195-3.pdf>].
- Vassileva, I. (1997) Hedging in English and Bulgarian Academic Writing, *Culture and Style in Academic Discourse*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin.
- Wishnoff, J., R. (2000) Hedging Your Bets: L2 Learners' Acquisition of Pragmatic Devices in Academic Writing and Computer-mediated Discourse, *Second Language Studies*, no. 19.1.

Inesa Šeškauskienė

Autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas anglų kalbos besimokančiojo kalboje (ESL): atvejo tyrimas

Santrauka

Autoriaus pozicijos švelninimas arba sąšvelnis (*hedging*) akademiniam diskurse, kuris vis labiau suprantamas kaip dialogas su skaitytoju, pastaruoju metu gana dažnai tyrinėjamas. Tiesa, nors visi autoriai pripažįsta reikšminio svarbą, tiek patyrusių rašytojų, tiek besimokančiųjų kalboje, švelninimo samprata jų darbuose gerokai skiriasi. Šiame straipsnyje laikomasi gana paplitusios sampratos, kad švelninimas yra lingvistinė strategija, leidžianti autoriui apsidrausti nuo galimos kritikos jo postuluojamų teiginių atžvilgiu.

Šiame straipsnyje pateikiami rezultatai tyrimo, kurio tikslas – patvirtinti ar paneigti hipotezę, kad kuo besimokantysis geriau moka kalbą, tuo geriau jis įvaldo ne tik diskurso, bet ir metadiskurso elementus, tokius kaip sąšvelniai. Duomenys surinkti iš 4 kurso anglų filologijos specialybės studentų baigiamųjų darbų ir sudaro apie 40 000 žodžių. Tyrimas parodė, kad skirtingai nuo Hylando ir Lowo gautų rezultatų, lietuviai, besimokantieji anglų kalbos kaip specialybės, ne tik pasyviai išmoka sąšvelnius atpažinti tekste, bet ir aktyviai juos vartoja savo produkuojamuose tekstuose, o sąšvelnių dažnumas atitinka patyrusių mokslininkų tekstuose nustatytas sąšvelnių vartojimo tendencijas. Tokie rezultatai leidžia teigti, kad kultūrinė gimtosios kalbos interferencija yra minimali, o kalbos mokymuisi didesnę įtaką daro besimokančiojo sąveika su specialybės teksta anglų kalba.

Straipsnis įteiktas 2008 06

Parengtas spaudai 2008 10

The author

Inesa Šeškauskienė, PhD (linguistics), associate professor of the English Philology Department, Vilnius University.

Research interests: cognitive linguistics, linguistic semantics, ESP, EAP, ELT, contrastive linguistics.

Address: Vilnius University, Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513 Vilnius, Lithuania.

E-mail: inesa.seskauskiene@flf.vu.lt

DOI: 10.5755/j01.sal.1.13.43324