

Калиновська Ірина. Канадські топоніми українського походження в етнолінгвістичному й лінгвокультурологічному аспектах. Як відомо, топоніми надають інформацію про історичне минуле народів, межі їх розселення, культурні, торговельні й географічні центри тощо. Будучи важливою частиною мовних даних, топоніми є вираженням не лише історії людей, але і їхньої культури, способу життя, щоденного оточення, спілкування й т. ін. У статті основну увагу зосереджено на вивченні канадських топонімів українського походження, зокрема висвітленні їхніх етнолінгвістичних і лінгвокультурних аспектів. Аналіз відображає національні особливості української етнічної групи в Канаді, її культури та історичної спадщини, які представлені в топонімах, що робить внесок у розвиток культури Канади та її духовного зростання. Визначено й проаналізовано особливості значення, походження та історичного розвитку топонімів. У перспективі слід зосередити увагу на вивченні факторів, які впливають на вживання канадських топонімів українського походження, їх класифікації за різними критеріями, порівнюючи особливості розвитку й використання топонімів в Україні та Канаді.

Ключові слова: топонім, топоніміка, українське походження, лінгвокультурний аспект, етнолінгвістичний аспект.

The article acted to the edotorial board
24.03.2016

УДК 811. 111'38:162

Larysa Kyrychuk

Boosters and Hedges as Subjectivity Markers in Research Article Conclusions

The present paper is devoted to the study of subjectivity devices, namely, boosters and hedges, in the Conclusion section of research articles. The aim of the study is to indicate the amount of these elements in the Conclusions and to reveal their pragmatic meaning. The boosters and hedges are viewed as pragmatic persuasive devices which contribute to the effective negotiation of knowledge and encouraging the audience's involvement. The quantitative analysis demonstrates that the employment of these devices is quite balanced across the research articles. The results of the discourse analysis indicate that the key pragmatic function of boosters and hedges is to build the writer-reader relationship by modifying the illocutionary force of the assertions. The research also proves that the interactional pragmatic devices can be fully understood only in the connection with the institutional context. The findings of the analysis made it possible to verify the claims about the tendency of balancing the strategies of enhancing and softening the statements and the one of a steady drop in the occurrences of boosters in academic articles.

Key words: research article, subjectivity marker, interactional device, booster, hedge.

Introduction: the Significance of the Research. It is widely recognized that an academic text is supposed to give a comprehensive view of the current state of knowledge; it involves informing on empirical research that, conventionally, must be reports objectively, that is stating facts and data. 'For many years it has been assumed that elements contributing to persuasive purpose of an author were not appropriate in academic writing. It was assumed that in this type of discourse only aseptic truth should be allowed' [18, p. 223]. Admittedly, the power of persuasion of an academic piece lies mostly in the very scholarly conception and the relativity of facts that the author states and non-contradiction of basic principles in their development. Hence, the task of a research text is clear, non-ambiguous and logical presentation of its content, otherwise it might violate the forms of intellective reasoning.

However, regardless of the general tendency to certain unification of verbal patterns scholars involves in the studies of research text indicate a considerable amount of academic subjectivity in them. In fact, the subjectivity lies in the pragmatic nature of academic writing, since its purpose is to convince the readership. The author of an academic text wishes to guide the audience through the research exposition by highlighting the factors that corroborate the final conclusions and the factors that leave room for discussion [18, p. 224].

Specifically, to convince the reader the author employs verbal expressions whose function is to modify his/her assertions or to lay a particular emphasis on some facts. In order to lead the readers to interpret their statements in the desired way academics use pragmatic interactional devices, such as boosters, hedges, attitude markers, self-mentions, etc.

The aim of the present study is to indicate the amount of the interactive elements such as boosters and hedges in the Conclusion section of academic papers and to reveal their pragmatic meaning. The results obtained

in the analysis will make it possible to verify the claim of increase in the number of hedges in research articles as compared to the number of boosters [3; 4].

Subjectivity in Academic Discourse. Since the authors strive to convince the audience in the validity of their views, academic texts are not likely to be impartial, instead they are marked by their own pragmatics. The pragmatic content of a research paper is realized by both verbal and non-verbal means as well as structural-compositional factors. Hence, the task of convincing the audience is primarily achieved by the logic of thought development and argumentation. Undeniably, research papers are the results of authors' work of mind which aims at reflecting the objective reality.

However, although the academic discourse involves sharing objective, empirically verified knowledge, this knowledge is constructed in a social context where any claim appears to be open to audience's interpretation, in other words, the new knowledge is created through interaction with one's peers [18, p. 225] and is expected to be recognized and accepted by colleagues in the academic community. New knowledge seems to be more reliable and the text is more subject to be respected as a valid source of information within the discipline when they encourage the audience's involvement. Moreover, the subjectivity in academic texts is prompted by the author's intention to distinguish his / her opinions from facts and evaluate the certainty of their assertions [9, p. 179]. While reporting on their findings the authors demonstrate the amount of their commitment or the degree of their attachment to the propositional information, that is they take a stance. Actually, pluralism, subjectivity and possibility of interpretation are widely recognized as inherent features of scientific research and knowledge construction in intellectual communication [3]

The orientation of academic text at social interaction, that is evoking the readers' responses and encouraging the academic discussion as well as the authors' wish to personalize their writing by showing their attitude towards the propositional content (that is taking a stance) testify to the subjectivity of academic writing. Drawing on recent research on the correlation between objectivity and subjectivity Legeyda A. argues that 'it is an accepted stereotype that objectivity must be seen as priority in scientific research. Scientific objectivity is, in fact, linguistically hidden subjectivity' [12, p. 49].

Subjectivity in academic discourse has been studied from terminologically and conceptually different perspectives, like appraisal, attitude, evaluation, stance, interpersonal, etc. [4, p. 129]. Hyland, in particular, believes that any metadiscourse is interpersonal and that interpersonal takes into account readers' knowledge, textual experience and readers' processing features and is realized through rhetorical devices [10; 11].

Interactional Devices. As it has been mentioned above, in order to promote their ideas and theories academic writers try to make their research exposition convincing and, at the same time, encouraging a discussion. This can be achieved by employing some interactional strategies that are realized through the use of the verbal expressions whose ultimate function is to construe and attain persuasion in academic writing and to help the authors to exercise a certain degree of their authority. 'When drafting their research for publication authors must employ rhetorical resources to interact with their readers in ways that are consistent with social rules and expectations as well as with the particular epistemological norms and conventions governing the discipline' [18, p. 222].

This kind of verbal expressions are termed as metadiscourse markers, interactional / interactive elements, pragmatic persuasive devices, etc. They supplement propositional information and enable the authors to make their positioning explicit, thus, indicate the authorial stance. K. Hyland has elaborated a metadiscourse model which includes the interactional elements such as boosters, hedges, attitude and engagement markers and self-mentions [10; 11]. The first two types of the interactional elements, namely, boosters and hedges are in the focus of our analysis.

Since the notable feature of academic writing lies in the manner of author's stancetaking towards the information that is being presented, boosters and hedges are viewed as the verbal expressions that indicate a specific type of this stancetaking: the authors use them to tone down uncertainty or potentially risky claims or to emphasize what they believe to be correct, thus, conveying appropriately collegial attitudes to the readers [9, p. 179].

Theoretical Framework. The scholars who are studying the textual functions of booster and hedges in research articles are strikingly unanimous about their linguistic nature and pragmatic implications, however, they indicate some specific features of these interactional elements. Coates (1987) holds the view that they are the indicators of epistemic modality, testifying to author's confidence or lack of confidence in the presented propositional information [1, p. 112]. Skelton (1988) points at the possibility of the pragmatic interactional elements to make language more flexible and the world more subtle rather than purely propositional [13, p. 38]. Hyland (2005) believes that boosters and hedges are the pragmatic markers of self-reflective nature used to negotiate interactional meaning in academic texts [11, p. 37]. According to him, boosters allow writers to project

a credible image of authority, decisiveness and conviction in their views, while hedges help them to demonstrate personal modesty and integrity [7; 8; 9]. Crismore, Markkanen, Steffenson (1993) view boosters and hedges as the makers of the same phenomenon, that are used to denote the writer's degree of commitment to the truth of his / her statements [2]. Vazquez and Giner (2009) also hold that boosters and hedges are both two sides of the same coin in the sense that they both contribute to the persuasive import of academic communication [18]. Holmes (1982) uses the term 'boosters' to refer to lexical items that the writer can use to show strong conviction for a statement; she suggests the term 'downtoners' for hedges defining them as the units that are used to indicate tentativeness or uncertainty [6]. Vassileva (2001) argues that boosters are the expressions of commitment whereas hedges are the expressions of detachment [17, p. 85]. Sayah and Heshemi (2014) treat boosters and hedges as the stance and engagement features of academic texts [15].

As far as the research on application and distribution of the interactional elements is concerned, scholars indicate their uneven distribution in different fields of academic discourse as well as different amount of their employment over years. They point at low-hedged and high-hedged sections of academic papers (Methods, Results) and heavily-hedged Introduction and Discussion sections. (Salager-Meyer, 1994; Hyland, 2000; Shengming, 2009; and others). Miao-Hsia Chang, Yu-Wen Lou, Yueh-Kuei Hsu (2012), Sayah and Heshmi (2014) explore the distribution of boosters and hedges across different disciplines and cultures. Danzin & Lincoln (2005), Gillaerts, Van De Velde (2010) report that boosters and attitude markers are increasingly less often used on their own but with an accompanying hedge. They claim that the combination of boosters and hedges are the strategies to mitigate a strong presence of the author's stance; they also indicate a steady rise in the use of hedges and notable drop in the occurrence of boosters in American academic texts over years. [3; 4]

Boosters and Hedges. Having reviewed the existing research works on boosters and hedges done by scholars we now can highlight their significant features.

Boosters are the interactional elements, meant to express author's certainty or commitment in regard to the claim s/he makes. They range in form from adverbs (*actually, certainly, clearly, considerably, etc.*), and adjectives (*undeniable, important, definite, etc.*) to phrases (*It is clear/true/ a fact that..., I am sure that...*). By using boosting devices writers are able to demonstrate their confidence and assurance for the propositional information. This may result in elimination of possible alternative voices or creation of an image of assertiveness in order to instill trust and confidence in the audience. Hyland argues that although the assertion of the writer's conviction can be seen as leaving little room for the reader's own interpretation, boosters also offer writers a possibility to engage with their readers and create interactional solidarity [11].

Hedges are defined as mitigation expressions used by authors to lessen the impact of their utterances and to present a proposition as an opinion rather than a fact. In general, they are designed to indicate the author's relative detachment or low commitment to the certainty of the referential information. [11]. The key functions of hedging in academic writing are 1) to protect the author from too strong assertions and from being criticized for possible errors or invalid claims; 2) to convey collegial respect for the views of other fellow researchers; 3) to leave room for negotiations, other possibility or interpretations; 4) to reduce confrontation in the interaction with other academics. Scholars classify them as epistemic hedges (*somewhat, approximate, etc.*), possibility hedges (*perhaps, possibly, maybe, etc.*), downtoners (*a bit, slightly, more or less, etc.*), lexical hedges (*about, a few, kind of, like, several, etc.*) and adverbs of frequency (*frequently, often, sometimes, etc.*) [5]. Hedges manifest themselves in a cautious manner of writing, that is the avoidance of too definite statements.

Methods and Material. 1. The Conclusion section of 17 research articles (approximately, one page texts) from the collection 'Subjectivity and Epistemicity. Corpus, Discourse, and Literary Approaches to Stance' (Dylan Glynn & Mette Sjolín 2014) constitute the material of the present analysis.

The Conclusion section is regarded as the part in a research article where the authors report on their constructs and findings generalizing them as phenomena. They are supposed to highlight the key points of their analysis which they wish to get across and demonstrate the importance of their ideas, that is to prove that the research does matter. This suggests the idea of the possibility of employment of persuasive devices including boosters and hedges. Traditionally, the Conclusion section is expected to be made of formulatory statements that shape new knowledge in a clear and impassionate way, avoiding any speculation or evaluation markers. However, in order to project the image of an honest and competent personality the author might wish to use persuasive rhetorical devices.

2. The verbal expressions that are focused on in the present study are specified as boosters, such as *very, very much, highly, mainly, actually, moreover, most of, crucial, important, clear(ly), fully, extremely, must, need,*

should, undeniably, in fact, etc. and hedges, such as *can, could, may, might, seem, possible, possibly, probably, perhaps, some, generally, to be likely, tend to*, etc.

3. Each Conclusion text is analyzed individually, the instances of booster and hedge occurrences are counted manually throughout the texts. The spotted modifiers are studied in the narrow and broad distribution applying the moves of the discourse analysis. Within the framework of this method the Conclusion texts are viewed as communicative events, or a voice in the academic discussion on the scholarly topic. Following this approach, it is necessary to take into account the social conventions of the Conclusion composition and content outlined by the academic community. Hence, the verbal patterns of boosting and hedging are considered to be the forms of social behavior whose textual meaning is decoded adequately by the members of the academic community due to the shared language-using practices. This allows tracing how the verbal expressions with boosters and hedges contribute to construction of knowledge on the level of interaction.

Results and Discussion:

1. The analysis of 17 texts of almost the same length (approximately one page) shows that the density of the interactional boosting and hedging devices in the Conclusion section of the research papers slightly differs from piece to piece, to be exact, in Conclusion 1 (p. 15–16) they are 11, in Conclusion 2 (p. 37–38) – 8, in Conclusion 3 (p. 58–59) – 12, in Conclusion 4 (p. 86–87) – 18, in Conclusion 5 (p. 104) – 17, in Conclusion 6 (p. 116–117) – 7, in Conclusion 7 (p. 139–140) – 11, in Conclusion 8 (p. 161–162) – 13, in Conclusion 9 (p. 182) – 13, in Conclusion 10 (p. 209–210) – 13. In Conclusion 11 (p. 232–233) – 12, in Conclusion 12 (p. 257–258) – 15, in Conclusion 13 (p. 274–275) – 15, in Conclusion 14 (p. 297–298) – 8, in Conclusion 15 (p. 322–323) – 4, in Conclusion 16 (p. 344–345) – 8, in Conclusion 17 (p. 360–361) – 17.

As the quantitative analysis shows the average number of the interactional boosting and hedging elements in the Conclusion chapters is 12 which suggests that all writers do employ the subjectivity markers while formulating the final statements about their research findings. On the other hand, the different numbers of the occurrence of the interactional devices in each text, namely, 4 elements in Conclusion 15 and 18 elements in Conclusion 4 or 17 elements in Conclusion 5 and Conclusion 17, speak to the possibility of qualifying the Conclusion texts as those with the high, medium and low degree of subjectivity.

2. The figures indicating the occurrence of boosters and hedges (as shown in Table 1) demonstrate the specific correlation of the interactional pragmatic devices of tentativeness and assurance in the research Conclusion.

Table 1

Texts	Boosters	Hedges
Conclusions 1	8	3
Conclusions 2	5	3
Conclusions 3	7	5
Conclusions 4	8	10
Conclusions 5	5	12
Conclusions 6	5	2
Conclusions 7	7	4
Conclusions 8	7	6
Conclusions 9	7	6
Conclusions 10	9	4
Conclusions 11	7	5
Conclusions 12	8	7
Conclusions 13	5	10
Conclusions 14	3	5
Conclusions 15	1	3
Conclusions 16	8	0
Conclusions 17	7	10

The figures in the table show that the authors of the academic papers employ 107 boosters and 97 hedges in their Conclusions. The difference of 10 units in favor of boosters allows us to surmise that the authors do prefer the assertive statements to the uncertain ones in the Conclusions. This kind of stancetaking is particularly exercised in Conclusion 16 where all the interactional elements are boosters. However, we have to admit that the

difference in the proportion of the use of boosters and hedges across the texts is rather little and this conforms to the general tendency of balancing the expressions of different degree of strength. The same tendency (that of balance) becomes apparent while regarding the proportion of boosters and hedges occurrences in each text: the difference between the number of boosters and hedges is 2–5 units in 14 texts out of 17 ones, that is, in the majority of the analyzed texts. Consequently, the writers tend to employ them rather evenly.

3. The analysis has also revealed that some verbal patterns of boosting and hedging are used by the writers more often than the others. Namely, boosters such as *clear*, *clearly*, *more*, *moreover*, *important* have the highest frequency of use:

1. ...*which clearly* requires further attention (Conclusion 14).
2. *It has become clear* in this study that ... (Conclusion 6).
3. As such, *uno* expresses *more clearly* subjectivity to the event in which it involves the speaker (Conclusion 6).
4. *It is clear* that these are not only represented in the feminine form ... (Conclusion 6).
5. *The results of the analysis clearly* demonstrate that ... (Conclusion 13).
6. *Although, undeniably*, the latter have so far played an *important* role in furthering our understanding (Conclusion 16).
7. ... *plays an important* role in political discourse (Conclusion 12).
8. *The answer in itself is more important* than its content (Conclusion 9).
9. *Moreover*, wildness also constitutes a process of action which defines nature's stance (Conclusion 2).
10. *Moreover*, any quantitative approach to such phenomena must be manual and therefore highly subjective (Conclusion 1).

The discourse analysis of the Conclusion sections with the boosters proves that their used predominantly in the following functions: 1) to emphasize shared knowledge between the writers and the readership as a prerequisite for reaching identical conclusions, as in examples 1, 2, 4, 6 and 2) to project an image of assurance in order to instill trust in the audience, as in examples 3, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10.

As far as the hedges are concerned, the most frequent ones are the patterns with *seem*, *possible*, *possibly*, *perhaps* and the modal verbs *can*, *may*:

1. ...*the term 'wild' no longer needs to represent a separation between human and nature, but can* instead signify their unity (Conclusion 2).
2. *The conclusion that can* be drawn from this ... (Conclusion 3).
3. A conclusion *may* be drawn that *perhaps* epistemic 'must' is not yet as widespread as some linguists claim (Conclusion 4).
4. *This may* be *partially* explained by the pattern of historical development of the verb (Conclusion 4).
5. *Parker can* be understood to possess extensive practical wisdom (Conclusion 10).
6. *There might* be two reasons why confirmation-demanding tag questions *seldom seem* to be captured in corpora of general spoken conversation (Conclusion 9).
7. ... *it is possible* to notice the difference in the use of the category (Conclusion 12).
8. *The findings of the analysis seem* to support the position of ... (Conclusion 4).
9. *It seems*, therefore, that apart from being a marker of common ground ... (Conclusion 7).
10. ... *what seemed* to be a relatively high degree of authority ... (Conclusion 8).
11. *The findings seem* to be also indicative of culture specific patterns of pragmatic behavior (Conclusion 13).

Though hedges are generally believed to be the markers of doubt or uncertainty, it is hardly possible to interpret their meaning in the frame of uncertainty when they are used in the Conclusion section in particular where the writer's assertions are naturally expected. All the exemplified instances demonstrate that the authors use the hedges to mitigate their assertions and lessen the illocutionary force of their utterances rather than to express their doubt or minimize their commitment. Hence, the hedges used by the authors in the Conclusion mostly perform the function of conveying collegial respect for the views of the fellow academics. The strategy of cautious writing seems to be quite appropriate in the final part of the research article since due to it the authors may offer room for negotiations and, eventually, open the door to academic discussion.

The results of the analysis allow us to make the following conclusions.

1. The relatively great number of subjectivity devices in the Conclusion section proves that the academic authors arrange verbally the final part of their research articles in a manner as to orient it at building writer-reader cooperation and enhancing social relationship with the fellow researchers.

2. The slight difference between the occurrences of the interactional devices of boosting and hedging in the Conclusion testifies to the tendency of balancing the rhetorical strategies of strengthening and softening the statements that the authors make. This supports the claim that these devices help academics to gain acceptance

for their work by balancing conviction with caution and by conveying an appropriate disciplinary persona of modesty and assertiveness [7].

3. The fact that the number of boosters, though little, however prevails over the number of hedges somehow questions the claim about a steady rise in the occurrence of hedges and a notable drop in the occurrence of boosters.

More profound understanding of author's subjectivity in the Conclusion can be achieved if the pragmatic interactional elements such as attitude and engagement markers and self-mentions are also included into the analysis. Besides, the cases of mitigation of a strong presence of the author's stance (when a booster is used with an accompanying hedge) also need a thorough researchers' consideration.

References

1. Coates J. Epistemic Modality and Spoken Discourse / J. Coates // *Translations of the Philological Society*. – 1987. – P. 110–131.
2. Crismore A. Metadiscourse in persuasive writing: A study of texts written by American and Finish students / A. Crismore, R. Markkanen and M. Steffensen // *Written Communication*. – 10. – 1993. – P. 39–71.
3. Denzin N. K. *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research* / N. K. Denzin, Y. S. Lincoln. – Thousand Oaks : Sage Publications, 2005. – 1210 p.
4. Gillaerts P. Interactional Metadiscourse in Research Articles Abstracts / P. Gillaerts, F. Van de Velde. – Lessius University College, Sint-Andriess, Antwerp, Belgium, 2010.
5. Hinkel L. Hedging, Inflating, and Persuading in L2 Academic Writing / L. Hinkel // *Applied Learning*. – Vol. 15, No 1, 2. – 2005. – P. 29–53.
6. Holmes J. Expressing Doubt and Certainty in English / J. Holmes // *RELC Journal*. – No 3. – 1982. – P. 9–28.
7. Hyland K. Writing with conviction? Hedging in science research articles / K. Hyland // *Applied Linguistics*. – 17 (4). – 1996. – P. 433–454.
8. Hyland K. Exploring corporative rhetoric: Metadiscourse in the CEO's letter / K. Hyland // *The Journal of Business Communication*. – 35. – 1998. – P. 224–245.
9. Hyland K. Hedges, Boosters and Lexical Invisibility: Noticing Modifiers in Academic Texts / K. Hyland // *Language Awareness* – 9 (4). – 2000. – P. 179–197.
10. Hyland K. Metadiscourse in Academic Writing. *Applied Linguistics* 25/2 / K. Hyland, Tse Polly. – Oxford : University Press, 2004. – P. 156–177.
11. Hyland K. *Metadiscourse. Exploring Interaction in Writing* / K. Hyland. – BlumSBury Publishing, 2005. – 240 p.
12. Legeyda A. V. Hedging-Ariadne's Thread? Objectivity through Subjectivity in Academic Discourse / A. V. Legeyda // *Вісник ХНУ*. – № 973. – 2011. – P. 46–50.
13. Miao- Hsia Chang. Subjectivity and Objectivity in Academic Discourse. How Attribution Hedges Indicate Authorial Stance / Miao- Hsia Chang, Yu-Wen Luo, Yueh-Kuei Hsu. – *Concentric : Studies in Linguistics*, 2012. – No 38.2. – P. 293–329.
14. Salager-Meyer F. Hedges and textual communicative Function in Medical English Written Discourse / F. Salager-Meyer // *English for specific purposes*. – No 13 (2). – 1994. – P. 147–171.
15. Sayah L. Exploring Stance and Engagement Features in Discourse Analysis Papers / L. Sayah, M. R. Heshemi // *In Theory and Practice in Language studies*. – 2014. – Vol. 4, No 3. – P. 593–661.
16. Skelton J. Comments in academic articles / J. Skelton // In: Grunwell P. (ed) *Applied Linguistics in Society*. – London : CILT/BAAL, 1988.
17. Vassileva I. Commitment and Detachment in English and Bulgarian Academic Writing / I. Vassileva // *English for Specific Purpose*. – 2001. – No 20. – P. 83–102.
18. Vazquez I. The Use of Boosters in Modeling Persuasion in Academic Discourses / I. Vazquez, D. Giner // *Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses*. – University of Zaragoza, 2009. – No 22. – P. 219–237.

Киричук Лариса. Бустери й хеджі як маркери суб'єктивності (на матеріалі частини «Висновки» наукової статті). У цій роботі вивчено засоби суб'єктивності, а саме бустерів (boosters) і хеджів (hedges) у частині «Висновки» наукових статей. Мета студії – визначити обсяг цих елементів у висновках і з'ясувати їх прагматичне значення. Бустери й хеджі трактують як переконувальні засоби, що забезпечують передачу знань ефективним способом і сприяють залученню аудиторії. Кількісний аналіз показує, що використання цих засобів є достатньо рівномірним у досліджуваних текстах. Результати дискурсивного аналізу свідчать, що головною прагматичною функцією бустерів і хеджів є побудова стосунків між автором і читачем, що відбувається модифікацією іллокутивної сили авторських тверджень. Дослідження також свідчить, що інтерактивні прагматичні засоби повинні аналізуватися лише у зв'язку з інституціональним контекстом. Результати аналізу дали змогу перевірити положення щодо тенденції до збалансування стратегій посилення та послаблення авторських тверджень і тенденції до зменшення кількості бустерів у наукових статтях.

Ключові слова: наукова стаття, маркер суб'єктивності, інтерактивний засіб, бустерінг, хеджінг.

Киричук Лариса. Бустеры и хеджи как маркеры субъективности (на материале части «Заключение» научной статьи). В работе изучаются средства субъективности, а именно бустеров (boosters) и хеджей (hedges) в части «Заключения» научных статей. Цель студии – определить объем данных элементов в заключениях и выяснить их прагматическое значение. Бустеры и хеджи рассматриваются как средства убеждения, которые обеспечивают передачу знаний эффективным путем и способствуют вовлечению аудитории. Количественный анализ показывает, что использование этих средств есть достаточно равномерным в исследуемых текстах. Результаты дискурсивного анализа свидетельствуют, что ключевой прагматической функцией бустеров и хеджей есть создание отношений между автором и читателем, что происходит, благодаря модификации иллокутивной силы авторских утверждений. Исследование также показывает, что интерактивные прагматические средства должны анализироваться только в связи с институциональным контекстом. Результаты анализа позволили проверить точность положений относительно тенденции к сбалансированию стратегий усиления и послабления авторских утверждений и тенденции к уменьшению количества бустеров в научных статьях.

Ключевые слова: научная статья, маркер субъективности, интерактивное средство, бустеринг, хеджинг.

The article acted to the edotorial board
31.03.2016

УДК 811.111'37'38'06+81-112

Людмила Короткова

Диференціальні ознаки креативного стилю в англomовному модерністському дискурсі

Будь-яка творча людина
належить певній країні і добі,
і це істотно впливає на її твори.
З. Фрейд

Творчість є фундаментальною характеристикою людської природи. Здатність людини до творчості проявляється у всіх сферах життя, у маленьких речах, а також у головних здобутках цивілізації. У статті розглянуто міждисциплінарний підхід до складного феномену творчості / креативності. Креативність – це діяльність, яка має творчий характер лише в тому випадку, якщо їй властиві атрибути неповторності, оригінальності і унікальності і за характером здійснення, і за результатами. Креативність – це також процес. Динаміка старого й нового (традиції та новаторства), діалог й енциклопедичні знання адресанта / адресата є невід'ємними складниками творчого / креативного процесу. Для пояснення сутності креативного стилю нами запропоновано гіпотезу: креативний стиль в англomовному модерністському дискурсі – це витончене, гармонійне поєднання вербального та візуального мистецтва. У результаті лінгвопоетологічного аналізу встановлено, що диференціальними ознаками креативного стилю є, по-перше, індикатори візуального мистецтва (техніка зі сфери образотворчого мистецтва); по-друге, вербальна палітра (лексика зі сфери образотворчого мистецтва); по-третє, традиція й новаторство (конвергенція мовностилістичних засобів та символів).

Ключові слова: вербальна палітра, гармонія, диференціальні ознаки, індикатори візуального мистецтва, креативний стиль.

Постановка наукової проблеми та її значення. Феномен творчості / креативності протягом багатьох століть хвилює психологів, педагогів, філософів, генетиків, письменників, акторів і художників. Проте багато питань, пов'язаних із творчістю / креативністю, зокрема в лінгвістиці, ще не знайшли свого вирішення й досі. У науці неможливо зрозуміти природу креативності без знання сутності креативності.

Поняття креативності є комплексним, загадковим і калейдоскопічним конструктом. Під час його аналізу розглядають різні сторони дійсності: людина, процес, продукт. Виходячи з презумпції креативності, вважаємо, що стиль англomовного модерністського дискурсу є креативним. Креативний стиль – це витончене, гармонійне поєднання вербального (проза) та візуального (живопис).

Аналіз досліджень цієї проблеми. Креативність (від латин. *Creatio* – творення) – загальна здатність до творчості, яка характеризує особистість у цілому, виявляється в різних сферах активності. Першу