

употребление русизмов; отсутствие корректной интерпретации фразеологических оборотов, неправильный перевод из-за ошибок в исходном тексте и тому подобное. К морфологическим ошибкам принадлежат некорректное определение частеречной принадлежности лексем в случаях грамматической омонимии, нарушение грамматических категорий, в частности категории времени глаголов, ошибки при образовании падежных окончаний существительных и прилагательных. К синтаксическим ошибкам относятся нарушения смысловых связей при построении словосочетаний и предложений, а именно согласование между членами предложения, некорректное употребление союзов в пределах синтаксических конструкций, нарушение порядка слов в предложениях.

Ключевые слова: машинный перевод; художественный текст; оценка качества перевода; переводческие трансформации, Pragma 6 On-Line; MateCat.

Karpina Olena. Comparative Analysis of Literary and Machine Translation (a Case Study of the Fragments of S. Platt's Novel "The Bell Jar"). The article offers a comparative analysis of the translation of literary text fragments carried out by automated online translation systems MateCat and Pragma 6 On-Line. The content of the concepts of adequate and equivalent translation is highlighted, which became the starting point for assessing the quality of machine translation. The choice of machine translation programs reflects two global strategies in terms of machine translation software modeling: rule-based and statistical machine translation systems. The translation transformations applied by the author of literary translation Olga Liubarska are characterized, serving as a standard of quality that meets the criteria of equivalent / adequate translation: accurately reproduces the content and renders the communicative attitudes of the author. Translation errors and flaws of automated online translation programs have been examined in detail. The detected errors were grouped according to linguistic levels, forming lexical, morphological and syntactic types of errors. Lexical errors include the use of words in uncharacteristic meaning, which does not correspond to their contextual environment; untranslated words and phrases, word-for-word translation, the use of Russianisms; inability to correctly interpret phraseological units, incorrect translation due to errors in the source text, etc. Morphological errors consist of incorrect rendering of parts of speech in cases of grammatical homonymy, violation of grammatical categories, in particular, the category of tense of verbs, errors in the formation of case endings of nouns and adjectives. Syntactic errors include violation of semantic relations in the construction of phrases and sentences, namely coordination between sentence members; incorrect use of conjunctions within syntactic constructions, violation of word order in the sentences.

Key words: machine translation; literary text; translation quality assessment; translation transformations, Pragma 6 On-Line; MateCat.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2410-0927-2020-12-17>

УДК 811. 111'38:162

Larysa Kyrychuk, Anna Bohdanova

FUNCTIONAL PARAMETERS OF PRAGMATIC INTERACTIVE MARKERS IN COMPOSITIONAL PARTS OF RESEARCH ARTICLES

It is a common knowledge that academic writing is expected to be factual and objective, however, the authors tend to express their subjective opinions demonstrating their attitudes towards their claims and, apparently, influencing the readers' attitudes. In order to pass on their messages in an intelligible, convincing, cooperative and polite way academic authors employ pragmatic interactive devices, i.e. boosters and hedges, whose function is to optimize the authors' relationship with their texts and with their readers. It is widely recognized that boosting and hedging are the communicative strategies adopted by academic authors to express a different degree of commitment or detachment. One of the frequently stated problems in this area is concerned with application and distribution of boosters and hedges in the componential parts of research articles. The aim of this study is to indicate the frequency of boosters and hedges in Introduction, Results and Conclusions parts of research articles and to pinpoint their pragmatic meanings. This may provide an opportunity to advance our understanding of the mechanisms of authors' influence and persuasion in the text production and text perception. The factual material of the study is collected from academic papers published in on-line linguistic journals. On the first step of the analysis the componential sections of the selected article (Introduction section, 7 pages; Result section, 13 pages; Conclusion section, 6 pages) are examined separately in order to trace the correspondence of their textual patterns to the academic audience expectations. Applying the procedure of quantitative analysis, the occurrences of boosters and hedges are counted manually in each of the componential parts; the data obtained are presented in the tables. Using the procedural elements of contextual and discourse analyses the spotted modifiers are examined in their narrow and broad distribution in order to point out their pragmatic functions in each of the research article sections. The cases of occurrence of boosters and hedges are interpreted as forms of social behavior or author's stances taken to establish interpersonal relationship with the audience and to ensure adequate reading of the text by their academic colleagues. The findings of the study are reported and commented on in the Results and Discussion section and generalized in Conclusions.

Key words: research article, article section, pragmatic marker, booster, hedge, communicative strategy, author's stance.

A research article is a genre of academic writing where scholars report on their accomplishments and findings, express their viewpoints, give their arguments and suggest new ideas. The standards of a research article involve formal style, objective informing, transparent manner of exposition and following a certain compositional pattern. Moreover, it should foster discussion among researchers in the field and provide a ground for new ideas. Although academic writing is expected to be factual and objective, the authors, however, tend to express their subjective opinions demonstrating their attitudes towards their claims and, apparently, influencing the readers' attitudes.

Introduction. In order to pass on their messages in an intelligible, convincing, cooperative and polite way academic authors employ pragmatic interactive devices, i.e. boosters and hedges whose function is to optimize the authors' relationship with their texts and with their readers. It is widely recognized that boosting and hedging are the communicative strategies adopted by academic authors to express a different degree of commitment or detachment (Holmes, 1984; Vassileva, 2001), and to balance assertion and caution, confidence and tentativeness. As Hyland states, "The expression of doubt and certainty is central to the rhetorical and interactive character of academic writing. Its importance lies in the fact that academics gain acceptance for their research claims by balancing conviction with caution, either investing statements with the confidence of reliable knowledge, or with tentativeness to reflect uncertainty or appropriate social interactions." [7, p. 1].

Recently, a considerable amount of literature has grown up around the issue of boosters and hedges. The studies have provided important information about socio-linguistic and pragmatic nature of boosters and hedges, their functions and implications as well as the tendencies of their application over years and across different disciplines (Holmes, 1982; Skelton, 1988; Salager-Meyer, 1994; Vassileva, 2001; Hyland, 1996, 1998, 2000, 2005; Vazquez and Giner, 2009; Sayah and Heshemi, 2014 and others). One of the frequently stated problems in this area is concerned with application and distribution of boosters and hedges in the componential parts of research articles. However, due to some subtle changes in communicative strategies being currently modified, a study is needed to extend and update the data in order to confirm or supplement or question the previous research having been done.

The aim of this study is to indicate the frequency of boosters and hedges in Introduction, Results and Conclusions parts of research articles and to pinpoint their pragmatic implications. This may provide an opportunity to advance our understanding of the mechanisms of authors' influence and persuasion in the text production and text perception.

Literature Review. A large and growing body of literature has investigated the textual functions of hedges and boosters. Ken Hyland (1998) having analyzed 56 research papers and interviews with academics, based on corpus data, identifies hedges and boosters as important pragmatic devices which play a significant role as connectors between the writer and readers [7]. In his previous research (1996) he focuses on the category of hedges. Specifically, Hyland distinguishes reader- and content-oriented hedges [6, p. 4–5]. The reader-oriented hedges are seen as linguistic devices used by authors to influence the audience's attitudes and opinions while the content-oriented hedges are designed to express a degree of confidence in the truth of a proposition. Additionally, he divides content-oriented hedges into two types: accuracy-oriented and writer-oriented. K. Hyland (1998) regards the accuracy-oriented hedges as the pragmatic markers used to increase knowledge accuracy whereas writer-oriented hedges are viewed as the pragmatic markers used to keep the writer's statements under control, so that the writer could avoid future criticism and opposition. As boosters are concerned, Hyland holds the view that they allow the authors "to negotiate the status of the information, helping them to establish its perceived truth by strategically presenting it as consensually given" [9, p. 11].

According to Crismore, Steffensen and Markkanen (1993), the denotement of author's commitment to the truth of their own statements can be identified by both hedges and boosters. Specifically, they point out that these pragmatic markers are two sides of the same coin in the sense [3]. Having conducted the analysis of 645 research paper abstracts Hu and Cao (2011) summarize that boosters and hedges should be seen as metadiscursive resources for academic authors which are employed to demonstrate the authors' epistemic stance. Following Hyland, they also highlight the boosters and hedges' role in establishing cooperative relations between the author and readers [5]. Akbas (2018), supporting Stubbs (1986), points out that the act of demonstrating a certain degree of

commitment takes place when the author attempts to express a confident voice of authority and, thus to set a higher level of confidence towards the truthfulness of their claims. This can also be regarded as reinforcement of the truth value with a boosting effect in the statements via a range of linguistic items that can also be classified as boosters [1]. The scholar interprets the pragmatic implications of hedges as the author's intention to withdraw commitment by expressing a certain degree of detachment or, specifically, doubt and hesitancy in the presentation of the proposition. The strategy of softening the force of factual knowledge claims is apparently adopted by authors to provide space for alternative voices. "The linguistic items classified as hedges can be used for explicitly qualifying a degree of detachment from what is asserted." [1, p.39]. According to Myer (1989), Salager-Meyer (1994) and Vold (2006), boosters and hedges express not only cautiousness and doubt but also politeness [10; 11; 12]. It is worth noting that the process of hedging is viewed as a negative politeness whereas the process of boosting as a positive politeness [2].

The brief review of the relevant sources in the field demonstrates that the researchers are unanimous about the ability of boosters and hedges to modify the force of authors' statements in academic papers. Evaluating the impact of these linguistic devices the scholars emphasize their significant role in text production and text perception. Additionally, data from a few studies suggest that boosters and hedges are distributed unevenly across different parts of academic texts. In this light, there is a need for a systematic analysis of application of boosters and hedges in order to trace the tendencies of textualization of writers' intentions and motives in componential parts of a research article.

Hedges and boosters. Considering all the evidence provided in the studies mentioned above we now need to point out the pragmatic features of boosters and hedges in order to outline the framework within which the succeeding analysis will be conducted.

It is generally recognized that academic authors rarely express their opinions or ideas as proven facts. Instead, they are likely to represent them with a certain degree of confidence. It is assumed that the scale of confidence may vary from a very strong point to a low one or even lack of confidence in the truth of claims. As the study demonstrates, the authors' attitudes towards their claims are verbalized through the linguistic devices of boosters and hedges.

Hedging is thought to be a communicative strategy adopted by authors to weaken the force of their statements. Depending on the componential part of a research article where they are used, hedges may indicate either the authors' attitude towards their claims or the authors' attempt to foster cooperation with the reader. Consequently, the range of pragmatic meanings of hedges varies from low confidence (or lack of confidence) to establishing interpersonal relationship with the reading colleagues. Specifically, the text-oriented hedges are employed to indicate 1) low commitment to the truth of a claim; 2) uncertainty or hesitation in the truth of a claim. The reader-oriented hedges are used 1) to reduce the risk of potential opposition or criticism; 2) to provide room for counter arguments or readers' opinions; 3) to facilitate academic discussion. Being used as linguistic devices of cautious style they may also function as markers of politeness or modesty. The verbal forms that are used in the hedging function are divided into six groups: 1) lexical hedges (*sort of, several, about, etc.*); 2) epistemic hedges (*approximate, likely, mostly, etc.*); 3) adverbs of frequency (*occasionally, generally, often, etc.*); 4) downtoners (*partly, a little, in some respects, etc.*) 5) possibility hedges (*probably, perhaps, etc.*) 6) assertive pronouns (*somewhat, somehow, etc.*) [4].

Boosters, similar to hedges, are used to represent the attitudes of research articles' authors towards their statements or involve the readers in a discussion. Particularly, they are designed to modify the force of a statement in terms of emphasizing what is believed to be true and correct. By employing them the authors are able to formulate their claims with a certain degree of strength, thus demonstrating their commitment to what is being said. The text-oriented boosters indicate authors' intention 1) to intensify the importance of their claims; 2) to emphasize some information as a prerequisite for reaching an agreement between the readers and themselves; 3) to foreground some of their claims; 4) to acknowledge their assurance and certainty about some issues. The reader-oriented boosters are regarded as units of persuasion and reassurance, thus they are apparently employed 1) to convince the readers in the truth of a claim; 2) to express authors' advice or recommendation. The language units of boosting

include phrases (*it is a fact that.../I claim that.../I am sure that...*), adverbs (*obviously, completely, etc.*), adjectives (*definite, important, etc.*) and verb groups (*it shows / demonstrates / proves / testifies to, etc.*).

Data and Method. The factual material of the study is collected from five random academic papers published in on-line linguistic journals: 1) *“Reliable Discourse Markers for Contrast Relations”* (Jennifer Spenader and Anna Lobanova, 2002); 2) *“When students tackle grammatical problems: Exploring linguistic reasoning with linguistic metaconcepts in L1 grammar education”* (Jimmy H.M. van Rijt, Peter J.F. de Swart b, Astrid Wijnands, Peter-Arno J.M. Coppens, 2019); 3) *“The Transparency Trope: Deconstructing English Academic Discourse”* (Karen Bennett, 2015); 4) *“Critical thinking, questioning and student engagement in Korean university English courses”* (Scott A. DeWaelche, 2015); 5) *“Generating monologue and dialogue to present personalised medical information to patients”* (Sandra Williams, Paul Piwek and Richard Power, 2007).

1. On the first step of the analysis the componential sections of the selected article (Introduction section, 7 pages; Result section, 13 pages; Conclusion section, 6 pages) are examined separately in order to trace the correspondence of their textual patterns to the academic audience expectations. It should be noted that each of the componential sections is seen as a communicative event with its definite structure and function in the text. The standard approach to research article sections presupposes presenting accurate information on the issue being reported that must follow a certain textual pattern. In this light, the writers’ judgements, comments and opinions about their statements are viewed as pragmatically charged representations.

2. On the next move of the analysis our task is to highlight the linguistic forms of boosting and hedging which are designed to demonstrate the authors’ attitudes towards the propositional information of their statements. Applying the procedure of quantitative analysis, the occurrences of boosters and hedges are counted manually in each of the componential parts; the data obtained are presented in the tables below.

3. Using the procedural elements of contextual and discourse analyses the spotted modifiers are examined in their narrow and broad distribution in order to point out their pragmatic meanings in each of the research article sections. The cases of occurrence of boosters and hedges are interpreted as forms of social behavior or author’s stances taken to establish interpersonal relationship with the audience and to ensure adequate reading of the text by their academic colleagues.

4. Additionally, in order to differentiate the verbal forms of the pragmatic markers we use the Hyland’s taxonomies of boosters and hedges [8].

Table 1

Hyland’s taxonomies of hedges and boosters

Taxonomy of hedges	Taxonomy of boosters
About, almost, apparent, appear, appeared, appears, approximately, argue, argued, argues, around, assume, assumed, broadly, certain amount, certain extent, certain level, claim, claimed, claims, could, couldn’t, doubt, doubtful, essentially, estimate, estimated, fairly, feels, felt, frequently, from my perspective, from our perspective, from this perspective, generally, guess, indicate, indicated, indicated, in general, in most cases, in most instances, in my opinion, in my view, in this view, in our view, largely, likely, mainly, may, maybe, might, mostly, often, on the whole, ought, perhaps, plausibly, possible, possibly, postulate, postulated, postulates, presumably, probable, probably, quite, rather (...), relatively, roughly, seems, should, sometimes, somewhat, suggest, suggested, suggests, suppose, supposed, suspect, suspects, tend to, tended to, tends to, to my knowledge, typical, typically, uncertain, uncertainly, unclear, unclearly, unlikely, usually, would, wouldn’t.	Actually, always, believe, believed, believes, beyond doubt, certain, certainly, clear, clearly, conclusively, decidedly, definite, definitely, demonstrate, demonstrated, demonstrates, doubtless, establish, established, evident, evidently, find, finds, found, in fact, incontestable, incontrovertible, incontrovertibly, indeed, indisputable, indisputably, know, known, must (possibility), never, no doubt, obvious, obviously, of course, prove, proved, proves, realize, realized, realizes, really, show, showed, shown, shows, sure, surely, think, thinks, thought, truly, true, undeniable, undeniably, undisputedly, undoubtedly, will (except when it expresses futurity), without doubt.

Results and Discussion.

Boosters and hedges in the Introduction section.

The results of the quantitative analysis of five Introduction section texts demonstrate that the academic writers do use the pragmatic markers of boosting and hedging while establishing the context of their studies. As shown in Table 2, the hedge elements prevail in the analyzed Introductions; the average number of hedging occurrences is 11 whereas the average number of boosting occurrences is 4. Additionally, the density of employment of the pragmatic devices differs from text to text, e.g., there have been found 22 hedges and 6 boosters in Introduction 2, whereas only 3 hedges and 3 boosters in Introduction 2.

Table 2

Hedges and boosters used in the Introduction sections

Texts	H.	B.
Introduction 1	3	3
Introduction 2	22	6
Introduction 3	6	5
Introduction 4	16	1
Introduction 5	9	3
	56	18

**H. – hedges; B. – boosters.*

The figures presented in Table 2 demonstrate uneven distribution of boosters and hedges across the five Introduction texts which may testify to the fact that the authors express their attitudes through boosting and/or hedging their statements with high, moderate or low frequency. The figures also suggest that the authors may have their individual motivations of using boosters and hedges, so that their claims could sound more persuasive. The discourse analysis of the cases of boosting in the Introduction sections indicates that the authors use them to foreground some information, or to emphasize the importance of some facts as a prerequisite for the further-going analysis, or to assure the readers in the truth of their claims. For example,

1. *From these studies, it has become **clear** that...* (Introduction 2)
2. *Research **shows** that language teachers...* (Introduction 2)

As the hedges are concerned, they are used to represent authors' low commitment to the truth of the claims, or authors' intention of being cautious when expressing their opinions. For example,

1. *...research into teacher beliefs has revealed that teachers **generally** tend to adopt teaching styles...* (Introduction 2)
2. *This is **likely** a result of current practice...* (Introduction 2)
3. *(the study) ...it **could potentially** help her in her next consultation in a number of ways* (Introduction 5)

Boosters and Hedges in the Result section.

The data obtained on this stage of the analysis (Table 3) point at the authors' preference for hedging devices, viz., 73 hedges versus 35 boosters. The average number of hedges is 15, while the boosters' one is only 7 that speaks to the tendency of employing hedges more frequently than boosters. However, closer inspection of the data proves that this tendency is not steadfast since boosters prevail in Result 2 (3 hedges and 7 boosters) and boosters and hedges are used evenly in Result 5 (1 hedge and 1 booster). The different proportions in figures of the boosting and hedging cases in the analyzed sections, as shown in Table 3, may suggest that the academic writers take stances depending on their own vision of effective communication, mostly in favor of hedging their statements.

Table 3

Hedges and boosters used in the Results Sections

Texts	H.	B.
Results 1	17	7
Results 2	3	7
Results 3	27	15
Results 4	25	5
Results 5	1	1
	73	35

**H. – hedges; B. – boosters.*

Considering academic writing standards and the functions of the Result section in a research article we believe that the authors use more hedges in order to avoid too definite statements and to provide space for negotiations with their academic colleagues for the data may allow interpretation options. For example,

1. ... a small set of closed class words that are particularly **likely** to be discourse markers. (Results 1)
2. Within the body of the text, the work of others **may be** referred to using direct quote... (Results 3)

The boosters are apparently employed to highlight some significant datum or to express authors' certainty while commenting on the data. For example,

1. ... it is **clear** that there were students that struggled with these activities. (Results 4)
2. This **of course** has implications for the development of rational argument... (Results 3)

It is worth noting that the authors interconnect boosters and hedges in this section to reach the balance between assurance and caution. Additionally, the high frequency of the pragmatic markers (R 3) indicates the author's intention to express his/her subjective attitude to the results while the low frequency of the pragmatic markers (R 5) could be interpreted as the author's intention to avoid subjectivity of writing and thus, focusing on its factuality.

Boosters and Hedges in the Conclusion Sections.

The results obtained from the quantitative analysis of boosters and hedges in the Conclusion sections are set out in Table 4. As the Table shows, there is a significant difference between the number of hedges (59 units) and boosters (23 units), with the average figure of 12 for hedges and 5 for boosters. It is apparent from this Table that hedges are used almost three times as many as boosters. The most surprising result comes from Conclusion 3 in which, contrary to the general estimation picture, boosters prevail over hedges. This may be explained by the author's individual stance on the pragmatic markers employment as the most effective way to get across his/her message.

Table 4

Hedges and boosters used in the Conclusion sections

Texts	H.	B.
Conclusion 1	11	6
Conclusion 2	30	8
Conclusion 3	5	6
Conclusion 4	10	2
Conclusion 5	3	1
	59	23

**H. – hedges; B. – boosters.*

In the Conclusion sections, where the authors are expected to summarize the key issues examined in their papers, the high frequency of hedges suggests that the authors tend to mitigate their statements. In this section hedges are likely to be used to provide room for discussion. For example,

1. *Perhaps it is even more likely that their subject knowledge has diminished over the years...* (Conclusion 2)

2. *This result may indicate that...* (Conclusion 2)

Boosters in the Conclusion section are viewed as pragmatic markers used to emphasize significance of the findings and to express confidence in the truth of the concluding remarks. For example,

1. *Thus, it becomes clear just how central rhetoric is to...* (Conclusion 3)

2. *Of course, analysis length cannot be directly related to reasoning quality...* (Conclusion 2)

Boosters and hedges in the concluding statements of the research papers obviously complement one another making it possible for the writers to persuade their readers by establishing interpersonal relationship with them. The significant difference in the pragmatic markers occurrences in favor of hedges indicates that the authors verbalize their final claims in a cautious manner and tend to treat the compositional part of Conclusion as a platform for academic discussion.

Conclusions. The purpose of the current study was to point out the functional features of the pragmatic interactive markers of boosters and hedges in the compositional sections (Introduction, Results and Conclusion) of research articles. This study has shown that, alongside the objective informing, the authors use strategically the pragmatic markers to persuade the readers. Taken together, the results of the study suggest that the authors opt for various pragmatic devices to communicate their ideas effectively. The most significant finding to emerge from this study is that hedges occur by far more frequently than boosters in each of the examined compositional sections. The overwhelming number of hedges (188 hedging units versus 76 boosting units) suggests that the authors tend to lessen the force of their claims presenting them as subjective opinions rather than accredited facts. This, apparently, speaks to the tendency of prioritizing politeness and respect to the readers. Thus, by using hedges as reader-friendly tools the authors are able to express their intention to set a dialogical format in communicating the information and to open the door for an academic discussion. The findings of this study have certain implications for the understanding of how the pragmatic markers in research articles may facilitate effective presentation of academic opinions and ideas. Overall, this study strengthens the idea that the pragmatic markers should be seen as tools of influence and persuasion in academic writing.

We admit that the most important limitation of this study lies in the small sample size which does not allow us to make these findings less generalizable. There is, therefore, a definite need for broadening the scope of factual material so that the results could be more accurate and convincing.

References

1. Akbas, Erdem. 2018. "Strengthening or Weakening Claims in Academic Knowledge Construction: A Comparative Study of Hedges and Boosters in Postgraduate Academic Writing". *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice* 8: 831–859. doi:10.12738/estp.2018.4.0260.
2. Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. 1998. *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
3. Crismore, Avon, Raija Markkanen, and Margaret S. Steffensen. 1993. "Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study of Texts Written by American and Finnish University Students". *Written Communication* 10: 39–71. doi:10.1177/0741088393010001002.
4. Hinkel, Eli. 2005. "Hedging, Inflating, and Persuading in L2 Academic Writing". *Applied Language Learning* 15: 29–53.
5. Hu, Guangwei, and Feng Cao. 2011. "Hedging and boosting in abstracts of applied linguistics articles: A comparative study of English- and Chinese-medium journals". *Journal of Pragmatics* 43: 2795–2809. doi:10.1016/j.pragma.2011.04.007.
6. Hyland, Ken. 1996. "Writing Without Conviction? Hedging in Science Research Articles". *Applied Linguistics* 17: 433–454. doi:10.1093/applin/17.4.433.
7. Hyland, Ken. 1998. "Boosters, hedges and the negotiation of academic knowledge". *Text – Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse* 18: 349–382. doi:10.1515/text.1.1998.18.3.349.
8. Hyland, Ken. 2005. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum.
9. Hyland, Ken. 2011. "Dialogue, community and persuasion in research writing". In *Dialogicity in Written Specialised Genres*, edited by Luz Gil-Salom, and Carmen Soler-Monreal, 1–20. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

10. Myers, Greg. 1989. "The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles". *Applied Linguistics* 10: 1–35. doi:10.1093/applin/10.1.1.
11. Salager-Meyer, Françoise. 1994. "Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse". *English for Specific Purposes* 13: 149–170. doi:10.1016/0889-4906(94)90013-2.
12. Vold, Eva Thue. 2006. "Epistemic modality markers in research articles: a cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study". *International Journal of Applied Linguistics* 16: 61–87. doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2006.00106.x.

Киричук Лариса, Богданова Анна. Функціональні особливості прагматичних інтерактивних маркерів у структурних розділах наукових статей. Загальновідомим фактом є те, що наукова стаття передбачає виклад актуальної та об'єктивної інформації, проте авторам-науковцям притаманно виражати свою суб'єктивну думку, демонструючи особисте ставлення до своїх стверджень і, у такий спосіб, впливаючи на ставлення читачів до повідомлення. Адекватний, переконливий, кооперативний та ввічливий спосіб подачі повідомлення включає використання прагматичних інтерактивних засобів, а саме бустерів та хеджів, функцією яких є оптимізація відношень автора зі своїм текстом і з читачами. Відомо, що використання бустерів та хеджів є комунікативними стратегіями, які застосовуються авторами для вираження різного ступеню залучення чи відсторонення. Однією з проблем, які часто розглядаються у цій області досліджень, є особливості застосування та розподілу бустерів і хеджів у структурних розділах наукових статей. Метою нашої наукової розвідки є виявлення частотності використання бустерів та хеджів у структурних розділах статей "Вступ", "Результати" і "Висновки" і окреслення їх прагматичних значень. Дослідження може сприяти поглибленому розумінню механізмів авторського впливу та переконання у процесах створення тексту і його сприйняття читачами. Матеріалом дослідження обрано статті, опубліковані в наукових Інтернет-журналах. На початковій стадії аналізу кожний структурний розділ обраних статей (7 сторінок розділу "Вступ", 13 сторінок розділу "Результати" і 6 сторінок розділу "Висновки") розглядається окремо з метою визначення відповідності його текстуальної моделі нормативним очікуванням академічної аудиторії. Застосовуючи процедуру кількісного аналізу, підраховуються усі випадки використання бустерів і хеджів у кожному зі структурних розділів; отримані результати подаються у таблицях. Застосовуючи процедурні елементи контекстуального та дискурсивного аналізів, позначені модифікатори розглядаються у вузькій та широкій дистрибуції з метою визначення їх прагматичних функцій у кожному зі структурних розділів обраних наукових статей. Випадки вживання бустерів і хеджів інтерпретуються як форми соціальної поведінки або ж як авторське позиціонування з метою встановлення кооперативних відношень з аудиторією та забезпечення адекватного прочитання тексту колегами-науковцями. Одержані результати дослідження подаються та коментуються у розділі "Результати та Обговорення" і узагальнюються у розділі "Висновки".

Ключові слова: наукова стаття, структурний розділ, прагматичний маркер, бустер, хедж, комунікативна стратегія, авторське позиціонування.

Киричук Лариса, Богданова Анна. Функциональные особенности прагматических интерактивных маркеров в структурных разделах научных статей. Общеизвестным фактом есть то, что научная статья предусматривает изложение актуальной и объективной информации, однако авторам-ученым присуще выражать свое субъективное мнение, демонстрируя личное отношение к своим утверждениям и, таким способом, влияя на восприятие сообщения читателями. Адекватный, убедительный, кооперативный и вежливый способ подачи сообщения включает в себя использование прагматических интерактивных средств, а именно бустеров и хеджей, функцией которых есть оптимизация отношений автора со своим текстом и с читателями. Известно, что использование бустеров и хеджей есть коммуникативной стратегией, которая применяется авторами для выражения разной степени вовлечения или отстранения. Одной из часто рассматриваемых проблем в этой области исследований является применение и распределение бустеров и хеджей в структурных разделах научных статей. Цель нашего исследования – выявление частотности использования бустеров и хеджей в структурных разделах статей "Вступление", "Результаты" и "Выводы" и определение их прагматических значений. Исследование может способствовать углубленному пониманию механизмов авторского влияния и убеждения в процессах создания текста и его восприятия читателями. Материалом исследования послужили статьи, опубликованные в научных Интернет-журналах. На начальной стадии анализа каждый структурный раздел из отобранных статей (7 страниц раздела "Вступление", 13 страниц раздела "Результаты" и 6 страниц раздела "Выводы") рассматриваются отдельно с целью определения соответствия его текстуальной модели нормативным ожиданиям академической аудитории. Применяя процедуру количественного анализа, подсчитываются все случаи использования бустеров и хеджей в каждом из структурных разделов; полученные результаты подаются в таблицах. Применяя процедурные элементы контекстуального и дискурсивного анализов, выделенные модификаторы рассматриваются в узкой и широкой дистрибуции с целью определения их прагматических функций в каждом из структурных разделов отобранных статей. Случаи использования бустеров и хеджей интерпретируются как формы социального поведения или как авторское позиционирование для построения кооперативных отношений с аудиторией и обеспечения адекватного прочтения текста коллегами-учеными. Полученные результаты исследования прокомментированы в разделе "Результаты и Обсуждение" и обобщены в разделе "Выводы".

Ключевые слова: научная статья, структурный раздел, прагматический маркер, бустер, хедж, коммуникативная стратегия, авторское позиционирование.