

**ФИЛОЛОГИЯ. ТЕОРЕТИЧЕСКАЯ, ПРИКЛАДНАЯ И  
СРАВНИТЕЛЬНО-СОПОСТАВИТЕЛЬНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА  
PHILOLOGY. THEORETICAL, APPLIED AND COMPARATIVE  
LINGUISTICS**

Научная статья  
УДК 81'42

Филологические науки

<https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2023.6.3.421-430>

**АРГУМЕНТАТИВНЫЙ ПОТЕНЦИАЛ ХЕДЖЕЙ:  
КОММУНИКАТИВНЫЕ УДАЧИ И «СТРАТЕГИЧЕСКИЕ  
СТЕРЕОТИПЫ» В ХОДЕ ПРЕЗЕНТАЦИИ НОВОГО НАУЧНОГО  
КОНТЕНТА В РАЗНОЯЗЫЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЯХ ПО ЭКОНОМИКЕ**

**Б.В. Светайлов**

*АО «Концерн Энергомера», г. Ставрополь, Россия*

*borya.svetajlov@yandex.ru, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3126-1687>*

**Аннотация.** Статья посвящена вопросу использования хеджей и хеджинговых конструкций в научных работах по экономике, написанных на английском, турецком и французском языках. Цель исследования заключается в определении особенностей употребления хеджинговых маркеров в разноязычных научных статьях экономической тематики с точки зрения их аргументационной составляющей в ходе презентации автором нового научного контента. Особое внимание уделяется прагматической составляющей хеджирования в рамках научного дискурса в ходе анализа того, какой коммуникативный эффект производят хеджи и хеджинговые конструкции на адресата, в чём заключается их функциональная специфика в разных разделах научных статей, как автор достигает поставленные им цели посредством их употребления. Анализ хеджирования осуществляется с учётом норм и требований, предъявляемых к научным статьям, коммуникативной составляющей и процесса налаживания имплицитного диалога автора статьи с потенциальным адресатом, прагматического потенциала хеджей в рамках аргументационного процесса и выдвижения автором гипотетических суждений. Кроме того, проиллюстрированы различные аспекты модальности хеджей и хеджинговых конструкций и их семантики, а также роль употребления субъективно-оценочных и акцентирующих формул, относящихся к категории хеджинговых, в научных статьях по экономике.

**Ключевые слова:** хедж; хеджирование; научная статья по экономике; научный дискурс; аргументативный потенциал; прагмалингвистика

**Для цитирования:** Светайлов Б.В. Аргументативный потенциал хеджей: коммуникативные удаchi и «стратегические стереотипы» в ходе презентации нового научного контента в разноязычных публикациях по экономике. *Казанский лингвистический журнал*. 2023;6(3): 421–430. (In Eng.) <https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2023.6.3.421-430>

Original article

Philology studies

<https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2023.6.3.421-430>

## ARGUMENTATIVE POTENTIAL OF HEDGES: COMMUNICATION SUCCESS AND “STRATEGIC STEREOTYPES” DURING THE PRESENTATION OF NEW SCIENTIFIC CONTENT IN ARTICLES ON ECONOMICS WRITTEN IN DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

*B. V. Svetaylov*

*JSC “Energomera” Concern”, Stavropol, Russian Federation  
borya.svetajlov@yandex.ru, <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3126-1687>*

**Abstract.** The article is devoted to the use of hedges and hedging constructions in scientific articles on economics written in English, Turkish and French. The purpose of the study is to determine the features of the use of hedging markers in multilingual scientific articles on economic topics in terms of their argumentative component during the presentation of new scientific content by the author. Particular attention is paid to the pragmatic component of hedging within the framework of scientific discourse during the analysis of what communicative effect hedges and hedging constructions produce on the addressee, what is their functional specificity in different sections of scientific articles, how the author achieves his goals through the use of them. Analysis of hedging is carried out taking into account the norms and requirements for scientific articles, the communicative component and the process of establishing an implicit dialogue between the author of the article and a potential addressee, the pragmatic potential of hedges within the framework of the argumentation process and the author's hypothetical judgments. In addition, various aspects of the modality of hedges and hedging constructions and their semantics are illustrated, as well as the role of the use of subjective-evaluative and emphasizing formulas, belonging to the category of hedging, in scientific articles on economics.

**Keywords:** hedge; hedging; scientific article on economics; scientific discourse; argumentative potential; pragmalinguistics

**For citation:** Svetaylov B.V. Argumentative Potential of Hedges: Communication Success and “Strategic Stereotypes” During the Presentation of New Scientific Content in Articles on Economics Written in Different Languages. *Kazan Linguistic Journal*. 2023;6(3): 421–430. <https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2023.6.3.421-430>

One of the characteristics of a scientific text is the presence of hedges and hedging constructions in it. The relevance of the article is justified by the need to identify the functional role of hedging in scientific articles written in English, French and Turkish, as well as their competent use when presenting new information during the study.

The object of the study is the phenomenon of hedging in multilingual scientific articles on economics. The subject of the study is such a characteristic of hedges and hedging markers as their argumentative potential within the framework of scientific discourse. The purpose of the study is to determine the features of the use of hedging

markers in scientific articles on economics, written in different languages, from the point of view of their argumentative component during the presentation of new scientific content by the author.

The material of the study is scientific articles on economics written in English, French and Turkish, from both rating and under-rating scientific periodicals. It allows to analyze the argumentative potential of hedges on the example of languages with different structures.

The phenomenon of hedging is actively studied in the works of various researchers, because it is associated with the careful promotion of ideas and assumptions, which is of great importance in academic writing, in which researchers are tasked with presenting unproven statements with a high degree of caution and accuracy. In this regard, according to researchers B.V. Svetaylov and A.I. Milostivaya, norms and restrictions of scientific discourse play a key role in understanding the essence of a scientific text, which, in turn, is reflected both in the correct presentation of new scientific content and of the results of scientific article [1, p. 135]. It is important to note the institutional nature of scientific discourse, which is a “normative speech interaction” of communication participants and involves taking into account their status roles and the correlation of these roles with certain goals, the achievement of which is important within a particular social institution [2, c. 365].

One of the key conditions for the success of scientific communication is the possession and adherence to certain norms by all its participants. Analyzing hedging from this perspective, it is important to note its correlation with pragmalinguistic problems, as well as to emphasize the importance of the addressee's intention when writing a scientific text. As A.I. Milostivaya notes, the pragmalinguistic problematics seems relevant in this research context, since its goals and objectives form an integral part of the “epistemological coordinate system of the antropocentric version of linguistics”, which is important when considering issues of scientific thinking [3, p. 52–53].

The pragmatic potential of hedging funds is also associated with the informativeness of a scientific text, which can be considered in terms of the correspondence of the presented information to an addressee. Informativeness, according to N.A. Sigacheva and T.V. Marsheva, is the main function of scientific style [4, p. 147]. Based on the research of M.I. Solnyshkina, the informativeness of the text can be understood through its “comprehensibility for a reader, which allows to determine the degree of this correspondence” [5, p. 49]. According to N.N. Bobyreva, the communicants of a scientific text are professionals who have the competence to “perceive complex scientific knowledge” [6, с. 368], including terminological systems, which are a set of “terminological units corresponding to the present stage of the development of science” [7, с. 361].

The argumentative potential of hedging funds is also of great importance in scientific articles on economic topics in the course of the development of the author's own ideas. The modality of hedging markers allows the researcher to present the results of his research in a tactful manner, without imposing his own point of view and allowing the possibility of the existence of other opinions on the issue. Based on the research of A. Kristic, it can be noted that in this aspect the use of hedges is of particular importance in such parts of scientific work as “introduction” and “results and discussion” [8, p. 13], since they most suggest the presence of reflections in them, the making of assumptions and proving them. Let's consider this aspect in the following examples:

*Two possible explanations exist for why income elasticities for religious giving are inelastic* [9, p. 731]. In this example, in the introduction of the article the author develops the issue of income elasticity, citing several existing points of view in the course of his argument, which makes his reasoning more objective. To expand one's own thought, basing on already available explanations, the hedging adjective *possible* is used, emphasizing that these are only possible opinions on the issue that will be analyzed in the future.

In the introduction of an article, an author may pose questions about which further discussion will be conducted and hypothetical judgments will also be introduced. In addition, the fuzzy semantics of hedges also allows an author of an article to distance himself from the controversial issues, described by him, in order to avoid unsubstantiated statements [10, p. 6]:

*Il semble donc raisonnable de supposer que ces conditions étaient favorables à la collusion* [11, p. 7]. – *It therefore seems reasonable to assume that these conditions favored collusion.* This example illustrates how the use of the hedging construction *Il semble donc raisonnable de supposer* allows the researcher to introduce new information into reasoning based on previously presented data. At the same time, we can note the caution with which new information is introduced, which allows us to speak of a lesser degree of categoricity of this proposition, designed to protect the author from possible criticism against him.

*Thus, our results suggest that government dissaving may be of second-order importance for trends in real rates and that other factors, such as demographics, may dominate* [12, p. 134]. In this case we can observe that the author puts forward his own opinion and his assessment of the significance of factors affecting the dynamics of real rates, while using the hedging verb *suggest* and the modal verb *may*, which help to reduce the categoricity of the proposition. It allows us to talk about the researcher's removal of epistemic responsibility when introducing new information based on the results of his own research.

*Now, assume the same taxpayer donated US\$100 to charity* [9, p. 722]. This example illustrates how the hedging verb *assume* in the imperative mood contributes to the development of the author's thought in the process of argumentation in the “discussion” section. It allows to analyze the issue from a different point of view through the introduction of an example that has a hypothetical character, and thereby more illustratively formalize the opinion introduced by him.

Discussion of the results in a scientific article suggests the need to defend one's own point of view, while avoiding categorical judgments and inaccurate formulations

when expressing a subjective opinion. Let's see how the use of hedges contributes to this goal: *Les marches A et B peuvent être considérés comme matures, tandis que les marchés "a" et "b" peuvent être interprétés comme des marchés périphériques, avec une profitabilité moindre* [11, p. 11]. – *Markets A and B can be considered mature, whereas markets "a" and "b" can be designated as marginal markets with lower profitability.* The author, while putting forward his own opinion, uses hedging constructions *peuvent être considérés*, due to which in the process of argumentation he manages to avoid categoricity when introducing information of a presumptive nature. On the other hand, it can be noted that the author at the same time confirms the truthfulness of this opinion, on which he plans to rely in the course of further argumentation.

*Böylelikle doğrudan yabancı yatırım girişlerinin, ihracat üzerindeki etkisinin daha net bir şekilde ortaya çıkacağı düşünülmektedir* [13, s. 84]. – *Thus, it is believed that the impact of the inflow of foreign direct investment on exports will manifest itself more clearly.* In this example, we can observe how the researcher in the course of reasoning first provides the necessary data, then draws a conclusion based on them. However, it can be noted that this happens with a certain degree of caution and it has the character of a reference to previously entered information, and also assumes a shade of generally accepted opinion, which is facilitated by the use of the hedging verb *düşünülmektedir*, as well as the adverb *daha*.

Hedges can also take the form of subjective evaluation formulas, allowing the author to express his subjective opinion on the problem under consideration, to form his own conclusion on it in the course of argumentation:

*Bien évidemment, cette exploration interne de la position de Lyotard nous conduira à rencontrer ses limites et angles morts* [14, p. 656]. – *Of course, this internal study of Lyotard's position will lead us to its limitations and blind spots.* The construction *bien évidemment* emphasizes the author's confidence that the study of Lyotard's position, to which he refers in the process of reasoning, should reveal the limitations and blind spots of this concept. Thus, the author additionally demon-

strates his own conviction that this study is a sufficient justification for identifying the shortcomings mentioned by him in the article.

*Başarılı girişimciler, kaynakları kullanma konusunda rakiplerine göre daha fazla kendine güvenmeli ve aldıkları kararların riskleri ile yaşayabilecek kadar güçlü ve iyimser olmalıdırlar* [15, s. 55]. – *Successful entrepreneurs must be more confident in using resources than their competitors, and they need to be strong and optimistic enough to live with the risks of their decisions.* In this example, we can observe that the researcher directly expresses his own opinion about what behavior of entrepreneurs is necessary from his point of view, resorting to the use of hedging verbs *güvenmeli* and *olmalıdırlar*. These verbs acquire the meaning of subjective-evaluative formulas due to the affix of duty *-mAlI*, reinforced in the second case by the affix *-dır*. At the same time, the presence of hedges *daha* and *kadar* in the proposal allows to conclude about the author's caution when expressing his judgment.

Hedging can also be implemented through the accentuating formulas, the purpose of which is to focus the addressee's attention on what they will be informed about later [16, p. 99]. Let's consider on the following examples how accentuating formulas are used in the course of the deployment of their own thoughts by the authors of scientific papers: *Bu açıdan değerlendirildiğinde, ihracat ve ekonomik büyümenin artmasında doğrudan yabancı yatırım girişlerinin olumlu etkileri olabileceği ve bu nedenle teşvik edilmesi gerektiği sonucu ortaya çıkmaktadır* [13, s. 84] – *When assessing from this point of view it is concluded that the inflow of foreign direct investment can have a positive impact on the increase in exports and economic growth, and therefore it should be encouraged.* By using the introductory construction *bu açıdan değerlendirildiğinde* the author focuses on a specific point of view, emphasizing that he considers the state of affairs presented by him to be true from this perspective. The author additionally formalizes the argumentation process with the hedges *olabileceği* and *gerektiği*, the first of which expresses the modality of the possibility, and the second prescribes a certain action as desirable.

Thus, the use of hedging in scientific articles on economics written in English, French and Turkish has a significant argumentative potential that allows to formalize the results of one's own research and introduce new information into the text taking into account the norms imposed on this type of articles. The role of hedges and hedging constructions in this perspective is especially important in such sections of scientific papers as "introduction" and "results and discussion". As a tool of argumentation, hedges, including those in the form of subjective-evaluative and accentuating formulas, allow an author to put forward a judgment in a tactful manner, making his propositions less categorical, to accurately express his own opinion when analyzing and representing new scientific content, and to relieve himself of epistemic responsibility for it. It also contributes to the involvement of the addressee in the process of argumentation by a researcher of his own ideas and concepts.

#### Список литературы

1. Милостивая А.И., Светайлов Б.В. Лингвистические особенности англоязычной научной статьи по экономике. *Актуальные проблемы филологии и педагогической лингвистики*. 2019;4:133–139. DOI: 10.29025/2079–6021-2019-4-133-139.
2. Сергеева Ю.С. Конститутивные признаки академического дискурса: цифровые трансформации. *Казанский лингвистический журнал*. 2020;4(3):361–372. DOI: 10.26907/2658-3321.2020.3.4.361-372.
3. Милостивая А.И. Прагмалингвистическое осмысление коммуникативного действия в эпистемологическом контексте XX–XXI вв. *Вестник Ставропольского государственного университета*. 2009;1:52–58.
4. Сигачева Н.А., Маршева Т.В. Проблемы перевода англоязычных научных текстов в сфере геодезии. *Казанский лингвистический журнал*. 2019;4(4);143–153.
5. Солнышкина М.И., Мартынова Е.В., Андреева М.И. Пропозициональное моделирование для оценки информативности текста. *Ученые записки национального общества прикладной лингвистики*. 2020;3(31):47–57.
6. Бобырева Н.Н. Лексические маркеры научного спортивного дискурса (на материале издания "Science of gymnastics journal"). *Казанский лингвистический журнал*. 2021;3(4);366–379. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2021.4.3.366-379>.
7. Сакаева Л.Р., Тахтарова С.С., Базарова Л.В., Яхин М.А. Логико-понятийная классификация терминологии сферы «медицина» в английском, русском и турецком языках. *Казанский лингвистический журнал*. 2022;5(3);360–368. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2022.5.3.360-368>.
8. Kristic A. *Hedging in Academic Writing: A Contrastive Analysis of Scientific Articles and Student Papers*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb; 2018. 32 p.
9. Brooks A.C. How Did the Great Recession Affect Charitable Giving? *Public Finance Review*. 2018;46(5):715–742. DOI: 10.1177/1091142117691604.
10. Eromiants I.S., Zhdanova E.V., Marinenko L.A. The Peculiarities of Hedging Language in Academic Writing. *Идеи. Поиски. Решения: сборник статей и тезисов XII Междуна-*



родной научно-практической конференции (Минск, 26 октября 2018 г.). Минск: издательство БГУ. 2018;2:5–8.

11. Avenel É., Caprice S. Collusion et Possibilité D'entrée en Aval dans une Industrie Verticalement Intégrée. *Revue économique*. 2018;1(69):5–28. DOI 10.3917/reco.pr2.0110. (На франц. яз.)

12. Lunsford K.G., Kenneth D.W. Some Evidence on Secular Drivers of US Safe Real Rates. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics*. 2019;11(4):113–139. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20180005>.

13. İmamoğlu I.K. Doğrudan Yabancı Sermaye Yatırımları ve İhracat İlişkisi: Türkiye Ekonomisi için ARDL Sınır Testi Yaklaşımı. *Uluslararası Ekonomi, İşletme ve Politika Dergisi*. 2022;6(1):79–96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29216/ueip.1079243>. (На тур. яз.)

14. Sobel R. Critique du Capitalisme et Différend Salarial: Lyotard Lecteur Kantien de Marx. *Oeconomia*. 2017;9–4:655–688. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/oeconomia.6919>. (На франц. яз.)

15. Kuduz N., Atasever M. Finans İşletmelerinin Stratejik Yönetim Bağlamında Misyon ve Vizyon İfadesi Bileşenlerine Göre Girişimcilik Özellikleri. *İzmir İktisat Dergisi*. 2022;37(1):53–76. DOI: 10.24988/ije.793444. (На тур. яз.)

16. Фомина М.А. Маркеры адресанта в научном диалоге. *Лингвокультурное образование в системе вузовской подготовки специалиста*. 2017;(10):96–103.

#### References

1. Milostivaya A.I., Svetaylov B.V. Linguistic features of an English-language Scientific Article on Economics. *Aktual'nye problemy filologii i pedagogicheskoi lingvistiki*. 2019;4:133–139. DOI: 10.29025/2079–6021-2019-4-133-139. (In Russ)

2. Sergeeva Yu.S. Constitutive features of academic discourse: digital transformation. *Kazan linguistic journal*. 2020;4(3):361–372. DOI: 10.26907/2658-3321.2020.3.4.361-372. (In Russ)

3. Milostivaya A.I. Pragmalinguistic understanding of communicative act in epistemological context of the 20th–21st centuries. *Vestnik Stavropol'skogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. 2009;1:52–58. (In Russ.)

4. Sigacheva N.A., Marsheva T.V. Problems of translation of English scientific texts in the sphere of geodesy. *Kazan linguistic journal*. 2019;4(4):143–153.

5. Solnyshkina M.I., Martynova E.V., Andreeva M.I. Propositional modeling as a tool to assess text information complexity. *Uchenye zapiski natsional'nogo obshchestva prikladnoi lingvistiki*. 2020;3(31):47–57. (In Russ.)

6. Bobyreva N.N. Lexical markers of the scientific sport discourse (based on “Science of gymnastics journal”). *Kazan linguistic journal*. 2021;3(4):366–379. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2021.4.3.366-379>. (In Russ.)

7. Sakaeva L.R., Takhtarova S.S., Bazarova L.V., Yahin M.A. Logical and conceptual classification of English, Russian and Turkish medical terminology. *Kazan linguistic journal*. 2022;5(3):360–368. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26907/2658-3321.2022.5.3.360-368>. (In Russ.)

8. Kristic A. *Hedging in Academic Writing: A Contrastive Analysis of Scientific Articles and Student Papers*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb; 2018. 32 p.

9. Brooks A.C. How Did the Great Recession Affect Charitable Giving? *Public Finance Review*. 2018;46(5):715–742. DOI: 10.1177/1091142117691604.

10. Eromiants I.S., Zhdanova E.V., Marinenko L.A. The Peculiarities of Hedging Language in Academic Writing. *Idei. Poiski. Resheniya: sbornik statei i tezisov XII Mezhdunarodnoi nauchno-prakticheskoi konferentsii* (Minsk, October 26, 2018). Minsk: izdatel'stvo BGU. 2018;2:5–8.

11. Avenel É., Caprice S. Collusion and downstream entry in a vertically integrated industry. *Revue économique*. 2018;1(69):5–28. DOI 10.3917/reco.pr2.0110. (In French)

12. Lunsford K.G., Kenneth D.W. Some Evidence on Secular Drivers of US Safe Real Rates. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics.* 2019;11(4):113–139. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20180005>.

13. İmamoğlu I.K. Foreign direct capital investments and export relationship: ARDL bound testing approach for the Turkish economy. *International Journal of Economics, Business and Politics.* 2022;6(1):79–96. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29216/ueip.1079243>. (In Turkish)

14. Sobel R. Critique of capitalism and wage dispute: Lyotard Kantian Reader of Marx. *Oeconomía.* 2017;9–4:655–688. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/oeconomia.6919>. (In French).

15. Kuduz N., Atasever M. Entrepreneurship characteristics of financial enterprises according to the mission and vision expression components in the context of strategic management. *İzmir Journal of Economics.* 2022;37(1):53–76. DOI: 10.24988/ije.793444. (In Turkish.)

16. Fomina M.A. The addresser's markers in academic dialogue. *Lingvokul'turnoe obrazovanie v sisteme vuzovskoi podgotovki spetsialista.* 2017;(10):96–103. (In Russ.)

**Автор публикации**

**Светайлов Борис Владимирович** –  
Переводчик

АО «Концерн Энергомера»

Ставрополь, Россия

Email: [borya.svetajlov@yandex.ru](mailto:borya.svetajlov@yandex.ru)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3126-1687>

**Раскрытие информации о конфликте интересов**

Автор заявляет об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

**Информация о статье**

Поступила в редакцию: 26.04.2023

Одобрена после рецензирования: 28.05.2023

Принята к публикации: 5.06.2023

Автор прочитал и одобрил окончательный вариант рукописи.

**Информация о рецензировании**

«Казанский лингвистический журнал» благодарит анонимного рецензента (рецензентов) за их вклад в рецензирование этой работы.

**Author of the publication**

**Svetaylov Boris Vladimirovich** –  
Translator

JSC “Energomera” Concern”

Stavropol, Russian Federation

Email: [borya.svetajlov@yandex.ru](mailto:borya.svetajlov@yandex.ru)

<http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3126-1687>

**Conflicts of Interest Disclosure**

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

**Article info**

Submitted: 26.04.2023

Approved after peer reviewing: 28.05.2023

Accepted for publication: 5.06.2023

The author has read and approved the final manuscript.

**Peer review info**

Kazan Linguistic Journal thanks the anonymous reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.