

UOT 81

THE PRAGMATIC FUNCTIONS OF HEDGES IN HUMAN-AUTHORED ACADEMIC TEXTS INTRODUCTION

Fardin Karami Qebchaq*Master's degree student in English Linguistics at Khazar University***ORCID:** 0009-0001-4823-1794**E-mail:** fardin.karami@khazar.org

fardin.karami1998@gmail.com

Açar sözlər: hedging, akademik yazı, pragmatika, metadiskurs*Ключевые слова:* Хеджирование; академическое письмо; прагматика; метадискурс*Key words:* hedging, academic writing, pragmatics; metadiscourse

Academic texts are considered as literal and evenhanded ways of communication; nonetheless, a momentous amounts of researches have demonstrated that this discourse is naturally oratorical and bilateral. Academic authors ardently manufacture knowledge, make claims, and engage with their audiences through a range of linguistic strategies, rather than presenting facts in simple ways. Restraint is one of the most significant of these strategies, that infers to the use of linguistic devices that decrease the power or inevitability of a interpretation. As researchers like Ken Hyland have mentioned, evasion plays a central role in academic discourse by allowing authors to clarify ambiguity, foresight, and openness to different clarification.

Writers apply hedges usually through different lexical and grammatical forms like modal verbs (e.g., might, could), epistemic adverbs (e.g., probably, likely), adjectives (e.g., probably, possible), and metadiscursive statements (e.g., it seems that, it could be advocate that). While these forms may inconsiderately enfeeble statements, their function in academic writing is far more complex. statements of ambiguity serve as essential tools for conducting informational claims, sustaining reliability, and simplifying scholarly interplay instead of demonstrating ambiguity in a negative sense. In such manner, statements of ambiguity should be considered not as a loss of reliance, but as a intentional and strategic feature of impressive academic communication.

From a pragmatic aspect, hedging are relatively related to the expectations of the academic community and the author's purpose. Demir's (2018) research marks that lexical warnings are generally used to warrant that arguments remain prudent and measure the strength of claims. Similarly, Akbas and Hardman (2018), headlining the dynamic relationship between reinforcers and warnings in academic knowledge construction, illustrate that authors strike a steady balance between modifying and reinforcing their claims depending on rhetorical needs. This balance reflects the essentially dialogical nature of academic discourse, where knowledge is not only inferential but also negotiated. [5, p. 3–7; 4, p. 833–840]

Hedging is considered as a practical fundamnetal based on rhetorical practice by Jameel (2023). From this point of view, academic writing surpassses the transportation of information and involves purposeful strategies to construct the reader's responds, decrease discrepancy, and avouch the ratification of arguments. Consequently, hedging provides diverse communicative

functions such as lenitive expressions, illustrating politeness, and encouraging reader commitment. Then as well, Lim (2015) accentuates that abstinence is crucial for sustaining the author's credibility because it empowers writers to recognize limitations, illustrate awareness of differing attitudes, and elude overgeneralization. This is exclusively important in academic settings because overly utter or certain claims imperil being considered unfounded or disingenuous. [6, p. 4–7; 7, p. 1698–1700].

Hyland's considerable contributions to the study of academic discourse makes hedging as a considerable focal tool in the social structure of knowledge. He ratiocinates that hedges grant writers to illustrate belonging to a erudite society, align their manifestos with disciplinary indentures, and frame their arguments in ways that are both persuasive and plausible. Along these lines, hedging operates not only as a linguistic device but as an expression of wider epistemological and institutional principles that shape academic communication. [1, p. 40–60] Hedging pragmatic aims are important for a consummate perception of academic writing, and it's essential to understand it due to its fundamental role. To evaluate hedging as a purposeful resource that authorizes writers to shape meaning, equipoise assurance, and engage with their readers, we provide this research. The article desires to show these linguistic strategies are necessary to impressive reasoning and the construction of knowledge within academic discourse, through researching and studying the various pragmatic functions of hedges.

Literature Review

Hedging is extensively recognized as a foundation facet of academic discourse, underscoring the intrinsically empirical and negotiated procedure of constructing knowledge. Hyland's early studies (1996, 2005) indwell hedging within the extensive concept of metadiscourse, illuminating it as an cooperation resource that facilitates writers to introduce allegations carefully while involving readers in interpretation. From this aspect, academic writing is not naturally the delivery of knowledge but a form of social engagement in which writers must anticipate objections, adapt to punitive anticipations, and instate credibility. Therefore, hedges supply an important function in balancing inevitability with unsettledness, allowing writers to elude sheer statements while still advancing their arguments. [2, p. 435–440; 1, p. 40–60]

Later studies have laid on this mindset by tracking how hedges are linguistically conveyed and operatively allotted in academic writing. Demir (2018) proffers a elaborate assessment of lexical hedges, showing that epistemic adverbs, modal verbs, and approximators are among the most widely used tools for diminishing claims. His analysis emphasizes that hedging reflects writers' sensible endeavors to adapt the level of assurance in their statements as a determined strategy. This view is adhere to Akbaş and Hardman (2018), who analyze the connection between hedges and boosters in postgraduate texts. Their discoveries demonstrate that strong academic discussion demands a effective interplay between bolstering and mollifying claims, emphasizing that hedging is central to convincing discourse rather than a signal of weakness. [5, p. 3–7; 4, p. 833–840]

From a pragmatic standpoint, hedging is nearly connected to the writer's expressive aims and the bilateral sides of academic writing. Jameel (2023) claims that hedging functions as a strategic apparatus provides writers chances to discuss meaning, decrease possible tensions, and figurize readers' exegesis. This amplifies the concept that academic discourse is

instinctively rhetorical, postulating careful linguistic selections to present claims in ways that are both valid and admissible. Correspondingly, Lim (2015), building on Hyland's pragmatic framework, asserts the pedagogical matter of hedging, highlighting that it helps writers hit a balance between assurance and caution, protect their validity, and identify alternative viewpoints. In the aggregate, these perceptions climax hedging as a essential structure for upholding academic accuracy and boosting structural scholarly dialogue. [6, p. 4–7; 7, p. 1698–1700]

In addition to its interactive role, hedging has also been conjoined to expanded epistemological and punitive practices. Hyland (2005) states that hedges reflect the agreements and expectancies of special academic societies, where knowledge is considered as conditional and open to modification. Within this mold, hedging empowers writers to arrange their claims with settled standards of proof and reasoning, consequently supporting the social confirmation of knowledge. Research further illustrates that inordinate certainty can be seen as overstating claims, whereas allocate use of hedging strengthens the validity and admissibility of academic discourses. [1, p. 40–60]

Despite that hedging has been broadly studied, scholars diverge in how they spotlight its main obligations. Some, such as Hyland (2005) and Demir (2018), emphasize its role in transmitting epistemic ambiguity, while others, including Akbaş and Hardman (2018) and Jameel (2023), underline its notion in coercion and disputation. Pedagogically conducted research, like that of Lim (2015), underlines the significance of clearly teaching hedging as a essential academic writing skill. Altogether, these viewpoints demonstrate that hedging is a multidimensional emanation that cannot be confined to a solo aim, operating simultaneously at pragmatic, linguistic, and social levels. [1, p. 40–60; 5, p. 3–7; 4, p. 833–840; 7, p. 1698–1700]

Overall, the investigation illustrates that hedging is a significant feature of academic discourse, serving various pragmatic processes that patronage effectual communication. Although previous studies have comprehensively investigated both the functions and forms of hedges, there is still a need for a more integrated comprehension of the pragmatic intentions that steer their use. To address this issue, this scrutiny inspects how hedges function as strategic devices for managing assurance, shaping discussions, and amusing readers in academic contexts.

2. Hedging as a Pragmatic Phenomenon

In academic discourse, Hedging should be assumed not merely as a set of linguistic patterns, but as a inherently pragmatic phenomenon formed by context, purpose, and interplay. While statements of indeterminacy are often determined by their outward perceptions, such as modal verbs (might, might), adverbs (probably, probably), or expressions (it seems that), their notion lies in what they do not in what they are. To put it another way, statements of uncertainty function at the level of meaning within the context in which writers make calculated selections to manage how their asserts are expounded by readers.

From a pragmatic viewpoint, language is assumed as a means of action, with meaning assembled by the interaction of speaker or writer, message, and audience. Through this mold, hedges serve as devices that provide ability to writers to formulate the power of their statements in line with communicative goals and disciplinary conventions. As Hyland (1996, 2005) claims, academic writing is innately collaborative, demanding authors to assume feasible reader

responses and settle their claims consequently. Hedges thus function as clue resources for administering this interaction, admitting writers to present propositions as experimental rather than absolute. [2, p. 435–440; 1, p. 40–60]

One of the main pragmatic aspects of hedging is its role in freighting epistemic position, that is, the writer's level of nomination to the integrity of a allegation. Rather than presenting knowledge as constant or utter, academic writers mostly frame their arguments as open to exegesis, modification, or disputation. This practice is exclusively considerable in academic contexts, where new comprehensions must be unified into existing frameworks and acutely assessed by the academic society. Thru hedging, writers illustrate awareness of the restrictions of their proofs, the complication of their subject importance, and the possibility of intermittent explanations (Hyland, 2005). In this way, hedging demonstrates not only a linguistic selection but also an epistemological direction. [1, p. 40–60]

Accompanying this, hedging is firmly connected to the interpersonal aspect of academic discourse. As Jameel (2023) apperceives, hedges make writers able to soften the strength of their claims, through reducing the tendency of opposition and maintaining an atmosphere of academic civility. This correlates with extensive pragmatic theories of face-saving and civility, in which speakers point to elude attenuate the social standing of others. In academic writing, this becomes specially significant when engaging with former study, since extremely forceful or direct critique may be judged improper. Statements like *it appears that* or *it could be argued that* make writers able to transmit assessment in a way that is more diplomatically socially acceptable and nuanced. [6, p. 4–7]

In addition, hedging has a considerable role in the convincing aspect of academic discourse. However it may emerge counterintuitive, softening the strength of a allegation can indeed intensify its reliability. As Akbaş and Hardman (2018) indicate, efficient academic discussion depends on a accurate balance between assurance and percaution, beacuse extremly assertive statements may impede the writer's reliability. By engaging hedges, authors introduce their arguments as purposeful and evidence-based, incentive readers to remark rather than simply accept their inferences. In such manner, hedging operates as a delicate yet effective convincing strategy that promotes reader nomination and agreement. [4, p. 833–840]

Hedging's role in conforming to disciplinary conventions as a pragmatic practice is another considerable aspect of it. Academic fields vary in how much assurance or assumption they permit, and writers must adapt their use of hedges to these expectations. Hyland (2005) highlight that hedging practices are formed by the principles of specific discourse communities, reflecting common presumptions about what counts as appropriate argumentation. Consequently, hedging is not simply a matter of distinctive style but also a sign of belonging within a specific academic culture. [1, p. 40–60]

Briefly, hedging portrays a complicated collaboration among social context, linguistic statment, and communicative goal. It make writers able to transmit unsureness, manage interactive dynamics, adhere to disciplinary conventions, and reinforce encouragement. Considering hedging as a pragmatic phenomenon is hence vital for recognizing its role in academic writing, as it emphasizes the strategic and functional nature of these apparently simple linguistic markers.

3. Main Section: Pragmatic Intentions of Hedges

Hedges in academic writing are not indeed rhetorical markers of unsureness but act as intentional pragmatic devices that make writers able to attain particular communicative goals. Their usage reflects attentive choices about how to display knowledge, engage readers, and place arguments within the wider scholarly community. As former research has displayed, hedging administer several levels at once, serving epistemic, interactive, and oratorical purposes. This segment hence examines the main pragmatic intentions that underpin the use of hedges in academic contexts. [1, p. 40–60; 6, p. 4–7]

3.1. Expressing Epistemic Uncertainty

One of the most essential pragmatic roles of hedging is the statement of epistemic unsureness, whereby writers illustrate that their allegations are not definite but open to commentary and modification. Academic knowledge is seldom presented as stable or definite; instead, it is usually outlined as temproray and advancing. By using hedges such as *may*, *might*, *could*, *probably*, and *likely*, writers indicate varying degrees of assurance, thereby connecting their statements with the inherently experimental character of academic research.

This pragmatic function serves for various significant aims. First of all, it defends writers from possible criticism by averting overgeneralization or unreasonable claims. Second, it illustrates a consciousness of the limitations of the possible evidence, which in turn reinforces the validity of the argument. As Hyland (2005) apperceives, the use of epistemic hedges displays that writers affirm the complication of their subject matter and exercise precaution in their impressions. Hence, hedging boosts its academic rightfulness by presenting it as properly qualified rather than shrinking a statement. [1, p. 40–60]

3.2. Enhancing Persuasion and Acceptability

Although hedging decreases the imposition of an expression, it incongruously boosts persuasion by making claims more admissible to readers. Solid, incompetent purports may come across as extremely assured or even dogmatic, which can arouse stability. On the other hand, hedged statements attract attention and encourage compromise by providing claims as sensible rather than exacted.

As an illustration, statements such as *this may suggest* or *it is possible that* make writers able to guide readers toward a specific exegesis without definitely insisting on it. As Akbaş and Hardman (2018) highlight, impressive academic writing demands a balance between strengthening and attenuating claims, with hedging playing a focal role in maintaining this equivalence. From a pragmatic viewpoint, the purpose is not exclusively to convey information but to influence the reader's judgment in a precise and admissible way. [4, p. 833–840]

3.3. Maintaining Politeness and Academic Diplomacy

Hedging also complies a vital interactive function by making writers able to sustain politeness and academic diplomacy. Because academic discourse most of the time contains engaging with the work of others, straight and unmitigated criticism can menace the “face” of comrade researchers and disrupt the cooperative backbone of academic exchange.

To lighting this, writers use hedges such as *it seems that*, *it appears that*, or *it could be argued that*, which mollify interpretative expresions. As Jameel (2023) illustrates, these frames make authors available to represnt oppositions in a respectful, non-confrontational method. The pragmatic purpose here is to protect professional relations while advancing one's own dispute. In such manner, hedging functions as a device for balancing crucial engagement with social

harmony. [6, p. 4–7]

3.4. Supporting Argumentation and Interpretive Flexibility

Another major pragmatic function of hedging is its role in supporting argumentation by permitting flexibility in exegesis. Scholarly claims are rarely presented as utter facts; instead, they are shaped as exegesis of evidence that stay open to substitutable readings. Hedges make writers able to acknowledge this complication and position their assertions as one possible viewpoint among others.

An example of this is, an expression such as *the results might indicate a shift in behavior* provides space for additional debates and analysis rather than preventing other viewpoints. This openness is crucial in academic contexts, where knowledge progresses through continuous argument and serious evaluation. Through employing hedges, writers build room for dialogue and illustrate awareness of the provisional nature of their inferences. [1, p. 40–60]

3.5. Limiting Generalizations

Hedging also has a crucial role in controlling the domain of claims and avoiding overgeneralization. Because academic writing often addresses complex phenomena that cannot be commonly applied, writers use frequency and degree markers such as *often*, *generally*, *typically*, and *in many cases* to determine the situations under which a statement is credible.

The pragmatic goal here is to assure accuracy and correctness, through reinforcement the reliability of the discourse. Vast, comprehensive claims are more assailable to challenge, whilst carefully hedged assertions are more vindicable. These forms are remarkably important for sustaining a balance between generalization and specificity, make writers able to underline patterns without exaggerating their emphasis. [5, p. 3–7]

3.6. Managing Approximation and Degree

Hedging is also used to transmit estimate and ambiguity, exclusively in quantitative or interpretative contexts. Phrases such as *approximately*, *roughly*, *somewhat*, *relatively*, and *fairly* provide ability to writers to evade accurate figures or definitive judgments when such accuracy is either unattainable or dispensable.

This pragmatic function mirrors the recognition that not all perspectives of research can be evaluated with complete precision. By employing approximators, writers display their detections in a way that is both pragmatic and methodologically sound. The purpose is to supply meaningful information without misleading the reader, assuring that claims remain valid while acknowledging innate limitations.

3.7. Expressing Authorial Stance

Eventually, hedging plays a crucial role in declaring authorial state, or the writer's attitude toward the proposition being advanced. Through phrases such as *apparently*, *seemingly*, and *presumably*, writers can indicate distance, uncertainty, or discreet confirmation.

This function is firmly attached to the construction of academic character, as it makes writers able to position themselves as critical, reflective, and aware of the limitations of their work. As Hyland (2005) illustrates, stance-taking is a focal feature of academic communication, and hedging equips the linguistic means through which this stance is articulated. The pragmatic purpose, hence, is not only to present information but also to form how that information is understood in relation to the writer's potency and validity. [1, p. 40–60].

4. Discussion

The study of hedges as pragmatic tools makes obvious that their role in academic context expands far beyond signaling doubt. Rather than debilitating arguments, hedges function as strategic resources that provide writers ability to form knowledge in ways that are reliable, convincing, and socially passable. The discourse in the former sections demonstrates how hedging operates concurrently across epistemic, interactive, and rhetorical aspects, affirming its focal significance in academic context. In this framework, hedging should be considered not as a circumferential stylistic specification but as a core mechanism through which academic communication attains accuracy, diplomacy, and convincing force.

One of the main intuitions to appear from this debate is that hedging reflects the innately interim character of academic knowledge. As Hyland (2005) emphasizes, academic asserts are rarely presented as utter truths; instead, they are framed as exegeses that remain open to edification, challenge, and argument. The use of epistemic hedges makes writers able to suit their evidences with this expectation, signaling both an awareness of limitations and a recognition of intermittent statements. Consequently, hedging is directly responsible about the validity of academic writing, accordingly it illustrates intellectual precaution, methodological rigidity, and respect for the evolving nature of scholarly query.

On the flip side, hedging plays a viatal role in encouragement and debate. While it may seem nonrational, strategically decreasing assurance often rises the admissibility of claims. As Akbaş and Hardman (2018) ratiocinate, impressive academic writing depends on hitting a careful balance between statement and mitigation. Excessively strong assertions risk being perceived as unfounded or exceedingly confident, whilst properly hedged expressions invite readers to engage with the reasoning and evaluate its reliability. Persuasion in academic discourse, thus, is not gained by forceful claim but through the nuanced debate of meaning, where hedging works as a focal mechanism for developing validity, openness, and reader alignment. [1, p. 40–60; 4, p. 833–840]

Interpersonal function is another significant aspect of hedging, especially in fostering politeness and academic diplomacy. Academic writing reveals within a community managed by common principles, where respect for colleague scholars is necessary. Hedges make writers able to criticism, oppose, or appraise in ways that minimize possible conflict. As Jameel (2023) exclaims, this function is vital for maintaining the aggregate spirit of scholarly communication, in which knowledge is co-established rather than inflicted. In this framework, hedging reflects not only particular rhetorical choices but also the vaster social conventions that form academic discourse. [6, p. 4–7]

The discussion also highlights its role in administering extension and accuracy. Academic contexts often include identifying templates or orientations, yet such extensions must be intently qualified to avoid overstatement. By using approximators and frequency markers, writers can introduce results with the accurate level of explicitness, assuring that asserts remain accurate and vindicable. This function underlines the link between methodological responsibility and hedging, because it makes authors able to demonstrate their data in an intricate and delicate way.

Significantly, the multifunctionality of hedging presents that these devices cannot be diminished to a single pragmatic aim. Rather than, they perform within an unified system of meaning-making, where various functions often overlap. For example, a lone hedge may at

once transmit doubt, soften a assertion, and boost encouragement. This complication demonstrates the sight that hedging is deeply ingrained in the communicative practices of academic writing, necessitating authors to make context-sensitive choices formed by audience, intention, and disciplinary norms.

Eventually, the findings refuse the common misapprehension that hedging marks laxity or a lack of assurance. Just the opposite, the expert use of hedges illustrates mighty rhetorical qualification and an awareness of academic conventions. Writers who use hedging efficiently are better equipped to direct the requirements of academic communication, illustrating their arguments in ways that are reliable yet open to discuss.

To put it briefly, the discussion illustrates that hedging is an essential principle of academic context, operating as a bridge between knowledge construction and social interaction. Its pragmatic roles illustrate that academic writing is not exclusively about conveying information, but about engaging in a complex procedure of debate with readers and the wider scholarly community.

5. Conclusion

This study has explored hedging as a focal pragmatic aspect of academic context, emphasizes its role as a strategic device rather than only stylistic device. Drawing on former research and theoretical aspects, it has been illustrated that hedges carry out a diversity of interconnected functions that backing the effective construction and communication of knowledge. Far from signaling infirmity or lack of assurance, hedging reflects a major awareness of the epistemic, interpersonal, and rhetorical necessities of scholarly discourse.

The study has shown that hedges work for diverse interconnected functions in academic context. They make writers able to demonstrate epistemic doubt, aligning assertions with the temporary nature of scholarly knowledge, while also fulfilling convincing aims by making arguments more admissible through the evasion of overly solid or categorical allegations. Simultaneously, hedging has a role in academic politeness and diplomacy, enabling serious engagement with existing research in ways that respect other scholars. The study further highlighted how hedges assistance discussion, restrict generalizations, and operate approximation, all of which raise the accuracy and validity of academic texts. Furthermore, hedges act as indications of authorial condition, helping writers place themselves in relation to their assertions and punitive communities.

Altogether, these findings emohasize the multifunctional essence of hedging and its importance in accelerating interaction between authors and readers. Academic context is not exclusively the presentation of facts, but a procedure of debate in which meaning is cooperatively made. Hedges has a central role in this procedure by make writers able to balance assurance with precaution, authority with openness, and criticism with respect.

Overall, comprehension on the pragmatic purposes behind hedging suggests valuable vision into the workings of academic discourse. It emphasizes the significance of context-sensitive language use and the exigency for writers to make purposeful rhetorical selections. In consequence, hedging should be considered as a necessary detail of impressive academic communication, integral both to the construction of knowledge and to the retention of scholarly dialogue.

References

1. Hyland, K. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. London: Continuum, 2005, pp. 1–230.
2. Hyland, K. “Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles.” *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 17, no. 4, 1996, pp. 433–454.
3. Hyland, K., & Tse, P. “Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal.” *Applied Linguistics*, vol. 25, no. 2, 2004, pp. 156–177.
4. Akbaş, E., & Hardman, J. “Strengthening or weakening claims in academic knowledge construction: A comparative study of hedges and boosters in postgraduate academic writing.” *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, vol. 18, no. 4, 2018, pp. 831–859.
5. Demir, C. “Hedging and academic writing: An analysis of lexical hedges.” *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, vol. 14, no. 4, 2018, pp. 1–15.
6. Jameel, A. F. “A pragmatic study of hedging in academic discourse.” *International Journal of Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, vol. 13, no. 1, 2023, pp. 1–12.
7. Lim, J. M.-H. “Hedging in academic writing: A pedagogically motivated qualitative study.” *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 197, 2015, pp. 1697–1702.
8. Lakoff, G. “Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts.” *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, vol. 2, no. 4, 1973, pp. 458–508.
9. Zhang, W., & Hyland, K. “Hedging and boosting in scientific writing: A corpus-based study.” *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, vol. 46, 2020, pp. 100877.

F.K. Qebchaq

The pragmatic functions of hedges in human-authored academic texts introduction Summary

Hedging is a main aspect of academic writing that mirrors the experimental and interactive essence of scholarly communication. This article has researched the pragmatic purposes of the fundamental hedges, moving beyond their superficial grammatical shapes to assay their circumstantial functions. Drawing on available literature, hedging is visualized as a tactical resource that make authors able to regulate the strength of their assertions, attract readers, and align with disciplining prospects. Thus the article aims to analyse various pragmatic functions: expliciting epistemic doubt, improving encouragement and admissibility, preserving politeness and academic diplomacy, encouraging debate, restricting generalizations, and transmitting authorial viewpoint. Far from indicating weak or uncertain writing, hedges are fundamental tools for constructing reliable, delicate, and reader-oriented debates. By balancing assurance with precaution and dominion with openness, hedging has a focal role in deliberating meaning and socially developing knowledge in academic contexts. Overall, the observations highlight the significance of perception hedging as a pragmatic phenomenon and climax its emphasis in impressive academic communication.

F.K. Qebchaq

**İnsan müəllifli akademik mətnlərdə hedcinq ifadələrinin praqmatik funksiyaları
Xülasə**

Hedcinq (hedging) akademik yazının əsas elementlərindən biri olub, elmi ünsiyyətin eksperimental və interaktiv mahiyyətini əks etdirir. Bu məqalə əsas hedcinq vasitələrinin praqmatik məqsədlərini araşdırır və onların yalnız səthi qrammatik formalarından kənara çıxaraq kontekstual funksiyalarını təhlil edir. Mövcud ədəbiyyata əsaslanaraq, hedcinq müəlliflərə iddialarının gücünü tənzimləməyə, oxucuları cəlb etməyə və akademik intizamın tələblərinə uyğunlaşmağa imkan verən strateji bir resurs kimi təqdim olunur. Buna görə də məqalə müxtəlif praqmatik funksiyaları təhlil etməyi hədəfləyir: epistemik şübhənin ifadəsi, inandırıcılıq və qəbul olunmanın artırılması, nəzakət və akademik diplomatiyanın qorunması, müzakirənin təşviqi, ümumiləşdirmələrin məhdudlaşdırılması və müəllif mövqeyinin çatdırılması. Zəif və ya qeyri-müəyyən yazı göstəricisi olmaqdan uzaq, hedcinqlər etibarlı, incə və oxucu yönümlü arqumentlərin qurulması üçün əsas vasitələrdir. Əminliklə ehtiyatlılıq, eləcə də hökmranlıqla açıqlıq arasında balans yaradaraq, hedcinq akademik mühitdə mənanın formalaşdırılmasında və biliklərin sosial inkişafında mühüm rol oynayır. Ümumilikdə, nəticələr hedcinqin praqmatik fenomen kimi əhəmiyyətini vurğulayır və onun effektiv akademik ünsiyyətdəki rolunu ön plana çıxarır.

Ф.К. Гебчаг

**Прагматические функции средств хеджирования в академических текстах,
написанных человеком
Резюме**

Хеджирование (hedging) является одним из ключевых аспектов академического письма, отражающим экспериментальный и интерактивный характер научной коммуникации. В данной статье исследуются прагматические цели основных средств хеджирования, выходя за рамки их поверхностных грамматических форм и анализируя их контекстуальные функции. Опираясь на существующую литературу, хеджирование рассматривается как стратегический ресурс, позволяющий авторам регулировать степень категоричности своих утверждений, привлекать внимание читателей и соответствовать требованиям академической дисциплины. В связи с этим статья направлена на анализ различных прагматических функций: выражения эпистемической неопределённости, повышения убедительности и приемлемости, сохранения вежливости и академической дипломатии, стимулирования дискуссии, ограничения обобщений и передачи авторской позиции. Хеджирование отнюдь не является признаком слабого или неуверенного письма; напротив, оно выступает важным инструментом для построения надёжных, тонких и ориентированных на читателя аргументов. Балансируя между уверенностью и осторожностью, а также между категоричностью и открытостью, хеджирование играет

ключевую роль в формировании смысла и социальном развитии знаний в академическом контексте. В целом результаты подчёркивают значимость хеджирования как прагматического явления и его важную роль в эффективной академической коммуникации.

Redaksiyaya daxil olub: 01.05.2026