Types of Hedges Used by American and Vietnamese Celebrity

Nguyen Quang Ngoan*, Nguyen Le To Quyen

*Department of Foreign Languages, Quy Nhon University,
170 An Duong Vuong, Quy Nhon, Binh Dinh, Vietnam*

Abstract: The study was to compare and contrast type of hedges used by American and Vietnamese celebrities in responses to questions in interviews. The data were collected from 96 online interviews with American and Vietnamese celebrities. The study was conducted mainly with quantitative methods with the combination of some qualitative methods for explanation and discussion. The findings showed that out of the five categories under investigation, *"Quality hedges"* were most frequently-used with a rather high rate, while *"Relevance hedges"* took the lowest position in frequency by both groups of celebrities. Also, hedges used in the American and Vietnamese data were different from each other in the distribution of *"Quantity hedges", "Manner hedges"* and *"Mixed hedges"*.

Keywords: American celebrities (Acels), Vietnamese celebrities (Vcels), hedges on quality maxim (QlHs), hedges on quantity maxim (QnHs), hedges on relevance maxim (ReHs), hedges on manner maxim (MaHs), mixed hedges (MiHs).

1. Introduction

Hedging is supposed to be one of the most effective means to achieve the communicative purpose as well as to reduce the friction and maintain harmony. Hedging is likely to be frequently used by celebrities, whose all communicative activities and behavior always attract the attention and concern of the public. It is for this reason that we decided to examine semantic features of hedges used by American and Vietnamese celebrities in responses to questions in interviews with all their characteristics as well as similarities and differences. The paper starts with some theoretical background, followed by the methodology of study and results of the study before it ends up with the conclusion.

2. Theoretical background

The term *"Hedge"* goes back to the 1970s with Lakoff [1], who first introduced the term in his article, showing his concern about the logical relationships of words and their semantic aspects of hedging. Lakoff does not consider context to be important for giving hedges their meaning but sees hedges as independent lexical items with the capacity to make things *"fuzzier"* [2: 238]. In his article, Zadeh [3] follows Lakoff by analyzing English hedges from the point of view of semantics and

_____
* Corresponding author. Tel.: 84-906505968
Email: ngoanqnue@yahoo.com

logics, but he assumes that hedges vary in their dependency on context. Later on, Lakoff's pioneering ideas have been further developed by a number of pragmaticians and discourse analysts in a broader view on hedging. Hedging is considered as not only a semantic phenomenon but also a pragmatic one [4: 173], and it is also realized from a social, pragmatic, and discoursal point of view [5], [6], and [7].

Grice, cited in Yule [8], proposes four conversational maxims of the cooperative principle, namely *"Quality", "Quantity", "Relevance"* and *"Manner"*. The maxim of Quality says that speakers are expected to be sincere, to be saying something that they believe to correspond to reality. The Maxim of Quantity mentions that speakers should not give more or less information than it is required. The Maxim of Relevance states that speakers are assumed to be saying something that is relevant to what has been mentioned before. The Maxim of Manner requires that speakers should be brief and orderly, and avoid obscurity and ambiguity. However, to achieve a certain communicative purpose, sometimes the cooperative principle should be flouted or violated. In these situations, speakers tend to use hedges to imply that they are fully aware of the importance of the cooperative principle and are trying to observe it.

3. Methodology

3.1. Research question

What are the similarities and differences in types of hedges used by American celebrities (ACels) and Vietnamese celebrities (VCels) in their responses to questions in interviews?

3.2. Research methods

The study was a combination of *quantitative* and *qualitative* methods for a thorough analysis of the research topic. Techniques of *statistic, descriptive, analytic, contrastive* and *synthetic* analysis were also

applied in this research to make a detailed description of hedging devices used in English and Vietnamese as well as the similarities and differences between the two languages.

3.3. Data collection

The data in the present study were selected on the basis that they were all transcripts of interviews with American and Vietnamese celebrities. Celebrities chosen in this research were related to three groups: high-ranking politicians, businessmen, and well-known artists. Accordingly, the quantity of data included 48 interviews in each language that were equally divided into three groups: 16 interviews with politicians, 16 interviews with businessmen, and 16 interviews with artists. All of the interviews were gathered from reliable websites such as *http://www.cnn.com, http://www.foxnews.com, http://www.bbc.co.uk, http://vnexpress.net, http://www.nhandan.com.vn, http://www.tienphong.vn*, and so on. The author then went on identifying all the types of hedges used by interviewees as samples in the selected interviews. Since the main concern of the study was to examine the frequent types of linguistic hedges, prosodic features, such as: the length of pause, stress, intonation, and interruption were not counted. In total, there were 2340 hedges found in the data, in which 1807 hedges were used by American interviewees and 533 hedges by Vietnamese interviewees. For confidentiality, names of the interviewees were not included in the report.

3.4. Analytical framework

The analytical framework was based on Brown and Levinson's [9] classification of hedges addressed to Grice's four maxims, with *QnH2* and *MaH3* being supplemented strategies suggested by Nguyễn Quang [10]. However, in the process of analyzing data, it was interesting to discover that there were some cases of merger, in which it was almost impossible to determine exactly which maxim a hedge was linked to. In other words, in these cases the

hedge carried more than one meaning or it was used with different purposes. To account for these indeterminate instances, a supplementary category of *Mixed Hedges* (MiHs) was established, which included *MiH1* and *MiH2*. Consequently, the analytical framework was conducted as follows:

a. Hedges on Quality Maxim *(QlHs)*

- Strategy *QlH1*: The speaker's uncertainty of the truth of his utterance

- Strategy *QlH2*: The speaker's emphasis on his commitment to the truth of the utterance

- Strategy *QlH3*: Disclamation of the speaker's assertion in informing the hearer

b. Hedges on Quantity Maxim *(QnHs)*

- Strategy *QnH1*: Giving notice that provided information is not as much or not as precise as might be expected

- Strategy *QnH2*: Giving notice that provided information is more informative than might be expected

c. Hedges on Relevance Maxim *(ReHs)*

- Strategy *ReH1*: Preparatory condition for not shocking the hearer when the speaker changes the topic

- Strategy *ReH2*: The speaker's uncertainty of the relevance of the utterance

- Strategy *ReH3*: The speaker's implicit claim to being relevant by giving reasons for the utterance

d. Hedges on Manner Maxim *(MaHs)*

- Strategy *MaH1*: Making communicative intentions explicit

- Strategy *MaH2*: The speaker's query whether the hearer is following the speaker's discourse adequately

- Strategy *MaH3*: The speaker's want to ensure what the speaker hears from the hearer is correct

e. Mixed Hedges *(MiHs)*

- Strategy *MiH1*: Quality-Quantity hedges

- Strategy *MiH2*: Quality-Manner hedges

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Overall similarities and differences in types of hedges used by ACels and VCels

Table 1. Types of hedges used by ACels and VCels in descending order of frequency

	ACels				**VCels**		
	Tokens	Rate per turn	Percentage		Tokens	Rate per turn	Percentage
QlHs	*1352*	*1.57*	*74.8%*	*QlHs*	*436*	*0.98*	*81.8%*
MaHs	*323*	*0.38*	*17.9%*	*QnHs*	*41*	*0.09*	*7.7%*
QnHs	*81*	*0.09*	*4.5%*	*MiHs*	*36*	*0.08*	*6.8%*
MiHs	*40*	*0.05*	*2.2%*	*MaHs*	*13*	*0.03*	*2.4%*
ReHs	*11*	*0.01*	*0.6%*	*ReHs*	*7*	*0.02*	*1.3%*
Total	1807	2.1	100%	Total	533	1.2	100%

* Similarities

As show in Table 1, hedging devices emerged in both American and Vietnamese data were realized in all the five types, namely *QlHs, QnHs, ReHs, MaHs,* and *MiHs.* Another noticeable similarity was that *QlHs* ranked at the highest position in frequency and *ReHs* were least commonly used in both groups.

Specially, *QlHs* – the most prominent type – accounted for an extremely high contribution, at 74.8% for ACels and 81.8% for VCels.

* Differences

It can also be seen from Table 1 that ACels used hedging devices more frequently than VCels in the collected interviews, with 2.1 hedges per turn in the American data but only

1.2 in the Vietnamese one. However, it was also worthy noticing that although the frequency in using hedges by ACels was approximately twice higher than that by VCels, the rates of using *QnHs* per turn were entirely the same (0.09) and the rates of using *ReHs* per turn were nearly identical in the two groups of celebrities, hovering at 0.01 in the American data and 0.02 in the Vietnamese. Furthermore, as shown in Table 1, setting *QlHs* and *ReHs* aside, the

position in distribution of the three remaining types were quite distinguished between the American and Vietnamese data. The descending order in frequency of hedges used by ACels was *MaHs* (17.9%), *QnHs* (4.5%) and *MiHs* (2.2%), whereas the one by VCels was *QnHs* (7.7%), *MiHs* (6.8%) and *MaHs* (2.4%)

4.2. Similarities and differences in QlHs used by ACels and VCels

Table 2. *QlHs* used by ACels and VCels in descending order of frequency

	ACels			VCels	
	Tokens	Percentage		Tokens	Percentage
QlH1	869	64.3%	*QlH1*	276	63.3%
QlH2	469	34.7%	*QlH2*	125	28.7%
QlH3	14	1%	*QlH3*	35	8%
Total	1352	100%	Total	436	100%

* Similarities

It is clearly shown in Table 2 that all the three strategies were applied to form *QlHs* in both sources of data. The second similar point in using *QlHs* by ACels and VCels was that *QlH1* was used most frequently, *QlH2* ranked at the second position and *QlH3* occupied the lowest rank. Furthermore, it was evidential that the proportions of *QlH1* in the two sources of data were rather high and approximately identical, with 64.3% for ACels and 63.3% for VCels. With such initial results, it seemed that celebrities were rather fond of employing hedges to show their uncertainty about what was uttered. It might be the case that they were fully aware that the propositional content of their utterance might be true or false and, therefore, what was uttered was only their own view. However, in certain situations, they possibly also wanted to defend their standpoint by emphasizing the commitment to the truth of their utterances. That was perhaps the reason why *QlH2* was used relatively often. The low contribution of *QlH3* in both groups of data also clearly indicated that in general, celebrities rarely used hedges to disclaim the assumption that the point of their assertion was to inform or

to invite the interviewers to assert the truth of their utterances.

* Differences

The results pointed out that differences in using *QlHs* by ACels and VCels were not really considerable apart from the imbalance in contribution of *QlH3* in the two sources of data. In spite of sharing the same lowest rank, compared to the contribution of *QlH3* in the total of *QlHs* used by ACels, the frequency of *QlH3* used by VCels proved eight times higher.

Following are some examples, presented as an illustration for the use of *QlHs* in both sources of data

- QlH1

*(1) The truth is more hopeful and **probably** more complicated.*

*(2) **Theo tôi**, hàng Việt Nam cần chú ý nhiều hơn về sự ổn định chất lượng.*

As can be seen in examples (1) and (2), "probably" and "theo tôi" were employed as QlH1. If the speakers only said that *"The truth is more hopeful and more complicated"* or *"Hàng Việt Nam cần chú ý nhiều hơn về sự ổn định chất lượng"* and they did not know for

sure if the truth was more complicated or if Vietnamese goods had to be paid more attention to on the stability of quality, they might have violated the maxim of quality since they said something that they did not know to be true or false. Nevertheless, by adding "probably" and *"theo tôi"*, the speakers wanted to confirm that they were well observing the conversational maxim of quality and what was uttered was only their own view.

- QlH2

(3) **Obviously***, the teachers have an obligation.*

(4) **Tôi tin** *có những triển vọng rất hứa hẹn đối với đầu tư của Anh vào Việt Nam trong năm nay và trong những năm tới.*

Celebrities were possibly aware that creating a strong belief in the public was a necessary and really crucial thing. Hence, in certain situations they were fond of using expressions emphasizing the commitment to the truth of their utterances to show that they were responsible for what was uttered as well as to defend their standpoint. It was possibly the reason for the occurrence of QlH2 *"obviously"* and *"tôi tin"* in examples (3) and (4).

- QlH3

(5) **Most Americans think** *there are already universal background checks.*

(6) Trước giờ **người ta luôn nói** *tôi bị người khác chi phối.*

It was obvious that *"most Americans think"* and *"người ta luôn nói"* used in examples (5) and (6) were QlH2. If the speakers had not used these expressions and had only said that *"there are already universal background checks"* or *"Trước giờ tôi bị người khác chi phối"*, they would have been thought to assert the truth of the utterances. However, by adding *"most Americans think"* and *"người ta luôn nói"*, the speakers disclaimed what was uttered was their standpoint.

4.3. Similarities and differences in QnHs used by ACels and VCels

Table 3. *QnHs* used by ACels and VCels in descending order of frequency

	ACels			**VCels**	
	Tokens	Percentage		Tokens	Percentage
QnH1	*65*	*80.2%*	*QnH1*	*24*	*58.5%*
QnH2	*16*	*19.8%*	*QnH2*	*17*	*41.5%*
Total	81	100%	Total	41	100%

* Similarities

As indicated in Table 3, *QnHs* used by ACels and VCels were realized by two strategies, of which *QnH1* was employed more frequently. This was possibly because not only ACels but also VCels preferred to give notice that though they were aware of observing the cooperative principle, the provided information would not be as much or precise as might be expected.

* Differences

Although *QnH1* was more prominent than *QnH2* in both American and Vietnamese data, there remained one main difference in the frequency of these two strategies. In fact, the distance in the distribution of the two strategies used by ACels was rather large. To be more specific, the frequency of *QnH1* was four times higher than *QnH2*. Meanwhile, the contribution of *QnH1* in the Vietnamese data was only 17% higher than the share of *QnH2*. Probably, the reason for ACels to use *QnH2* much less frequently was somewhat linked to American cultural features in communication. As widely believed, Americans generally do not use many redundancies like Vietnamese people and the way of expressing their ideas is normally more direct [10: 214].

The use of *QnHs* by ACels and VCels is exemplified by some following typical examples:

- *QnH1*

*(7) **At some point** it's not what leaders say, it's the accumulation of sort of direction and experiences, successes and failures.*

*(8) Điều này cũng **có phần**...không sai.*

As mentioned in the beginning of the paper, celebrities are in fact the focus of attention. Accordingly, they must be always careful with their utterances to create and preserve a good image in the public. Understanding that the information in their utterances might not be comprehensively precise or adequate as expected, they used *QnH1* such as *"at some point"* and *"có phần"* in examples (7) and (8) to assert that the truth of the information was believable just to some extent.

- *QnH2*

*(9) **Like I said**, the type of day I love is just like everybody else's.*

*(10) **Như đã đề cập ở trên**, trong gần 4 năm trở lại đây, chúng ta đã đạt được "03 giảm" và kiềm chế được tỷ lệ nhiễm HIV…*

In examples (9) and (10) *"like I said"* and *"như đã đề cập ở trên"* were resorted as *QnH2*. The speakers well knew that in order to achieve high effects in communication, they should not say more than what was cooperatively necessary. Obviously, the information in examples (9) and (10) had been mentioned before and the repetition aimed at a certain purpose. Hence, the occurrence of the two hedges *"like I said"* and *"như đã đề cập ở trên"* was a proof about the speakers' awareness.

4.4. Similarities and differences in ReHs used by ACel and VCel

Table 4. *ReHs* used by ACels and VCels in descending order of frequency

	ACels			VCels	
	Tokens	Percentage		Tokens	Percentage
ReH1	*10*	*90.9%*	*ReH3*	*4*	*57.1%*
ReH2	*1*	*9.1%*	*ReH1*	*3*	*42.9%*
ReH3	*0*	*0%*	*ReH2*	*0*	*0%*
Total	11	100%	Total	7	100%

* Similarities

The first similarity in *ReHs* used by ACels and VCels was that all hedges of this type found in the data were realized in only two strategies even though, according to the theory, they could be recognized in three. Furthermore, *ReH1* was the only one used by both ACels and VCels. It seemed they both perceived hedges should be used to give the notice that the topic would be changed.

* Differences

It is illustrated from Table 4 that there were no cases of *ReH3* used by ACels, whereas the strategy absent in the Vietnamese data was *ReH2*. More clearly, it seemed that contrary to VCels, ACels did not prove to be relevant by giving reasons for their utterances but sometimes tended to show that they were not sure of whether their utterance was relevant or not.

Another noticeable point was linked to the difference in the distribution of the two strategies in the data sources. In the American data, it was discovered that most of ReHs were created with *ReH1*, which appeared more prominent, with an extremely high rate of 90.9%. In contrast, the distance in distribution between the two strategies used by VCels was not that large. *ReH3*, which proved to be the more prominent one, accounted for only 57.1%.

Some prime examples of ReHs are given below for illustration.

- *ReH1*

(11) **By the way**, *I can be proven wrong here but think about it.*

(12) **Nhân đây** *tôi cũng muốn nói đến chuyện duyệt phim.*

Changing the topic in conversations is normally unavoidable. Nevertheless, sudden changes surely make certain impositions on the hearers' face. Therefore, it was necessary for the speakers to give notice that they were about to change the topic and it was perhaps the reason why *"by the way"* and *"nhân đây"* were used as *ReH1* in examples (11) and (12).

- *ReH2*

(13) I'm not giving them a hard time, but we've got to learn **if you say, what have you learned**, *we try to learn from people's successes…*

It was clear that in example (13) *"if you say, what have you learned"* was employed as a

ReH2. To explain for the appearance of this hedge, it is supposed that the reason was related to the interviewee's uncertainty of the relevance of his utterance. Accordingly, he used this expression as a means to protect himself.

- *ReH3*

(14) **Để giải thích kỹ vấn đề này**, *tôi xin quay lại trước đó một kỳ tăng giá tức là ngày 17/7/2013, khi giá thế giới có biến động bất thường…*

ReH3 used in example (14) was *"để giải thích kỹ vấn đề này"*. If the speaker had only said *"tôi xin quay lại trước đó một kỳ tăng giá tức là ngày 17/7/2013, khi giá thế giới có biến động bất thường…"*, his utterance could have been considered not to be relevant to the content of the conversation. However, by giving the reason for the utterance *"để giải thích kỹ vấn đề này"*, his contribution proved to be related to the purpose of exchange.

4.5. Similarities and differences in MaHs used by ACels and VCels

Table 5. *MaHs* used by ACels and VCels in descending order of frequency

	ACels			VCels	
	Tokens	Percentage		Tokens	Percentage
MaH1	*317*	*98.1%*	*MaH1*	*9*	*69.2%*
MaH2	*6*	*1.9%*	*MaH2*	*2*	*15.4%*
MaH3	*0*	*0%*	*MaH3*	*2*	*15.4%*
Total	323	100%	Total	13	100%

* Similarities

In general, *MaHs* used by ACels were identical with those used by VCels in that *MaH1* with the aim of making communicative intentions explicit could be interpreted as the most outstanding one.

* Differences

As shown in Table 5, compared to the absence of *MaH3* in the American data, VCels employed all the three strategies to form *MaHs*, with *MaH2* and *MaH3* sharing the same

frequency, at 15.4%. The use of *MaHs* by ACels and VCels proved quite distinguished in the proportion distance between the most prominent strategy and the remainders. Both ranking the first, *MaH1* used by ACels nearly occupied the exclusive position since its frequency took up to 98.1%, whereas the contribution of *MaH1* used by VCels was actually much lower, at 69.2%.

The use of *MaHs* is illustrated in the following examples.

- *MaH1*

*(15) **I mean**, that's just an amazingly short term for a subscription service.*

*(16) Trên thân thể tôi có hơn 30 vết thương và tôi được xếp hạng thương binh loại hai. **Điều đó có nghĩa là** tôi đã mất hơn 60% khả năng…*

The celebrities might have been aware that in order to get effective communication they would make their contribution clear, avoiding ambiguity. It was the reason why *"I mean"* and *"điều đó có nghĩa là"* appeared in examples (15) and (16). By using the *MaH1*, their utterances became more hedged.

- MaH2

*(17) So it wasn't even about how many takes was that, it was just like, let's experiment, **you know what I mean?***

*(18) Ca sĩ phòng trà thì có gì là không tốt, **phải không chị?***

As shown in examples (17) and (18), *"you know what I mean"* and *"phải không chị"* were employed as *MaH2*. In these situations the speakers wanted to ask whether the hearers were following their discourse adequately or whether the hearers understood what the speakers said. By using these hedges in their responses to questions in interviews, the celebrities showed their concern for the feeling of the others. Accordingly, they could make a good impression in the public.

- MaH3

*(19) **Ý anh muốn nói tới** một hình tượng... cơ bắp **chăng**?*

Understanding the importance of explicitness in utterances, the celebrity was afraid what he uttered might be obscure and ambiguous. Therefore, in example (19) he used the expression *"ý anh muốn nói tới…chăng"* as an *MaH3* with the aim of ensuring what he heard from the hearer was correct.

4.6. Similarities and differences in MiHs used by ACels and VCels

Table 6. *MiHs* used by ACels and VCels in descending order of frequency

	ACels			VCels	
	Tokens	Percentage		Tokens	Percentage
MiH1	*16*	*40%*	Ql-QnHs	*10*	*27%*
MiH2	*24*	*60%*	Ql-MaHs	*27*	*73%*
Total	40	100%	Total	37	100%

* Similarities

It was really surprising for the authors to discover that all cases of merger in using hedges by ACels and VCels were instances indeterminate between *QlHs* and *QnHs* or between *QlHs* and *MaHs*. Additionally, it was worthy of noticing that in both groups, *MiHs* assigned to Quality-Quantity (*MiH1*) was less common than those linked to Quality-Manner (*MiH2*).

* Differences

As shown in Table 6, the unique difference in using *MiHs* of ACels and VCels was related to the distance in the distribution of two subtypes *MiH1* and *MiH2*. In the American data, the frequency of *MiH1* was two thirds of the contribution of *MiH1*. On the contrary, the occurrence of *MiH1* in the Vietnamese data was just well under one third of those belonging to *MiH2*.

Typical examples of *MiHs* can be observed in the following examples:

- MiH1

*(20) **As you may know**, we're blocked in a couple of countries.*

*(21) **Như chúng ta đã biết**, tại Hội nghị Cấp cao ASEAN 21 vừa qua, Lãnh đạo ASEAN đã nhất trí…*

In examples (20) and (21) *"as you may know"* and *"như chúng ta đã biết"* appeared in the role of *MiH1*. It was obvious that these hedges were linked to both maxims of quality and quantity. The appearance of the two hedges could be explained that the speakers wanted to invite the hearers to assert the truth of the utterance with the aim of reducing their responsibility for the propositional accuracy as well as to show they knew for sure about the fact that the given information had been mentioned before and the repetition aimed at a certain purpose.

- MiH2

*(22) **The fact** is that it does impact.*

*(23) Và việc "sến" hay không còn phụ thuộc vào người hát. **Thực tế là** có nhiều người hát nhạc "sến" nhưng vẫn thấy không "sến" và ngược lại.*

"The fact" and *"thực tế là"* in examples (22) and (23) were employed as *MiH2*. There was a perfect combination of quality maxim and manner maxim in these hedges. By using these expressions the celebrities emphasized their commitment to the truth of the utterances as well as made the utterances more clear and explicit. Hence, what they uttered became more persuasive.

5. Conclusion

To sum up, the hedging devices emerging in both American and Vietnamese data were classified into four primary types, namely *QlHs, QnHs, ReHs* and *MaHs*, and a supplementary type of *MiHs* containing all cases of merger. Out of the five types, *QlHs* were most commonly used and accounted for an extremely high contribution and *ReHs* ranked at the lowest position in frequency in both groups. Generally, strategy 1 (*QnH1, QlH1* …) was employed by both groups of ACels and VCels and in most types it emerged as the most common one, apart from the group of *ReHs* used by VCels. Another similarity was related to the classification of *MiHs* when all

cases of merger in both groups of data were instances indeterminate between *QlHs* and *QnHs* or between *QlHs* and *MaHs*, in which *MiHs* assigned to Quality-Manner (*MiH2*) were more prominent. As regards the differences, the hedges used by ACels and VCels also revealed a large number of dissimilarities. The first distinguishing point was the distribution of *QnHs*, *MaHs* and *MiHs*. The descending order in frequency of the hedges used by ACels is *MaHs, QnHs* and *MiHs*, whereas the one by VCels remained *QnHs*, *MiHs* and *MaHs*. Another noticeable difference was that in general in the American data, the distance in the distribution between the most frequent strategy or type and the remainders was extremely large, a part from the instances of *QlHs* and *MiHs*. Meanwhile, the result found in the Vietnamese data showed the contrary. In fact, the imbalance in the distribution between the most prominent strategy or type and the remainders generally was relatively lower, excluding the instance of *MiHs*. In addition, the most different and noticeable point was that overall *ACels* used hedging devices in interviews more frequently than VCels.

References

[1] G. Lakoff, Hs: A study of meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. In P. Peranteau, J. Levi, and G. Phares (Eds.), Papers from the Eight Regional Meeting of Chicago Linguistic Society (pp. 183 –228), Chicago University Press, Chicago, 1972.

[2] G. Clemen, The concept of hedging: Origins, approaches and definitions. In R. Markkanen and H. Schröder (Eds.), Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon in academic texts (pp. 235–248), Walter de Gruyter, Berlin, 1997.

[3] L. A. Zadeh, A fuzzy-set-theoretic interpretation of linguistic hedges. Journal of Cybernetics 2 (1972) 4.

[4] A. Mauranen, "They're a little but different"...: Observations on hedges in academic talk. In K. Aijmer and A. B. Stenström (Eds.), Discourse patterns in spoken and written corpora (pp. 173-

197), John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, 2004.

[5] K. Hyland, Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles, Applied Linguistics 17 (1996) 433

[6] K. Hyland, Hedging in scientific research articles, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 1998.

[7] K. Hyland, Disciplinary discourses: Social interaction in academic writing, Longman, London, 2000.

[8] G. Yule, Pragmatics, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1997.

[9] G. Brown and S. Levinson, Politeness: Some universals in language usage, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987.

[10] Nguyễn Quang, Một số vấn đề giao tiếp nội văn hóa và giao văn hóa, Nxb ĐHQG Hà Nội, Hà Nội, 2003.

Các kiểu rào đón thường được sử dụng bởi các nhân vật nổi tiếng Mỹ và Việt Nam

Nguyễn Quang Ngoạn, Nguyễn Lê Tố Quyên

*Khoa Ngoại ngữ, Trường Đại học Quy Nhơn,
170 An Dương Vương, Quy Nhơn, Bình Định, Việt Nam*

Tóm tắt: Nghiên cứu này nhằm mục đích so sánh và đối chiếu các phương thức rào đón mà các nhân vật nổi tiếng Mỹ và Việt Nam hay sử dụng khi trả lời phỏng vấn. Dữ liệu nghiên cứu được lấy từ 96 cuộc phỏng vấn các nhân vật nổi tiếng Mỹ và Việt Nam tải từ Internet. Nghiên cứu được thực hiện chủ yếu bằng phương pháp định lượng dù phương pháp định tính có được sử dụng hỗ trợ cho phần giải thích và bàn luận. Kết quả cho thấy trong số năm kiểu rào đón, các phương tiện rào đón *"Chất"* được dùng nhiều nhất với tỉ lệ khá cao còn các phương tiện rào đón *"Hệ"* được sử dụng với tần suất thấp nhất. Ngoài ra, các phương tiện rào đón mà các nhân vật nổi tiếng Mỹ và Việt Nam hay sử dụng còn cho thấy sự khác biệt trong tần suất xuất hiện của phương tiện rào đón *"Lượng"*, *"Thức"* và *"Hỗn hợp"*.

Từ khóa: Nhân vật nổi tiếng Mỹ (Acels), nhân vật nổi tiếng Việt Nam (Vcels) phương tiện rào đón chất (QlHs), phương tiện rào đón lượng (QnHs), phương tiện rào đón hệ (ReHs), phương tiện rào đón thức (MaHs), phương tiện rào đón hỗn hợp (MiHs)