

us human?, in J. Zlatev, T. P. Racine, C. Sinha & E. Itkonen (eds.), *The Shared Mind: Perspectives on Intersubjectivity*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins, 1–14.



## **Reformulation markers in research writing: A cross-linguistic and cross-disciplinary study**

Jolanta Šinkūnienė  
(Vilnius University)

**Keywords: metadiscourse, reformulation markers, Lithuanian, English**

**Schedule: Thu 16.30 Room 10**

Research writing in different science fields and cultures has been one of the favored objects of discourse studies of the past several decades. One area of research writing that has attracted considerable attention of scholars is the use of metadiscourse markers, which are employed by academic writers to create convincing, powerful and coherent discourse. A growing body of literature on hedges, boosters, attitudinal lexis, personal pronouns and other metadiscourse items has revealed interesting ways in which the ‘big culture’ (i.e. national culture) and the ‘small culture’ (i.e. disciplinary culture) (cf. Atkinson 2004) play a role in the creation of academic text (see Fløttum *et al.* 2006, Hyland 2005, Hyland & Sancho Guinda 2012, Mur-Dueñas 2011, *inter alia*). One metadiscourse category, reformulation markers or code glosses (Hyland 2005), are very important contributors to “coherent, reader-friendly prose” (Hyland (2007: 266), employed to facilitate the reader’s understanding of the message the writer tries to convey. While there is a number of studies investigating reformulation markers in English (see, for example, Del Saz Rubio 2007 for an overview) these metadiscourse items received less attention in languages other than English or in a contrastive perspective, a notable exception being Spanish vs English studies (Cuenca 2003, Murillo 2012, 2016).

The aim of the present paper is to address this gap by contrasting forms and functions of reformulation markers employed in research writing in two languages (American English and Lithuanian) and three science fields (humanities, medicine, technology). Quantitative and qualitative approaches are employed alongside contrastive analysis to reveal the ways in which the two languages and three science fields overlap or differ with regard to the use of reformulation markers. The English language data is taken from the Academic language subcorpus of COCA, while the Lithuanian language data comes from Corpus Academicum Lithuanicum ([www.coralit.lt](http://www.coralit.lt)), a specialized synchronic corpus of written academic Lithuanian (roughly 9 million words). The first part of the paper looks at the distribution and frequency patterns of reformulation markers taking into account disciplinary and language specific variation in their use. The second part follows the classificational framework suggested by Murillo (2012) in order to reveal the primary functions these markers perform in different disciplines and research cultures. The preliminary results suggest that it is the humanities scholars who employ reformulation markers most frequently in both languages. The cross-cultural analysis reveals interesting rhetorical and pragmatic functional employment of these markers in the two languages. Extending research on the use of metadiscourse elements in languages other than

English helps to highlight universal patterns of research writing as well as peculiar features typical to specific cultural communities.

### References

- Atkinson, Dwight, (2004), Contrasting rhetorics/contrasting cultures: why contrastive rhetoric needs a better conceptualization of culture, *Journal of English for Academic Purposes* 3, 277–289.
- Cuenca, Maria-Josep, (2003), Two ways to reformulate: a contrastive analysis of reformulation markers, *Journal of Pragmatics* 35(7), 1069–1093.
- Del Saz Rubio, Maria Milagros, (2007), *English discourse markers of reformulation*, Bern: Peter Lang.
- Fløttum, Kjersti, Dahl, Trine, & Kinn, Torodd, (2006), *Academic voices: across languages and disciplines*, Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Hyland, Ken, (2005), *Metadiscourse: exploring interaction in writing*, London/New York: Continuum.
- Hyland, Ken, (2007), Applying a gloss. Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse, *Applied Linguistics* 28(2), 266–285.
- Hyland, Ken, & Sancho Guinda, Carmen, (Eds), (2012), *Stance and voice in written academic genres*, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mur Dueñas, Pilar, (2011), An intercultural analysis of metadiscourse features in research articles written in English and in Spanish, *Journal of Pragmatics* 43, 3068–3079.
- Murillo, Silvia, (2012), The use of reformulation markers in Business Management research articles: an intercultural analysis, *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 17(1), 69–90.
- Murillo, Silvia, (2016), Reformulation markers and polyphony: a contrastive English-Spanish analysis, *Languages in Contrast* 16(1), 1–30.



Towards a Typology of Non-Compositional uses of Future Anterior in Europe

Dmitri Sitchinava

<pdf>

**Schedule: Thu 16.30 Room 7**



### **Null *se* constructions in Brazilian and European Portuguese – Morphosyntactic deletion or emergence of new constructions?**

Augusto Soares da Silva, Susana Afonso & Dafne Palú  
(Universidade Católica Portuguesa, University of Exeter & Universidade Católica Portuguesa)

**Keywords: constructional variation, Cognitive Grammar**

**Schedule: Thu 14.00 Room 4**