MINISTRY OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF DANANG

LE THI KHANH CHI

A STUDY OF ATTITUDINAL DISJUNCTS

IN ENGLISH VERSUS VIETNAMESE

Field : The English Language

Code: 60.22.15

MASTER THESIS IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE
(A SUMMARY)

DANANG - 2011

The thesis has been completed at the College of Foreign Languages, Danang University.

Supervisor: NGU THIEN HUNG, Ph.D.

Examiner 1: **PHAN VAN HOA, Assoc, Prof, Dr.**

Examiner 2: **NGUYEN QUANG NGOAN, Ph.D.**

The thesis to be orally defended at Examining Committee.

Time: July 2011

Venue: Tay Nguyen University

The original of this thesis is accessible for purpose of reference at the College of Foreign Languages Library, Danang University and the Information Resources Centre, Danang University.

CHAPTER 1   INTRODUCTION

1.1. RATIONALE

In everyday communication, writers or the speakers do not simply inform about the state of affairs mentioned in their utterances. They usually qualify their utterances with some language devices to signal some extra information and comment on the reliability and the source of his or her knowledge. In order to achieve their goals, both writers and speakers commonly express attitudes, value judgments, and commitments towards the propositional contents. For instance, these following utterances have the same descriptive content, but different connotative meanings

(1a) They have no right to be here.   [51, p.201]

(1b) *Obviously*, they have no right to be here.

(1c) *Probably*, they have no right to be here

(1a) is simply a narrative sentence in which one state of affairs is indicated, and it contains no comment of speaker (S), no S's attitude, etc., so hearer (H) is not be able to identify S's intention. On the contrary, if it is verbally qualified by words or phrases denoting attitudes such as "*Obviously*" and "*Probably*", in (1b) and (1c), they can be said to convey their attitude and comment towards a state of affairs mentioned in the prepositional content of the utterance. With the additional meaning of the two words "*Obviously*" and "*Probably*", the force of S's comment can be manifested and the statement sounds more persuasive and personally emotional. These words, which are technically called "Attitudinal Disjuncts", are useful language devices for S to successfully show his / her attitude.

So far much has been written on the related semantic areas such as modality, evidentiality, hedges and style disjuncts in English and Vietnamese, the term ADs may be unfamiliar even so strange to many learners of English, because ADs are just one kind of disjuncts. In addition, when learning English, learners usually have the tendency to

pay much attention to the information denoted by main elements of a sentence. Adverbs, particularly ADs do not attract much concern of them. Among these peripheral elements, the ADs may have been considered unimportant point and are therefore misinterpreted.

However, ADs not only play an important role in expressing the speaker's or writer's evaluation to the clause, but can be also considered as one device to signal the basic purposes of modulating the speaker's or writer's claim, especially, when transmitting a thought, manifesting an intention or displaying information. If placed in wrong position, ADs may create a misunderstanding between the speaker and the hearer. However, not many Vietnamese learners of English can realize this problem.

Another strong motivation for our choice is the expectation that with a study of the issues of ADs that the learners will be able to understand and use ADs in a better way and quickly acquire some communicative strategies in spoken and academic writing language and from this, they can get great benefit to enhance their competence in spoken and written communication as well as achieve cooperation in interaction. Consequently, the final purpose of this study, therefore, is getting communicative efficiency.

1.2. JUSTIFICATION OF THE STUDY

A study in terms of syntax, semantics and pragmatics on ADs will be a significant contribution to the teaching and learning of the learners in the periphrastic units.

1.3. RESEARCH SCOPE

The study concentrates primarily on the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects of a small group of ADs in lexical category.

1.4. RESEARCH ORGANIZATION

Chapter 1: Introduction
Chapter 2: Literature Review and Theoretical Background
Chapter 3: Methodology of Research
Chapter 4: Findings and Discussion
Chapter 5: Conclusion and Implications

CHAPTER 2 LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1. PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Halliday [17] in his discussion on Theme - Rheme structure introduced one kind of elements that "has special status in the thematic structure". These elements included ADs known as "Modal Adjuncts" by his term.

Biber et al. gave preference to the term *stance adverbials* and distinguished them with the other two types: *circumstance adverbials* and *linking adverbials*. Simultaneously, they labeled ADs as one of the major grammatical devices used to express attitude and judgment-which differs from epistemic stance and style stance with respect to structural and semantic characteristics.

Quirk and Green Baum have mentioned ADs through their broader term called "Disjuncts" which covered the whole range of ADs. Disjuncts, defined as "a special type of adverbs that have a sort of superior role to the rest of the sentence". They are classified into two classes: Style disjunct and Attitudinal disjunct.

In a paper of Susan & Douglas described the ways speakers and writers used Adverbials to make their personal "stance". The term Adverbial Marking Stance was defined within three major domains: Epistemic stance, Attitudinal stance, and Style stance.

In the reality of the increasing needs for communication, ADs are becoming one of useful means to express speaker's or writer's comment or attitude on what they are saying in order to create illocutionary force of their utterance to the hearers or readers. In this sense, the pragmatic functions of ADs are also of interest and are investigated by some Vietnamese grammaticians and linguists from different approaches.

Nguyen Minh Thuyet and Nguyen Van Hiep (1998) classified such phrases as *" nghe đâu P, chắc chắn là + P, rõ ràng là + P, sẽ có thể + P có thể sẽ + P, hình như (là) + P , dường như là+ P , chừng như + P..."* as a type of subordinate elements. They called such phrases as "định ngữ câu" (sentence predicate) which could be placed at the initial position or be inserted between Subject and Predicate with the function of expressing the modality meaning about what was said in a sentence.

Also, in the master thesis "Boosting and Hedging in Academic writing" of Tran Thi Phuong Thao mentioned syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of hedging and boosting markers in written discourses as "Modal Disjuncts".

From another approach, in Evidential Markers in English versus Vietnamese by Tran Thi Thanh Chau, the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of evidential markers in English and Vietnamese have been analyzed along the scale of evidential categories in a contrastive analysis with the Vietnamese equivalents.

Perhaps the most beneficial concerning the matters of ADs are the master thesis of Đoan Thi Thu Ha and Ph.D. Thesis of Ngu Thien Hung, they have analyzed and described essential features of a number of words and phrases, which they called "Quán ngữ tình thái" in the relation to the content of the clause and communication situation. However, the authors seemed to deal with a broad area of all kinds of disjuncts, and accordingly, ADs (especially degree of conditions for truth of content such as *nghe đâu , chắc chắn là , rõ ràng là , sẽ có thể , có thể sẽ , hình như (là), dường như là ...* have not been considered as independent markers and have not been fully described.

Generally speaking, these researches have investigated syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of many kinds of ADs. However, this is still a broad field with various kinds of ADs. Moreover, as far as contrastive studies are concerned, those English

ADs do not have exact Vietnamese equivalents, which may create difficulties for Vietnamese learners of English in interpreting and performing them in discourse. What is more, learners of English may make mistakes when they are trying to distinguish between ADs and other kinds of Adverbs such as Adverb of manner (hereafter MA). For instance, in the following sentences, learners of English may get confused in distinguish between MA and AD.

2.2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.2.1. Defining Disjuncts and ADs

Downing and Locke [14] defined disjuncts as linguistic items which "represent a comment by the speaker or writer on the content of the clause as a whole." He also defined ADs in the following way: "ADs express writers' affective values – their attitudes towards the propositional content and/or readers rather than commitment to the truth–value.

2.2.2. ADs and Concepts of Modality

2.2.3. The Classification of ADs

2.2.3.1. Type (a): Degree of truth

2.2.3.2. Type (b): Value judgment

However, due to the limitation of the research, the study only focuses on ADs relating to *Type (a),* Degree of truth, which consists of two categories: The ADs express conviction and The ADs figure out some degree of doubt.

2.2.4. ADs and the Cooperative Principle

2.2.5. ADs and Politeness

Brown and Levinson [10] classify "face" into two kinds: *Negative face* and *Positive face,* which are used in Manipulation and Politeness principle.

2.2.6. Hedging as the Modification of the Illocutionary Force

Holmes [19] claimed that modifying the illocutionary force of a

speech act may serve to express a variety of attitudes to the hearer, ranging from very positive to the negative attitudes.

2.3. UNSOLVED PROBLEM

The comparison and contrast on Syntactic, Semantic and Pragmatic features of ADs in English and Vietnamese in such modern theories do not attract much attention of linguists. Such issues as the precise degree that each AD should be assigned with, their capability in collocation with other modal markers such as modal lexical verbs, modal auxiliaries, their pragmatic roles in interaction have not been touched on and examined closely. Therefore, This study is carried out in an attempt that the research may help Vietnamese learners of English who really wish to enhance their competence in spoken and written communication and achieve cooperation in interaction thorough understanding and appropriate use of ADs in their process of using English.

2.4. SUMMARY

CHAPTER 3   RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. AIMS AND OBJECTIVES

3.1.1. Aims

The research is carried out in order to increase students' awareness about significant similarities and differences between ADs of two languages, and enhance their abilities to use ADs appropriately and communicatively in various situations.

3.1.2. Objectives

- To give a description of English and Vietnamese ADs with reference to structures, semantics and pragmatics.

- To find out the similarities and differences between ADs in English and their Vietnamese equivalents in terms of syntax, semantics and pragmatics.

- To provide some suggestions to the problems that the Vietnamese learners of English may encounter in interpreting and using ADs.

3.2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

- What are the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features of ADs in English and Vietnamese?

- What are the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese ADs in terms of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects?

- What potential difficulties do Vietnamese students of English may have when interpreting and using ADs?

3.3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND RESEARCH METHOD

The study is mainly qualitative and descriptive approach: 500 utterances from novels, short stories and plays were interpreted qualitatively. To serve the investigation, the contrastive analysis was also executed to present the similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese ADs. A contrastive analysis of ADs in different kinds of English and Vietnamese discourse was conducted so as to draw out some qualitative information in terms of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic features with particular reference to the learning and teaching of ADs.

3.4. DESCRIPTION OF POPULATION AND SAMPLES

Samples were taken from many different sources so as to eliminate the element of subjectivity in the findings of the study that results in a good conclusion and implications.

3.5. DATA COLLECTION
3.6. DATA ANALYSIS

By comparing and contrasting English and Vietnamese ADs from different discourses in terms of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects, some similarities and differences between English and Vietnamese ADs in the distribution and interpersonal effects can be identified. Basing on the data collected from analyzing, the potential difficulties that the Vietnamese learners of English may encounter can be found.

3.7. PROCEDURES
3.8. INSTRUMENTS
3.9. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY

CHAPTER 4   FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION
4.1. SYNTACTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ADS IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.1.1. The Morphological and Syntactic Features

The majority of English modal adverbs of attitude in English derives from adjectives and ends in suffix-*ly* and –*ed* participle plus suffix-*ly*. Although there are also common simple forms, such as *perhaps, maybe* and so on.

Traditionally, the *-ly* adverbs in English can have their equivalents in Vietnamese in form of adjective base plus the corresponding collocutor -*một cách.*

4.1.2. Syntactic Position of ADs in English and Vietnamese

The positions of ADs can be understood as follow

Initial position *(I)*:	before the subject
Medial position *(M):*	- immediately before the operator, the verb, or before the complement in intensive clauses - immediately before auxiliary and after auxiliary
Final position *(F):*	after an intransitive verb, an object or a complement

Adverbials in English and Vietnamese were found to be realized in a wide range of syntactic forms.

4.1.2.1. Single Adverb Construction

ADs of single adverbs expressing degree of doubt are possibly, probably, perhaps, maybe, etc., in English and chắc là, có thể, hình như là, có lẽ là…in Vietnamese. English ADs showing the degree of truth

are certainly, clearly, surely, obviously and so on. The equivalent Vietnamese ADs are rõ ràng là, dĩ nhiên là, không nghi ngờ gì…

Typically, these words have considered freedom on positional terms and may appear at several places in a clause structure, however, their common positions are in the *I* position of the clausal structure.

4.1.2.2. Adjective Constructions

Both English adjective phrases constructions and Vietnamese lexical phrasal constructions often appear in *I* position. The structure is usually used to convey the level of personal certainty. With a first person pronoun subject it shows the speaker/writer's strong belief about the information. English adjective phrase construction is characteristically realized in the syntactic structure: *It + be + Adj. + (that) P* and *I + be + Adj. +(that) P*. The Vietnamese counterpart is typically characterized by the pattern: *Adj (là) P*.

4.1.2.3. Noun Constructions

The common position for Np constructions are *I* position in both English and Vietnamese with common patterns such as *There is/There are + (Np) + that P* in English and *Có + Np (rằng/là) P/ Np là P* in Vietnamese.

ADs can be also modified as premodifiers as *almost, very* and *quite* in English and *rất, khá* in Vietnamese and they may also co-occur in informal speech and writing and express emphasis.

4.1.2.4. Verb Constructions

Verb phrase constructions in both languages were found to appear in the clause structure *I + Vp (that) P/ Tôi + Vp (rằng) P* where the AD construction is syntactically realized as a main clause.

4.1.3. ADs and Modal Auxiliary Verb Collocation

We also found instances of speech act verbs between ADs and modal auxiliary verb as the collocation with degree words that act as the specifier or modifier to strengthen the force of the performative verbs.

In Vietnamese, modal auxiliary were found to collocate with an AD in initial position in both formal and informal style while no examples were found in formal, academic English.

(73) Cũng *có thể sẽ* tăng lương cho hai cô.   [37, p.16]

The auxiliary verb can occur with more than an AD indicating probability.

(74) *I'm quite sure* no one *can* have *possibly* failed to notice the poster on your bedroom door.   [55, p.408]

In Vietnamese, despite the same form in realization, there is a difference between modal auxiliary and modal expression. Modal auxiliary has only one position, that is, right after the subject. Modal expression, on the contrary, can take other positions: in front of the subject or between the subject and the predicate. Sometimes, this difference is so subtle that we cannot recognize it easily. In our research we decide to consider them as the same due to the capability to express modality.

Thus, it is plausible to create a collocation between a modal auxiliary and an AD in the corresponding categories which match the modal members according to the suitable scale of certainty. This can be summarized in the tables below:

Table 4.3. The Potential Collocation of Modal Auxiliaries and ADs

Members of ADs / Member of Modal Auxiliary		A.Possibility possibly, perhaps maybe	B.Probability probably, quite likely most likely	C.Certainty certainly, definitely, surely, for certain, of course
A. Possibility	*might,may, could, can*	+		
B. Probability	*should, ought to, would, will*		+	
C. Certainty	*must, can't*			+

Table 4.4. Syntactic Position of ADs in English and Vietnamese

Category of Modal Constructions	English			Vietnamese		
	I	M	F	I	M	F
Single adverbs	+	+	+	+	+	+
Adjective	+	+	+	+	+	-
Noun	+	-	-	+	-	-
Verb	+	+	+	+	+	+

4.2. SEMANTIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ADS IN ENGLISH VERSUS VIETNAMESE

4.2.1. Semantic Characteristics of ADs in term of Doubt and Certainty

The decision of choosing an appropriate AD with specific degree of strength helps to build up the reliability in the course of interaction. The degrees of reliability vary according to the ADs used in the utterance.

In order to make convenient for the research, S's levels of attitude towards the propositional content are semantically classified into 2 main degrees:

4.2.1.1. ADs Indicating High Certainty

The term "High certainty of ADs" here implies such ADs that express S's attitude or judgment on P, in which P indicates strong conviction with a high and certain ability or reliability happening as *certainly, surely, clearly, evidently, obviously,…etc.* The semantic equivalents in Vietnamese are *rõ (là), rõ ràng là, chắc chắn là, không nghi ngờ gì.* By using these ADs in the utterance, the speaker may imply that the truth or evidence for judging the reliability of the content proposition is no way necessary.

All ADs with high certainty have lexical source "certainty". Yet they do not express certainty to the same degree. The ADs have different semantic developments and these explain their different

functional behavior.

4.2.1.2. ADs Indicating Low Certainty

ADs of this group express S's attitude, comment or judgment about the uncertainty and doubt he casts on the content of the proposition. *Perhaps, probably, possibly, maybe, seemingly, allegedly* in English and *có thể sẽ*, *chắc là, có thể, hình như (là), dường như là ,* *có lẽ là...* are considered as low certainty ADs. These help to signal doubtful hypotheses and are beneath challenge and substantiation.

In short, such ADs of two levels above are expressing S's attitude, comment, and judgment on what he/ she said and on the subject of the sentence successfully. When using ADs, S is about to have H make a preparation to listen to his/ her conviction and engagement. And so, ADs, when used, make their very contribution to the ability of expressing the modality for the whole sentence.

4.2.2. The Semantic Functions of ADs in terms of Modal Concord

Two modal expressions in the sentences are interpreted as if they contained just a single modal operator. We propose to call this phenomenon "modal concord". However there are some restrictions on modal concord. For instance, there appear to be two main constraints on modal concord. First, two expressions can only participate in a concord construction if they are of the same modal type. The second one is that the modals involved have to have the same, or at least similar, quantificational force.

Languages differ in which modals count as sufficiently similar. For instance, in English we find *"probably"* combines with expressions of necessity rather than possibility.

4.3. PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF ADS IN ENGLISH AND VIETNAMESE

4.3.1. ADs as the Modification of Illocutionary Force

4.3.1.1. Boosting the Illocutionary Force of the Utterance

a. Positive Politeness Strategies with High ADs in Affirming the Concession in Keeping the Face of S and H

The corpus yielded instances of ADs used for boosting function, specially to convince the addressee, most often in the positive strategy which highlights the speaker's and hearer's positive face. However, in Vietnamese, S usually marks this strategy by using performative structures or high certainty ADs.

In communication, the disadvantages of S have tendency to be hidden by the Modesty maxim and Honesty one.

Speakers showed strong commitment towards the truth value of a proposition, to reveal their concession to the hearers to share opinions, especially in negotiation. In doing so, the focus is on another proposition rendering the speaker's different viewpoint. However, it is not always that the speaker conforms to this norm and accepts the cost. He or she may choose to use high certainty of ADs to assert his/ her statement in order to save or protect his positive face.

If the disjuncts were omitted, the force of the speech acts would not be so clearly intensified and the persuasiveness in these utterances would not be so explicitly manifested as in examples with the disjuncts.

b. Positive Politeness Strategies with High ADs in Saving S's Face from the Objection

High certainty ADs can be used to emphasize S's opinions and standpoints. Sometimes, the previous judgments of the interlocutors are likely to threaten to S's face, and then S reacts to the judgment of the person using ADs of high certainty to contradict the previous speaker's remark.

4.3.1.2. Softening the Illocutionary Force of the Utterance

a. Negative Politeness Strategies with Low ADs in Softening Criticism

S may employ the ADs with low certainty to down tone or soften the illocutionary force whose effect by nature is to potentially

threaten the other speaker's face.

b. Negative Politeness Strategies with Low ADs in Avoiding Imposing the Knowledge

Low certainty of ADs are used to reduce the S's certainty and soften the illocutionary force of an affirmative action when S believes that H has an opposite opinions or thoughts.

By using low certainty ADs the speaker intended to tone down the force of the utterance whose effect might possibly hurt the hearer's face. It can be seen that the content of the proposition in these utterances were not pleasant or flattering to the hearer. It is hard to receive such unfavorable remarks for a normal hearer; accordingly, these utterances should be hedged or softened to reduce the face risk to both the speaker and the hearer in an embarrassing situation.

Table 4.6. English and Vietnamese ADs with Positive Politeness Strategies

Linguistic devices	English	Vietnamese	Strategies	Pragmatic
High ADs	certainly, surely, + but	chắc chắn, tất nhiên, đương nhiên, + nhưng ...	Affirming the concession on H	Orienting H+S, softening the disadvantages for S+H (action of judgment)
	actually, certainly, In fact	đấy chứ, chứ, cơ mà, thì có, kia, mà, sự thật là, thật ra	Affirming the opinion to save S	Orienting S, boosting benefits for S (action of confession)
	certainly, really, awfully,	quá, lắm, thật cực kỳ, đúng là, rất chi là,	Boosting H's quality	Orienting H, boosting benefits for H(action of judgment, compliment)

Table 4.7. English and Vietnamese ADs with Negative Politeness
Strategies

Linguistic devices	English	Vietnamese	Strategies	Pragmatic
Low ADs	I'm afraid, I guess, just seems, seems like pretty,	dường như, hơi, cũng hơi, có vẻ, có lẽ, người ta nói	Avoiding critism	Orienting H , softening the action of judgment, evaluation, critism
	perhaps, maybe	hình như, có lẽ, có khi	avoiding the imposing of knowledge	Orienting H , softening the action of declaration about academic knowledge

4.3.2. ADs and Function of Organizing the Discourse

Semantically and grammatically, in order to participate into the conversation successfully, both S and H should create something besides the propositional information that they need to provide. Therefore, although it is only a piece of interaction to exchange information or simply a normal greeting, an utterance needs to have some linguistic devices to make it more natural and more interpersonal. And one of these is to use ADs.

4.3.3 Remarks on the Similarities and Differences of ADs in English and Vietnamese.

4.3.3.1. Similarities between English and Vietnamese ADs

Lexically, English and Vietnamese languages exist on the variations of ADs such as: words or group of words and noun phrases.

Syntactically, both languages have a large number of ADs at the initial position in the sentence. This is considered a natural thematic position for the departure of an opinion or judgment qualified with an

attitudinal disjunct. At this position, ADs of both languages take the function of a modifier to the whole sentence or utterance.

These ADs are peripheral to the clause structure and can be omitted without affecting on syntactic structure of the proposition following. A linguistic element is semantically detached when its presence or absence does not alter the core meaning of the sentence.

Another similarity in syntax is that, ADs in both languages can occur in declarative sentences, not in imperative ones. Illocutionary satellites cannot fall within the scope of negation, but the predication they can combine with can be positive or negative.

Table 4.9. The Semantic Similarity of ADs in English and Vietnamese

Functions	English	Vietnamese
showing speakers' commitment	+	+
using high and low ADs (depending on the reliability on P)	+	+
combining the auxiliary and the ADs according to degree of strength	+	+
being modified as premodifiers of degree	*almost, very, quite* +	*rất, khá* +

Table 4.10. The Pragmatic Similarity of ADs in English and Vietnamese

Functions		English	Vietnamese
Boosting the illocutionary force	*Softening the illocutionary force*	+	+
- High ADs in affirming the concession in keeping the face of S and H	- Low ADs in softening critism	+	+
- High ADs in boosting in saving S's face by the objection	- Low ADs in avoiding imposing the knowledge	+	+

4.3.3.2 Differences between English and Vietnamese ADs

Table 4.11. Syntactic Differences of ADs in English and Vietnamese

Category of Modal Constructions	English			Vietnamese		
	I	M	F	I	M	F
Adjective	+	+	+	+	+	-
Noun	+	-	-	+	-	-

Semantically, the most recognizable difference is the unequal number of ADs serving for the same purpose between English and Vietnamese ADs. More specifically, there are much more ADs in number in Vietnamese compared to those ADs in English. For example, the English disjunct "*probably*" expressing the degree of certainty of S's commitment on the content of what's said can be translated such many equivalent meanings in Vietnamese as *có lẽ, chắc sẽ, biết đâu* and *có thể*. The diversity in the number of these sentence adjuncts in Vietnamese has created ability for Vietnamese people to show their emotion, their comment appropriately and successfully.

Pragmatically, Vietnamese constraints in positions of ADs have prevented the ability of replacing of Vietnamese ADs, whereas this occurs rather easily in English. This mobility in positions and in changing the function enriches pragmatic using of English ADs in the held of translation and interpretation Adverbs in general and ADs in particular. Moreover, for the purpose of hedging, in English the ADs indicating the speaker's adherence to Quality Maxim and the ADs showing negative politeness are found the predominating groups meanwhile the ADs indicating the speaker's adherence to Quality Maxim and Quantity Maxim can be said to be typical in Vietnamese.

4.3.4. Potential Mistakes in Comprehending and Using ADs and Solutions

Sometimes, students make mistakes without recognizing the problem. So it is necessary to equip students with the awareness about

their mistakes making and how to correct these mistakes in their process of competence and usage.

Apart from paying attention to the semantic and pragmatic features of English ADs in the comparison to those of Vietnamese language, learners should be aware of the different positions of AD in the relation to other sentence components, especially in the relation to Adverb of manner (MA).

In order to distinguish an AD from an MA, this study proposes several ways, especially focus on the way of distinguishing the two kinds by means of their positions in a sentence:

- At the initial position: it is the most popular position of ADs, whereas the ability of appearing MA is rare.

- At the final position: it is the position characterized for MA with its function of complementing for the main Verb in the sentence.

- In the medial position: this position is applied mainly for AD since this placement of AD is also helps AD to carry out the function of expressing S's judgment on the Subject. AD at this position usually precedes the main verb and implies that the comment is carried out on the subject of the sentence. So whenever an Adverb is before the main verb, it has more possibility to be an AD than an MA.

Moreover, there are many possible ways to distinguish AD from MA such as: depending on the meaning of the main verb in the sentence (for example, if the main Verb is "see", the adverbs modifying it must be MA: see obviously, clearly etc), or depending on the meaning of the whole sentence (for example, if P following Adverb contains S's opinion, attitude or judgment about the content of what is said, or about the people involved, that Adverb may be AD). However, these distinctions are not as obvious as way of looking at the AD's positions in the sentence, and therefore do not take the effort of searching in this study.

4.4. SUMMARY

In conclusion, this chapter has made an analysis on the syntactic, semantics and pragmatic features of English ADs in comparison to those of Vietnamese's based on the qualitative and contrastive methods of analyzing. Also, some potential mistakes that students may make in the process of interpreting and performing ADs are described and analyzed specifically.

CHAPTER 5 CONCLUSION – IMPLICATIONS

5.1. CONCLUSION

The contrastive analysis of ADs in English and Vietnamese enables us to draw some remarks on their syntactic, semantic and pragmatic aspects.

Syntactically, English and Vietnamese make use of a wide range of ADs in form of simple words, phrases, clauses which encompass many categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and their collocations. The derivation process in English morphology allows ADs to be formed from adjectives and thus, they outnumber the Vietnamese counterpart members whose capacity to be derived from the root form is almost null. Also, ADs in English have been found to be more mobile and flexible in the clausal structure whereas those in Vietnamese are rather restricted to their distinctive positions as thematic or finally after the rheme. Especially, ADs in form of adverbs in English are more productive in their capacity and function as satellites in collocating with other modal markers such as modal lexical verbs and modal auxiliaries while only "sẽ" in Vietnamese allow the collocation with other members such as "chắc sẽ", "có thể sẽ", "có lẽ sẽ" …

Semantically, ADs in English and Vietnamese are encoded with semantic features such as the marking of an attitude towards the truth or reliability of the state-of-affairs mentioned in the proposition in terms of

a scale of reliability. The analysis also reveals the psychological aspects of ADs in their desirability, their pleasantness with which the speakers may decide to choose the right member on the scale of strength to show a convergence or divergence.

Pragmatically, the use of ADs in English and Vietnamese can be governed according to the speaker's motivation in modulating their attitude toward the illocutionary force of utterance. The choice of an AD may be resulted from the motivation to tone down or boost up the force of a speech act which may threaten or enhance the hearer and speaker's face.

5.2. IMPLICATIONS FOR LANGUAGE LEARNING AND TEACHING

With a hope of giving Vietnamese learners of English an aware of the importance of ADs in everyday conversation, the study also proposes several ways of solving the problems which they may face with. From that, learners can create their confidence in dealing with ADs and establish the habit of using ADs in everyday conversation effectively. Through out this study, it can be seen that the understanding and using of ADs may be significant and important to learners of both English and Vietnamese in their study and practice; however, they are not easy for them to acquire.

Firstly, the difficulty may lie in the awareness of the learners on this phenomenon, which is partly due to the lack of teaching of this area of language use. As we have seen, so far English ADs have been paid attention to in a number of teaching materials. Yet, the role of ADs; in particular, their use and functions have not been focused in the process of teaching and learning. Students are not taught to modulate their propositions or their attitude properly in some situations; that may be one of the reasons for their unnatural communication.

Secondly, the data analysis proves that the common

grammatical categories of ADs and their positions in English and Vietnamese are different from each other. As far as a transfer problem concerned, the learners' habit of ADs performance in Vietnames may impact on their utilization of ADs in the target language. They may not make full use of ADs various types in their utterance or modalized sentences but confine themselves to the use of some common ADs, which turn out to be often importer. Besides adverbs, ADs can be marked by adjective and noun constructions which are used formally in English discourse with distinctive functions. In the actual performance of modalized utterances with disjuncts, the Vietnamese learners of English may ignore this linguistic fact and may stick to the use of some common ADs. As a result, they confine themselves in some category of disjucts and fail to modulate, indicating the appropriate degree of cetainty to the content of proposition and moreover, in appropriate atmosphere of formal or informal discourse.

Thirdly, negative transfer may occur as the result of the imbalance in the distribution of a certain grammatical category in the two languages. Vietnamese learners may possibly not utilize English auxiliary modal appropriately, specifically in the harmony with disjuncts of other types. The failure of using different disjuncts in the same utterance may lead to a negative contextual effect to the hearer who could not know whether the speaker is offering him concession in some viewpoint or denying his idea straightfowardly with a single strong disjuncts. The Vietnamese learners's limitation in performing disjuncts marking English may be due to the unawareness of the harmony and reinforcement of different types of disjuncts. This suggests a need to provide the learners with pragmatic knowledge, specifically the set of constraints of proposition.

Fourthly, when encountering the sentences containing ADs, learners need to be aware of the implication in which the speaker

makes. It is, therefore, important to distinguish whether a statement implicates S's evaluation on the fact in the sentence or not.

As regards teaching, there must be systematic preparation when it comes to teaching ADs expressing degree of truth, especially in the context. Examples for presentation and illustration should be put in the original context for optimum cognition and understanding. The teaching of ADs to students of both languages must be carried out step by step, from the most commonly used to the least popular, from the most general to possible variants.

In conclusion, from the analysis illustrated, Vietnamese learners of English can help themselves improve their understanding about English ADs in the comparison to Vietnamese ones, so that they avoid the negative interference of their mother tongue in the process of learning a foreign language. The study also implicates that as for foreign language teaching, the teachers of English can predict the learners' potential mistakes as well as apply some teaching techniques to a better teaching.

Above are some difficulties Vietnamese learners of English may encounter during their study and communication. With a view to helping them overcome these problems and be more successful in their learning process, we would like to make some suggestions for language learning and teaching. When teaching ADs, teachers do not only attract learners' attention to the forms, the common patterns and semantic meaning but also to pragmatic factors like the illocutionary force, the source of the information as well as the pragmatic functions.

In the first place, more emphasis should be put on the teaching of English ADs to the second language learners and on their awareness of the effects of ADs in the statements. Students should be helped to understand the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic characteristics and differences of ADs in the two languages.

Importantly, teaching is often made for pragmatic principles; the learners' attention should be drawn to practical pragmatic knowledge acquired through their language learning. Particularly, the cooperative and politeness principles are worth the learner's great concern as they are among the factors that can govern the success of conversational situations. Then, appropriate language devices relevant to these principles in both English and Vietnamese should be provided for each communicative strategy. In addition, as we have known, the rules of appropriateness vary from culture to culture. Thus, along with such language specific phenomenon, a contrastive analysis on cross-culture norms should also be executed during the teaching- learning process.

Moreover, in the process of learning a foreign language, learners tend to look for the semantic equivalents between the target language and their native one, since it is easier for them to make acquaintance and to gradually improve their language skills in the target language. More specifically, learners will find in this study the similarities and differences between English ADs and Vietnamese ones, which is partly helpful for their interpreting and using English ADs in particular and English Adverbs in general.

Last but not least, variant spoken as well as written tasks that require the learners to apply their pragmatic knowledge in using ADs should be designed, for example:

- Identifying the ADs and their semantic or pragmatic functions in the discourse;

- Inserting and removing ADs and justifying the effect on the meaning of the text;

- Replacing variant ADs in an utterance and discussing the change of meaning;

- Using ADs in the most effective way to achieve the communicative goals;

- Translating the texts realized with ADs into Vietnamese or English;

5.3. LIMITATIONS AND SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

Being aware that ADs are a topic of significance to Vietnamese learners of English, we have made a great effort in doing the research. Nonetheless, owing to the shortage of reference materials and the framework of the thesis, the study remains some inevitable restrictions and shortcomings. Some deductions drawn out from the findings are to some extent subjective and some focal points have not been thoroughly examined or explored as they should have been.

In the thesis, ADs have been dealt with in the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic domains with samples of ADs from novels, short stories, articles in paper newspapers, but a number of related problems are still aside. Therefore, we suggest intensive research on the following:

- Investigations into the use of ADs in various contexts such as science, education, politics, entertainment and so on.
- The role of each component in shaping the semantics of ADs and their collocation.