

Armenian Folia Anglistika – the official peer-reviewed academic journal of the Armenian Association for the Study of English (since 2005) and Yerevan State University (since 2015) aims at fostering research of the English Language, Literature and Culture in Armenia and elsewhere and facilitate intellectual cooperation between high school teachers and scholars.

In 2007 the Editorial Board of *Armenian Folia Anglistika* announced the opening of a new section in the Journal – Armenological Studies, which invites valuable and innovative contributions from such fields as Armenian Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Ethnic Studies, Cultural History, Gender Studies and a wide range of adjacent disciplines.

Armenian Folia Anglistika is intended to be published twice a year. Articles of interest to university-level teachers and scholars in English Studies are warmly welcomed by the multi-national Editorial Board of the Journal. Articles should be directed to the Editor-in-Chief.

Հիմնադիր և գլխավոր խմբագիր՝
ՄԵՂԱ ԳԱՍՊԱՆՐՅԱՆ
Համարի թողարկման
պատասխանատու՝
ԼԻԼԻ ԿԱՐԱՊԵՏՅԱՆ
Լրատվական գործունեություն
իրականացնող
«ԱՆԳԼԵՐԵՆԻ
ՈՒՍՈՒՄՆԱՍԻՐՈՒԹՅԱՆ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ԱՍՈՑԻԱՑԻԱ» ՀԿ
<http://www.aase.y su.am>
Վկայական՝ 03Ա 065183
Տրված՝ 28.06.2004 թ.

Yerevan State University
Press

Editor-in-Chief

Seda Gasparyan – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Corresponding Member of RA NAS, Honoured Scientist of RA, Head of Yerevan State University English Philology Department, President of Armenian Association for the Study of English.

Phone: +374 99 25 50 60;

E-mail: sedagasparyan@yandex.ru; sedagasparyan@ysu.am

Editors

Shushanik Paronyan, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Gaiane Muradian, Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Astghik Chubaryan, PhD in Philology, Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia).

Editorial Advisory Board

1. Svetlana Ter-Minasova – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor Emeritus at Lomonosov Moscow State University, President of the Faculty of Foreign Languages and Area Studies, Doctor Honoris Causa at the Universities of Birmingham, UK (2002), The State University of New York, USA (2007), the Russian-Armenian Slavonic University, Armenia, Visiting professor at the National Research Tomsk State University, Russia (2013), Yunshan Professor at Guangdong University of Foreign Languages and International Relations, China (2016), holder of Lomonosov Award (1995), Fulbright's 50th Anniversary Award (1995), Boris Polevoi Prize (2015), Member of the Council of Experts of the International Academic Forum, Japan (2013).

2. Angela Locatelli – Professor of English Literature, Bergamo University, Italy, Adjunct Professor in the Department of Religious Studies at the University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, Faculty Member of the International PhD Network established in 2008 by the University of Giessen, Germany, holder of a Fellowship at the Folger Shakespeare Library in Washington (1999, 2008), one of the three General Editors of EJES (European Journal of English Studies) (2004-2010).

3. Olga Aleksandrova – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of the Department of English Linguistics at Lomonosov Moscow State University, holder of Lomonosov Award (2001), Award of the International Federation of Modern Language Teachers' Associations at FIPLV (2005).

4. **John Stotesbury** - Adjunct Professor of the Department of English University of Oulu, Finland, Adjunct Professor of Philosophical Faculty, School of Humanities, Finland.
5. **Elżbieta Chrzanowska-Kluczevska** – Professor, Dr. hab. Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Institute Filologii Angielskiej, Katedra Jezykoznawstwa Angielskiego. Cracow, Poland.
6. **Elżbieta Manczak-Wohlfeld** – Professor, Dr. hab. Uniwersytet Jagiellonski, Institute Filologii Angielskiej, Katedra Jezykoznawstwa Angielskiego. Cracow, Poland.
7. **Alessandra Giorgi** – PhD in Philology, Full Professor, Department of Linguistics and Comparative Cultural Studies, Ca’Foscari University of Venice, Italy.
8. **Buniatova Isabella** – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of the Department of Germanic and Romance Philology, Boris Grinchenko Kyiv University, Ukraine.
9. **Ірина Шевченко** - Doctor of Philology, Full Professor, V. N. Karazin Kharkov National University, Head of the Department of Business Foreign Language and Translation, Academician of Academy of Sciences of the High School of Ukraine, Editor-in-Chief of The International Journal “Cognition, Communication, Discourse”.
10. **Ewa Salkiewicz-Munnerlyn** – Professor, Doctor of Cracow Academy after Andrej Frycz Modrzewski, Cracow, Poland.
11. **Marta Dabrowska** – Associate Professor, Doctor hab. , Institute of English Studies, Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland.
12. **Peter Sutton** – Freelance Editor and Translator, UK.
13. **Sona Haroutyunian** – Doctor of Linguistics, Professor at the Department of Asian and African Studies, Visiting Professor at University of California Los Angeles (2009), Nida School of Translation Studies, New York - Misano Adriatico (2012), California State University Fresno (2013), Yerevan State University (2015), City University of New York (2017).

Managing Editor

Lili Karapetyan – Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia)

Assistant Editor

Gohar Madoyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University (Armenia)

Երևանի պետական համալսարան

**Անգլերենի ուսումնասիրության հայկական
ասոցիացիա (Անգլերենի ուսումնասիրության
եվրոպական ֆեդերացիայի անդամ)**

**ԱՆԳԼԻԱԳԻՏԱԿԱՆ
ՀԵՏԱԶՈՏՈՒԹՅՈՒՆՆԵՐԻ
ՀԱՅԿԱԿԱՆ ՀԱՆԴԵՍ**

**Միջազգային գրախոսվող ամսագիր
համագործակցությամբ՝**

Երևանի Վալերի Բրյուսովի անվան պետական
լեզվա հասարակագիտական համալսարանի
(Հայաստան)

Մոսկվայի Մ. Լոմոնոսովի անվ. պետական համալսարանի
(Ռուսաստան)

Կրակովի Յագիելոնյան համալսարանի
(Լեհաստան)

Մոնտենեգրոյի համալսարանի

ԵՐԵՎԱՆ – 2019



100



Yerevan State University

**Armenian Association for the Study
of English (Member Association of the
European Society for the Study of English)**

**ARMENIAN FOLIA
ANGLISTIKA**

**Reviewed International Journal
in cooperation with:**

Yerevan Brusov State University of Languages
and Social Sciences
(Armenia)

Lomonosov Moscow State University
(Russia)

Jagiellonian University, Cracow
(Poland)

University of Montenegro
(Montenegro)

YEREVAN – 2019

CONTENTS

Linguistics

Seda Gasparyan

A Methodological Mechanism for Applying the Hermeneutical Approach9

Mariam Askarian, Hovhannes Vanesyan

Sports Metaphors in American Political Discourse30

Kristine Harutyunyan, Anna Sargsyan

The Sociolinguistic Perspective of Hedging in English44

Hovhannes Vanesyan

Politeness and Its Perception by Armenian Learners of English:

From Theory to Action53

Methodology

Tatyana V. Sidorenko, Margaret Apresyan

CLIL as a New Innovative Pedagogy: the case of Russia and Armenia63

Veronik Khachatryan, Armenuhi Ghalachyan

Meeting the Goals and Challenges of Adult EFL Learners88

Syuzanna Tadevosyan

Inclusive Education in Armenia103

Culture

Evgeniia Zimina, Mariana Sargsyan

Politics, Poetry, People: an Overview of Contemporary Poetry Trends

in the British Literary Landscape113

Narine Harutyunyan

On Some Forms of “Out-Group” Intolerance and “Unlimited”
Tolerance in Linguoculture 130

Marine Yaghubyan

The Use of Positive and Negative Politeness Strategies to Express
Request in English and Armenian Cultures..... 141

Mara Baghdasaryan

Fate across Cultures: a Linguocognitive Approach..... 151

Literature

Angela Locatelli

Spatial Mobility as Social Mobility in the Early Seventeenth Century:
Henry Peacham Jr.’s Picaresque Novel
A Merry Discourse of Meum and Tuum 166

Vicky Tchapanian

Morality vs Immorality in the Miserable Life of
Daniel Defoe's Moll Flanders..... 182

Armenological Studies

Seda Gasparyan, Luiza Gasparyan

On Translational “Lacunae” in the English Translation of
The History of Armenia by Movses Khorenatsi 191

**To the Centenary
of Yerevan State University**

The Sociolinguistic Perspective of Hedging in English

Kristine Harutyunyan, Anna Sargsyan

Yerevan State University

Abstract

Hedging refers to linguistic strategies which qualify categorical commitment, expressing possibility and probability rather than certainty. Hedges express tentativeness and possibility in communication, so their appropriate use in different discourses is vital. The aim of the present paper is to describe and analyze the social factors and social parameters that influence and determine the use of hedging in English speech; particularly we focus on gender, occupation, topic and setting while examining each type of speech. The famous TED talks (usually short, influential and powerful) serve as a primary source of investigation.

Key words: *sociolinguistic perspective, social interaction, hedging, social factors, TED talks.*

Introduction

Sociolinguistics as a discipline studies a wide variety of dialects to analyze different social variables influencing the speaker's language. It often shows the humorous realities of human speech and how a dialect of a given language can describe the speaker's age, gender, social class or the level of education.

The basic components in sociolinguistic explanations of why we speak differently in different social contexts are the social factors. They are very important in describing and analyzing all kinds of information. In any situation linguistic choices generally indicate people's awareness of the influence of one or more social factors (Holmes 2013).

Language variation allows to locate speakers in a multi-dimensional society. Age is one of the dimensions on which we construct identities for

ourselves and others. Gender also plays an important role in language variation as we have linguistic differences between male and female speech (Lakoff 1975).

Hedges are communicative strategies for reducing the force of statements, to show doubt and indicate that information is presented as opinion rather than accredited fact. Hedges may be understood as positive or negative politeness in which the writer or speaker tries to appear humble rather than arrogant or all-knowing. It also guarantees a certain level of acceptability in a community, so one could consider hedges as ways of being more precise in reporting results. Hedging may present the true state of the writers' or speakers' understanding and may be used to negotiate an accurate representation of the state of the knowledge under discussion. By hedging, authors or speakers tone down their statements in order to reduce the risk of opposition.

There is much dispute about the linguistic difference between men and women, about the language they use. Hedging, being a kind of politeness marker, plays an important role in showing the differences of its usage from a sociolinguistic perspective, particularly focusing on such social and contextual parameters as gender, class, age, ethnicity, setting, etc.

Thus, our intention has been to carry out quantitative and qualitative analyses from a sociolinguistic perspective of twenty-minute speeches of ten people (five men and five women) to provide a detailed interpretation of hedges used in male and female speeches.

A Case Study of Hedging from a Sociolinguistic Perspective

Sociolinguistics studies language in general and particular linguistic items in relation to the society which uses it. In any situation linguistic choices generally reflect the influence of the setting or social context of the interaction. This is one of the basic components in sociolinguistic explanations of why we speak differently in different social contexts (Hickey 2007). The context in language use is very important, for linguistic and social behavior not only has to be appropriate to the individual and his socio-economic background, but it also needs to be suitable for particular occasions and situations.

Investigating the social context of TED talks, we have observed that almost in all the speeches the setting is primarily informal, friendly and inspiring, which presupposes free usage of various language means by the speakers. And hedging devices as common linguistic means of communicative strategies are abundantly utilized by the speakers in talks for different purposes. Hedges are widely used in conversation and in social interaction since they tone down and reduce the force of the statements and indicate that the information is presented as opinion rather than accredited fact.

Thus we can say that the benevolent setting of TED talks contribute to the unrestrained code choice. As an exemplification we can mention the usage of vulgar words by one of the speakers in his speech. Moreover, if we take into account the fact that the audiences are people of various interests and occupation, and that they are not indispensably representatives of science, technology, psychology or culture, then the usage of diverse linguistic means, in our case the utilization of hedging, is completely justified.

Context in language use is very important, for linguistic and social behavior not only has to be appropriate to the individual and his socio-economic background, but it also needs to be suitable for particular occasions and situations. In other words, language varies not only according to the social characteristics of the speaker but also according to the social context in which he finds himself.

For a more in-depth analysis of the material we have considered the occupations of the speakers which also deals with the themes touched upon by them. The largest amount of hedges is used by Amy Cuddy (132), who is a social psychologist, a professor and a researcher. She delivers her speech on body language and how nonverbal behavior affects people's perceptions. The next, in terms of the amount of hedges used in the speech, is Brené Brown (79), a vulnerability researcher who speaks about a personal quest to know herself and to understand humanity. Then comes Susan Cain (51), she is a former corporate lawyer and negotiations consultant who argues that introverts bring extraordinary talents and abilities to the world. The health psychologist Kelly McGonigal (42) states that stress is a positive thing. The last one is the famous

model Cameron Russell (34) speaking about beauty and trying to prove that looks are not everything. This study of women's speech shows that the number of hedges used in female speech varies from speaker to speaker, confirming the fact that the big amount of hedging used in female speech is not only conditioned by the gender of the speaker but also by the speaker herself.

Considering men's speech we have noticed that the number of hedges used by men is not much as compared with that of the women. This may promote a preconceived idea that women use more hedges than men because of their gender differences, if not for other social factors and social parameters that should be taken into consideration.

For a more comprehensive and thorough analysis let us take into consideration the occupation of each of the speakers and reveal the subject matter of their speech. Among men Ken Robinson used the largest amount of hedges (48). He is a creativity expert who challenges the school system to cultivate creativity and acknowledge multiple types of intelligence. Next is Pranav Mistry (44), a MIT graduate student who invented SixthSense wearable device that enables new interactions between the real world and the world of data. The life coach and expert in leadership psychology Tony Robbins (43) discusses in his speech the "invisible forces" that motivate our actions in order to know why we do what we do. The leadership expert Simon Sinek (21) presents a simple, but powerful model for inspirational leadership-starting with a golden circle. And the last one is the career analyst Dan Pink (20) who examines the puzzle of motivation with a fact that social scientists know. This study, first of all, has revealed that women use more hedging devices and politeness markers than men do during their speech. Women mentioned above used about 338 hedging devices of different kinds, while men used only 176 hedges. This is a considerable quantitative difference between the two genders, which might give a preconceived idea that gender presupposes some extent of certainty or lack of certainty.

Hedging and Its Functions in Speech

The notion that gender presupposes some extent of certainty or lack of certainty is not an absolute one. Moreover, such an explanation is too narrow and restrained because the possible different communicative functions of hedges have not been taken into consideration. By functions we namely mean the inclusion of others into speech or arousing interest in the topic. In other words, hedges can function as conversational facilitation strategies to keep the conversation flowing, and when considering cross-gender issues it is of paramount importance to take into account the different functions and purposes of the employed strategies, as well as the various social factors and social parameters that can influence the code choice of the speaker (Fishman 1983).

In examining the usage of hedging by two genders the investigation of the mere quantity used by two genders is not sufficient. It is also necessary to take into consideration the taxonomy of hedging devices, i.e. the main types of hedging used during the speech (Salager-Meyer 1997). It is of paramount importance to get a more comprehensive sociolinguistic picture of the speech material under consideration and this will be done by calculating which kinds of hedges are mostly used and for what purposes.

The most frequently used type of hedging by two genders is the introductory phrases. These hedges are mainly used during the speech as false starts, as markers of hesitation and subjectivity. The next commonly used hedging device differs across gender, in men's speech it is the approximators of degree, quantity, frequency and time, in women's speech it is the adjectival, adverbial and nominal modal phrases. As for the approximators, they are used either because of the speaker's lack of precise information or as strategies of being more accurate in representation. The adjectival, adverbial and nominal modal phrases mainly contain shades of possibility, probability and hesitancy. Yet, we may claim that there are not many quantitative differences between these two types of hedges in men's and women's speech. Such is the case with the modal lexical verbs as well, which express doubt and evaluation rather than mere description.

And the last three hedges, which have low frequency of usage in male and female speeches – are if-clauses, modal auxiliary verbs and compound hedges. As we have observed in the examples, if-clauses render hypothetical meaning which is deemed possible if certain conditions are met. As far as the modal auxiliary verbs are concerned, they often convey possibility and probability of the action. And the hedging with the least frequency is compound hedges, which also expresses probability but with the help of two hedging items.

Another social factor that is necessary to consider in the process of analyzing the usage of hedging by two genders is the topic. Sociolinguistic studies show that people may select a particular variety, code or language means to discuss a particular topic. That is to say, they use the language which is associated with that particular domain.

Thus, we can also consider the themes and topics discussed in the ten TED Talks to find out whether they play any role in the number of hedges used by the two genders. The main themes and subjects discussed by women are psychology, body language, stress, beauty and vulnerability. If we compare the number of hedges used by Amy Cuddy (132), Kelly McGonial (42) and Susan Cain (51), taking into consideration that all of them dealt with psychological issues, we may deduce that there is much difference in the number of the hedging devices found in the speeches they delivered. As compared to the other two talks which are related to beauty and vulnerability, Cameron Russels uses 34 hedges and Brené Brown uses 80 respectively.

Concluding the study of the hedges used with reference to the topic discussed by women, we can note that talks connected with psychology and different psychological issues include more hedges than others not connected with the mentioned topics. Hence, in case of women's talks, the topic plays not a primary, but an important role in code choice, and in this particular case in the number of hedges.

As for the topics touched upon by men, they include creativity, business, leadership psychology and technology. Simon Sinek's (21), Tony Robins' (43) and Dan Pink's (20) talks are connected with business and leadership. As we see the number of hedges used by them does not much differ, but compared to the

other two male speeches, which refer to creativity and technology, the number of hedges does not prevail (Ken Robinson 48 and Pranav Mistry 44). Thus, the topic of the talks is of relevant importance in conditioning the number of hedging devices used by men.

Another reference point to consider frequency of usage of hedges might be a cross-gender analysis, connected with one and the same topic. For example, Amy Cuddy's (132), Susan Cain's (51) and Tony Robins' (43) talks are related to psychology, but the number of hedging devices differs considerably, which shows that although the topic and the theme of the talks play some role with reference to the number of hedges used within the talks by speakers of the same gender, on a broader scale – considering one and the same topic in a male – female continuum, the difference is quite vivid in favour of more hedges used by women.

Conclusion

Considering all the possible social factors and social parameters that could influence the usage of hedging by two genders in speech, we have come to the conclusion that women's abundant utilization of hedging devices is not necessarily conditioned by their inferiority, powerlessness and deficiency, but by the fact that they are better and skilled communicators. Studying gender issues we should focus our attention on all the possible social factors and social parameters, and we should not ignore the role of context and blindly over-emphasize the linguistic differences between men and women. Hedging does not only refer to hesitation, doubt, insecurity and lack of confidence; it is also a conversational and politeness strategy which carries out interactional and facilitative functions. Hedging enables us to maintain better interpersonal relationship and to keep the conversation flowing.

References:

1. Fishman, J.A. (1972) *The Sociology of Language: An Interdisciplinary Social Science Approach to Language in Society*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.

2. Hickey, R. (2007) *Language and Society*. Cambridge: CUP.
3. Holmes, J. (2013) *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. New York, Routledge, Taylor and Francis group.
4. Lakoff, R. (1975) *Language and Woman's Place*. New York: Harper & Row.
5. Salager-Meyer, F. (1997) *I Think that Perhaps You Should: A Study of Hedges in Written Scientific Discourse*. // Functional approaches to written text: Classroom applications. United States Information Agency.

Sources of Data:

1. Cain, Susan, *The power of introverts*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/susan_cain_the_power_of_introverts [Accessed March, 2019]
2. Cuddy, Amy, *Your body language shapes who you are*. Available at: <https://www.ted.com/talks/amy_cuddy_your_body_language_shapes_who_you_are> [Accessed January, 2019]
3. Brown, Brené, *The power of vulnerability*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/brene_brown_on_vulnerability [Accessed December, 2018]
4. McGonigal, Kelly, *How to make stress your friend*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/kelly_mcgonigal_how_to_make_stress_your_friend [Accessed January, 2019]
5. Mistry, Pranav, *The thrilling potential of SixthSense technology*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/pranav_mistry_the_thrilling_potential_of_sixthsense_technology [Accessed March, 2019]
6. Pink, Dan, *The puzzle of motivation*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/dan_pink_on_motivation [Accessed December, 2018]
7. Robbins, Tony, *Why we do what we do*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/tony_robbins_asks_why_we_do_what_we_do [Accessed February, 2019]
8. Robinson, Ken, *Do schools kill creativity*. Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/ken_robinson_says_schools_kill_creativity [Accessed March, 2019]

9. Russell, Cameron, *Looks aren't everything. Believe me, I'm a model.* Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/cameron_russell_looks_aren_t_everything_believe_me_i_m_a_model [Accessed January, 2019]
10. Sinek, Simon, *How great leaders inspire action.* Available at: https://www.ted.com/talks/simon_sinek_how_great_leaders_inspire_action [Accessed February, 2019]
11. TED Talks (Available at: <https://www.ted.com/>) [Accessed January 2019].

Հեջավորման հանրալեզվական բնութագիրը անգլերենում

Հեջավորումը խոսքային տարբեր իրավիճակներում հավանականությունն արտահայտող հաղորդակցական կարևորագույն միջոց է: Հեջավորման կիրառությունը պայմանավորված է հասարակական և հանրալեզվական մի շարք գործոններով: Հանրահայտ TED Talks անգլերեն հակիրճ և տպավորիչ խոսքային նյութի հիման վրա հողվածում փորձ է արվում բացահայտել հեջավորման կիրառությունը պայմանավորող այնպիսի գործոններ, ինչպիսիք են գենդերը, մասնագիտությունը, թեման և միջավայրը:

Received by the Editorial Board 25.01.2019

Recommended for publication by the reviewers 05.03.2019

Accepted for print 22.04.2019

Our Authors

Angela Locatelli – Professor (Full and Tenured) of English Literature, and Director of the PhD Program in “Euro-American Literatures”, University of Bergamo, Italy.

E-mail: angela.locatelli@unibg.it

Anna Sargsyan – MA in Linguistics, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: kristineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Armenuhi Ghalachyan – PhD in Philology, Senior Professor, Chair of Theory of Language and Cross-Cultural Communication, Russian-Armenian University.

E-mail: armiine@mail.ru

Evgeniia Zimina – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Department of Romance and Germanic Languages, Kostroma State University.

E-mail: ezimina@rambler.ru

Hovhannes Vanesyan – PhD student at English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: hovhanesyan@yandex.ru

Kristine Harutyunyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: kristineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Luiza Gasparyan - PhD in Philology, Institute of Literature, NAS RA.

E-mail: luizagasparyan@rambler.ru

Mara Baghdasaryan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Chair of English Language 2, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: marabaghdasaryan@ysu.am

Margaret Apresyan – PhD in Linguistics, Professor, Head of the Chair for ESP, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: english@ysu.am

Mariam Askarian – MA in Linguistics, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: mariamaskaryan@gmail.com

Mariana Sargsyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: marianasargsyan@ysu.am

Marine Yaghubyan – PhD in Philology, Associate Professor at the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: marina.yaghubyan@ysu.am

Narine Harutyunyan – Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor at the Department of English for Cross-Cultural Communication, Yerevan State University.

Email: narineharutyunyan@ysu.am

Seda Gasparyan – Corresponding Member of RA National Academy of Sciences, Honoured Scientist of RA. Doctor of Sciences (Philology), Professor, Head of English Philology Department, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: sedagasparyan@yandex.ru, sedagasparyan@ysu.am

Syuzanna Tadevosyan – PhD in Philology, Senior Professor, Chair of Theory of Language and Cross-Cultural Communication, Russian-Armenian University.

E-mail: syuzantadevosyan@mail.ru

Tatyana Sidorenko – PhD in Pedagogy, Assistant Professor, School of Core Engineering Education, Tomsk Polytechnic University.

E-mail: SidorenkoT@tpu.ru

Veronik Khachaturyan – PhD in Philology, Assistant Professor at the Chair of English Language 2, Yerevan State University.

E-mail: veronikkhachaturyan@ysu.am

Vicky Tchapanian – PhD in Philology, Lecturer at the Department of Business and Economics, Lebanese University.

E-mail: vicky.tchapanian@hotmail.com

Author Guidelines

Manuscript Submission

Manuscripts should be submitted by one of the authors of the manuscript through the online manuscript management system. Only electronic Word (.doc, .docx) files can be submitted. Only online submissions are advised strongly to facilitate rapid publication and to minimize administrative costs. Submissions by anyone other than one of the authors will not be accepted. The submitting author takes responsibility for the paper during submission and peer review. If for some technical reason submission through the online Manuscript Management System is not possible, the author can send manuscript as email attachment. Email submission: afajournal@ysu.am

Editorial Policy

Armenian Folia Anglistika is concerned with such fields as Linguistics, Literary Criticism, Translation Studies, Methodology, Ethnic Studies, Cultural History, Gender Studies, Armenian Studies and a wide range of adjacent disciplines. The articles address a wide range of interesting questions and are of consistently high quality. The reviewing is timely, knowledgeable and objective. The book reviews are very balanced and informative. The language of submission and publication is English.

Editorial Process

This journal follows strict double blind fold review policy to ensure neutral evaluation. All manuscripts are subject to peer review and are expected to meet standards of academic excellence. High quality manuscripts are peer-reviewed by minimum two peers of the same field. The reviewers submit their reports on the manuscripts along with their recommendation of one of the following actions to the Editor-in-Chief:

Recommendation regarding the paper:

1. I recommend the paper for publication
2. I recommend the paper for publication after major/minor corrections
3. I do not recommend the paper for publication

The Editor-in-Chief makes a **decision** accordingly:

1. to publish the paper
2. to consider the paper for publication after major/minor corrections

In these cases the authors are notified to prepare and submit a final copy of their manuscript with the required major/minor changes in a timely manner. The Editor-in-

Chief reviews the revised manuscript after the changes have been made by the authors. Once the Editor-in-Chief is satisfied with the final manuscript, the manuscript can be accepted. The Editor-in-Chief can also reject the manuscript if the paper still doesn't meet the requirements.

3. to reject the paper

The editorial workflow gives the Editor-in-Chief the authority to reject any manuscript because of inappropriateness of its subject, lack of quality, incorrectness, or irrelevance. The Editor-in-Chief cannot assign himself/herself as an external reviewer of the manuscript. This is to ensure a high-quality, fair, and unbiased peer-review process of every manuscript submitted to the journal, since any manuscript must be recommended by one or more (usually two) external reviewers along with the Editor in charge of the manuscript in order to accept it for publication in the journal.

Ethical Issues:

Authors cannot submit the manuscript for publication to other journals simultaneously. The authors should submit original, new and unpublished research work to the journal. The ethical issues such as plagiarism, fraudulent and duplicate publication, violation of copyrights, authorship and conflict of interests are serious issues concerning ethical integrity when submitting a manuscript to a journal for publication.

Withdrawal of Manuscripts:

The author can request withdrawal of manuscript after submission within the time span when the manuscript is still in the peer-reviewing process. After the manuscript is accepted for publication, the withdrawal is not permitted.