VILNIUS UNIVERSITY

Gintarė Žalkauskaitė

FEATURES OF IDIOLECT IN E-MAILS

Summary of doctoral dissertation

Humanities, Philology (04 H)

Vilnius, 2012

This doctoral dissertation was written at Vilnius University in 2007–2011.

Research supervisor:
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Loreta Vilkienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The dissertation will be defended at the Council of Philology of Vilnius University:

Chair:
Prof. Habil. Dr. Regina Koženiauskienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Members:
Prof. Dr. Giedrė Čepaitienė (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Irena Smetonienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Meilutė Ramonienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Dr. Jurgita Girčienė (Institute of the Lithuanian Language, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Opponents:
Prof. Habil. Dr. Kazimieras Romualdas Župerka (Šiauliai University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

Dr. Loreta Vaicekauskienė (Vilnius University, Humanities, Philology – 04 H)

The public defence of the dissertation is to be held in the meeting of the Council of Philology of Vilnius University at 3 p.m. on 6 January 2012 in the V. Krėvė lecture hall of the Faculty of Philology, Vilnius University.
Address: Universiteto St. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lithuania.

The summary of the dissertation was sent out to relevant institutions on 5 December 2011.
The dissertation is available at the library of Vilnius University.

VILNIAUS UNIVERSITETAS

Gintarė Žalkauskaitė

IDIOLEKTO POŽYMIAI ELEKTRONINIUOSE LAIŠKUOSE

Daktaro disertacijos santrauka

Humanitariniai mokslai, filologija (04 H)

Vilnius, 2012

Disertacija rengta 2007–2011 metais Vilniaus universitete.

Mokslinio darbo vadovė:
doc. dr. Loreta Vilkienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija ginama Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos mokslo krypties taryboje:

Pirmininkė:
prof. habil. dr. Regina Koženiauskienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Nariai:
prof. dr. Giedrė Čepaitienė (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

doc. dr. Irena Smetonienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

doc. dr. Meilutė Ramonienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

dr. Jurgita Girčienė(Lietuvių kalbos institutas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Oponentai:
prof. habil. dr. Kazimieras Romualdas Župerka (Šiaulių universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

dr. Loreta Vaicekauskienė (Vilniaus universitetas, humanitariniai mokslai, filologija – 04 H)

Disertacija bus ginama viešame Filologijos mokslo krypties tarybos posėdyje 2012 m. sausio mėn. 6 d. 15 val. Vilniaus universiteto Filologijos fakultete, Vinco Krėvės auditorijoje.

Adresas: Universiteto g. 5, LT-01513, Vilnius, Lietuva.

Disertacijos santrauka išsiuntinėta 2011 m. gruodžio mėn. 5 d.

Disertaciją galima peržiūrėti Vilniaus universiteto bibliotekoje.

FEATURES OF IDIOLECT IN E-MAILS

Summary

Idiolect may be defined as a totality of the features of linguistic expression of an individual comprising the propensities and skills of his/her expression and distinguishing him/her from other language users. The concept *idiolect* remains debatable: some sociolinguists do not recognize idiolect (Jakobson 1971, Labov 1989), but others (Леонтьев, 1968, Hudson 1996) see idiolect as an essential phenomenon of language use. Such contradictory scientific attitudes show that the linguistic expression of individuality has not been sufficiently researched either in Lithuania or in the whole world. Researching idiolect can reveal certain aspects and motives of language use and help us achieve a better understanding of the behaviour of language. Practical studies of idiolect are conducted in forensic linguistics in order to attribute authorship to texts. Forensic linguistics needs works which give a scientific basis to the attribution of authorship and expand its possibilities. This dissertation takes up the topic of the expression of idiolect in e-mails in order to expand the present research methodologies of authorship attribution and apply them to the study of electronic discourse.

The Object of Research – peculiarities of the linguistic expression in personal e-mails which can be considered features of the author's idiolect. The features of idiolect at the levels of the lexis and graphics of the e-mails – the tendencies in the use of lexis, punctuation marks, emoticons and other graphical symbols – were taken into consideration.

The Aims and Goals of Research

The aim of this dissertation is to determine whether e-mails reveal the author's idiolect and through which lexical and graphical features it is expressed. To fulfil the research aims, the following goals were raised:

1.   To collect a corpus of personal e-mails written by six authors.

2. To analyze the lexical and graphical expression characteristic to the e-mails of the collected corpus.

3. To compare the features of lexical and graphical expression in the e-mails written by six persons and determine whether they include any features of linguistic expression suggestive of the authors' individual style.

4. To generalize on the basis of the distinctions in the features of the linguistic expression of the six authors what groups of speech units are necessary to the identification of idiolect.

5. To provide recommendations for forensic linguists conducting research in the field of the attribution of authorship.

Research Novelty

This dissertation is new in several respects:

1. New field of research: Lithuanian linguists have yet paid little attention to the issues of forensic linguistics.

2. Non-researched object: theoretically, Lithuanian linguists have studied idiolect by applying the concept of individual style (Pikčilingis 1971 (a), 1971 (b), Župerka 2001), but they have not analyzed idiolect more comprehensively.

3. Non-researched material: this dissertation analyzes personal e-mails, which have not been researched in the works of Lithuanian linguists. Newsletters, which belong to another type of e-mails, have been analyzed in Asta Ryklienė's dissertation (2001). It should be noted, however, that Ryklienė's research was conducted ten years ago and the electronic discourse is changing rather quickly, so the need for new research remains. This dissertation presents new data about the language of e-mails.

Defence Statements:

1. The lexical and graphical expression of personal e-mails reveals the features of the idiolects of the six authors. Analyzing the lexical and graphical expression of e-mails can help distinguish one author of e-mails from another.

2. Idiolects are distinguished by the use of words of different parts of speech, so it is appropriate to analyze the whole lexis used in the texts in order to distinguish between idiolects.

3. At the level of lexis, idiolects are most evidently distinguished by:

- Words entailing modality and rendering the author's evaluation and attitudes;

- Different standard and nonstandard words and abbreviations chosen from possible lexical variants;

- Certain words or sayings preferred by the author and used in various situations;

- Words of a certain meaning that are used quite often, for example, those denoting emotions and states.

4. Idiolect is marked by the more or less prevalent use of a certain punctuation mark in the texts of one author as compared to the texts of other authors and a recurrent use of less conventional punctuation marks and their combinations.

5. The authors of e-mails tend to use one or several versions of possible emoticons. Idiolect is marked by a set of emoticons used by the author.

Data and Methods

The corpus consisting of e-mails of six authors collected for this dissertation and the features of idiolects have been distinguished by comparing the language of these authors. This dissertation does not attempt to define the features of idiolect of a single person, but to show the more general trends in the expression of idiolect. The authors have been selected for their affinity in terms of their social characteristics so that it is possible to determine the differences between their idiolects rather than sociolects. The authors of the e-mails are 24-32-years-old university graduates, four men and two women who belong to a group of travellers. The e-mails chosen for the research were sent to the author of the present dissertation and other addressees' friends and acquaintances as well as to four online conferences uniting the fold: *turizmas.konferencijos.lt, vuzk.yahoogroups.com, nevykeliai.yahoogroups.com, alpinizmo-asociacija.googlegroups.com*. The data of these texts are presented in table 1.

Table 1: *Data of the texts*

Person	Number of e-mails	Number of words	Dates of e-mails
Jonas	149	10.687	2008-02-27 – 2010-07-07
Linas	160	11.208	2008-08-04 – 2010-06-11
Romas	206	10.769	2008-01-29 – 2010-05-26
Tadas	194	11.177	2008-04-28 – 2010- 07-03
Rūta	145	11.103	2008-02-27 – 2010-05-31
Inga	141	10.146	2007-04-12 – 2010-07-12
Total	996	65.090	

As the table demonstrates, the part of each author in the corpus consists of over 10.000 words. The e-mails were collected over a period of two and a half years, from the beginning of 2008 to the middle of 2010. One author's e-mails date back to as far as 2007 because an attempt was made to collect parts of similar volume for each author while evaluating the volume of the corpus in words. The corpus was used in order to compile lists of frequency in using word forms[1] and determine the most frequent words in personal e-mails, which can be linked to the authors' idiolects. While researching the graphical level of linguistic expression, the corpus was used in order to determine the frequency of using non-Lithuanian letters, punctuation marks and other graphical units.

The main method of this research is contrastive analysis – by comparing frequencies of repetition of textual units in the e-mails of the selected authors, this dissertation has determined which units, as used in different frequency, help to distinguish between the authors' idiolects. The material was analyzed in several stages:

-   The corpus data were processed quantitatively by applying the programme *WordSmith Tools* or the *Microsoft Word* function "Find" and lists of frequencies of textual units (words and word forms, punctuation marks, symbols and other characters) were compiled;

-   Frequencies of speech units applied by different authors were compared and it was determined which of them distinguish one or two authors from the others;

-   Further research was conducted by using the qualitative method: the purpose and nature of words with different frequencies in the text was analyzed, the

---

[1] Word forms here refer to written shapes of inflective grammatical forms of words (lexemes) and non-inflective words (Zinkevičius 2000, 245).

words whose use is determined by the situation or circumstances of creating the text were separated from those to be related with the linguistic habits of the author;

- Groups of units of linguistic expression to be related with the idiolect were discerned in order to help conduct a more purposeful research of idiolect. In this stage of the research, the descriptive analytical method was applied.

The Structure of the Dissertation

The dissertation consists of a theoretical part and an analysis part, recommendations for the experts conducting research of authorship attribution, conclusions, references and an appendix of frequencies of lexical forms. The theoretical part of the dissertation consists of three chapters. In the first chapter of the theoretical part, the concept of idiolect is discussed and studies of idiolect are reviewed. In the second chapter, the scheme of trends of forensic linguistics is presented and the methodologies applied for the analysis of idiolect in the research of the attribution of authorship are discussed. In the third chapter, research of the electronic discourse is reviewed, the scheme of genres of electronic discourse is presented and the genre of e-mails analyzed in the dissertation is explained more widely.

The analysis part of the dissertation consists of three main chapters. At the beginning of this part, the material of research and methods are discussed. In the second chapter, the analysis of the lexical expression of idiolect is described and the third chapter presents the analysis of the graphical expression of idiolect. The recommendations for forensic linguists based on the results of this research are presented in a separate chapter. In the conclusions of the dissertation, generalizations of the research results are presented.

Previous Research of Idiolect

In linguistics, Wilhelm Humboldt and young grammarians were among the first to focus their attention on an individual and encourage the study of daily speech and the language use of separate individuals. The first person who suggested the term of idiolect was American linguist Bernard Bloch; he defined it as „the totality of the possible

utterances of one time in using a language to interact with one other speaker" (1948, 7). As the science of sociolinguistics evolved, much attention was paid to the research of sociolects and the conception of individuality in language was criticized. A number of linguists denied the existence of idiolect (Jakobson 1971, Barthes 1977, Labov 1989). This denial was linked to the emphasis on the importance of the linguistic community to the use and change of language. The term of idiolect was avoided in linguistics. For example, Barbara Johnstone (1996, 2000, 2003), who has been researching the individuality of language for many years, does not use the term of idiolect. The term of individual style, rather than that of idiolect, has also been used by Lithuanian linguists (Pikčilingis, Župerka, Žalkauskienė). Nevertheless, the interest in the expression of individuality in language increased in the last decade as the science of forensic linguistics developed and there has been an increase in the studies of authorship attribution and plagiarism.

Idiolect was researched more comprehensively by forensic linguists developing the methods of the attribution of authorship applied in practice (Вул 1977, Kniffka 1981, 1990, Žalkauskienė 1999, McMenamin 2002, Coulthard 2007) as well as by scholars (Лютикова 2000, Kuhl 2003, Mollin 2009, Barlow 2010). Forensic linguists emphasize the groups of linguistic features whose analysis can help us to distinguish between authors. Linguists-scientists mostly analyze the language of certain authors and try to define the linguistic expression characteristic to that author. The linguistic expression is determined not only by the author, but by a number of other factors (type of text, addressee and circumstances), so it can be very diverse. Research conducted so far comprise only part of the possibilities in the analysis of idiolects.

The expression of idiolect in nonfiction texts in Lithuanian has only been researched in the works of forensic linguists (Dambrauskaitė 1972, Žalkauskienė 1999). The essentials of the analysis of authorship have already been developed in Lithuania, but separate genres of texts have not been researched yet and it has not been attempted to determine which features of language are the most significant in texts of different types. The practical goal of this dissertation is to expand the research methodology of authorship applied in Lithuania. First, this dissertation makes an attempt to ascertain which language features we should focus on

in the analysis of online texts because such texts are on the increase and online language is different from usual written language. Following the present research of discourse, this analysis attempts to take into consideration not only stylistic features, but also the peculiarities of discourse as part of the author's idiolect.

Results of the Research

Features of idiolect in the lexis of e-mails

In studying the lexical level of linguistic expression, lists of forms of the most frequent words used by the six authors were contrasted and the following word forms were searched for:

- Word forms used by one author eight or more times and not used by other authors;

- Word forms used by one author eight or more times and no more than half as often by the others;

- Word forms used by two authors eight or more times and no more than half as often by the others.

This was done in order to determine the word forms recurring in the texts of one author and not used or used much more seldom by the other authors. The word forms, which were often used by two authors, but twice as rarely or even less so by the other authors were also considered significant in distinguishing between idiolects.

The completed analysis shows that the e-mails of all the six authors contain word forms, which were used more often by one author as compared to the others. 23 word forms as used by Jonas, 30 by Tadas, 10 by Romas, 22 by Linas, 29 by Rūta and 21 by Inga are characteristic of their linguistic expression and may be related with the authors' idiolects. It is evident that the number of the most frequent words is not equal in the texts of different authors, thus, the lexis of some authors includes more features of idiolect than that of the others. Among the selected words distinguished by the frequency of their use, most were verbs (29 forms were selected), fewer adverbs (20 forms), pronouns (17 forms), particles (11 forms), nouns (10 forms), inserts (7 forms), interjections and greeting words (6 forms),

conjunctions (5 forms), prepositions (3 forms), and adjectives (3 forms). Among the forms distinguished by the frequency of their use, there were no onomatopoeic interjections and numerals. It can be suggested that onomatopoeic interjections are seldom used in e-mails and numerals are mostly written in numbers. It is evident that words of all parts of speech can be important while researching idiolect (as the volume of our research is limited, the significance of onomatopoeic interjections and numerals cannot be excluded). In analyzing the word forms, which are to be related with idiolect, it was noticed that it is possible to classify them according to their purpose and nature of use.

A major part of the words distinguished by the frequency of their use were linked to the expression of the author's attitude: out of 111 words and word forms under analysis 40 render evaluation or attitudes. The author's attitude is expressed by the different frequency in the use of modal verbs and verbs suggestive of modality (*reik* 'I need', *teks* 'it will fall', *turim* 'we have to', *galite* 'you can', *bandysiu* 'I will try', *pavyko* 'I succeeded', *norėjau* 'I wanted to', *tikiuosi* 'I expect to' etc.), some adverbs (*beveik* 'almost', *geriau* 'better', *biškį* 'a little', *panašiai* 'similarly', *labai* 'very'), most particles (*juk* 'after all', *gi* 'ever', *taigi* 'thus', *galbūt* 'maybe', *muset* 'probably', *tipo* 'kind of' etc.), all adjectives (*faina* 'fine', *gražu* 'nice', *smagu* 'jolly') and most inserts (*atrodo* 'it seems', *matyt* 'likely', *panašu* 'looks like', *rodos* 'it looks like', *žinoma* 'sure').

Most words distinguishing the authors have variants, which the other authors choose more often. Where one of the possible variants becomes dominant in the author's texts, it becomes part of his/her idiolect. Among the word forms analyzed, there were some pairs or sequences of variants: the verbs *prisegu* 'attach' and *prikabinu* 'add', the particles *va* and *vat* 'so', *gi* and *taigi* 'thus'; *galbūt* 'maybe', *visgi* 'however', *muse* 'probably' and *panašu* 'likely'*maybe;* conjunctions *bet* 'but' and *tačiau* 'though', *nes* 'as' and *kadangi* 'because'. There is variation in the use of shortened and non-shortened as well as standard and nonstandard forms. Thus, every time different variants of expression are possible in language, words chosen by some authors can differ from those of other authors and can indicate idiolect.

Beside the words that show attitudes or are chosen from linguistic variants, there are sayings preferred by the authors and used for various situations; for example, Linas uses the words *dalykai* 'things' and *panašiai* 'similarly' in a broader sense than it is usual in common language. Some words the authors like show the way of thinking characteristic to that person; for example, the pronouns which are abundantly used by Jonas show his tendency towards generalization and the cohesive words used by Inga more than by the others are suggestive of her logical thinking. Idiolect can also be suggested by excess linguistic phenomena, which are noticed in analyzing the use of pronouns and prepositions or by the use of a certain part of speech, which is generally more prevalent than usual, for example, pronouns, adjectives, particles etc.

Idiolects of some authors can be traced in words, which denote time or place and are used more abundantly as compared with the other authors. Among the substantives and adverbs analyzed in this research, 12 forms of words denote time (for example, *savaitę* 'for a week', *šiemet* 'this year', *vėliau* 'later', abbreviations from *daba* 'now', *šian* 'today'). Five words or forms denoting time recur in Tadas's e-mails: *vakarą* 'in the evening', *anksčiau* 'earlier', *ilgai* 'for a long time', *šiandien* 'today', *šįvakar* 'this evening'. This shows that some authors are more concerned with the exact denotation of time as compared with the others and it can be reflected in their idiolects.

The e-mails analyzed are also different in terms of their use of words denoting emotions and states: Rūta uses more words rendering positive emotions and emotional evaluations as compared to the other authors (*faina* 'fine', *gražu* 'nice', *patiko* 'I liked it', *smagu* 'fun', *super* 'super', *pasiilgau* 'I miss', *tikiuosi* 'I hope'). Thus, certain tendencies and habits of a person's linguistic expression can be recognized on the basis of the frequently used words.

Features of idiolect in the graphics of e-mails

This dissertation analyzes the use of punctuation marks in e-mails, orthography without Lithuanian letters and use of letters of a non-Lithuanian alphabet as well as the use of emoticons and graphical symbols.

Punctuation marks

Frequencies of punctuation marks used in the e-mails under analysis are presented in table 2.

Table 2: *Frequencies of punctuation marks*

Punctuation marks	Rūta	Tadas	Romas	Linas	Jonas	Inga	Total/ average
,	1020	762	850	1184	578	833	5227 / 871
.	723	1145	628	983	924	617	5020 / 837
?	186	108	157	182	103	141	877 / 146
???	-	-	-	-	10	-	10
(?)	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
?!?!	-	-	-	1	-	-	1
?.....	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
-	60	23	297	53	168	256	857
...	63	26	10	4	160	107	370
..	-	7	88	8	3	1	107
....	-	3	-	-	2	2	7
.....	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
( )	43	28	104	42	47	92	356 / 59
[ ]	-	-	-	1	-	4	5
< >	-	1	-	-	-	-	1
:	23	30	115	11	88	35	302
!	27	4	42	20	15	48	156 / 26
!!	15	-	-	1	-	-	16
!!!	3	-	2	-	1	3	9
!!!!	-	-	1	-	-	1	2
" „	5	21	64	6	9	6	111
' '	-	-	-	-	-	13	13
{ }	-	2	-	-	-	-	2
/	1	5	15	7	6	8	42
;	-	4	2	2	5	2	15
Total	2169	2187	2385	2510	2120	2177	

Table 2 shows that e-mails tend to make use of the conventional punctuation marks of the written language, but some of them have more typographic variants in electronic texts as

compared with the usual written texts. Although the total number of punctuation marks used in the e-mails of each author (indicated in the lower row of table 2) is quite similar, the use of separate symbols varies among the authors in a statistically significant way: Rūta (1020) and Linas (1184), who mostly use a comma, write it twice as often as Jonas (578), who uses the least commas; the use of ellipsis ranges from 4 in Linas's e-mails to 160 in Jonas's texts; brackets – from 104 in Romas's e-mails to 28 in Tadas's e-mails; exclamation marks – from 48 in Inga's e-mails to 4 in Tadas's e-mails etc. Thus, comparing the use of punctuation marks among the authors has shown a great variation in the use of most punctuation marks in e-mails. All the authors have shown a preference for a certain kind of punctuation mark. The frequency of the use of a punctuation mark is linked to the habits of the author's linguistic expression, thus, it shows his/her idiolect.

It should be noted that the use of conventional and unconventional punctuation marks in e-mails cannot be evaluated in the same way in the study of idiolect. Out of the conventional marks (comma, point, question mark, dash, ellipsis, brackets, colon, exclamation mark and quotations marks) those that are used more often or seldom by one author as compared with the others may be linked to idiolect. For example, all the authors of the e-mails researched in this dissertation use dashes, but one of them used only three dashes throughout all of his e-mails, so the non-use of dashes distinguishes him from the other authors. In analyzing the conventional punctuation marks of e-mails, both the frequencies and nature of their use prove to be important. The research data of the present dissertation allows us to claim that the features of individual expression emerge in the analysis of syntactic constructions that use commas, full stops in completing abbreviations, end-of-sentence marks used not at the end of a sentence or recurrent use of a punctuation mark in an unusual position. For example, one author of the e-mails under analysis put a dash after the expletives *va* 'this'*, žiū* 'look' and the insert *tiesa* 'in fact'*,* at the beginning of a sentence; a similar use of a dash was not noticed in the e-mails of the other authors, so this unusual use of a dash can help to distinguish the texts written by this author from the others.

Unconventional or rarely used marks in e-mails can only be associated with idiolect in case of recurrence in the texts of one person, for example, single quotation marks were only

used by one of the authors, and this alone distinguished this author from the others. The following combinations of punctuation marks are not frequent in e-mails (**???**, **!!,** etc.), thus their repeated use can be linked to idiolect.

Lithuanian and non-Lithuanian letters

The suspended use of the letters of the Lithuanian alphabet (*ą, č, ę, ė, į, š, ų, ū, ž*) and the use of non-Lithuanian letters was not only researched in the corpus collected for the dissertation, but also by surveying 219 internet users by means of a questionnaire. It has been determined that most people (70 percent of the respondents of the survey) write some e-mails using Lithuanian letters and others without them, but one strategy of writing chosen by the author usually dominates in his/her e-mails and only a minor part deviates from the dominant strategy. Among the authors of the e-mails in the corpus, Jonas and Rūta wrote all of their e-mails without Lithuanian letters, Romas and Tadas wrote almost all of their e-mails using Lithuanian letters and Linas and Inga wrote in both ways. Thus, authors following one strategy can be distinguished from authors following another kind of strategy.

Certain letters of a non-Lithuanian alphabet were used a few times (*x, q, w)* in the e-mails of all the six authors, but they were mostly used in non-Lithuanian words written in their original orthography: names, abbreviations etc., for example, two letters *w* were used to write the word *Windows*. Writing non-Lithuanian letters in words like this should not be related with idiolect. Only two authors used letters of a non-Lithuanian alphabet in Lithuanian or slang words, for example, *kuxarka, saxmatai, xata, texniskai, xebra,* thus recurrent use of non-Lithuanian letters in Lithuanian and slang words in e-mails can be associated with the author's idiolect.

Emoticons

The variants of emoticons found in the researched e-mails, their most general meaning and frequency of use are presented in table 3.

Only one variant of emoticons was frequent in the e-mails analyzed in this research – the symbol meaning a smile **:)** (it was used 748 times in total). It is the only variant which

was often used by five authors; the other variants of emoticons were used much more seldom. The symbol meaning sadness **:(** was used more often by two authors: 34 times in Rūta's e-mails and 22 times in Inga's e-mails. Five more emoticons meaning positive emotions were only used more often by individual authors: **;)** – 37 times in Romas's e-mails, **:D** – 16 times in Linas's e-mails, **(:**– 45 times in Rūta's e-mails, **:))** – 13 times in Romas's e-mails, **:)))** – 15 in Inga's e-mails. Taking into account all the variants of emoticons, most of them were found in Rūta's e-mails – 242 emoticons altogether; only one emoticon was used in Jonas's e-mails. Jonas's e-mails, written as they were without emoticons, are clearly different from the other authors' e-mails, thus the absence of emoticons in e-mails can be evaluated as a sign of an individual style.

Table 3: *Frequencies of use of emoticons*

Interjections and their meanings	Rūta	Tadas	Romas	Linas	Jonas	Inga	Total
:)	156	92	130	209	1	160	748
;)	4	-	37	1	-	1	43
:(	34	-	1	-	-	22	57
:(((	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
:D	-	2	-	16	-	-	18
(:	45	-	-	-	-	-	45
;(	3	-	-	-	-	1	4
:))	-	1	13	-	-	-	14
:)))	-	-	2	-	-	15	17
:))))	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
;)))	-	-	1	-	-	-	1
:P	-	-	1	1	-	-	2
:/	-	-	-	3	-	-	3
;-)	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
;-)))	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
:0	-	-	-	-	-	1	1
Total	242	95	185	230	1	206	

The research conducted shows that the authors of these e-mails only tend to use one or several possible variants of emoticons and use other symbols very seldom, so the e-mails of

one author can include a certain set of often-used emoticons distinguishing him/her from the other authors.

<u>Other graphical symbols</u>

The analysis of the e-mails of the six authors in this dissertation shows that graphical symbols (**~, ',+,%, x, =, -, >, &, +-, *, <**) are not frequent in personal e-mails. In the e-mails analyzed, the most prevalent symbol was ~ (50) and it was used as a substitute for the word *apie* 'about, around'. Four variants of the use and relation of this symbol and word were determined: both the symbol ~ and the word *apie* are used seldom; the symbol ~ is used much more often than the word *apie*; the word *apie* is used more often than the symbol ~; both the word *apie* and the symbol ~ are used often. Thus, the graphical symbol does not compete with the word, but it can suggest the author's need to often mention the concept denoted by the symbol and the word.

Recommendations for the Experts

The results of this research allow us to give recommendations to the experts conducting research in the field of the attribution of authorship. In looking for the features of idiolect in e-mails it may be useful:

- To distinguish between the expression determined by the situation and topic of the text and the expression uncovering the author's linguistic habits;

- To distinguish between the linguistic expression characteristic to e-mails and that which is uncharacteristic;

- To group the words and graphical symbols showing the propensities of the linguistic expression of the author;

- To analyze the use of words of every part of speech and every graphical symbol as it is suggested in the classification of features below.

In order to distinguish between the authors' idiolects, a consistent analysis of the use of words of every part of speech and every graphical symbol can be useful. Thus the classification of the features of lexical and graphical expression is presented in table 4 in

order to systemize the research. Following the results of the research of e-mails demonstrated in the dissertation, table 4 indicates the aspects which can enable recognizing the features of idiolect in the analysis of the use of certain units of speech.

Table 4: *Classification of the features of lexical and graphical expression*

Level of language	General trends of analysis	Groups of units of speech	Aspects and units of speech to be analyzed
Lexis	- Words chosen from linguistic variants; attention should be paid to the use of nonstandard lexis; - Words used in an unusual meaning or unusual context; - Words of a certain meaning rendering the way of thinking of the author; - Preference to a certain word.	Substantives	- Expression of time and place
		Adjectives	- Expression of emotions and evaluation
		Pronouns	- Excess words
		Verbs	- Expression of modality and attitude; - State-expressing words; - Abbreviations; - Expression of attention to the addressee
		Adverbs	- Expression of modality and attitude; - Expression of time and place; - Excess words; - Abbreviations
		Particles	- Expression of evaluation
		Prepositions	- Excess words
		Conjunctions	- Words of logical text relation
		Interjections	- Expression of emotions and evaluation; - Expression of attention to the addressee
		Inserts	- Expression of modality and attitude; - Words of cohesion
Graphics	Quite frequent or rare use of a certain punctuation mark	Conventional punctuation marks	- Syntactic constructions punctuated or not punctuated with commas; - Abbreviation-ending points; - End-of-the-sentence marks used not at the end of a sentence; - Recurrent use of a mark in an unusual position
	Recurrent use of a certain punctuation mark	Combinations of punctuation marks	Writing combinations **(?)**, **(!)**, **!!**, **??**, **?!** etc.

		Unconventional or seldom used punctuation marks and their variants	- Unusual variants of ellipsis (**..** or **....** and longer ones) ; - Variants of angle brackets **[]**, **{}**, **<>** etc.; - Single quotation marks, sloping dash, semicolon.
	Consistent use or non-use of Lithuanian letters	Lithuanian letters	Use of individual letters is to be analyzed while researching orthographic mistakes
	Recurrent use of letters in Lithuanian words or nonstandard or foreign words	Non-Lithuanian letters	Use of letters *x, q, w*
	Quite frequent use or non-use of an emoticon	The main emoticon	Use of the emoticon **:)**
	Recurrent use of emoticons	Other emoticons	Use of the emoticons **;), :(, :D, :)), :P** etc.
		Other graphical symbols	Apostrophe, symbols **~, +,%, x, =, -, >, &, +-, *, <**

These recommended steps of research and classification of the features can help to conduct a more comprehensive analysis of texts and evaluate various aspects of linguistic expression where it is necessary to determine the authorship of e-mails. Seeing as the present analysis of lexical and graphical features is concerned with the aspects which have escaped the methodologies applied in previous research, the recommendations this dissertation extends may also be useful in the research of written texts and partially help in the analysis of other genres of electronic discourse.

Conclusions of the Research

1. The research results allows us to draw the following general conclusions about the features of idiolect in personal e-mails:

1.1. The features of authors' idiolects are revealed in the lexical and graphical expression of personal e-mails. Some e-mails show more features of idiolect in one type of linguistic expression, other e-mails in another, which necessitates the most comprehensive possible research of the totality of linguistic expression for the study of idiolect.

1.2. Idiolects are characterised by:

- Units of speech recurrent in texts of most authors, but used by one author more frequently than by the others;

- Units of speech recurrent in texts of most authors, but used seldom or not used at all by one author;

- Units of speech recurrent in the e-mails of one author, but used seldom or not used at all by the others.

2. The current research revealed certain lexical features of idiolects:

2.1. The contrastive analysis of the words and word forms which are often used in e-mails has shown that all the authors' e-mails contain words which are used twice or more frequently by certain authors as compared to all the authors and part of these words is to be linked to idiolect. Idiolects can be indicated by the forms of words of all the parts of speech used in the texts, so in order to distinguish between idiolects, it is necessary to analyze the whole lexis used in the texts and not be limited to individual groups of words.

2.2. At the lexical level, words that enable the distinction of idiolects are most often those which express the author's evaluation or attitudes and imply modality. The author's attitudes are expressed through the use modal verbs and verbs with an aspect of modality, various adverbs, most particles and some adjectives and inserts.

2.3. Idiolect is perceived in the author's preference for words from possible lexical variants. Idiolect is observed in the use of abbreviated word forms and certain nonstandard lexis. The research results have shown that some authors tend to use abbreviated forms or nonstandard lexis, while the others do not.

2.4. Idiolect shows itself in the use of excess pronouns, adverbs, prepositions and other words repeating the afore-mentioned information.

2.5. The more frequent use of words of a certain meaning by one author in contrast to others also signals idiolect. For example, the use of substantives, adverbs and prepositions denoting time and place, verbs, interjections and adjectives denoting emotions and states and the frequency or nature of cohesive words (mostly conjunctions and inserts).

3. Research results suggest certain graphical features of idiolect:

3.1. All the authors of e-mails have their own preference for punctuation marks. Thus, punctuation marks make an important group of features distinguishing the idiolects of e-mails.

3.1.1. Idiolect is suggested by a frequent or rare use of a conventional punctuation mark (comma, point, question mark, dash, ellipsis, brackets, colon, exclamation mark and quotation marks) in the texts of one author as compared to those of the other authors.

3.1.2. Punctuation marks which are used in e-mails more seldom (unusually shaped brackets, ellipsis, single quotation marks, sloping dash or colon) as well as combinations of punctuation marks (for example, a sequence of two, three or more exclamation or question marks, question mark in brackets etc.) can be important in distinguishing idiolects where the punctuation marks recur in the texts of the same author.

3.2.1. The conducted survey allows us to draw a conclusion that most people write some of their e-mails using Lithuanian letters (*ą, č, ę, ė, į, š, ų, ū, ž*) and other e-mails – not using them. In analyzing the corpus of e-mails, it was noticed that the strategy of writing chosen by the author dominated in his/her e-mails and only a minor part deviated from the pattern. Where the author consistently follows one strategy, it can help us distinguish him/her from the author following another kind of strategy.

3.5. This research allows us to state that letters *q, w, x* in Lithuanian e-mails are mostly used in non-Lithuanian words written in their original orthography. Letters *q, w, x* which are written in Lithuanian words and nonstandard foreign words can be linked to idiolect.

3.3. Research results show that the emoticon **:)** used by most authors in their personal e-mails can be related with idiolect where it is used more frequently or seldom in one author's e-mails as compared to those of the others. Other emoticons are to be associated with idiolect if they are recurrent in the author's e-mails. The best way of distinguishing idiolect is by looking at a whole set of emoticons used by the author in his/her e-mails.

3.4. Graphical symbols (**~, ',+,%, x, =, -, >, &, +-, *, <**) are seldom used in personal e-mails instead of words or in another meaning, thus their recurrent use in an author's e-mails is to be associated with idiolect.

While focusing on two linguistic levels – lexical and graphical – the present dissertation presented an analysis of a certain part of the possible expression of idiolect in e-mails. It should be emphasized that for practical purposes – the attribution of authorship – the features of various levels of language (graphics, lexis, syntax, semantics, pragmatics etc.) should be studied because idiolect can only be defined as the totality of features of different linguistic strata. Thus, a more profound understanding of idiolect and the work of forensic linguists need further research of the expression of idiolect at all linguistic strata. The research of the present dissertation is relatively small; therefore, its conclusions may be challenged and extended by researching both larger sets of e-mails and texts of other genres of electronic discourse.

IDIOLEKTO POŽYMIAI ELEKTRONINIUOSE LAIŠKUOSE

Reziumė

Darbo objektas – asmeninių elektroninių laiškų kalbinės raiškos savitumai, kuriuos galima laikyti autoriaus idiolekto požymiais. Idiolektu vadinama individo kalbinės raiškos požymių visuma, apimanti jo raiškos polinkius ir įgūdžius, ir skirianti jį nuo kitų kalbos vartotojų. Idiolekto požymių ieškota elektroninių laiškų leksikos ir grafikos lygmenyse – tyrinėti leksikos, skyrybos ženklų, jausmaženklių, kitų grafikos ženklų vartojimo polinkiai.

Darbo tikslai ir uždaviniai

Disertacijos tikslas yra nustatyti, ar elektroniniuose laiškuose atsiskleidžia autoriaus idiolektas ir kokiais leksiniais bei grafiniais požymiais jis pasireiškia. Darbo tikslui pasiekti keliami tokie uždaviniai:

6. Sukaupti šešių autorių asmeninių elektroninių laiškų tekstyną.

7. Išanalizuoti tiriamojo tekstyno laiškams būdingą leksinę ir grafinę raišką.

8. Palyginti leksinės ir grafinės raiškos bruožus šešių asmenų elektroniniuose laiškuose ir nustatyti, ar esama su individualiu autorių stiliumi sietinų kalbinės raiškos požymių.

9. Iš šešis autorius skiriančių kalbinės raiškos bruožų apibendrinti, kokios kalbos vienetų grupės yra reikšmingos idiolekto atpažinimui.

10. Pateikti rekomendacijų autorystės tyrimus atliekantiems teismo lingvistams.

Darbo naujumas

Darbas yra naujas keliais požiūriais:

1. Nauja darbo sritis: teismo lingvistikos aktualijoms Lietuvos kalbininkų kol kas yra skirta mažai dėmesio.

2. Netyrinėtas objektas: teoriškai idiolektas Lietuvos kalbininkų yra aptartas vartojant individualaus stiliaus sąvoką (Pikčilingis 1971 (a), 1971 (b), Župerka 2001), tačiau išsamiau nėra analizuotas.

3. Netyrinėta medžiaga: disertacijoje analizuojami asmeniniai elektroniniai laiškai, netyrinėti Lietuvos kalbininkų darbuose. Kitas elektroninių laiškų tipas – tam tikrų naujienų grupių elektroniniai laiškai – yra analizuoti Astos Ryklienės disertacijoje (2001). Pastebėtina, kad A. Ryklienės tyrimai atlikti prieš 10 metų, o elektroninis diskursas gana sparčiai kinta, todėl naujų tyrimų poreikis išlieka didelis. Šioje disertacijoje pateikiama naujų duomenų apie elektroninių laiškų kalbą.

Darbo vertė

Disertacija turi tiek teorinę, tiek praktinę vertę. Teorinę disertacijos vertę sudaro naujų lietuvių kalbotyros mokslui sričių, sąvokų ir terminų aptarimas. Disertacijos autorės pateikta nauja idiolekto apibrėžtis, pasiūlytas Rytų ir Vakarų Europos teismo lingvistikos tradicijas vienijantis teismo lingvistikos krypčių skirstymas, pateikta elektroninio diskurso žanrų schema bei elektroninių laiškų skirstymas į tipus. Tiek teismo lingvistikos krypčių, tiek elektroninio diskurso žanrų aptarimas galėtų būti atrama būsimiems teismo lingvistikos ir elektroninio diskurso tyrimams.

Praktinė disertacijos vertė sietina su poreikiu teoriškai pagrįsti ir praplėsti autoriaus nustatymo galimybes teismo lingvistikoje. Remiantis atlikto tyrimo rezultatais pateikiamos rekomendacijos autorystės tyrimus atliekantiems ekspertams.

Ginamieji teiginiai:

1. Asmeninių elektroninių laiškų leksinėje ir grafinėje raiškoje atsiskleidžia laiškų autorių idiolektų požymiai. Leksinės ir grafinės raiškos tyrimas gali padėti atskirti vieną elektroninių laiškų autorių nuo kito.

2. Idiolektus skiria įvairių kalbos dalių žodžiai, todėl siekiant atskirti idiolektus tikslinga analizuoti visą tekstuose pavartotą leksiką.

3. Leksikos lygmenyje idiolektus aiškiausiai skiria:

- autoriaus vertinimą ir nuostatas perteikiantys bei modalumą reiškiantys žodžiai,

- iš galimų leksinių konkurentų pasirenkami skirtingi norminiai ir nenorminiai žodžiai, trumpiniai,

- konkretūs žodžiai ar posakiai, kuriems autorius teikia pirmenybę ir vartoja įvairiose situacijose,

- palyginti gausiai vartoji kurios nors reikšmės žodžiai, pvz., įvardijantys emocijas ir būsenas.

4. Idiolektą rodo vieno autoriaus tekstuose lyginant su kitais autoriais dažnesnis arba retesnis kurio nors iš įprastų skyrybos ženklų vartojimas bei pasikartojantis mažiau įprastų skyrybos ženklų ir jų kombinacijų vartojimas.

5. Elektroninių laiškų autoriai yra linkę vartoti vieną ar kelis iš galimų jausmaženklių variantų. Idiolektą žymi autoriaus vartojamų jausmaženklių rinkinys.

Tiriamoji medžiaga ir tyrimo metodika

Tyrimui buvo surinktas šešių autorių asmeninių elektroninių laiškų tekstynas, kurį sudaro laiškai, siųsti darbo autorei ir kitiems adresantų draugams bei pažįstamiems, taip pat į keturias internetines konferencijas, vienijančias bendraminčius. Visuose laiškuose vyrauja neoficialus bendravimo stilius. Tekstyno apimtis yra daugiau nei 10.000 kiekvieno autoriaus žodžių, iš viso – 65.090 žodžių 996-iuose laiškuose.

Tekstyno duomenys apdoroti kiekybiniu metodu. Kalbos vienetų vartojimo dažniai skaičiuoti naudojant programą *WordSmith Tools* bei pasitelkus *Microsoft Word* funkciją „Rasti". Buvo suskaičiuoti žodžių ir žodžių formų, skyrybos ženklų, simbolių ir kitų rašmenų vartojimo dažnumai visuose laiškuose ir kiekvieno autoriaus laiškuose atskirai. Tolesniam tyrimui taikytas kokybinės analizės metodas. Palyginti skirtingų autorių kalbos vienetų dažniai ir nustatyta, kurie kalbinės raiškos vienetai kartojasi vienų autorių laiškuose, o kitų laiškuose yra daug retesni arba nevartojami. Siekta įžvelgti dažnesnio kalbos vienetų vartojimo motyvus konkretaus autoriaus laiškuose. Kalbinės raiškos vienetai, kurių dažnesnis vartojimas nulemtas ne situacijos ar aplinkybių, o autoriaus kalbinių įpročių, buvo priskirti prie žyminčių idiolektus ir apibendrintos tokių kalbos vienetų grupės.

Disertacijos struktūra

Disertaciją sudaro teorinė ir tiriamoji dalys, rekomendacijos autorystės tyrimus atliekantiems ekspertams, išvados, literatūros sąrašas ir leksikos formų dažnių priedas. Teorinė disertacijos dalis sudaryta iš trijų skyrių. Pirmajame teorinės dalies skyriuje aptariama idiolekto sąvoka ir apžvelgiami idiolekto tyrimai. Antrajame skyriuje pateikiama teismo lingvistikos krypčių schema ir aptariamos autorystės tyrimuose idiolekto analizei

taikomos metodikos. Trečiajame skyriuje apžvelgiami elektroninio diskurso tyrimai, pateikiama elektroninio diskurso žanrų schema ir plačiau apibūdinamas disertacijoje analizuojamas elektroninių laiškų žanras.

Tiriamoji disertacijos dalis susideda iš trijų pagrindinių skyrių. Šios dalies pradžioje aptariama tyrimo medžiaga ir metodai. Antrajame skyriuje aprašomas atliktas idiolekto leksinės raiškos tyrimas, trečiajame – idiolekto grafinės raiškos analizė. Atskiru skyriumi pateikiamos tyrimo rezultatais grįstos rekomendacijos teismo lingvistams. Disertacijos išvadose pateikiami tyrimų rezultatų apibendrinimai.

Tyrimo išvados

1. Atliktas tyrimas leidžia pateikti tokias bendrąsias išvadas apie idiolekto požymius asmeniniuose elektroniniuose laiškuose:

1.1. Asmeninių elektroninių laiškų leksinėje ir grafinėje raiškoje atsiskleidžia autorių idiolektų požymiai. Vienų autorių laiškuose idiolekto požymių daugiau vienoje, kitų – kitoje kalbinėje raiškoje, todėl idiolekto atpažinimui reikalingas kuo platesnis visos kalbinės raiškos tyrimas.

1.2. Idiolektus žymi:

- kalbos vienetai, kurie yra pasikartojantys daugelio autorių tekstuose, bet vieno autoriaus vartojami dažniau nei kitų,

- kalbos vienetai, kurie yra pasikartojantys daugelio autorių tekstuose, bet vieno autoriaus vartojami palyginti retai arba visai nevartojami,

- vieno autoriaus laiškuose pasikartojantys kitų retai vartojami arba nevartojami kalbos vienetai.

2. Atliktas tyrimas atskleidė tam tikrus leksinius idiolektų požymius:

2.1. Lyginant elektroniniuose laiškuose dažnai vartojamus žodžius bei žodžių formas, nustatyta, kad visų autorių laiškuose esama dvigubai ar kelis kartus dažniau nei kitų autorių vartojamų žodžių, kurių dalis sietini su idiolektu. Idiolektus gali žymėti visų tekstuose vartojamų kalbos dalių žodžių formos, tad norint skirti idiolektus tikslinga analizuoti visą tekstuose pavartotą leksiką, neapsiribojant tik atskiromis žodžių grupėmis.

2.2. Leksikos lygmenyje vieni labiausiai skiriančių idiolektus yra autoriaus vertinimą ir nuostatas perteikiantys bei modalumą reiškiantys žodžiai. Autoriaus nuostatas parodo modaliniai ir modalumo atspalvį turintys veiksmažodžiai, įvairūs prieveiksmiai, daugelis dalelyčių, dalis būdvardžių ir įterpinių.

2.3. Idiolektas atsiskleidžia iš galimų leksinių konkurentų nevienodai pasirenkant žodžius. Idiolektą rodo sutrumpintų žodžių formų ir tam tikros nenorminės leksikos vartojimas. Pastebėta, kad dalis autorių yra linkę vartoti sutrumpintas formas arba nenorminę leksiką, o kitiems autoriams tokia raiška nėra būdinga.

2.4. Idiolektą rodo pertekliniai jau įvardytą informaciją pakartojantys įvardžiai, prieveiksmiai, prielinksniai ir kiti žodžiai.

2.5. Idiolekto požymis yra vieno autoriaus dažnesnis nei kitų tam tikros reikšmės žodžių vartojimas, pvz., laiką ir vietą įvardijančių daiktavardžių, prieveiksmių, prielinksnių, emocijas ir būsenas įvardijančių veiksmažodžių, jaustukų, būdvardžių, vartojimas., loginių teksto siejimo žodžių (daugiausia jungtukų ir įterpinių) dažnis arba pobūdis.

3. Atlikus tyrimą pastebėti tam tikri grafiniai idiolekto požymiai:

3.1. Vieni elektroninių laiškų autoriai dažniau pasirenka vienus, o kiti – kitus skyrybos ženklus. Taigi, skyrybos ženklai sudaro svarbią elektroninių laiškų idiolektus skiriančią požymių grupę.

3.1.1. Idiolektą rodo vieno autoriaus tekstuose lyginant su kitais autoriais dažnas arba retas kurio nors iš įprastų skyrybos ženklų (kablelio, taško, klaustuko, brūkšnio, daugtaškio, skliaustelių, dvitaškio, šauktuko, kabučių) vartojimas.

3.1.2. Retesni elektroninių laiškų skyrybos ženklai (neįprastos formos skliausteliai ir daugtaškiai, viengubos kabutės, pasvirasis brūkšnys, kabliataškis) bei skyrybos ženklų kombinacijos (pvz., dviejų, trijų ar daugiau šauktukų arba klaustukų eilė, klaustukas skliausteliuose ir kt.) gali būti svarbūs skiriant idiolektus, jei yra pasikartojantys vieno autoriaus tekstuose.

3.2.1. Atlikta anketinė apklausa leidžia daryti išvadas, kad didžioji dalis asmenų dalį elektroninių laiškų rašo su lietuviškomis raidėmis (*ą, č, ę, ė, į, š, ų, ū, ž*), o dalį – be jų. Analizuojant elektroninių laiškų tekstyną pastebėta, kad laiškuose vyrauja viena autoriaus

pasirinkta rašymo strategija, o kitaip rašoma tik nedidelė dalis laiškų. Jei autorius nuosekliai laikosi vienos rašymo strategijos, šis požymis gali padėti jį atskirti nuo priešingos strategijos besilaikančio autoriaus.

3.5. Atliktas tyrimas leidžia teigti, kad didžioji dalis raidžių *q, w, x* lietuviškuose elektroniniuose laiškuose pavartojamos originalia rašyba užrašytuose nelietuviškuose žodžiuose Su idiolektu sietinos lietuviškuose žodžiuose ir nenorminėse svetimybėse rašomos raidės *q, w, x*.

3.3. Atlikus tyrimą pastebėta, kad asmeniniuose elektroniniuose laiškuose daugelio autorių vartojamas jausmaženklis **:)** gali būti siejamas su idiolektu, jei vieno autoriaus laiškuose jis yra dažnesnis ar retesnis nei kitų autorių laiškuose. Kiti jausmaženkliai su idiolektu sietini, jei yra pasikartojantys vieno autoriaus laiškuose. Geriausiai idiolektą skiria visas autoriaus laiškuose vartojamų jausmaženklių rinkinys.

3.4. Grafiniai ženklai (**~, ',+,%, x, =, -, >, &, +-, *, <**) vietoje žodžių ar kita reikšme asmeniniuose elektroniniuose laiškuose vartojami retai, todėl pasikartojantis jų vartojimas vieno autoriaus tekstuose sietinas su idiolektu.

Šioje disertacijoje analizuojant du kalbos lygmenis – leksinį ir grafinį – ištirta tam tikra dalis galimos idiolekto raiškos elektroniniuose laiškuose. Pabrėžtina, kad svarbiausiam praktiniam tikslui – autoriaus identifikacijai – būtina tirti įvairių kalbos lygmenų (grafikos, leksikos, sintaksės, semantikos, pragmatikos ir kt.) požymius, nes idiolektas gali būti apibrėžiamas tik kaip įvairių kalbos lygmenų požymių visuma. Tad gilesnei idiolekto sampratai ir praktiniam teismo lingvistų darbui reikalingi idiolekto raiškos visuose kalbos lygmenyse tyrimai. Šios disertacijos tyrimas yra santykiškai nedidelės apimties, tad jo išvados galės būti tikrinamos ir papildomos tiriant tiek didesnius elektroninių laiškų tekstynus, tiek ir kitų elektroninio diskurso žanrų tekstus.

LIST OF PUBLICATIONS ON THE SUBJECT OF DISSERTATION

1. Žalkauskaitė, G. 2009. Lietuviškos raidės elektroniniuose laiškuose. *Kalbos kultūra 82*, 275–286.
2. Žalkauskaitė, G. 2009. Interneto tekstas kaip autorystės tyrimo objektas. *Kriminalistika ir teismo ekspertizė: mokslas, studijos, praktika VI*. Kolektyvinė monografija. Vilnius: Lietuvos teismo ekspertizės centras, 361–369.
3. Žalkauskaitė, G. 2011. Idiolekto požymiai elektroninių laiškų leksikoje. *Kalbotyra* (accepted for publication).
4. Žalkauskaitė, G. 2011. Idiolektų požymiai elektroninių laiškų skyryboje. *Mokslo žurnalas „Lietuvių kalba",* online at http://www.lietuviukalba.lt/index.php?id=183
5. Žalkauskaitė, G. 2011. Teismo lingvistikos kryptys ir taikymas Lietuvoje. *Kriminalistika ir teismo ekspertizė: mokslas, studijos, praktika VII*. Mokslinių straipsnių rinkinys. III dalis. Vilnius: Lietuvos teismo ekspertizės centras, 91–99.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS ON THE SUBJECTE OF DISSERTATION

1. *Lietuviškos raidės elektroniniuose laiškuose*. Forum „Lithuanian language in Internet: challenges, opportunities, perspectives" held by The Office of the Inspector of Journalist Ethics, Mykolas Romeris university and Commission of the Lithuanian Language, 23 April, 2009
2. *Lietuviškos raidės elektroniniuose laiškuose.* Lithuanian Social Sciences Forum, 22–24 May, 2009
3. *Interneto tekstas kaip autorystės tyrimo objektas*. VI international scientific and practical conference „Criminalistics and Forensic Examination: Science, Studies, Practice", 17 October, 2009
4. *Kalba ir žmogus: idiolekto leksikos tyrimas*. International conference of Applied Linguistics „Languages and people: dialogues and contacts", 24 September, 2010

5. *Forensic Linguistics*. International Seminar of Baltic states handwriting experts in Tallinn (Estonia), 11 June, 2011

6. *Teismo lingvistikos kryptys ir taikymas Lietuvoje*. VII international scientific and practical conference „Criminalistics and Forensic Examination: Science, Studies, Practice", 18 (June), 2011

Apie autorę

Gintarė Žalkauskaitė 2001 m. Vilniaus universitete baigė lietuvių filologijos bakalauro, 2003-aisiais – lietuvių kalbotyros magistrantūros studijas. Nuo 2002 m. dirba Lietuvos teismo ekspertizės centre. 2003 m. įgijo rašysenos eksperto kvalifikaciją, 2006 m. įgijo teismo lingvistinių tyrimų eksperto kvalifikaciją. 2007 m. pradėjo Vilniaus universiteto humanitarinių mokslų doktorantūros studijas. 2008 m. gavusi VU doktorantų mobilumo fondo paramą buvo išvykusi trumpai stažuotei į Tarptautinę teisės lingvistikos analizės vasaros mokyklą Birmingeme Astono universitete. Domisi teismo lingvistika, idiolekto ir elektroninio diskurso tyrimais. Yra Taikomosios kalbotyros asociacijos narė.

About the author

Gintarė Žalkauskaitė graduated from Vilnius university and attained the bachelor degree in Lithuanian Philology in 2001 and the master degree in 2003. Since 2002 she has been working at the Forensic Science Centre of Lithuania. She has acquired the handwriting expert's qualification in 2003 and forensic linguistics expert's qualification in 2006. In 2007 Gintarė Žalkauskaitė started her PhD student at Vilnius University. In 2008 she attended the International Summer School in Forensic Linguistic Analysis, which took place at Aston university in Birmingham. Gintarė Žalkauskaitė is interested in forensic linguistics, idiolect and electronic discourse researches. She is a member of the Lithuanian Applied Linguistics Association.