



UNIVERSITI PUTRA MALAYSIA

**HEDGING IN THE DISCUSSION SECTION OF RESEARCH
ARTICLES WRITTEN BY NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE WRITERS OF
ENGLISH**

HELEN TAN

FBMK 2002 17

**HEDGING IN THE DISCUSSION SECTION OF RESEARCH ARTICLES
WRITTEN BY NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE WRITERS OF ENGLISH**

By

HELEN TAN

**Thesis submitted to the School of Graduate Studies, Universiti Putra Malaysia
in fulfillment of the requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts**

August 2002



To my Heavenly Father, in whose presence I find comfort and strength

and

To Mary, my Blessed Mother who never fails to intercede for me



Abstract of thesis presented to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia in fulfilment of the requirement for the degree of Master of Arts

**HEDGING IN THE DISCUSSION SECTION OF RESEARCH ARTICLES
WRITTEN BY NATIVE AND NON-NATIVE WRITERS OF ENGLISH**

By

HELEN TAN

August 2002

Chairman: Associate Professor Chan Swee Heng, Ph.D.

Faculty: Modern Languages and Communication

Hedging as a pragmatic-discourse phenomenon has gained much attention among academics and linguists researching the English language as well as other languages. The use of hedging is a significant communicative resource for academic writers to put forth their claims without the fear of being negated by the discourse community.

This study compared the use of hedges in the discussion section of Research Articles (RAs) of two groups of writers (native versus Malaysian) and of two different disciplines (humanities versus science). For this purpose, the hedging patterns in 40 RAs (10 each from the two groups of writers and the two different disciplines) were analysed contextually.



The findings from the study showed that both the native writers and Malaysian writers generally did use hedges in the discussion section of their RAs. However, by comparison, the native writers tended to hedge more than Malaysian writers. In addition, it was also found that formulaic hedging expressions were popular among Malaysian writers. In comparing between the disciplines, writers of the science discipline appeared to hedge slightly more than writers from the humanities disciplines.

In sum, hedging is an important rhetorical device that permeates academic writing and therefore, language instructors should sensitize their writing students to the effective use of hedging in academic writing.

Abstrak tesis yang dikemukakan kepada Senat Universiti Putra Malaysia sebagai memenuhi keperluan untuk ijazah Master Sastera

**STRATEGI MENGELAK KELANGSUNGAN DALAM BAHAGIAN
PERBINCANGAN KERTAS KAJIAN YANG DI TULIS OLEH PENUTUR JATI
DAN BUKAN PENUTUR JATI BAHASA INGGERIS**

Oleh

HELEN TAN

Ogos 2002

Pengerusi: Professor Madya Chan Swee Heng, PH.D.

Fakulti: Bahasa Moden dan Komunikasi

Strategi mengelak kelangsungan sebagai satu fenomena wacana pragmatik telah mendapat perhatian hangat dalam kalangan ahli akademik and ahli linguistik yang mengkaji bahasa Inggeris dan juga bahasa lain. Kegunaan strategi mengelak kelangsungan ialah satu sumber komunikasi yang penting bagi para penulis akademik supaya mereka mengajukan dakwaan mereka tanpa ditolak oleh komuniti wacana.

Kajian ini membuat perbandingan kegunaan strategi mengelak kelangsungan dalam bahagian perbincangan kertas kajian antara dua kumpulan penulis (penulis penutur jati bahasa Inggeris dengan penulis Malaysia) dan juga antara dua jurusan yang berlainan (jurusan kemanusiaan dan jurusan sains). Untuk tujuan ini, analisis secara konteks dibuat keatas pola strategi mengelak kelangsungan dalam 40 kertas kajian (10 kertas

kajian daripada dua kumpulan penulis dan 10 lagi daripada dua jurusan yang berlainan iaitu jurusan kemanusiaan dan jurusan sains). Kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa secara umum penulis penutur jati bahasa Inggeris dan penulis Malaysia telah menggunakan strategi mengelak kelangsungan dalam bahagian perbincangan kertas kajian. Namun, secara perbandingan, kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa penulis penutur jati bahasa Inggeris telah menggunakan strategi mengelak kelangsungan yang lebih banyak daripada penulis Malaysia. Tambahan lagi, kegunaan strategi mengelak kelangsungan berformula sangat digemari oleh penulis Malaysia. Dalam perbandingan yang dibuat antara jurusan, telah didapati bahawa penulis jurusan sains telah menggunakan lebih banyak strategi mengelak kelangsungan daripada penulis jurusan kemanusiaan.

Sebagai kesimpulan, strategi mengelak kelangsungan ialah satu bentuk retorik penting yang berpengaruh dalam penulisan akademik. Oleh itu, pengajar bahasa terutamanya pengajar bahasa Inggeris perlu mendedahkan keberkesanan kegunaan strategi mengelak kelangsungan dalam penulisan akademik kepada pelajar mereka.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my heartfelt thanks and gratitude to my supervisory committee, Associate Professor Dr Chan Swee Heng, Associate Professor Dr Rosli Talif, and Dr Wong Bee Eng. They have given me insightful feedback, support and encouragement and I have learnt much about writing research under their supervision.

I would also like to thank Ain Nadzimah Abdullah, my former supervisor, for her constructive comments on the research. My appreciation also goes to Dr Jothi Malar Panandam from the Veterinary Science Department for her help during the embryonic stage of the research.

My heartfelt appreciation is extended to Ho Sook Wah and Lee Geok Imm for sparing their time and energy to be the raters for this research. My burden of solving the ambiguities of categorizing the hedges was greatly lightened because of their helpful comments.

Last but not least, I am grateful to my husband and children for their moral support and encouragement, without which, this research would not have materialized.



This thesis submitted to the Senate of Universiti Putra Malaysia has been accepted as fulfillment of the requirement of Master of Arts. The members of the Supervisory Committee are as follows:

Chan Swee Heng, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Chairperson)

Rosli Talif, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

Wong Bee Eng, Ph.D.

Faculty of Modern Languages and Communication
Universiti Putra Malaysia
(Member)

AINI IDERIS, PH. D.
Professor/Dean
School of Graduate Studies
Universiti Putra Malaysia

Date:



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
DEDICATION	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ABSTRAK	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	vii
APPROVAL	viii
DECLARATION	x
TABLE OF CONTENTS	xi
LIST OF TABLES	xiii
LIST OF FIGURES	xv
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS	xvii
CHAPTER	
I	INTRODUCTION
	Background 1
	Statement of the Problem 3
	Purpose of Study 5
	Research Questions 5
	Significance of Study 7
	Limitations of Study 7
	Definition of Key Terms 9
II	LITERATURE REVIEW
	Introduction 12
	Discourse Analysis and Discourse 13
	Development of Discourse Analysis 14
	Theories of Politeness 22
	Studies Related to Hedges 24
	Greg Myer's Pragmatics of Politeness 25
	Positive Politeness Strategies 27
	Negative Politeness Strategies 28
	Salager-Meyer's Taxonomy of Hedges 31
	Shields 32
	Approximators 33
	Introductory Phrases 33
	Emotionally – charged Intensifiers 33
	Compound Hedges 34
	Hyland's Categorization of Hedges 34
	Content-oriented hedges 37
	Accuracy – oriented Hedges 37
	Attribute Hedges 38
	Reliability Hedges 39
	Writer-oriented Hedges 40
	Reader-oriented Hedges 41



	Bloor and Bloor's Hedges in Economic Reports	44
	Hedging in Russian Academic Texts	50
	Comparative Study on Hedging between English and Bulgarian Writing	52
	Move-structures'	56
	Conclusion	59
III	METHODOLOGY	
	Introduction	61
	Research Design	62
	Sample	63
	Instruments	64
	Hyland's Categorization of Hedges	65
	Move-structures	67
	Pilot Study	70
	Data Analysis Procedures	72
	Counting Text length of the Discussion of the RAs	72
	Reading and Understanding the Discussion Section of the RAs	72
	Identifying Hedges and their Move-structures	72
	Counting the Frequency of Hedges	73
IV	RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	
	Introduction	74
	Results	76
	Categories of Hedges and Frequency of Use	76
	Forms of Hedges	90
	Accuracy-oriented Reliability Hedges	93
	Reader-oriented Hedges	96
	Move-structures	98
	Discussion	109
V	CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION	122
	REFERENCES	128
	APPENDIX A – Text Source	133
	APPENDIX B – A Sample of the Identification of Hedges in the Discussion Section of a RA	138
	APPENDIX C – Tally Sheet	143
	APPENDIX D – A sample of the Tabulation of Hedges on the Tally Sheet	147
	BIODATA OF THE AUTHOR	153

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Frequency of Hedges (overall) According to Hyland's (1996) Categorisation	77
2	Total Hedges used by Malaysian and Native writers	79
3	Frequency of the Categories of hedges Between MW (H & S) and NW (H & S)	80
4	Frequency of Hedges used in Humanities and Science Disciplines	82
5	Frequency of Hedges (per 1000 words) According to the Categories of Hedges for the Two Disciplines	83
6	Hedges Used by Writers in the Field of Humanities	85
7	Hedges used by Writers in the Field of Science	86
8	Hedges used by Malaysian and Native Writers in the Fields of Humanities and Science	88
9	Content-oriented and Reader-oriented Hedges in MW (H & S) and NW (H & S)	90
10	Categories of Hedges Used by Malaysian and Native Writer	91
11	Forms of Hedges Used in Accuracy-oriented Reliability Hedges	93
12	Forms of Hedges Used in Reader-oriented Hedges	97
13	Distribution of Hedges according to Move-structure (Overall)	99
14	Categories of Hedges Used in the Move-structures of Explaining Results and statement of Results (Overall)	102
15	Forms of Hedges Used in Explaining Results and Statement of Results	103
16	Categories of Hedges in the Statement of Results Used by MW-H, MW-S, NW-H and NW-S	106



17	Categories of Hedges in Explaining Results Used by MW-H, MW-S, NW-H and NW-S	107
----	---	-----



LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		Page
1	Micro Functions of an Utterance	17
2	Steps in Obtaining the Frequency and Forms of Hedges	62
3	Hyland's Categories of Hedges	65
4	Frequency of Hedges Between Content-oriented and Reader-oriented Hedges	77
5	Frequency of Hedges Between Accuracy-oriented and Writer-oriented Hedges	78
6	Frequency of Hedges Between Attribute-oriented and Reliability-oriented Hedges	78
7	Total Hedges Used by Malaysian and Native Writers	79
8	Frequency of the Categories of Hedges Between MW (H & S) and NW (H & S)	81
9	Hedges Used in Humanities and Science Disciplines	82
10	Frequency of Hedges (per 1000 words) According to the Categories of Hedges for the Two Disciplines	84
11	Hedges Used by Writers in the Field of Humanities	86
12	Hedges Used by Writers in the Field of Science	87
13	Hedges Used by Malaysian and Native Writers in the Fields of Humanities and Science	88
14	Content-oriented and Reader-oriented Hedges in MW (H & S) and NW (H & S)	90
15	Categories of Hedges Used by Malaysian and Native Writers	92
16	Forms of Hedges Used in Accuracy-oriented Reliability Hedges	94
17	Forms of Hedges used in Reader-oriented Hedges	97



18	Distribution of Hedges according to Move-structure (Overall)	99
18a	Distribution of Hedges according to Move-structure	100
19	Categories of Hedges Used in the Move-structures of Explaining Results and Statement of Results (Overall)	102
20	Forms of Hedges Used in Explaining Results and Statement of Results	104
21	Categories of Hedges in the Statement of Results Used by MW-H, MW-S, NW-H and NW-S	106
22	Categories of Hedges in Explaining Results Used by MW-H, MW-S, NW-H and NW-S	108



List of Abbreviations

CP	:	Co-operative Principle
FTA	:	Face Threatening Act
MW	:	Malaysian Writer
MWs	:	Malaysian Writers
MW (H)	:	Malaysian Writers from the field of Humanities
MW (S)	:	Malaysian Writers from the field of Sciences
NW	:	Native Writer
NWs	:	Native Writers
NW (H)	:	Native Writers from the field of Humanities
NW (S)	:	Native Writers from the field of Science
NNW	:	Non-Native Writer
NNWs	:	Non-Native Writers
PP	:	Politeness Principle
RA	:	Research Article
RAs	:	Research Articles



CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

In the past, research on writing had mainly focused on learners' difficulties in writing as well as their attitudes towards writing. However, in the last decade or so, researchers of writing have begun to focus on more specific aspects of text construction. Among these has been the study of the use of hedges in academic writing. The term 'hedge' was first used by Lakoff (1972:194) to mean "words whose job is to make things more or less fuzzy". Since the 1980s, hedging devices have been viewed as pragmatic phenomena that are prevalent in academic writing, particularly so in Research Articles (RAs). In the academic world, the RA is a public documentation of findings by researchers. It is an important medium by which researchers report their claims to their discourse community while at the same time anticipating acceptance or rebuttal of the claim. Therefore, stating a claim was a face-threatening act that warranted mitigation. As a result, a researcher or scientist was said to employ appropriate hedging devices as a strategy to mitigate the claim. The employment of hedging devices in RAs evolved to become a part of the conventions of the academic genre.

It must be noted here that RAs belong to a sub-genre of academic writing. The concept of genre as Swales (1990) puts it, is integrally tied up with the role of texts in realising the communicative purposes of the discourse community.

Therefore, genre is to a large extent fashioned by these purposes and the constraints imposed by factors in the contexts in which the text is produced. The characteristic features in any genre then could be invariant or they might vary according to the rhetorical demands of particular situations in which they occur. To put it simply, Dudley-Evans (1986) clarifies that genre has characteristic features of style and form that are recognised, either overtly or covertly, by those who use the genre. Therefore, writing in a particular genre such as research writing would have to conform to its conventions.

However, Hyland's (1996) study on hedging in academic writing revealed that generally non-native writers (NNWs) lacked the ability to hedge their claims and, thus, NNWs were not able to conform to the convention of the RAs genre. This led Hyland (1996:278) to assert the point that NNWs 'invariably require training in the appropriate use of hedging'. The reason given was that NNWs often have difficulties in expressing their commitment and detachment of their propositions in their research writings.

This inability to hedge propositions would definitely impede the NNWs' involvement in the world of research as stated by Hyland (1996b) who saw the inability to hedge statements appropriately as an obstacle to the NNW in participating actively in the research world which has always been dominated by English. A related point was also made by Kaplan (1987) who claimed that there was a lack of subtle writing skills among NNWs and that a NNW did not have a list or inventory that would allow him to make choices nor did he have the

sociolinguistic ability to identify these choices. Furthermore, a NNW generally failed to recognise the constraints a choice imposed on a text.

Day (1988:2) in his guide to scientific writing asserted that ‘science is too important to be communicated in anything other than words of certain meaning and that scientific writing should be as clear and simple as possible.’ However, studies have shown that writings in scientific RAs, are among other features, heavily hedged. There is therefore an apparent discrepancy in the advice given in Writing Manuals and the actual practice of researchers – creating problems for NNWs who wish to master the conventions of the RA genre.

Statement of Problem

The phenomenon of hedging in academic discourse had generated a lot of interest among researchers in the linguistic field. Several studies on the use of hedges have emerged such as those done by Skelton (1988); Myers (1989), Salager-Meyer (1994, 1997, 2000); and Hyland (1996a, 1996b, 1999, 2002). However, the corpora of these studies were taken mainly from the ‘hard’ sciences such as molecular genetics and molecular biology. A possible reason for this slant was that researchers of ‘hard’ sciences tended to carry out experimental research that would lead them to make rather definite claims. The use of hedges was therefore inevitable.

Although the study of hedges began with the ‘hard’ sciences, research into the ‘soft’ sciences such as the field of Economics, Education, Language and

Communication Studies has also been undertaken. One of the earliest studies on the 'soft' sciences was done by Bloor and Bloor (1993), who investigated how economists modified their propositions. A few years later, researchers such as Kreutz (1997), Namsaraev (1997) and Vassileva (2000) had enriched the existing literature on hedging by studying hedging in texts written in languages other than the English language. Kreutz (1997) did a comparative study on hedging in English and German academic texts, while Namsaraev (1997) explored hedging in Russian academic writing in sociological texts and Vassileva (2000), investigated hedging in English and Bulgarian academic texts. However, studies of hedging in RAs of Malaysian writers, particularly ones that compared RAs written by NWs with that of Malaysian writers in both the science and humanities disciplines, are relatively scarce.

In the Malaysian scenario, research on hedging is not something that is entirely new. However, the focus of the study was mainly on the oral discourse. An example of one such study was the work done by Zuraidah (2000). She dealt with hedging in the speeches of participants in a talk show. Although there have been efforts by Malaysians to study the hedging phenomenon in oral discourse in the Malaysian context, there is still a dearth of studies on hedging in written texts, particularly those that studied the hedging phenomenon in Malaysian academic texts.

Purpose of Study

In view of the scarcity of related studies by Malaysians on hedges in academic writing, the purpose of this study was to investigate the categories, frequencies and forms of hedges in the RAs in the fields of science and humanities written by Malaysian writers (MWs) and native writers (NWs). The RAs chosen from the field of science were those from the Medical Journals and for the field of humanities, the RAs chosen were from journals in English Studies. In addition, this study also sought to compare the extent to which frequencies and forms of hedging differed between the following groups of writers:

- a. Malaysian writers versus native writers in the field of humanities
- b. Malaysian writers versus native writers in the field of science
- c. Malaysian writers in the field of humanities versus Malaysian writers in the field of science

Since the hedges were identified in the context of the move-structures in the discussion section of the RAs, the pattern of hedges found in the move-structures and the forms of hedges were examined. Finally, the occurrence of the dominant hedges in the move-structures was compared between the native and Malaysian writers.

Research Questions

Based on the contention that there is limited research on hedging comparing Malaysian writers and native writers in the field of science and in the field of

humanities, it would be interesting to find out more about the hedging patterns in science and humanities RAs of Malaysian writers and how they compare with the hedging patterns of NWs. Therefore, the study seeks to answer the following questions:

1. What are the frequencies, categories and forms of hedges used in the Research Articles (RAs) written in the field of humanities and in the field of science by:
 - a. Malaysian writers?
 - b. native writers?

2. To what extent are the frequencies and forms of hedges in the RAs different between the following groups of writers:
 - a. Malaysian writers versus native writers in the field of humanities?
 - b. Malaysian writers versus native writers in the field of science?
 - c. Malaysian writers in the field of humanities versus Malaysian writers in the field of science?

3. What is the pattern of hedges found in the move-structures in the RAs and what are the forms of hedges?

4. How do the occurrences of dominant hedges in the move-structures differ between the native and Malaysian writers?

Significance of Study

This study is pertinent as it attempts to shed some light on the forms of hedges used by the NWs and MWs in two specific disciplines namely the field of humanities and the field of medicine. In addition, it is hoped that this study would find out whether the MWs, as non-native writers, suffer from an inability to hedge their propositions as claimed by Hyland (1996b). If this study did establish that MWs had difficulty in hedging their claims, then it would certainly heighten the need for specific input on hedging for prospective writers of RAs among non-native speakers.

Finally, the findings from this research might be of use to textbook writers. Hyland's (1994) study on twenty-two ESP and EAP textbooks showed that these textbooks which were essential tools to the learning of academic writing did not emphasize the use of hedging devices. Therefore, it is hoped that this study would be a catalyst for textbook writers to focus on this writing feature and provide interesting and challenging exercises on hedging in their textbooks for academic writings.

Limitations of Study

Most RAs are written according to the Introduction-Method-Result-Discussion format. However, this research only looked at the discussion section. This move was prompted by the work of Hyland (1996) where he stated that the concentration of hedging devices was highest in the discussion section. This is not surprising because the discussion section in any RAs is a platform for writers to