
**An Investigation of Iraqi English Foreign Language Learners
Awareness of Hedging Devices in Academic Writing**

Dr. Nawfal Sa'eed Majeed

College of Education

English Dept.

Sada Ali Hamid

M.A

ABSTRACT

The present study deals with an investigation of Iraqi English foreign language learners awareness of hedging devices as constitutive features of academic writing. Students in academic level may face many difficulties in using hedging devices because of:

1. Lack of teaching of this area of language use .
2. The students are not taught to modulate their propositions not even sensitized the issue.
3. Lack of awareness of the use of expressions of tentativeness and the end to mediate claims in academic texts may possibly hinder or even distort comprehension.

This study is limited to the third year students in the English Departments, College of Education and College of Education for Women, University of Tikrit.

1. Hedging Devices

Hedging is commonly viewed as an interactional phenomenon. That is, it is not enough for the addresser to simply produce a hedge, but rather the addressee must also interpret the hedge as such. "Intuition", therefore, plays a fundamental role in both the production and the interpretation of a hedge.

Intuition can be effective if it is based on "lexico-grammatical and pragmatic background knowledge which in turn

must arise from a complete understanding of a particular discourse community's expectations for a specific genre". So, hedging is considered an important strategy to show the relationship between language forms, messages and language users (Salager-Meyer & Sales, 1991: 36).

2. Hedging in Academic Writing

One of the most important features of academic discourse is the way that writers seek to modify the assertion that they make, softening the tone of risky claims, emphasizing on what they believe to be correct and conveying the writers attitude to readers. These expressions of doubt and certainty are known as hedges (Holmes, 1984: 47).

Cherry (1988: 75) finds that the use of hedging in academic writing is necessary to advance and support claims. Instructors of writing for non-native speakers contradict him. Those instructors argue that writing research articles in English requires direct, linear arguments and they are weakened by any personal reference or hedges (Bloor & Bloor, 1991: 9).

3. The Function of Hedging in Academic Writing

Hyland (1994: 240) points out that hedging in academic writing transmits a writer's expectation of the possibility of objection to his or her statement. Hyland confirms that hedging serve three main functions in gaining the reader acceptance of claims.

First, he thinks that hedges allow writers to express proposition with greater precision on areas which is re-explained clearly and precisely. Thus, hedging is an important means of stating uncertain claims with appropriate caution. Moreover, "academic writing is a balance of fact and evaluation as the writers

tries to present information as fully, accurately and objectively as possible". Writers often say "X may cause Y" rather than "X causes Y" to specify the actual state of knowledge on the subject. Hedges her distinguish the actual from the potential and imply that a proposition is based on the writer's probable reasoning rather than certain knowledge (ibid.: 242).

The second function concerns the writer's desire to expect possible negative results of being proven wrong. One can gain his academic trust by stating the strongest claims for his evidence. In addition, there is a need to cover himself and avoid being too strongly in his case. Thus, hedging help writers to avoid personal responsibility for statements in order "to protect their reputations and limit the damage which may result from categorical commitments" (Hyland, 1995: 35).

The third function of hedging contributes the development of the writer-reader relationship, directing the attention to the need for cooperation in gaining the reader's acceptance of claim. Thus mitigating the illocutionary force of speech acts is common in conversation where it has been linked to the expression of respect or politeness. In academic writing, writer must consider both the reader's role in confirming knowledge and the need to conform to community expectations on limits of 'self-assurance' (Hyland, 1996: 435).

5. Semantic Analysis of Hedging

Lakoff (1973a: 458) deals with semantics. His concern is in the way hedging function vis-à-vis the conceptual categories of natural language. In this way, Lakoff talks about the role of hedges in conceptualization as concerns "the experiential component of the ideational function of language".

Lakoff's analysis includes linguistically vague items that can be used to talk about the "natural phenomena" that fall outside the central core of the conceptual of those natural language such as 'fish', 'bird' or 'animal'. Thus, instead of saying that:

(1) *Whales are mammals.*

One can say that whales are in fact among the more peripheral members of the group that is being discussed and therefore we can say that:

(2) *Whales are more or less mammals.*

From this example, one can notice that the group membership of whales is thus qualified by the hedge more or less because cetaceans are not seemingly "stereotypical" mammals.

In the semantic analysis of hedging, Lakoff describes hedges as words that may achieve two contradictory functions, especially those of making things fuzzier or less fuzzy. In addition, Lakoff makes a useful characterization of hedges and hedging. Lakoff provides an additional insights into the semantics of hedging showing their "ideational" function.

5.1. Hedging as an Increase in Fuzziness

Lakoff (1973b: 299) observes that some verbs and syntactic constructions convey "hedged performative" that is, hedges can be used to tone down the illocutionary force of a whole speech act as in the following examples:

(3) *He is leaving on the next airplane.*

(4) *I suppose that he is leaving on the next airplane.*

Here, the introductory I suppose that can be used to reduce the force of assertion. However, in this example, it appears that the hedge makes an explanatory comments on the validity of the proposition that followed it, i.e. it emphasizes that what is said may not be absolutely true (ibid.: 304).

Lakoff (1973a: 459) focuses in his work on the idea that hedges are associated with an increase in linguistic fuzziness. He suggests that “natural language sentences are not completely true, false or nonsensical, but rather it is to some extent true and to some extent false and that membership in conceptual categories is not a simple Yes-No question but a matter of degree”. The following sentence is an example of Lakoff’s “birdiness hierarchy”.

(5) *Penguins are birds.*

5.2. Hedges as a Decrease in Fuzziness

Lakoff (1973a: 497) points out that hedges could be interpreted to show that “the phenomenon under scrutiny does not be in accordance with the limited conceptual categories of natural language”. Thus, by distancing the phenomenon from a given conceptual category, hedges can make the relationship between the phenomena of the universe and the relevant conceptual categories more accurate.

Burn(1991:7) looks at the “vegetableness hierarchy” which is introduced in Lakoff’s hierarchies and states that:

(6) *Pickles are vegetable.*

But when he looks at carrots, he has found that they are more associated with the main group of the conceptual category of vegetables and are therefore higher in Lakoff’s hierarchy than pickles. In addition, Burn mentions "In some cases, it may be sufficient to describe pickles simply as vegetable, but if we have to be more precise and mediated about their vegetableness, we can hedge our conceptualization ".Thus,one can say that:

(7) *Pickles can be viewed as vegetables(ibid.)*

6. Pragmatic Analysis of Hedging

Most of the studies that come after Lakoff is emphasized on the function of hedging in social interaction between discourse participants. Thus, hedging is viewed as pragmatic rather than purely semantic phenomenon.

Prince et al. (1982: 8 cited in Markkanen & Schroder, 2006: 3) provide a basis for a more pragmatic oriented approach to hedging. They show clearly the role of hedging in interaction between sender and addressee. Hubler (1983: 85) deals with “linguistic indetermination as a means of reducing the negatability of sentences”. He attempts to show the reasons underlying the use of hedges to be “pragmatic by nature”. Thus, hedging have been analysed on the communication situation especially the effect which is made by the strategy on the relationship between sender and addressee.

Hedging phenomena may be apprehend as contributing to the interpersonal function of language in order to “recognize the speech function, the type of offer, statement, command or question, the attitude and judgments embodied in it and the rhetorical features that consist it as a symbolic act” (Halliday & Hasan, 1989: 45). This explanation reflects the fact that utterances always have both an ideational and interpersonal component. So, hedging has been treated with a view of both of these elements of discourse.

6.1. Hedging as an Interpersonal Politeness Strategy

The notion of linguistic politeness is observed firstly in Grice’s studies on conversational maxims from the late 1960s on word. Grice (1975: 43 cited in Fraser, 1989: 5) thinks that in order to provide an explanation for language use in context, a politeness maxim should be added to the well known maxims he had made in

connection with his cooperative principle (maxim of quality, quantity, relation and manner).

Brown & Levinson (1978: 64 cited in Fraser, 1989: 6) indicate that the principles of politeness are not included within the same basic system as the kind of principle assumed by Grice. Instead, they look at politeness as distinct from such rules “actually as a social reason to deviate from Grice’s a social principles of linguistic behaviour”.

In addition, Leech (1983: 38) includes politeness in his interpersonal rhetoric. In his theory, politeness may be realized by estimating the relative value of one’s linguistic behaviour against a group of maxims whereby speakers minimize hearer cost and maximize hearer benefits, minimize their own benefit and maximize that of the hearer, minimize hearer dispraise and maximize hearer praise, minimize self-praise, and maximize self dispraise, minimize disagreement and maximize agreement between oneself and others.

6.1.1. Hedging as Interpersonal Negative Politeness Strategy

Hubler (1983: 156) selects carefully the idea of hedging phenomena as indications of negative politeness and maintain that hedges are used in negative face work. Hubler looks at hedging devices as “detensifying elements which senders can employ to maximize the emotional acceptability of the propositional content presented to the hearer for ratification”.

In addition, Hubler declares that hedges can be interpreted into two ways. First, senders may hedge utterances so as to give the audience a chance to express their opinions and recognize their want for “self determination”. Second, hedges can be interpreted as serving the sender’s negative face needed. Beside that, hedging can be described as “means of self protection”. For instance, in being tentative and cautious through hedging, the senders can limit their

responsibility toward the information presented and attempting to avoid imposition on their views in the form of “audience criticism” (ibid.: 159).

Moreover, hedging may be seen as a strategy protecting the sender’s negative face on occasions when the senders “indicates that he [or she] thinks he[or she] had good reason to do [...] an act which [the addressee] has just criticized” (Brown and Levinson, 1987: 67 cited in Fraser, 1989: 12).

6.1.2 Hedging as Interpersonal Positive Politeness Strategy

This aspect of hedging receives little attention in literature. Brown & Levinson (1987: 101 cited in Fraser, 1989: 13) believe that one way to express positive politeness toward one’s addressee, to communicate “that one’s own wants [...] are in some respect similar to the addressee’s wants” is to avoid disagreement. One avoidance strategy is interpreting one’s opinion savely vague, seeking agreement with the addressee when the latter has not made his or her position clear . Thus, hedging can be used toward this end. For example:

(8) *In a way, that painting is beautiful.*

Brown and Levinson argue that by using such a hedging, the sender avoids communicating his or her opinion and invite the addressee “to use his common knowledge” when interpreting the sender’s opinion .

In the same way, when the positive face of the addressee is threatened because of the criticism or complaints of the sender, the sender may choose to minimize the importance of the threat and hedge. For example:

(9) *You made a kind of a mess of it, didn’t you?*

In both (8) and (9), the hedge can be analysed as positive politeness markers that reduce the threat to the positive face of the addressee.

Brown & Levinson believe that hedging may be approached as a strategy aiming at the protection of the sender's positive face. In (8) the hedge In a way can be understood to function as a device by which the sender demands cooperation and agreement regarding his or her own ideas in communication.

6.2. Hedging: Context and Interpretations

As shown previously, hedges can be analyzed as negative politeness markers, but their use for seeking agreement may also be regarded as protection of the positive face of the sender and receiver. Holmes (1983: 106) indicates that the same linguistic features that can be interpreted as indicating a certain type of negative politeness in discourse between equal participants may have different functions in other contexts. Holmes deals with expressions of epistemic modality, including items that are elsewhere often described as hedging phenomena. He points out that in situations where "a speaker feels socially out-classed, ill-at-ease, or simply wishes to avoid offending addressees who are of greater social status or who are not familiar", Speakers commonly use hedging phenomenon to soften their utterances.

In addition, Holmes thinks that those who are of a socially superior status "may equally choose to attenuate or tone down the illocutionary force of a speech act, particularly one with negative effect [...]". Thus, hedging phenomena may occur in discourse between unequal participants so that lower position senders may exercise caution with regard to superior addressees.

In the present study, hedging is approached in broader terms as a process by which linguistic items including an inherent element of fuzziness are introduced into discourse. In different communicative situations, these elements can be seen to increase or decrease semantic fuzziness. Such semantic potential may be

employed to modify group membership, affect truth value, and to tone down illocutionary force.

7. The Test

Baker (1989: 3) defines test as a means of reaching to the correct and accurate decision. A diagnostic test is constructed by the researcher to identify the students' strength and weakness in this subject. Thus, the purpose of the test includes:

1. An investigation of Iraqi English Foreign Language Learners awareness of hedging devices in academic writing.
2. Giving the students a chance to articulate the fact that hedging is a human enterprise whose purpose is to limit the degree of certainty about a fact. Students can also state how a given hedging tactic in English would be rendered in their native language.
3. Helping the students to gain some control in their written assignment over the language forms that are considered socioculturally appropriate at a given level of formality.
4. Helping the students to identify subtle language forms, e.g. to distinguish between weak and strong reporting verbs or to identify mitigation.
5. Identifying the students' strength and weakness in this subject.

7.1. Procedures of the Test

The procedures followed are:

1. Describing the population and choosing the sample of the research.
2. Carrying out the test building, analysing its items statistically.
3. Measuring the power of difficulty and the discrimination of the items in the test.
4. Achieving the face and content validity to the items of the test.

-
5. Determining the reliability of the scores by applying the statistical methods.

7.2 Limits of the Test

The population of the research consists of the third year students randomly chosen from the English Departments of the College of Education and College of Education for Women at Tikrit University. The sample (typical examples) of students is (50), consisting of (32) female and (23) male students for the academic year 2005-2006. Table (1) illustrates the population distribution according to gender.

Table (1): The Population of the Research

No.	College	Male	Female	Total
1	College of Education	23	12	35
2	College of Education for Women	—	20	20
Total		23	32	55

7.3 Administration of the Test

The researcher distributes the sheets of the test to the testees. After that, the objective of the test are explained initially to the students. They are given instruction about the items of the test to help them to do what is required. The students are asked to write their names, the grade, the name of the college that is related to them.

The test papers are printed in order to be as interesting as possible. The test consists of two parts. Part one represents the recognition level. Part two represents the production level. For practically, the test paper is used as an answer sheet (See Appendix

2). The texts used in the test (taken from a wide range of academic genres) are selected as being both possibly relevant in topic and of potential interest for both students and lecturers in the field of study. It is slightly modified to minimize comprehension problems.

Thus , the test is administrated on (55) students in English departments , Colleges of Education (College of Education and College of Education for women) at Tikrit University . The test is given to them at the end of the second course of the academic year 2005 -2006 .After that , the students response are checked , corrected and analysed by the researcher .

7.4. Building up the Test

The test is built up according to:

1. Experience of the researcher in teaching English language at the high schools.
2. Experience of many experts in English language and linguistics.
3. The previous studies in the field of linguistics.
4. Some of the articles and textbooks relating to the topic of the study.

7.5. Estimating Items Difficulty

The power of difficulty and the discrimination of each item is measured by selecting the higher group which has the highest mark and the lower group which has the lowest mark and applying the following formula:

$$1. DL = \frac{\text{Number of those who answer incorrectly}}{\text{Total number of the sample}}$$

whereas,

DL = Difficulty level.

$$\text{2. Discrimination of the items} = \frac{t - b}{N}$$

whereas,

t = No. of correct responses in the top group.

b = No. of correct responses in the bottom group.

N = No. of candidates in one of the groups.

(Baker, 1989: 52)

The researcher observes that the range of the difficulty is from 30% to 80% and this range is considered acceptable.

7.6 The Pilot Study

In order to know if there is any difficulty in the items of the test, a random sample consisting of 20 male and female students, third year level from the College of Education, English Department, University of Tikrit are involved in an advance sitting for the test. This study is done in the second semester of the academic year(2005-2006). The time needed to show the effectiveness of the techniques and the appropriateness of the whole task is about one hour.

On the basis of the administration of the pilot test, it is decided that some explanations in the native language of the students, i.e. Arabic is necessary for attaining satisfactory performance. Accordingly, those requirements are met during the second administration of the task.

7.7. Items of the Test

The test consists of (6) questions. All of these questions are in the form of passages except the final one which is in the form of sentences. The first three questions confirm the recognition level. The latter three questions confirm the production level. The whole

test is built out of (44) marks. These marks are distributed among the items. The correct answer is given one mark and the incorrect answer is given zero.

7.8. Criteria for the Evaluation of the Test

7.8.1 Test Validity

Verma and Beard (1981: 87) describe the validity of a test as one of the most complex concepts in test construction. It refers to the degree of success with which a technique or any other instrument is measuring what it claims to measure. Hughes (1989: 22) shows that a test is said to be valid if it measures accurately what is intended to measure or can be used for the purpose for which it is intended. There are different types of validity, most prominent of which are face validity and content validity. Below is a brief explanation of the major features of them.

7.8.1.1 Face Validity

Hughes (1989: 27) admits that “A test which does not have face validity may not be accepted by candidates, teachers, educational authorities or employers. It may simply not be used”.

Face validity of the items of the test is checked by using the percentage scale and each item which gets 80% approval from the jury is considered valid and the item that get less 80% is omitted. All the members have agreed that the test is completely relevant (See Table No. 2).

7.8.1.2 Content Validity

Anastasi (1982: 131) defines content validity as “essentially the systematic examination of the test content to determine whether it covers a representative sample of the behavioral domain to be measured”. In addition, Hughes (1989: 22) shows that a test is said

to have content validity if its content constitutes a representative sample of the language skills, structures, etc. with which it is meant to be concerned.

To achieve content and face validity, the test is exposed to a jury of experts in the English Departments at the College of Education and College of Education for Women at Tikrit University, Mosul University (See Appendix 1). Each member is handed a copy of the test with a letter requesting them to give their opinions about the suitability of the test to level of the pupils. In addition, those experts are asked to give their suggestions and modifications about the items of the test to be taken in consideration.

Table (2): The Percentages that the Items of the First Test Received on the Basis of the Jury Member's Points of View

No. of Item	No. of Experts Who Agree on the Item	The Percentage
1	9	90%
2	10	100%
3	10	100%
4	9	90%
5	8	80%
6	10	100%

7.8.2 Test Reliability

Harrison (1983: 11) defines reliability as "the consistency with which a test measures the same thing all the time". Thus, reliability consists of three aspects: the place in which the test is produced, the way in which it is marked and the unity of the assessment it makes.

Hughes (1989: 31) emphasizes that reliability can be measured by correlation between the scores of the same group of students on two administrations of the test. This is called the re-testing coefficient of reliability. In this study, the Test-retest method is used to determine the reliability. According to this method, the test is reliable when the scores of the two administrations are correspondent, or there is just little difference.

Twenty students of the third year level are chosen randomly from the sample population. They are re-examined after two weeks of the first administration. The Correlation between the scores of the two test is computed by using the Pearson Correlation Coefficient formula. The reliability of the test estimated as 0.50 (See Appendix 3).

7.9 Statistical Methods

The following statistical method is used to achieve the purpose of the test.

1. Percentage: This method is used for measuring the validity of the items by applying:

$$\frac{\text{Less number} \times 100}{\text{High number}}$$

2. Pearson correlation formula is used to estimate the test reliability:

$$r = \frac{N \sum xy - (\sum x)(\sum y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum x^2 - (\sum x)^2][N \sum y^2 - (\sum y)^2]}}$$

where,

N = Number of the students in the sample

$\sum XY$ = Sum of the product X and Y scores for each student

$\sum X$ = Sum of the scores on one variable

$\sum Y$ = Sum of the scores on the other variable

$\sum X^2$ = Sum of the squared scores on the X variable

$\sum Y^2$ = Sum of the squared scores on the Y variable

(Glass and Stanley, 1970: 114)

3. The mean is computed by using the formula below:

$$\bar{X} = \frac{\sum X}{N}$$

where,

$\bar{X}$ = the mean and is referred to X bar

X = the scores of the students

N = the number of the students

$\sum$ = the mathematical verb directing us to sum all the measurement.

(Runyon and Harber, 1976: 79)

This formula is applied to find out the levels of the students.

8. Analysis of Results

The test is applied firstly to the third year students of the English Department at the College of Education. The obtained result by using this formula is (11.25) which is the real mean of the first test and if we compare it with the hypothesized mean which is (22), the result is lower than the hypothesized mean. Thus, one can conclude that the students level in learning hedges and their awareness of hedging devices in academic writing is low. After that, the same formula is applied to the third year students of English Department at the College of Education for Women. The result shows that the real mean of the students is (17.14) which is lower than the hypothesized mean which is (22). This means that the female student's level in awaring hedging devices is low(See Appendix 4 and 5)

Conclusion

In the light of the results of the research, the researcher has reached the following conclusions:

1. Hedging appears to be an area which L2 students find problematic and often a neglected area in teaching.
2. Hedging is mainly referred to in connection to writing.
3. As hedging is seen as an important way of modulating the propositional content and expressing the writer-reader relationship, it seems useful to raise learners' awareness of its presence in academic texts.
4. The incorrect perception of the meaning of the sentence could be due to L1 interference. Alternatively, it could indicate a lack of understanding.
5. Hedging devices play an important role in academic discourse and had a pragmatic impact on academic writing.
6. One can expect that by becoming familiar with hedging as one relevant discourse convention in academic writing, reading of academic texts might be facilitated.
7. Instructions seem to be necessary to identify the words that signal commitment and tentativeness.
8. In spite of the prominent role of hedges in research and materials for teachers of L2 academic learners, most students' textbooks for composition and writing mention hedges very briefly or not at all.

References

- Anastasi, A. (1982). **Psychological Testing**. London: Macmillan.
- Baker, David (1989). **Language Testing**. London: Edward Arnold.
- Bloor, M. & Bloor, T. (1991). "Cultural Expectations and Socio-Pragmatic Failure in Academic Writing". In P. Adams, B.

-
- Heaton & Howarth (eds.), **Socio Cultural Issues in English for Academic Purposes**. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 1-12.
- Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson (1978). "Universals in Language Usage: Politeness Phenomena". In Esher N. Goody (ed.), **Questions and Politeness: Strategies in Social Interaction**. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press .pp.56-589.
- Burns, Linda Claire (1991). **Vagueness: An Investigation into Natural Languages and the Sorites Paradox**. Pordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Cherry, R. (1988). "Politeness in Written Persuasion". **Journal of Pragmatics**, Vol.2, pp.63-81.
- Fraser, Bruce(1989). "Perspective on Politeness", pp.1-22.
- Glass, G. and Stanly, J. C. (1970). **Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology**. New York: Garden City.
- Grice, Paul (1975) "Logic and Conversation" In Peter Cole and Jerry Morgan (eds.) **Syntax and Semantics**, Vol.3. New York: Academic Press, pp.41-58.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Ruqayia Hasan (1989). **Language, Context and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective**. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Harrison, Andrew (1983). **A Language Testing Handbook**. London: Macmillan Publishers.
- Holmes, Janet (1983). "Speaking English with the Appropriate Degree of Conviction". **Learning and Teaching Languages for Communication: Applied Linguistic Perspectives**, ed. Christopher Brumfit. London: Center for

- Information and Language Teaching and Research, pp.100-113.
- _____ (1984). "Hedging You Bests and Setting on the Fence: Some Evidence for Hedges as Support Structure". **Te Reo**, Vol.27, pp.47-62.
- Hyland, Ken (1994). "Hedging in Academic Writing and EAP Textbooks" **English for Specific Purposes**, Vol.3, No.3, pp.239-256.
- _____ (1995). "The Author in the Text: Hedging in Scientific Writing". **Linguistics and Language Teaching**, Vol.18, pp.33-42.
- Hyland, Ken (1996). "Writing Without Conviction? Hedging in Scientific Research Articles". **Applied Linguistics**, Vol.17, No.1, pp.433-453.
- Lakoff, George (1973a). "Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts", **Journal of Philosophical Logic**, Vol.2, pp.458-508.
- Lakoff, G. (1973b). "The Logic of Politeness or Minding Your P's and Q's". **Papers from the Ninth Regional Meeting**, pp.292-305.
- Leech, Geoffrey Nigel (1983). **Principles of Pragmatics**. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Prince, Ellen F., Joel Frader, and Charles Bosk (1982). "On Hedging in Physician-Physician Discourse" IN **Linguistics and the Professions Proceedings of the Second Annual Delaware Symposium on Language Studies**, ed. R. Dietro . Norwood, Nj: Ablex Publishing Corporation , pp.83-97.

-
- Runyon, R. P. and A. Harber (1976). **Fundamentals of Behavioral Static**, 3rd edition. Massachusetts: Addison Welsey Publishing Company.
- Salager-Meyer, F. and Sales, J. C. (1991). "A Genre-Based and Text-Type Analysis of Hedging in Written Medical English Discourse". **Interface**, Vol.6, No.1, pp.33-54.
- Verma, G. K. and Ruth, M. Beard (1981). **What is Educational Research: Perspectives on Techniques of Research**. London: Gower Publishing Company, Ltd.
- Markkanen, R. & Hartmut Schroder (2006). "Hedging: A Challenge for Pragmatic and Discourse Analysis". File://F:\Nehedggw Folder\Hedging. pp1-12.
- Hubler, Axel (1983). **Understatements and Hedges in English**. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hughes, Arthur (1989). **Testing for Language Teachers**. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX (1)

The Names of Jury Members

The jury of experts are as follows:

1. Dr. Ulum Mohammed Ali (Ph.D.), College of Education, Tikrit University.
2. Dr. Misbah Mahmood Al-Sulaimaan (Ph.D.), College of Arts, Mosul University.
3. Dr. Nawfal Sa'eed Majeed (Ph.D.), College of Education, Tikrit University.
4. Dr. Riyadh Khalil Al-Temimi (Ph.D.), College of Education, Tikrit University.

5. Dr. Mohammed Abdulla Al-Malah (Ph.D.), College of Arts, Mosul University.
6. Dr. Amra Ibrahim Al-Algawi (Ph.D.), College of Education, Tikrit University.
7. Dr. Ali Sulaimaan Al-Duleimi (Ph.D.), College of Education for Women, Tikrit University.
8. Dr. Abdulla AL-Doori (Ph.D.), College of Education for Women, Tikrit University.
9. Mr. Khalf Ali, Instructor, College of Education for Women, Tikrit University.
10. Mohammed badii, Instructor, College of Education, Tikrit University.

APPENDIX (2)
A Copy of the Test Given to the Jury Members

Dear Professor/Doctor/Miss/Mr./Mrs.

The test attached to this letter is intended to:

1. Investigate Iraqi English Foreign Language Learners awareness of hedging devices in academic writing.
2. Help the students to gain some control in their written assignments over the language forms that are considered socioculturally appropriate at a given level of formality. The test falls into two parts:

Part I: takes the form of a recognition test.

Part II: takes the form of a production test.

The task is intended to involve 3rd year undergraduate students of English Department at the College of Education and College of Education for Women – University of Tikrit for the academic year (2005-2006).

You are kindly requested to give your opinion about the validity of the test by:

- a. Indicating the validity of each question.
- b. Suggesting any modification or changes to the items.

Question number valid invalid suggestions

I look forward to your participating.

Thank you for your participation.

Third Year Test

1. At the Recognition Level:

A. Circle tentative verbs, modal auxiliary verbs, and cognition verbs:

We conclude that seamen seem to be a special group with a high risk of fatal accidents. This might be because the men who choose to be seamen are accident prone. The occupation is more likely to be having an effect because the mortality from several kinds of accidents appeared to be related to length of employment. We believe that to prevent accidents at work as well as during leisure time, attention should be focused not only on technical devices but also on seaman's lifestyle in general (Salager –Meyer , 1997: 11).

B. Underline all the hedges in a passage, and discuss what functions they might be fulfilling. Do they sound natural and meaningful or are they distracting or unnecessary”

Very few studies have explored the effect of age on choice of language learning strategies, although it is possible that age is sometimes implied by course level. Ehrman and Oxford (1989) studied adult language learners, who seemed to use more sophisticated language learning strategies than younger learners .However, the adults were learning language for immediate career

proposed, and so motivation might have been a greater factor in these results than age. Leaver (1990) directly examined the results of age as a factor in strategy choice by comparing the strategies used by adult and children learning foreign languages. She believes that the differences in strategies that she found could be due to the way that these individuals gained their language skills rather than age: the younger subjects having learnt in a natural way and the adults in a classroom setting (Modified from an article by Rebecca Oxford cited in :Hyland ,2000:195).

C. Identify the epistemic verbs involved in the passage. Then explain which verbs express neutrality, opinion, uncertainty, fact or tentativeness.

Our results show a relation between smoking habit and the proportion of DNA modification in cervical epithelium. The presence of modification in cervical epithelium and the correlation with smoking habits strongly suggest that the modification are a consequences of exposure to tobacco compounds ... women with high proportions of DNA modification may have an increased susceptibility to cervical cancer. Our study then contradicts the results of the International Agency for Researcher on Cancer (1986) which claimed that there was not enough evidence to conclude that smoking is a cause of cervical cancer. Prospective studies of women with a high proportion of modified cervical DNA should be carried out to establish the risk (Discussion section of an article on smoking and cervical cancer illustrates the point cited in:Salager-Meyer,1997:11).

2. At the Production Level:

A. Rewrite the sentences with tentative verbs of interpretation opinion. Then re-write the sentences with epistemic verbs.

Middle insomnia associated with exacerbations of illness in patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Patients with fragment sleep experienced fatigue and joint pain. This is consistent with findings in animals and human that sleep deprivation reduces the pain threshold. These findings show that it is possible to threat pain and insomnia concurrently (Salager –Meyer ,1997: 12).

B. Fill in with appropriate words to show how a writer makes claims to his propositions:

Do you think you are a descendent of hunters? Heres news for

you the image of cavemen hunting animals for good soon change. Remains unearthed in archaeological sites have started to paint a very different picture-one of man as scavenger rather than hunter. The cavemen not have been as brave as we he was bones, of animals found at campsites have both cut marks from stone tools and the teeth of other animals. It that the marks are similar to those left behind by human scavengers today. The sites where these bones are simply came to an animal that had been killed, scared away the predator and ate the leftovers (Adapted from The New Straits Times: The Next Step,15: 2003).

C. Add one or more of the following words or phrases to the following sentences:

approximately, around, possible, somewhat, about, if this is clear, typically, sometimes, round, possibly

1. The average smoker at any times has ten percent of their blood out of action.
2. Typically sea water is alkaline about eight plus or minus nought point two PH units.
3. Each year, more than 15.000 women in Britain die from breast cancer and 2.000 from cancer of the cervix.

4. Northern off shore spotted dolphins were 40-50 percent of their original number, and common dolphins about 60 percent.
5. I don't know at all, but I think the other car was reversing.
6. I guess you start to get a sense of the interaction that could happen with that space.
7. Because they wanted to capture as true as a sense of amazement.
8. Now this is a controversial area.
9. The 6-10 in. (150-250mm) of total racking reported on worst-case vanes for both nozzle designs comprised one or two long cracks, perhaps 3-5 in. (75-125mm) each and one or two shorter cracks of 1-2 in. (25-50mm) each.

APPENDIX (3)

Test Reliability

Students	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1	12	11	132	144	121
2	10	13	130	100	169
3	6	8	48	36	64
4	12	7	84	144	49
5	16	17	272	256	289
6	17	9	153	289	81
7	14	22	308	196	484
8	13	9	117	169	81
9	12	14	168	144	196
10	16	16	256	256	256
11	14	12	168	196	144
12	13	10	130	169	100

13	9	13	117	81	169
14	8	4	32	64	16
15	14	14	196	196	196
16	8	10	80	64	100
17	9	7	63	81	49
18	8	9	72	64	81
19	14	9	126	196	81
20	17	12	204	289	144
Sum	242	226	2856	3134	2870

APPENDIX(4)

The student's Level in Awaring Hedging Devices in the College of Education

Domain	Item	The men of each Item	Hypothetical Mean	Real Mean	Student's Level
Recognition	A	3.6	11.5	3.3	very week
	B	5.4			
	C	1.5			
Production	A	0.02	11.5	0.6	very week
	B	0.3			
	C	1.5			

APPENDIX (5)
**The student's Level in Awaring Hedging Devices in the College
of Education for Women**

Domain	Item	The men of each Item	Hypothetical Mean	Real Mean	Student's Level
Recognition	A	3.1	11.5	3.8	very week
	B	6.2			
	C	2.3			
Production	A	0.1	11.5	1.4	very week
	B	1.7			
	C	2.4			