Hedges in English Research Articles by Kurdish and English Native Authors

Anjuman M .Sabir

Department of English- College of Education/University of Salahaddin
anjuman.sabir@su.edu.krd

Abstract

This paper examines the types and frequency of hedges written by Kurdish authors (KA) and English authors (EA) in different sections of English research articles in the field of linguistics during the period 2016-2018, based on the taxonomy of hedges proposed by Hyland (1998). Hence, a corpus of twenty research articles published in national and international journals were randomly selected and analyzed in terms of frequency and type. The choice of hedging devices is basically tactical since authors from both groups incline to use appropriate hedging strategies to express claims with accuracy, attention and humility. The results show that generally English authors use more hedges compared to Kurdish authors, this could be due to different cultural background, nationality, language proficiency and rhetorical differences between the two languages. English authors use lexical verbs, adverbs, adjectives and nouns in research articles more frequently than their Kurdish counterparts. The findings also provide some pedagogical implications for teachers in that they can employ various techniques to help students improve their ability in using hedging devices; they should also make students be aware of different types of hedging devices.

Keywords: Hedges, Types, Frequency, Kurdish authors, English authors.

1. Introduction

Various definitions have been given to hedging .Lakoff (1972:195) defines hedging as "words whose job it is to make things more or less fuzzy", implying that the writer is less than fully committed to the conviction of the referential information given .While for Lyons (1977) it is an utterance where the speaker qualifies his commitment to the truth of the proposition expressed by the sentence. Following Hyland (1996a; 1998) hedges are communicative strategies used by writers to minimize the force of the statement, they represent a weakening of a claim through commitment, to show doubt and indicate that the information presented as opinion rather fact or truth.Hedges have been referred to as softeners(Crystal and Davy,1975),downgraders (House and Kasper,1981), compromisers (James,1983),downtoners (Quirketal,1985),weakeners(BrownandLevinson,1987),politenessstrategies(Myers,1988),mod alitymarkers(Hyland,1994),pragmatic devices (Stubbe and Holmes,1995)and back grounding terms (Low ,1996). Later the terms have been used by applied linguists to describe devices which qualify the speakers' confidence in the truth of a proposition and by sociologists to avoid face-threatening behaviour, they enable writers to express propositions with greater precision and allow them to predict possible negative consequences of being proved wrong .Writers seek agreement for the strongest claims they can for their audience, hence they gain their academic credibility , they also allow writers to refer to speculative possibilities, while at the same time avoiding personal responsibility for their statements. Finally, they help writers to develop a relationship with the reader; addressing effective expectations in gaining acceptance for claims (Hyland, 1996b).In pragmatics, hedges are correlated with politeness, vagueness, hesitation and indirectness. Likewise, Brown and Levinson (1987) regard hedges as indirectness strategies to minimize the face threat based on their speech act theory. Thus,

according to them hedges are means to delimit and define the extent of claims, the truth value of a proposition, and the speaker's/writer's responsibility for the completeness of a proposition or claim ,they can be engaged to ensure cooperation, truthfulness, relevance, and clarity which on many occasions need to be softened for reasons of face .

2. Methodology
2.1 Research Questions

This paper focuses on the ways of language use in which Kurdish (KA) and English authors (EA) position themselves in the academic English research articles. Hence, a variety of expressions are used to mark the writer's personal point of view or judgment. Based on the samples, the hedge expressions in both versions of articles will be investigated, making an attempt to answer the following questions:

1. To what extent Kurdish (KA) and English authors (EA) use hedges in their academic English research articles?
2. What differences are found in the frequencies and types of hedging devices in both articles?
3. Is there any significant difference in the frequency and type of hedging devices in the different sections of research articles?

2.2 The Corpus

The data of the present paper is taken from (20) English research articles in the field of linguistics written by Kurdish and English authors, (10) articles from each group published between 2016-2018 .They were drawn from journals such as Zanco Journal of Humanity Sciences. Humanities Journal of University of Zakho, Journal of University of Duhok (Humanities. and Social. Sciences), Koya University Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences (KUJHSS), Journal of English Linguistics, Language Learning and Technology, the Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, and The Modern Language Journal. The English authors' corpus include (112,799)words , while the Kurdish authors corpus include (112,780) words ,and the two corpora contain (225.579)words.

2.3. The Procedure

First, the researcher uses the PDF converter to convert the articles from their original PDF format to Text Document format. Second, the researcher manually identifies hedges use in these articles; later the types and frequency of hedges are identified, analyzed, classified and compared based on Hyland's (1998) taxonomy of hedge , focusing on five lexical categories ,namely modal auxiliary verbs(may, shall and will), lexical verbs(appear ,argue suggest),adverbs (likely, possibly),adjectives (likely, possibly)and nouns (tendency ,suggestion, chance), this paper adopts this taxonomy, since it involves a number of discourse strategies performing hedging functions ,moreover, it gives an understanding of how hedges are used in scientific research articles.Examples from the two corpora are taken into account to show variations in hedging devices preferred by the two groups of authors.

3. Results
3.1 The Frequency of the occurrence of the Hedges in the Kurdish and English corpora

To analyse the data, first the hedging devices in the two groups of articles have been counted and their percentages computed .As can be seen in (Table1), generally English Authors (EA) used more hedging devices compared to Kurdish Authors (KA).

Table 1: General Distribution of Hedges

Corpus	Total	Hedges	Per 2000words	Per cent
KAs	112780	2086	36.992	%1.84
EAs	112799	2263	45.397	%2.00

Drawing from Table (1), the total raw number of hedges used in RAs written by Kurdish authors is 36.992 (n= 2086 words within the 112780 running words) per 2000 words, whereas the number of hedges used in RAs written by English authors is 45.397 (n=2263 words within the 112799 running words) per 2000 words. Therefore, the frequency of hedges in the two corpora shows that native English authors generally employed more hedges than Kurdish authors. These results indicate that the difference in the use of hedges is probably attributable to the fact that the corpus of the paper is from two different linguistic and cultural backgrounds group of authors. Thus, English authors tend to use more hedging devices to express uncertainty and cautious commitment to their assertions and at the same time to direct and motivate readers to accept their claims and views. Kurdish authors, on the other hand, seem to use fewer hedges in their research articles than native English ones; they tend to adopt a native English rhetorical style "to decrease writers' responsibility for their truth-value and to project politeness, hesitation, and uncertainty". (Hinkel, 2005:33). Then, the frequency of hedges is analysed across the five sections of research articles. Moreover, the number and percentage of hedging devices in different sections of research articles written by native and non-native authors are shown in Table (2). The results show that the most heavily hedged section of articles by Kurdish authors is the introduction and literature review section by 58.197% hedging words followed by results and discussion section by 23.969% hedging words. On the contrary the most heavily-hedged section of articles by English authors is the results and discussion section with 48.696% hedging words followed by the introduction and literature section with 31.064% hedging words. And the least heavily hedged section of articles by both Kurdish and English authors is the abstract section with 3.835% and 3.004% hedging words respectively. Table (2) presents the frequency of hedging categories across different sections of research articles.

Table 2: Frequency of Hedging Devices in Different Sections of Both Corpora

Hedges	Abstract		Introduction &Literature Review		Methodology		Result &Discussion		Conclusion		Total
	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p	F	p	
KAs	80	%3.835	1214	%58.197	160	%7.670	500	%23.969	132	%6.327	2086
EAs	68	%3.004	703	%31.064	185	%8.174	1102	%48.696	205	%9.058	2263

Then the frequency of hedging types is calculated and distributed based on their categories. The five main categories of hedges mainly lexical verbs, modal auxiliaries, adverb, adjective, and noun are used to show the distribution of hedging devices. The types of hedges with their frequency of occurrence were determined, categorized, and presented in the form of raw numbers, percentages, and frequency per 2000 words, as it is shown in Table (3).

Table 3: The Frequency and Percentage of Hedging Forms in Both Corpora

	Kurdish Authors			English Authors		
Hedges	Raw Number	Per2000words	Per cent	Raw Number	Per2000words	Per cent
Modal Auxiliaries	868	16.05	%41.610	659	13.220	%30.446
Lexical Verbs	494	9.137	%23.681	592	11.876	%26.159
Adverbs	415	7.6	%19.894	642	12.879	%28.369
Adjectives	210	3.8	%10.067	249	4.995	%11.003
Nouns	99	1.831	%4.745	121	2.427	%5.34
Total	2086	36.992	%100	2263	45.397	%100

3.2   Subcategories of Hedges in the Data
3.2.1   Modals Verbs

A closer look at Table (3) reveals that there is a noticeable difference in the occurrence of the five types of hedges used by Kurdish and English authors. Regarding the frequency , the most frequent hedging words in the two groups are modal auxiliaries, they account for the highest proportion among the five categories of hedges in both corpora .It should be mentioned that the frequency of using modal verbs is higher among Kurdish authors (i.e. %41.610 per 2,000 words; compared to English authors, %30.446 per 2000 words).Generally, the choice of modal verbs addressed and the information provided on their use is given the fact that modal verbs are the most easily identified and widely used means of hedging in academic writing. (Hyland,1994).Modal verbs are usually categorized into two groups: epistemic (extrinsic) and deontic (intrinsic) meanings (Quirk et al ,1985).Epistemic modals express "speakers' assumptions or assessment of possibilities, in most cases, it indicates the speaker confidence or lack of confidence to the truth of the proposition expressed" (Coates, 1983:18). Deontic modals, on the other hand, convey the meanings of necessity or possibility (Biber et al, 1999). This result is consistent with the findings of Hyland (1998) who reported that a higher proportion of hedges are modal verbs, "because modal verbs tend to downplay the person making the evaluation" (p. 371).As stated above, out of the 2086 and 2263 hedges in both Kurdish and English corpora, the total number of modals that occurred in both corpora is 868 and 659 respectively .Table (4) illustrates the modal verbs in rank order with their raw numbers and corresponding percentages. However, there is a divergence in the choice of the most frequent realizations of modal auxiliaries in the two corpora, while ,the most prominent modal auxiliaries in Kurdish research articles is 'should' , in English research articles the rate of appearance of 'may' is significant .Hence Logical probability function of modal verb 'should' deals with inference or prediction meanings (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman ,1999).Meanwhile ,in(Hyland ,1996a) the modal 'should' typically has a tentative assumption , expressing a less confident assumption of probability based on known facts. Similarly, various studies of spoken and written English demonstrate that 'may' is primarily employed as a marker of logical possibility, which is an important feature of academic texts ,'may', just like 'could and might', is used almost exclusively to express logical possibility(Biber et al, 1999) .Typical examples from the corpora are:

     1. Most of the Kurdish prepositions do not convey meaning if they occur alone. In other words they should be followed by place markers to indicate a place For example the preposition „le" in order to indicate a place it should be in forms such as „le ser/on, , le jer/under (Zanco Journal of Humanity SciencesVol.22,No1,2018)

     2. Despite the fact that Google assures that they take all security measures possible, some educational communities may still regard this as a challenge or rather as a deterrent to integrating Google applications in their classes.(The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes, Vol. 6, No 2, , 2018)

     In Example (1), it can be recognized that Kurdish writers use 'should' as a hedging strategy with the intention of showing their uncertainty , hence it combines subjectivity and logical assumption (Coates, 1983).On the other hand, 'May', in (2) is the most frequent modals written by native English-speaking authors ,it occurs over twice as often in print and is the only modal to figure more often in academic genres, perhaps because of its perceived formality(Hyland ,1996b).It expresses logical possibility and speaker's lack of confidence in the truth of the proposition of the statement(Biber et al,1999).

Table 4: The Frequency and Percentage of Modal Auxiliaries in Both Corpora

Kurdish Authors			English Authors		
Modal Auxiliaries	No	Per cent	Modal Auxiliaries	No	Per cent
Should	360	%41.474	Ought	2	%0.230
Can	149	%17.165	May	233	%35.356
Will	139	%16.013	Can	127	%19.271
Could	80	%9.216	Could	70	%10.622
May	61	%7.027	Will	70	%10.622
Would	34	%3.917	Might	60	%9.104
Might	30	%3.456	Would	55	%8.345
Shall	13	%1.497	Should	44	%6.676
Total	868	%100		659	%100

3.2.2. Verbs

Lexical verbs form the third and the second largest groups in both Kurdish and English data respectively. They constitute %23.681 of the total hedges in Kurdish data with a frequency of 494, whereas in English data it is %26.159 of the total hedges with a frequency of 592(see Table3). The most frequent verbs in the data are: 'suggest', 'indicate', 'appear', 'note', and 'suppose', they express uncertainty and the tentative assertion of hypotheses. Tables (5and 6) illustrate the verbs in rank order with their raw numbers and corresponding percentages in both corpora. Typical examples from them are:

     3. Thornburg (1999) suggests that the Audio-lingual method (henceforth ALM) might simply mean the teaching of the grammar syllabus without making any reference to grammar (Humanities Journal of University of Zakho Vol. 5, No. 1, 2017)
     4. This explanation is supported by the exit surveys, which indicated that 14% of learners felt that pre-task planning was not beneficial or necessary, as they could plan during the task instead (Language Learning and Technology vol. 22, no 18, 2018) .
     5. Some researchers and linguistics claim that inductive approaches are more effective than deductive approach (Zanco journal for human science, vol.. 21 ,No .2,2018).
As shown in the above examples, the lexical verb 'suggest' shows the writers' impersonal view of the discourse to make the text the source of judgments. Other verbs like 'indicate' and 'claim give conjectural than assertive meaning (Varttala, 2001) to the propositions which follow, and can be seen as a more tentative means of expressing a claim.

Table 5: The Frequency and Percentage of Verbs in Kurdish Authors

Verbs	No	Percent	Verbs	No	Percent
Suggest	72	%14.574	Observe	14	%2.834
Suppose	48	%9.716	Feel	12	%2.429
Indicate	42	%8.502	Seem	12	%2.249
Appear	47	%9.514	Offer	11	%2.226
Argue	41	%8.229	Propose	10	%2.024
Consider	38	%7.692	Perceive	9	%1.821
Seen	33	%6.680	Maintain	9	%1.821
Conclude	24	%4.858	Interpret	7	%1.417
Note	20	%4.048	Report	5	%1.012
Presume	19	%3.846	Evaluate	4	%0.809
Suspect	17	%3.441			
Total				494	%100

Table 6: The Frequency and Percentage of Verbs in English Authors

Verbs	No	Percent	Verbs	No	Percent
Indicate	50	%8.445	Doubt	18	%3.040
Appear	49	%8.227	Conclude	18	%3.040
Suggest	47	%7.939	Expect	18	%3.040
Note	46	%7.702	Suspect	14	%2.364
Feel	42	%7.058	Assume	14	%2.364
Report	38	%6.418	Perceive	13	%2.195
Seem	38	%6.418	Evaluate	13	%2.195
Seen	33	%5.75	Claim	11	%1.713
Offer	28	%4.729	Assert	10	%1.689
Consider	28	%4.729	Attempt	10	%1.689
Observe	23	%3.885	Speculate	9	%1.520
Argue	22	%3.716			
Total				592	%100

3. 2.3 Adverbs

Adverbs are the third and the second largest groups in both Kurdish and English respectively. They constitute %19.894of the total hedges in Kurdish data with a frequency of 415, while the total hedges in English data is %28.369 (Table3) with a frequency of 642. Hence35 forms were identified with the most frequent being (about, may be, almost, frequently, likely). Hedging adverbs are either 'downtoners' (Quirk et al, 1985), such as ('quite', 'nearly', 'practically' , 'almost' and 'usually') which lower the effect of the force of the verb or disjuncts, which can be divided into :Style disjuncts   conveying the speaker's comment on the style of what he is saying ('generally', 'approximately') and content disjuncts expressing doubt about the truth of the statement ('perhaps' , 'possibly ',may be' , 'probably' , 'likely'). The result is consistent with the findings of Hyland (1998) that there is a preference for impersonal strategies in academic writing and adverbs are less specific in attributing a source to a viewpoint. Tables (7and 8) list the most frequent adverbs in rank order in both corpora. Consider the following examples from them:

6. Over the course of seven weeks, approximately 293 submissions were made by Korean community members, with resulting interactions totaling over 165,000 words. (Language Learning & Technology Vol. 22, No 3, 2018).

7. This is probably caused because in Kurdish clusters of three concessive consonants are not possible. So, the production of the velar nasal is the result of the simplification of the consonant clusters. (Humanities Journal of University of Zakho Vol. 5, No. 4, 2017)

These hedges either suggest the absence of exact measurements as in 'approximately', or simply express doubt without carrying inferences about the truth of the statement as in 'probably'.

Table 7: The Frequency and Percentage of Adverbs in Kurdish Authors

Adverbs	No	Per cent	Adverbs	No	Per cent
About	92	%22.16	Around	12	%2.89
Almost	35	%8.43	Likely	10	%2.40
Generally	33	%7.95	Frequently	10	%2.40
Perhaps	32	%7.71	Nearly	10	%2.40
Possibly	31	%7.46	Mostly	8	%1.92
May be	28	%6.74	Relatively	8	%1.92
Sometime	20	%4.81	Widely	7	%1.68
Quite	14	%3.37	Normally	7	%1.68
Significantly	13	%3.13	Typically	7	%1.68
Probably	13	%3.13	Seldom	7	%1.68

Somewhat	12	%2.89	Roughly	6	%1.44
Total				415	100%

Table 8: The Frequency and Percentage of Adverbs in English Authors

Adverbs	No	Per cent	Adverbs	No	Per cent
About	164	%25.62	Significantly	12	%1.86
May be	39	%6.07	Possibly	12	%1.86
Frequently	35	%5.45	Barely	12	%1.86
Likely	34	%5.29	Commonly	12	%1.86
Often	32	%4.98	Probably	12	%1.86
Generally	26	%4.04	Roughly	12	%1.86
Typically	25	%3.89	Around	11	%1.71
Relatively	22	%3.42	Largely	11	%1.71
Primarily	20	%3.11	Potentially	11	%1.71
Approximately	18	%2.80	Somewhat	10	%1.55
Mostly	15	%2.33	Usual	10	%1.55
Partly	15	%2.33	Slightly	9	%1.40
Quite	14	%2.18	Partially	8	%1.24
Sometime	14	%2.18	Perhaps	7	%1.09
Highly	13	%2.02	Strongly	7	%1.09
				642	%100

3.2.4 Adjectives

Adjectives form the fourth most frequently employed hedging devices in both Kurdish and English respectively with 23 different forms represented. They constitute %10.067of of the total hedges in Kurdish data with a frequency of 210. And in English data it is %11.003 of the total hedges (see Table 3) with a frequency of 249. The top five most favored adjectives are 'significant', 'possible', 'general', 'small', 'large', and the least frequent adjectives are 'typical', 'slight', 'noticeable', 'main' , 'relative' and 'substantial' .Table (9 and 10) list the most frequent adjectives in rank order: Typical examples from the corpora are:

8. Another possible explanation for the lack of impact across conditions on learners' performance might have been due to the unlimited amount of within-task planning time. (Language learning and technology, vol22, No 3, 2018)

9. Concerning general nouns, greater male participation can be seen in both textbooks. Based on the frequency of occurrence, both textbooks include an approximate percentage of male and female linked general nouns(Zanco journal for human science, vol22 ,No .1,2018).

10. The researchers suggest that some of the spatial prepositions retain their meaning metaphorically under a non-spatial relation stressing that the use of non-spatial prepositions is only a relative semantic change and is therefore a limited aspect of the spatial prepositions.(Zanco journal for human science ,Vol . 22 ,No .1,2018).

Hedges, like 'possible', 'approximate' and 'relative', on the other hand, signify a weakening of a claim through an explicit qualification of the writer's commitment. This may be to show doubt and indicate that the information is presented as opinion rather than fact.

Table 9: The Frequency and Percentage of Adjectives in Kurdish Authors

Adjectives	No	Per cent	Adjectives	No	Per cent
Possible	32	%15.23	Large	13	%6.19
General	24	%11.42	Likely	13	%6.19
Improbable	16	%7.16	Common	11	%%5.23
Frequent	14	%6.66	Approximate	10	%4.76
Apparent	14	%6.66	Theoretical	7	%3.33
Relative	14	%6.66	Little	4	%1.90
Major	14	%6.66	Typical	2	%0.95

Significant	11	%5.23	Slight	2	%0.95
Small	13	%6.19	Noticeable	2	%0.95
			Main	2	%0.95
Total				210	%100

Table 10: The Frequency and Percentage of Adjectives in English Authors

Adjectives	No	Per cent	Adjectives	No	Per cent
Significant	37	%14.85	Approximate	6	%2.40
General	33	%13.25	Common	6	%2.40
Small	32	%12.85	Typical	5	%2.00
Large	31	%12.49	Considerable	4	%1.60
Little	31	%12.49	Rare	4	%1.60
Frequent	12	%4.81	Apparent	4	%1.60
Main	9	%3.61	Indicative	4	%1.60
Major	9	%3.61	Relative	3	%1.20
Possible	9	%3.61	Substantial	3	%1.20
Little	7	%2.81			
Total				249	%100

3.2.5 Nouns

Nouns occur as the least frequent category of the hedges in both data. They constitute only %4.745 of the total hedges in Kurdish data with a frequency of 99. And %5.34 of the total hedges in English data (see Table3) with a frequency of 121. The top five most favoured nouns are 'idea', 'opinion', 'probability', 'possibility' and 'suggestion'; the least frequent nouns are 'hope', 'likelihood', 'tendency', 'expectation' and 'interpretation'. Tables (11and 12) illustrate the most frequent nouns in both data in rank order: Consider the following examples from the both corpora:

11. The finding of Human test displays probability more than 0.05, thus the null hypothesis has been rejected and random effects are more appropriate for estimation purpose for the study. (Journal of University of Duhok /Humanities and Social Sciences, Vol. 21, No.1, 2018)

12. As piloting indicated that this was insufficient time for learners to complete the task, thus preventing the possibility of rehearsal. (The Journal of Teaching English for Specific and Academic Purposes Vol. 6, No 3, 2018)

As shown here, these hedging strategies indicate that both groups of writers try to present their reasoning in a plausible way rather than in a certain way, they function as means of conveying a cautious approach to the statements being made which might be a strategy used by the authors to get acceptance for their work, also it decreases the individual responsibility involved in making a statement (Serholt, 2012).

Table 11: The Frequency and Percentage of Nouns in Kurdish Authors

Nouns	No	Per cent	Nouns	No	Per cent
Idea	34	%34.34	Tendency	4	%4.04
Opinion	15	%15.15	Assertion	4	%4.04
Probability	10	%10.10	Premise	3	%3.03
Suggestion	7	%7.07	Interpretation	2	%2.02
Chance	6	%6.06	Expectation	2	%2.02
Belief	5	%5.05	Hope	2	%2.02
Alternative	5	%5.05			
Total				99	%100

Table 12: The Frequency and Percentage of Nouns in English Authors

Nouns	No	Per cent	Nouns	No	Per cent
Idea	33	%27.27	Expectation	6	%4.95
Possibility	12	%9.19	Chance	5	%4.13
Opinion	11	%9.09	Conclusion	4	%3.30
Suggestion	11	%9.09	Belief	3	%2.47
Assertion	9	%8.81	Hope	2	%1.65
Alternative	7	%5.78	Likelihood	2	%1.65
Assessment	7	%5.78	Tendency	2	%1.65
Evaluation	7	%5.78			
Total				121	%100

4. Discussion

Data analysis of different sections of English and Kurdish research articles have shown that native authors employ different kinds of hedging words more frequently than non-native authors in terms of their frequency and type .Regarding the frequency , the hedging words that are used most frequently in the two groups is modal auxiliaries ; although there is divergence in the number of hedges used, the tendency towards choosing types of hedging strategies seems to be identical in both groups of authors. It can be seen clearly in Table (3) that modal auxiliaries account for the highest proportion among the five categories of hedges in both corpora .Hence they could be considered as the central element of hedging types used in both corpora .Moreover, it should be mentioned that the frequency of using auxiliaries is higher among Kurdish authors (i.e. %41.610 per 2,000 words; compares to native authors, %30.446 per 2000 words). The next frequently categories of hedging devices are lexical verbs and adverbs (which account for %23.681and %19.894 of the total hedging words) in Kurdish authors and adverbs and lexical verbs (which account for %28.369 and %26.159) in English authors .The least other categories of hedging devices i.e. adjectives and nouns, constitute %10.067 and %4.74of the hedging words found in articles written by Kurdish and %11.003 and %5.34of hedging words written by English authors. Concerning, the distribution of hedges in different parts of articles. It is found that the most heavily hedged section of articles by Kurdish authors is the introduction and literature review section by 58.197% hedging words followed by results and discussion section by 23.969% hedging words. On the contrary the most heavily-hedged section of articles by English authors is the results and discussion section with 48.696% hedging words followed by the introduction and literature section with 31.064% hedging words. And the least heavily hedged section of articles by both Kurdish and English authors is the abstract section with 3.835% and 3.004% hedging words respectively. The difference of using fewer hedges by Kurdish authors can be due to the fact that the corpus of the paper is from two different linguistic and cultural background authors. Whereas one group wrote in a foreign language**,** the other wrote in their native language**.** Kurdish authors generally use few hedging devices as compared to English ones. Sometimes, they overuse or misuse hedges in sections which do not need their use, hence the similarities and differences in the application of various types of hedges depend on the authors' level of English language proficiency and the need to adapt to the accepted academic writing style.

5. Conclusion

The paper has examined the types and frequencies of hedges used by English and Kurdish authors in English research articles and the distribution of hedging devices in different rhetorical section of articles by them**.** The results have shown interesting variations with respect to the types, frequencies and percentages in certain categories due to cultural, rhetorical differences, language-specific and topic dependent between the two languages. The choice of hedging devices is basically tactical since authors from both groups incline to use appropriate hedging strategies to express claims with precision, caution and modesty. Based on the findings derived from the data examined, the researcher recommends that a guideline of hedges should be created for students to be used in their academic writing. Moreover, teachers can employ various

techniques to help students improve their ability in using hedging devices; they should also make students be aware of different types of hedging devices.

6. References

Biber,D.,S .Johansson ,G. Leech ,S.Conrad and E. Finegan (1999).*Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman .

Brown, P. & S. Levinson (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Celce-Murcia, M., and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book* (2nd ed.).Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Coates, J. (1983). *The semantics of the modal auxiliaries.* Buckingham : Croom Helm.

Crystal ,D .and Davy,D.(1975).*Advanced Conversational English* .London. Longman.

Hinkel, E. (2005). Hedging, inflating, and persuading in L2 academic writing. *Applied Language Learning*, 15 (1), 29-53.

House ,J.and Kasper , G.(1981)Politeness Markers in English and German In F.Columas (ed.) Conversational Routine (pp157085).The Hogue .Mouton.

Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(3), 239-256.

Hyland, K. (1996a). Talking to the academy: Forms of hedging in science research articles. *Written Communication,* 13, 2, 251-281.

Hyland, K.(1996b) Nurturing hedges in the ESP curriculum . *System*, 2, 4 :477-490.

Hyland, K. 1998. *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

James, A. (1983).Compromisers in English: A cross-disciplinary approach to their interpersonal significance .Journal of Pragmatics, 7,191-206.

Lakoff, G. (1972). *Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts* .Chicago Linguistic Society Papers, 8, 183-228.

Low, G.(1996) Intensifiers and Hedges in Questionnaire Items and the Lexical Invisibility Hypothesis .*Applied Linguistics* 17(1):1-37

Lyons, J.(1977*). Semantics*: volume 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Myers, G. (1988) "The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles." *Applied Linguistics*. 10: 1-35.

Quirk,   R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. New York: Longman.

Serholt, S. (2012). *Hedges and Boosters in Academic Writing: A Study of Gender Differences in Essays Written by Swedish Advanced Learners of English*. Goteborgs Universitet, Gothenburg, Sweden.

Stubbe,G.and Holmes ,J.(1995)You know, eh and other "exasperating expressions": An analysis of social andstylistic variation in the use of pragmatic devices in a sample of New Zealand English. *Language and Communication* 15(1):63-88 .

Varttala, T. A. (2001). *Hedging in scientifically oriented discourse: Exploring variation according to discipline and intended audience* (Unpublished PhD dissertation). University of Tarnpere. Finland.

پارێزبەندی لە توێژینەوەی نووسەرانی کوردو ئینگلیزدا

ئەنجومەن محمد صابرمحمد

زانکۆی سەڵاحەدین/ کۆلێژی پەروەردە/بەشی زماتی ئینگلیزی

anjuman.sabir@su.edu.krd

ئەم توێژینەوەیە سەرنج دەخاتەسەرهەریەك لەجۆارەکان ودەرکەوتەکانی زاراوەی پارێزبەندی لە بەشەکانی توێژینەوەی زمانی ئینگلیزی کە لەلایەن نووسەرانی کوردی بەرەچەڵەك نا ئینگلیز و هەروەها نووسەرانی بە نەژاد ئینگلیزی نووسراوە, لەبواری زمانەوانی گشتی لەنێوان 2016- 2018 داتاکانی ئەمر توێژینەوەیە لە (20) توێژینەوەی نووسراو لەلایەن دوو کۆمەڵەی نووسەرانەوە وەرگیراوە, لەسەر بنەمای پۆلێنناسی پارێزبەندی کە لەلایەن هایلاند (1998) ـەوە پێشنیاز کراوە,ئەنجامەکان ئەوە نیشان دەدەن , کە بە گشتی نووسەرانی بە نەژاد ئینگلیزی زیاتر زاراوەکانی پارێزبەندی بەکار دێنن بەبەراورد لەگەڵ نووسەرانی کوردی بەرەچەڵەك نا ئینگلیز رەنگە ئەمەش بەهۆی جیاوازی پاشخانی کەلتووری نەتەوەی و لێهاتوویی لە زمان ,رەگەز ,هەروەها جیاوازی رەوانبێژی لەنێوان دوو زمانەکە بێت. نووسەری ئینگلیز بەگشتی فەرمانی سەرەکی ,ئاوەڵفرمان ,ئاوەڵناو و ناو لە توێژینەوەکانیان زیاتر بەکار دێنن بەبەراورد بەهاوتای کوردیان,دەرئەنجامەکان هەندێك پێشنیازی تایبەت بە فێرکردن بۆ مامۆستایان دەستەبەر دەکەن بەجۆرێك دەتوانن تەکنیکی جۆراوجۆر بەکاربهێنن تا یارمەتی قوتابیان بدەن توانایان باشتر بکەن لە بەکارهێنانی ئامرازی پارێزبەندی, هەروەها دەبیت وا بکەن ئاگاداری جۆری جیاوازی ئامرازی پارێزبەندی بن.

ووشە سەرەکییەکان: پارێزبەندی, جۆرەکان,دەرکەوتە, نووسەرانی کورد, نووسەرانی ئینگلیز

تحوطات في مقالات البحث الإنجليزية من الكردية والإنجليزية المؤلفون الأصليون

انجومن محمد صابرمحمد

جامعة صلاح الدين/ كلية التربية /قسم اللغة اللانكليزية

يتناول البحث أنواع وتكرار التحوطات التي كتبها المؤلفون الأكراد (KA) والمؤلفون الإنجليز (EA) في أقسام مختلفة من مقالات البحث الإنجليزية في مجال اللغويات خلال الفترة 2016-2018 ، بناءً على تصنيف التحوطات التي اقترحها(Hyland (1998). وبالتالي ، تم اختيار مجموعة من 20 مقالة بحثية منشورة في مجلات وطنية ودولية وتحليلها عشوائيًا من حيث التكرار والنوع. يعد اختيار أجهزة التحوط تكتيكيًا في الأساس حيث يميل المؤلفون من كلا المجموعتين إلى استخدام استراتيجيات التحوط المناسبة للتعبير عن الادعاءات بدقة واهتمام وتواضع .كما.تظهر النتائج أن المؤلفين الإنجليز بشكل عام استخدموا المزيد من التحوطات مقارنة بالمؤلفين الأكراد ، وقد يكون هذا بسبب اختلاف الخلفية الثقافية والجنسية وإتقان اللغة والاختلافات البلاغية بين اللغتين. يستخدم المؤلفون الإنجليز الأفعال المعجمية والظروف والصفات والأسماء في المقالات البحثية أكثر من نظرائهم الأكراد. وتوفر النتائج بعض مقترحات التربوية للمعلمين حيث يمكنهم استخدام تقنيات مختلفة لمساعدة الطلاب على تحسين قدرتهم على استخدام أجهزة التحوط ؛و يجب عليهم أيضًا جعل الطلاب على دراية بأنواع مختلفة من أجهزة التحوط.

الكلمات الرئيسية: تحوطات. أنواع, تكرار؛ الكتاب الأكراد ؛ الكتاب الإنجليز.