

## INTERTEXTUALITY AND THE HEDGING SYSTEM OF THE FILIPINO ENGINEERING STUDENTS: PRACTICES AND PEDAGOGY

Susana Melon-Galvez  
Bulacan State University  
susanamelongalvez@yahoo.com

First draft received: 11 November 2016

Final proof received: 21 February 2017

### Abstract

Communicators must have a 'pact'; right idea, equals the 'right words'. Although text is taken wholly to get to the meaning, every word contributes to the message sent for a powerful effect to the receiver. For language to work, participants must therefore be in full control of the words to be used. How these words are framed or intertextualized brings the hedging system of the ESP students. To achieve precision in ESP writing is not simply done by stringing words. To effectively communicate, there are underlying principles to apply to improve constant human interaction. In order to maintain such relationship in the technical world, each participant must not totally eradicate the 'feeling' to get across to the meaning. The study aimed at finding out the use of hedges and the effects of task types caused by framing of ideas and whether these hedges were significant to Filipino ESP writers. Common practices were identified as well as some pedagogical implications in the writing of technical discourses. Using introspection and contextual analysis, the researcher was able to analyze hedges varying from words, phrases, to clauses. The researcher found nonsensicality in intertextualizing ESP texts and had no bearing on the hedging system of the ESP writers.

Keywords: hedges; hedging system; intertextuality; Filipino second language ESP writers

### To cite this paper (in APA style):

Melon-Galvez, S. (2017). Intertextuality and the hedging system of the Filipino engineering students: Practices and pedagogy. *International Journal of Education*, 9(2), 149-156 doi: dx.doi.org/10.17509/ije.v9i2.5479

### INTRODUCTION

Writing is an arduous process which begins when an individual sits down to write. What makes it more alienating has something to do with the multiple decisions one has to make in a matter of minutes: the mechanics of writing; the content to include; the logic and the relevance of the ideas; the audience to write for; the purpose of writing; the selection, sequence and structure of writing; the words to use; the tone and voice; the academic conventions to follow; the organization and transition between paragraphs; the coping with elements in writing; the choice of words; the spelling, the punctuation marks; and the format of the document. Besides the above mentioned problems, there are fears the individual considers when starting to grasp with thoughts; the anxiety on the expectations from self and others, the fear of being stuck or inability to persevere, and the helplessness and the disempowerment of failing to succeed due to lack of practice and experience (Bedenhorst, 2011). Discourse related difficulties add up to the burden; the context in which the individual is writing, the social conditions, the power issues such as gender or race affecting perception of authority, and the intertextuality s/he applies in writing. This framing system includes the ability to draw meanings from multiple texts both present and absent, the identity one shapes, the presentation of evidences needed for the text, the positioning of the text in the paragraph (as novice/authority or distant third person, close personal 'I'), and the discursive issues which need to be negotiated, whether knowledge or assessment (Badenhorst, 2011).

Writing is part of a complex network of social practices conducted within different academic discourses. It is one of the foundations of academic engagement. Such is a skill students must acquire to succeed. Students need to write to learn, to take notes, and to study. They also need to write to think, to process their ideas and to integrate new ones. They need to write because this is how they are assessed. Those who lack this ability find themselves struggling on the margins and losing confidence to complete their program requirements. Those who are able to write 'well' find their path through academia is less burdensome and more enjoyable. Yet, academic writing is seldom explicitly taught (Olivas & Li, 2006). Academic writing requires an understanding of shifting and competing discourse requirements, how the 'self' is bound up in writing, how authority is constructed, how language is shaped and shapes, how some ways of writing are privileged and others not, and what is valued in this context. The paper unpacks ways in which the requirements of academic writing can be made more explicit. Writing becomes the mechanism for the transmission of subject knowledge, rather than something that is integral to the writer developing expertise in that area. Essential in academic writing is the knowledge on framing texts and the on how ideas are put together which bring about one's hedging system.

Hedging system distances or gets near communicators. Absence of hedges does not warrant understanding of the text. The presence of this linguistic phenomenon can indicate a proposition as an opinion rather than a fact. The author reduces the

strength of what he is writing (Nivales, 2011) or shows certainty if not doubt toward his statement. Using hedges, a writer gives a certain space for readers to judge the truth value of the assertion or put an amount of confidence on the claim. To Myles (2002), vague language (with hedging system) has several possible pragmatic functions: to mark politeness to indicate solidarity with one's interlocutor, to soften a statement, to indicate uncertainty about the propositional content of an utterance, or to diminish the impact of the statement. Lack of familiarity to making propositions vague can cause difficulties for second language learners to perform writing tasks. In his study, hedge is considered to make discourses vague, evasive, and polite, causing equivocation. Such phenomenon marks intersubjectivity having a primarily interpersonal function. A face-saving strategy makes utterances less assertive by decreasing their exactness.

Aquino (2014) analyzed hedges in campus journalistic articles written by high school students and found that editorial issues are the mostly hedged and modal auxiliary verbs are found the most in those articles. Nivales (2011) conducted research on hedging in research papers written by novice college student-writers. Her research discovered that hedges were used mostly in the introduction and conclusion sections of the papers. Research on hedges in speech has also been conducted, such as one by Neary-Sundquist (2013). Meanwhile, this paper discusses the intertextuality and the hedging system used particularly on the writing techniques in an ESP class of engineering students. In other words, the type of writing analyzed is technical writing. In addition, the research does not focus so much on certain weaknesses like common grammatical, structural and syntactic errors made in writing tasks but on how discourses were framed and were linked to join in the conversation. The study was prompted due to the author's experiences in an ESL writing class. The researcher had encountered problems on how discourses were intertextualized, specifically in the writing of technical discourses.

Discussion of this research is focused on the hedges used and on how ideas are framed by the College of Engineering (COE) writers. The researcher dealt with the two distinct types of intertextuality: iterability and presupposition. Iterability is the capability of a text to be reiterated and repeated in various contexts explicitly seen in texts, as opposed to presupposition, which refers to assumptions a text makes or assumptions made without being specifically stated or explained within a text. Presupposition or otherwise known 'common sense' is applied when an obvious discourse is understood by a vast majority of the audience. The latter implies several facts giving the reader a chance to assume. Details can be added or removed to give readers more or less creative license to imagine the facts presented for further belief. Because the assumptions made by different readers can be drastically different from one another, it is important that the framework the author provides is sufficient to keep the assumptions that are crucial to the story itself constant between readers.

The researcher observed the insignificance of framing in ESP writing since technical students' discourses needed no iterability and presupposition. Intertextuality in discourses in creative writing was

different in technical writing. ESP framing did not call for 'mood setting' and did not initiate guessing. Language used in ESP writing were precise and distinct in all the techniques; definition, mechanism, process, and partition or classification, even with visuals or graphics.

This paper is not about ESP intertextuality or framing itself since the researcher believes that no text stands alone. The research focused on how like a web related ideas were put together written in variety of ways. Without a frame, a writer is simply making a statement said throughout the history. One's frame is the author's way of looking at a statement to explain an idea. The frame allows one to establish the argument in a novel way. A frame is the section in an academic paper in which a perspective that has already been accepted by a specific discourse community is presented in order to blatantly explain to the reader the point of view from which the rest of the essay will be analyzed.

### **Intertextuality**

Framing, known as intertextuality, is the shaping of a text's meaning by another text without the use of quotation marks. This device creates interrelationship between texts and generates related understanding in separate works. This discourse strategy is done when an author borrows and transforms a prior text and uses referencing for his own translated text. These references are made to influence the reader and add layers of depth to a text, based on the readers' prior knowledge and understanding. Intertextuality is not always intentional and can be utilized inadvertently. Intertextual figures can be separated into three types: obligatory, optional and accidental (Fitzsimmons, 2013). While obligatory intertextuality deliberately invokes a comparison and link between two (or more) texts, obligatory intertextuality relies on the reading and understanding of a prior hypotext before the comprehension of the hypertext can be achieved. Optional intertextuality on the other hand has a less vital impact on the significance of the hypertext. It is possible that the connection will slightly shift the understanding of the text to multiple texts of a single phrase or no connection at all. The intent of the writer when using optional intertextuality is to pay homage to the 'original' writers or to reward those who have read the hypotext. However, the reading of this hypotext is not necessary to the understanding of the hypertext. Accidental intertextuality is when readers often connect a text with another text, cultural practice or a personal experience, without there being any tangible anchorpoint within the original text. The writer has no intention of making an intertextual reference and it is completely upon the reader's own prior knowledge that these connections are made (Wöhrle, as cited in Fritzsimmmons, 2013).

Kristeva in 1966 coined the word intertextuality which means combining past writing into original or new pieces of text. All texts are necessarily related to prior texts through a network of links, writers make use of what has previously been written and thus some degree of borrowing is inevitable. This generally occurs within a specific discourse community, such as the ESP community. Intertextuality is often a purposeful use of other's work without proper citation which is often mistaken for plagiarism. While intertextuality is a small excerpt of a hypotext that assists in the understanding of the new

hypertext, plagiarism is the use of closely imitated language and thoughts of another author without authorization. Framing is using a part of another text and changing its meaning by placing it in a different context. This is done by using other's ideas to create or enhance their own new ideas, not simply plagiarizing them. Intertextuality is based on the 'creation of new ideas', while plagiarism is often found in projects based on research to confirm one's ideas (Pecoraria & Shaw, 2012).

### Hedging and Framing

Yu (2009) categorizes hedges into quantificational approximators, performative shields, modal shields, pragmatic-marker hedges, and other syntactic and discursive hedging strategies. The study revealed the relevance of textual context, the cognitive effect, the degree of vagueness or commitment, and the state of success of the communication in bringing about appeal for persuasion. 'Smallwords', the microsignals (signaling a softening of the message) and the macrosignals (indicating the degree of vagueness or commitment). It was argued in the study that there was no significant difference among the epistemic modals. Although there is relationship between the type of task learners perform and the type of language they produce and a number of convincing empirical evidence that different tasks do indeed elicit different kinds of language from learners, there was no difference between the two signals because both have the same effect of softening the message. They attribute this result to the different discourse modes required by the two types of tasks. The shared information task constitutes a descriptive discourse mode, while the split information task is basically persuasive. It is possible to select tasks in order to elicit particular language structures (Hesselgreen as cited in Yu, 2009).

Frame allows the reader to see a topic from a particular angle. Because of the established framework, the reader will logically understand the progression of the writer's argument because the writer has legitimized his or her claim by citing an accepted theory (framework). When one uses an academic concept already has been accepted by the discourse community as a frame, this frame "forces you to offer both a definition and description of the principle around which one argument develops" (Greene, 2001, p. 147). The frame does however allow the writer to focus the reader's attention in one specific direction. The framing concept that one chooses to use has already been accepted by the community and thus a part of their intertextual matrix. A well-developed frame is the doorway into an academic conversation. If one guides the members of a specific discourse through a paper using an idea that the community already holds as true, the new argument is more likely to gain acceptance from the audience as they understand where it is coming from (Burke quoted in Greene, 2001).

As ideas are framed, hedging system occurs. Numerous studies revealed the implicative presence of hedges. Salager-Meyer (1998) these phenomena are tools either for 'backgrounding' or for 'foregrounding'. The words 'very' and 'extremely' for example, were more or less visible in giving 'foregrounded' hypothesis while 'seem' and 'tend' were verbs used to decrease definiteness or were used to compromise. Salager-Meyer (1993)

discussed the relevant connection between hedges and its purpose. Another study of Salager-Meyer (1997) revealed the importance of using precise statement or proposition to measure one's confidence or lack of confidence.

Another significant study to discuss is Hyland (1996a). In his study, he highlighted verb hedges which he considered 'speech acts': 'appear', 'seem', 'suggest', 'indicate', 'assume', and 'believe'. Vartalla (1999) was also focused on verbs classified as: 'verbs of assertion' like 'strong' and 'weak' used to express neutrality, connotation, opinion or certainty; 'useful verb features' like 'believe', 'think', and 'estimate' used to express recommendation; and 'appear', 'seem', 'suggest' as 'speculative verbs'.

Also, Hyland (1996b) in his study established facts deliberately and straightforwardly used expressions 'will', 'would', 'could', 'may', and 'might'. Such modal verbs in his study were used in expressing an attitude of uncertainty and unproven status of hypothesis widely identified as means of hedging in academic writing. In similar study, 'would', 'should', 'can', and 'may' known as 'conditionals' were used to conceal and to perform 'passive transformational tasks'. Results of several studies will be presented to have a clear picture of hedges classification.

In his most recent research, Hyland (2015) classified 'epistemic modalities' into five (5) central classes; modal auxiliaries, main verbs, adverbs, adjectives, and nouns. A total of 80 different lexical items, characterized by tentativeness and possibility were observed. 'May' for auxiliary, 'argue' and 'believe' for verbs, 'possibly' and 'perhaps' for adverbs, 'potential' and 'probable' for adjectives, 'hypothesis' and 'idea' and 'notion' for nouns, were the concurrent items. Other items (in the same order of groupings) were; 'might' and 'could', 'claim' and 'suggest' and 'hypothesis', 'appear' and 'propose', 'seem' and 'tend', 'presumably' and 'probably' and 'hypothetical', and 'potential' and 'presumptive'.

### METHODOLOGY

There were five distinctive techniques in technical writing used by the respondents: definition, mechanism, process, and partition and classification. It should be understood that all these were types of reports. Learning to write technically was necessary to help students determine how details were arranged in the best way one could to communicate his ideas. A piece of writing of any length usually employs a combination of two or three of these styles of writing. Students were taught first to prepare the details for each writing technique.

**For Definition.** Respondents must be familiar with the formal and informal definition. While informal definition (the most preferred type of definition) consists of one or more synonymous expressions substituted for the common terms used, formal definition (or amplified definition) has three parts; the term (the word to be defined), the 'genus' (the group of class where the word belongs), and the 'differentia' (the distinctive characteristics of the term). Definition can also be done by comparing/differentiating the subject with another, or through analogy. A definer faces problem as to where the definitions are to be placed in his writing; in a special section in the introduction (when the term are of critical importance

in understanding the discourses), or in the text itself (when there are too many terms to be defined).

**For Mechanism.** The respondents must be familiar with the assembly of the movable parts having one part fixed with respect to a frame of reference and designed to produce an effect. The respondents may give in detail the definition of a machine first, then the function/s, the principle governing its operation, physical description, the principal parts and the subparts, and how the entire mechanism works.

**For Process.** Respondents must be familiar with the simple presentation of the series of stages or steps of actions taken. Unlike description of mechanism which uses spatial or logical order, processes are based on the time of occurrence evident with the use of transitional devices. Process descriptions are either: directional or instructional (when instructions are addressed to the doer or agent of action marked by imperative sentences and the use of 2<sup>nd</sup> person point of view- e.g. lay outting or cooking); or informational (when declarative sentences are used, when sentences are addressed to the reader, written in the active voice, and using the third person point of view- e.g. computer data processing or newspaper publishing). Main steps are discussed first followed by the substeps.

**For Partition and Classification.** It must be clear to the respondents that the two techniques are related but different in writing. While partition is the act of dividing a unit into its components, classification does a logical division. Partition deals with one unit unlike classification which always deals with two or more units. For partitioning, species is defined first than the guiding principle/s (one by one) as the basis for the writing technique then name all the parts and subparts without overlapping. To do

classification, there are two subjects presented. For the initial step, present the subject and the bases for partition, identify if not define, discuss the various bases for another partitioning (the significance or the purpose of the division) then the subdivisions in the best order of presentation then present the analysis using outlines and visuals to give the best explanation.

**The Participants**

The study participants were from the College of Engineering of Bulacan State University, Philippines, specifically Second Year General Engineering students enrolled in the ESP class. Respondents were grouped as to the project each would like to work. Samples from the population from different groups became the basis of the study. From the 234 technical outputs, data were gathered. Using purposive sampling, the researcher selected random samples of the four techniques in writing.

The researcher discussed the above techniques to the Second Year General Engineering students. Respondents were grouped as to the major they wish to take in Third Year; Mechatronics, Industrial, Civil, Mechanical, Electronics, and Electrical. After the groupings, each had a brainstorming exercise on the project for their feasibility studies. Each group was asked to bring the picture of the project they would wish to discuss the following day. Each group of four members had the same picture each. The researcher assigned each a picture with A for the one member to work on Definition, B for Mechanism, C for Process, and D for Partition and Classification. Each was also asked to bring readings of their project for referencing. After giving random assignment, respondents did the writing. Respondents were asked to write one to two paragraphs depending on the individual speed in organizing ideas.

**RESULTS AND FINDINGS**

**Table 1. For Definition**

Type of Definition	Hedges	Placement	Framing
(1) Informal	similarities, both, difference, and, (first, second, but, lastly, then- enumerating the characteristics)	Beginning	which
(2) Informal	similar (2), different, difference, and	second sentence	that
(3) Informal	similar, and, like (2), also	beginning	that (2), which
(4) Informal - formal	defined as, and (enumerating same qualities),	Beginning-conclusion	if clauses, that (3)
(5) Informal	a.k.a. (another name), like, both, and, or, such as	Beginning	that
(6) Formal	in comparison, both, in contrast (more), or (2)	Beginning	that (3)
(7) Formal	on the other hand, both (more)	Beginning	that (3), because
(8) Informal	like, unlike, and	Beginning	that
(9) Informal	also similar (comparing features of two subjects)	Beginning	because, that (2)
(10) Formal	also (enumerating features of the same subject)	Beginning	that (3), because (2), if, when
(11) Informal	not just/but also – and (many more features), unlike	Beginning	when
(12) Informal	similarities and differences, but (for distinct features), unlike	Beginning	and etc., that
(13) Formal	more-than, unlike, while, on the other hand, not like, similarities, both, and also both, or	Beginning	that (2)
(14) Informal	(etymology), compared to	Beginning	that
(15) Informal	compared, (2), not the same with	Beginning	which (2), that, when
(16) Formal	as, but, also (called), similarity	Beginning	that (4), when (2), because (2)
(17) Informal	also (called), also, and, unlike, (etymology) then, after that (enumerating features)	Beginning	so that, that (3)
(18) Informal	also (be called), also (used), in addition, instead of (for another feature)	Beginning & Body	that
(19) Formal	and	Beginning	that
(20) Informal	also, while-similarities, both, and (same feature)	Beginning	that (2)

Table 1 reveals how students framed definition as a writing technique. Although most students are familiar with formal and informal definitions, there was difficulty in substituting the term with another word (genus). Most preferred informal definitions by describing the subject (features), giving the functions, or directly enumerating the parts of the subject instead of amplifying it mostly done at the beginning of the paragraph. As to the type of hedges, there were the predominant uses of noun hedges (e.g. similar, similarity/ies, different, difference/s, a.k.a. -for etymology), pronoun hedge (both), adverbial hedges (e.g. for comparison-as, also, like, unlike, not the same with more-than; and time expressions- first, second, third, after, then, after that), and conjunctive hedges (e.g. and, or, while, but, not just/but also); all used to show the transition of ideas within a paragraph.

Very dominant in the intertextualizing process is the use of restrictive clauses 'that' and the nonrestrictive 'which'. A restrictive clause is one that limits -- or restricts --the identity of the subject in some way. Such restricts when the author intends to single out the subject (in this study, being defined). However, 'which', a nonrestrictive element, should take the place of 'that' telling an interesting or an incidental thing far from defining the subject. There are, however, instances of combining the two clauses which provide both limiting and nonlimiting

information about a subject in a paragraph. Most people probably use that and which interchangeably. In most instances, this doesn't cause undue confusion. But, in formal business or technical communications (for example, contracts, tenders or technical specifications), such ambiguities can give rise to serious legal and financial problems. Such pedantic attitude to the difference between that and which may be very necessary for business or technical writing.

Two other types of hedge were used in technical discourses; because and when. In Standard English, the word "because" can be used two ways. One of them is to introduce a clause as subordinating conjunction while the other is to team up with "of" to form what's called a compound preposition. In the case of the respondents, 'because clauses' were used for convenience. Maybe the causal factor is so obvious as to need no elaboration, or the speaker is distracted or giddy and eager to save effort and move on, or maybe the construction appeals for undefined aesthetic or social reasons. 'When clauses' however, were considered "temporal" time-related prepositions function as the complement. What was surprising about the phenomenon was that, such nonprogressive verb form was not used for activities of short duration but an interruption for description for definition.

**Table 2. For Mechanism**

Transition	Hedges	Emphasis/Effect
(1) Parts – function – features (parts)	is composed, used as, is consists of, approximately, in the first floor, in the second floor,	composition, function & benefit
(2) Formal definition – function – parts - process	to reduce, with the primary parts, to test/ a way of testing	Definition and parts, & process
Informal definition (functions), parts – features	to/may improve, provides, requires manpower, to properly work, should be put, mainly consists of	Functions
Informal definition (features) - parts – features (of the parts) – process	can perform by; is designed; to facilitate; is facilitated; first, second, third (functions); to do; is produced	Features & Process
Informal definition & parts (features)	is divided into different parts, can scan and print, can be used, to have a copy, will be used, can create, are used, to make	Parts & Features
Informal definition (functions) – parts – functions (of the parts), features (of each parts)	be considered, must be used, first (to enumerate the features), are primarily used, to access, are implemented, which includes, which is, should be sufficient to prevent, have to be used carefully, is used to make, to attain	Functions, Parts & Features
Informal definition (functions) – parts - features (of each part)	enables, to be informed and to be guided, basically warns, could possibly happen, would be responsible, another important parts, play a vital role, connect every single part, resulting to efficient flow of the mechanism	Function, Parts & Features (for the whole mechanism)
Informal definition – (features of the project) – parts – features (of the parts)	can be constructed, are extremely important parts, include the following, has advantages and disadvantages, is unique in appearance	Features
Informal definition – (parts) – features (of the parts)	is consists of, are connected, are used, has also, is connected, to be powered, that flow through, is accepted, when these are met, now supplies power to	Features
Informal definition (features) – parts – functions (of the parts)	is designed for, is uniquely assembled, is composed of, to help, that will effectively and efficiently help, will aid in detecting, is connected to, is located, are interconnected, to suffice, to detect, to alarm	Features
Informal definition (by comparison) - functions – parts - features (of the parts)	are inevitable, due to this, will be of great help, as a, to help, gives a warning, to start, plays, that detects, is also, connects to the other parts, connects to be fixed, not to be removed, all in all, will not function without the other	Features, Parts & Features of Parts (in relation to the whole mechanism)
Formal definition (functions) – parts – features (of the part) – more parts (toward the whole system)	that can consist, has different uses, when it is connected, when you start, can produce, will now be charging, with this, has connector on it, in making this mechanism, are the principal parts, that make up	Functions, Parts, & Features (toward the whole system)
	enables, to access, is capable of, uses, to account, are	

Informal definition (features) – parts - features (of the parts)	authorized, that handles, are settled, at the end, is presented, that has, has specific parts, that is capable, is read, an owner authentication, that is, that specializes, that is secured	Features & Parts
Informal definition (features - toward the whole system) – parts – (features of the parts)	to turn into, allows, to charge, to listen, consists of, as a whole, in order to install, that fits, must be mounted, onto the handle bars, that is included, protects, due to, takes, requires, should be placed, converts, that can be used, to charge	Features, Parts & Features
Features – informal definition – functions - features	that captures, uses, to enable, can be used, of transforming, into electrical energy, that can be stored, used to power, can provide, to operate	Features, Definition, Functions & Features
Informal definition (parts) - functions – comparisons	made up of, makes, is made up of, serves, would be one of the, that would make, more productive	Functions (Comparison)
Informal definition (parts) – features – functions	is made up of, becomes, to support, weighs about, can run and walk, when is not activated, can be used as, that supports, to sit, use to create, to produce, to help	Parts, Features & Functions
Formal definition – features – parts - process	that sorts, separates, is located, that will be operated, that actually separates, will be brought, to begin the process, will sense	Features & Parts
Informal definition (parts) – informal definition (another name) – functions	is consists, are connected, can be used, to sense, will be cancelled, are used, to assure, will be able to withstand, to give	Parts & Functions
Formal definition – parts – functions (of each parts) – features (of each parts)	that can navigate through, for the machine to function are the following parts, are responsible, can navigate, cannot serve, controls	Functions, Parts, & Functions & Features

Why respondents failed to frame correctly mechanism as a technique in ESP writing were because of: their lack of knowledge of the relationship between the two (mistake proofing) and because respondents were unaware of the transitional devices to be used to mean effect or to the the rhetorical functions in academic writing. Mistake proofing is the use of any automatic device or method that either

makes it impossible for an error to occur or makes the error immediately obvious once it has occurred. This occurred in the study when respondents considered transitional devices used a minor error early in the process which caused major problems later in the process or when such consequence became a product of 'mistaken identity'.

**Table 3. For Process**

Process Description	Voice	Point of View	Transition	Hedges
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	has developed – features – parts – features (of parts)	before, then,
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	is the development – processes	first, second, third, after,
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	Processes	first, second, third, fourth, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject - features – processes	since (time), planning (first step), the second step, , this (3 <sup>rd</sup> process), all these (referring to all the processes)
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	parts – feature (2 methods) – processes (two methods discussed)	first , after (the second method)
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup> – 1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (feature) – processes- parts – features	first, next, and then, when clause (time)
Informational	active	1 <sup>st</sup>	Subject (compared) - processes	first, then, next, lastly
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (feature) – processes-	first, second, third, fourth, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (feature) - processes	first, then, next, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features)	NONE
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	processes	first step, second, third, then
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (formal definition) – features - processes - subparts	basic steps: (enumerated with v-ing; creating, ensuring, receiving), (generally include)
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features) - processes	solder (first step), Next, before inserting, place (the next step), arm (next step), hook (next step), once removed
Directional/ Instructional	passive	1 <sup>st</sup>	subject (function) – feature – process – parts (in the first process) - processes	first, when clause, then, after that, lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (function) - processes	first, next, lastly, and then, and lastly
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features)	go, to adjust
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (features) – parts – processes	after (placing), now
Informational	active	3 <sup>rd</sup>	subject (background – the	finding (first step), then, also



interactions with professors motivated them to work harder or made them give up. Except for their own effort to learn, professors were the most influential factor for these students' learning (Leki, 2001). There may be some responsive professors to the needs of the students in writing and these supportive attitudes have a psychological impact on study participants. Professors' attitudes enhance or deter students' confidence and effort to learn. Their perceptions of their professors as supporters lead them to work harder. Professors' duty is to help students learn what they do not know, not to find out students' weaknesses and blame them for the weaknesses. A good learning environment is one where all students are treated equally and get equal attention, but it seems that there are not many classrooms in higher education measuring up to this standard. Professors play a great role in students' learning, especially ESL students' learning. Strategies employed in an ESL class are the most influential factor for ESL students' enthusiasm in learning. Teaching approaches and teachers' attitudes toward their students show how they view them, and this in turn influences students' learning behaviors. Professors' positive attitude may boost their enthusiasm for learning and confidence in themselves.

To ESP writers, framing texts to join conversation becomes a lot easier since references provide information students need. Although in English academic writing, there were specific formats writers should follow to adhere, writing becomes precise and direct disregarding individual hedging system. Intertextualizing of ideas was convenient due to lack of unnecessary expressions. With the absence of iterability and presuppositions, rewording eliminated long frustrating moments in writing ESP texts.

## REFERENCES

- Aquino, A. B. (2014). Hedges in campus journalistic articles. *E-International Scientific Research Journal* 6(4), 1-52.
- Bardovi-Harlig, K. (2000). *Tense and aspect in second language acquisition: Form, meaning, and use*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Bedenhorst, C. (2011). Academic writing: The key to student retention? *The Morning Watch*, 38(3-4). <http://www.mun.ca/faculty/mwatch/current.htm>
- Fitzsimmons, J. (2013). Romantic and contemporary poetry: readings. Retrieved from CQUniversity e-courses, LITR19049 - Romantic and Contemporary Poetry <http://moodle.cqu.edu.au>
- Greene, S. (2001). Argument as conversation: The role of inquiry in writing a researched argument. In Wendy Bishop and Pavel Zemliansky (eds.) *The Subject is Research* (pp. 145-164). Portsmouth, NH: Boynton/Cook
- Hyland, K. (1996a). Talking to the academy: Forms of hedging in science research articles. *Written Communication* 13, (2): 251-281. 10.1177/0741088396013002004
- Hyland, K. (1996b). Writing Without Conviction? Hedging in Science Research Articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(4), 433-454. DOI: 10.019/applin/17.4.433.
- Hyland, K. (2015). Metadiscourse. In Tracy, K. (ed.) *International encyclopedia of language and social interaction*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell. DOI: 10.1002/9781118611463/wbielsi003
- Leki, L. (2001). Material, educational, and ideological challenges of teaching EFL writing at the turn of the century. *International Journal of English Studies*, 1(2), 197-209.
- Myles, J. (2002). Second language writing and research: The writing process and error analysis in student texts. *TESL-EJ*, 6(2), 1-20.
- Nivales, M. (2011). Hedging in college research papers: Implications for language instruction. *Asian EFL Journal. Professional Teaching Articles – CEBU Issue* (52), 35-45.
- Neary-Sundquist, C. (2013). The use of hedges in the speech of ESL learners. *Estudios de lingüística inglesa aplicada elia*, 13, 149-174. <http://dx.doi.org/10.12795/elia.2013.i13.05>
- Olivas, M., & Li, C. (2006). Understanding stressors of international students in higher education: What college counselors and personnel need to know. *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 33, 217-222.
- Pecoraria, D. & Shaw, P. (2012). Types of student intertextuality and faculty attitudes. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 21(2), 149-164. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jslw.2012.03.006>
- Salager-Meyer F. (1993) Imprecision and vagueness (hedging) in today's medical discourse: Courtesy, coyness or necessity?. *The ESPecialist*, 14(1), 1-15. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(97\)00008-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(97)00008-2)
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1997). I think that perhaps you should: A study of hedges in written scientific discourse. *Applied linguistics*. ESP Journal. Pergamon.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1998). Language is not a physical object: Francise Salager-Meyer responds to Peter Crompton's "hedging in academic writing: Some theoretical concepts." *English for Specific Purposes*, 17(3), 295-302.
- Vartalla, T. (1999). Remarks on the communicative functions of hedging in popular scientific and specialist research articles on medicine. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18(2), 177-200. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(98\)00007-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(98)00007-6)
- Yu, S. (2009). The pragmatic development of hedging in EFL learners. (Unpublished Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from <http://dspace.cityu.edu.hk/handle/2031/5731>