CHAPTER V
CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter V presents the essential points that this study has found through analyzing hedging from skripsi-s based on Hyland’s (1998) and Vartalla’s (2001) theories. In addition, the recommendations that are realized from the interpretation of data are also presented so that the significance of this study in language education context is visible and the possibility for further research can be attempted.

5.1 Conclusions

This study focuses on hedging uses of non-native speakers of English in their academic writing skill. Particularly, the primary issue in this study is the difference in academic writing in research setting, namely, quantitative and qualitative skripsi-s. In order to decipher this issue, two research questions are formulized for clearer orientation of this study.

Based on the two research questions, this study finds out how hedging uses in skripsi-s are like. First, from belief on text based on frequency counts using Hyland’s (1998) and Vartalla’s (2001) theories of edging, it is revealed that there are a two participants of this study who are close to how English expert users use hedging in research writing. Hyland (1997) and Vartalla (2001) found out that the use of hedging in Journal corpus is about 20 occurrences per 1000 words. There are some samples of this study that approaches the number of hedging occurrences found by Hyland and Vartalla in international journal corpus regarded as convention of how rhetoric of research writing was expressed. Generally, most of participants of this study used hedging similarly to what expert users did, namely, 15.97 occurrences per 1000 words. This is a close number compared to standard. However, the most frequently used hedging category is verb category. This is different finding from Hyland (1997) and Vartalla (2001) who found adverb as the most frequently used hedging category.
Skripsi-s employing quantitative research method dominates the use of hedging in most of hedging sub-categories. In another side, hedging in skripsi-s employing qualitative research method occurred more frequently in sub-categories: adjective indefinite frequency, probability adverb, adverbs of indefinite degree, tentative cognitive verbs, indicating limits of accuracy, and theoretical information. However, from overall calculation, the quantitative skripsi-s (19.22) get more hedging uses than qualitative ones (12.72). The gap of difference between both groups is 33.8%. This is implied that Phenomena of hedging uses in academic writing setting are not always naturally occurred. Implicitly, Hinkel (2004) suggests that hedging should be used as one of materials in teaching writing mechanics. This suggestion is supported by Al-Quraisy’s (2011) finding that there are significantly different hedging uses of students’ academic writing when they were treated by learning instruction including materials about hedging. Therefore, the explicit teaching of hedging as metadiscoursive strategy in academic writing takes important role.

Second, in answering the research questions about polypragmatic models of hedging uses, the theory from Hyland (1995, 1996 and 1997) about are used. Quantitative skripsi-s tend to have hedging uses more than quantitative skripsi-s do. The percentage of difference is 36.2%. This is in line with the findings in the difference of hedging based on surface features. However, there is one specific issues worth to mention in the polypragmatic models of hedging uses, namely, that extreme samples exist in this quantification in qualitative and quantitative skripsi-s.

The 28 exemplifications of polypragmatic models of hedging from Hyland’s (1997) are used as the identification of the polypragmatic models of hedging. In attribute-hedge category, there are five exemplifications that match Hyland’s: indicating the degree to which the detected response varies from what is considered "normal"; denoting a deviation from an idealised conception of a particular process; indicating deviations from “ideal” correlations, causes, behavior, and so on; indicating the degree of precision intended and conveys the sense in which idea may be held to be true. In reliability-hedge, there are four
exemplifications: indicating an assessment of the reliability of truth, keeping interpretation close to findings, where may be less tenuous; using conventional epistemic forms in the main grammatical classes; commenting on probability of the content of a proposition being true and including both adverbs of uncertainty, which simply convey doubt on the information; and commenting on probability of the content of a proposition being true and include both adverbs of mental perception, which show how result are understood. In writer-oriented hedge, there are five exemplification: avoiding assuming explicit responsibility for an assertion, while seeking to secure ‘uptake’ by moving the reader to the writer’s standpoint; presenting a construction of abstract rhetors which, by nominalising a personal projection, suggest that the situation described is independent of human agency; serving qualification of specific claims; showing that the writer does not wish to be thought fully and personally committed to a belief in the proposed state of affairs; and referring to both the warrant for the claim and citing supporting. In reader-oriented hedge, there is only exemplification found, namely, using personal attribution.

5.2 Recommendations

This study is concerned with the phenomena of hedging uses as metadiscourse strategy in academic writing. Therefore there are two recommendations of this study, namely, theoretical orientation in discussion of hedging as metadiscourse strategy and practical use in language learning as teaching academic writing instruction.

For theoretical orientation, it can be suggested that hedging uses are a metadiscursive strategy in writing skill so that they can be taught and learned, although different genre or register may influence the uses in terms of expert English users. In addition, for non-native English speakers who are still in learning process of improving their English skills, instruction of hedging uses in writing class are more influential than register and genre of writing they create are. This assumption emerged from this study need quantitative proof, such as
experimental study on students’ hedging use with and without explicit learning instruction of hedging uses.

Practically, Hinkel (2004) describes the important role of hedging uses in writing (including skripsi) addressed to non-native English speakers as materials of teaching grammar. She puts hedging into grammatical aspect of writing in order to create better writing. In settings where English is a foreign language, the teaching of hedging uses in skripsi-s would be necessary. Therefore, this study can be regarded as needs analysis for considering the emergence of teaching hedging uses explicitly in academic writing.