

Hedges Expressions of Negotiation in Marnia Lazreg's "Questioning the Veil"

¹Febby Zuliana Putri, ²Lisetyo Ariyanti, S.S., M.Pd.

¹ Faculty of Language and Art English Literature Study Program,
Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia
febbyzuliana02@gmail.com

Abstract

This study explore hedges expression in Marnia Lazreg's "Questioning the Veil" (2009). This study employs a qualitative descriptive approach based on evasive expressions as defined by Salager-Meyer (1994) and Ken Hyland's (2005) model of interactional metadiscourse. The empirical findings reveal 100 instances of hedging expressions, namely Shields (41), Approximators (35), Compound Hedges (13), and Emotionally-Charged Intensifiers (11). Pragmatically, this tool sharpens the author's critical ability to mediate the conflict between socio-religious pressures and women's individual autonomy. Structurally, the interaction between "Attitude" and "Engagement" creates a persuasive dialogic space for readers. This study concludes that hedging functions as a strategy to advocate for women's autonomy without provoking radical resistance.

Keywords: Hedging, Pragmatics, Metadiscourse, Negotiation, Questioning the Veil.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini mengkaji penggunaan ungkapan-ungkapan yang bersifat menghindari dalam karya Marnia Lazreg berjudul "Questioning the Veil" (2009). Penelitian ini menggunakan pendekatan deskriptif kualitatif yang didasarkan pada ungkapan-ungkapan yang bersifat menghindari karya Salager-Meyer (1994) serta model metadiskursus interaksional karya Ken Hyland (2005). Temuan empiris mengungkapkan 100 penggunaan hedging, yaitu Shields (41), Approximators (35), Compound Hedges (13), dan Emotionally-Charged Intensifiers (11). Secara pragmatis, alat ini mempertajam kemampuan kritis penulis dalam menengahi konflik antara tekanan sosio-religius dan otonomi individu perempuan. Secara struktural, interaksi antara "Sikap" dan "Keterlibatan" menciptakan ruang dialogis yang persuasif bagi pembaca. Studi ini menyimpulkan bahwa hedging berfungsi sebagai strategi untuk memperjuangkan otonomi perempuan tanpa memicu perlawanan radikal

Kata kunci: Hedging, Pragmatik, Metadiskursus, Negosiasi, Questioning the Veil.

Article History

Received: Juli 2026
Reviewed: Juli 2026
Published: Juli 2026
Plagiarism Checker: No
235.223.443

Copyright : Author
Publish by : Argopuro



This work is licensed under
a [Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial
4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/)

A. INTRODUCTION

Discussions about women's bodies and the use of religious symbols—particularly the hijab—are often trapped in a rigid black-and-white dichotomy in modern society. On one hand, there is the institutionalization of religious doctrine and the standardization of societal morals that enforce visual compliance as a symbol of collective piety. On the other hand, there are discussions about individual autonomy and women's right to independently represent their own bodily identities. The ideological clash between the Social-Religious Pressure group and the Women's Individual Autonomy group often leads to radical confrontations when discussed in public spaces or academic texts. In the realm of written communication, critical nonfiction texts are often required not to present claims dogmatically or absolutely, but rather to create a dynamic space for dialogue that helps mediate sensitive interpersonal ideas.

This phenomenon of linguistic negotiation is clearly demonstrated in Marnia Lazreg's book "Questioning the Veil: Open Letters to Muslim Women" (2009). As an open letter, Lazreg employs rhetoric to avoid extreme opposition or direct confrontation with traditional readers or religious authorities. Instead, she employs a strategy of linguistic restraint or epistemic commitment limitation known as cautious expression or cautious language. By using this linguistic strategy, sensitive issues related to women's bodies are not framed in black-and-white terms but are carefully negotiated under the watchful eye of internalized patriarchal culture and spiritual demands. Therefore, research on how these negotiated expressions are constructed pragmatically and structurally has become urgent to enhance understanding of persuasive communication skills in responding to ideological conflicts.

To comprehensively examine the phenomenon of language modification in this critical text, it is necessary to combine pragmatic theory with interactive metadiscourse analysis. The use of hedging expressions is essentially a linguistic strategy employed by the author to indicate uncertainty, reduce commitment to knowledge, or modify the degree of truth in a statement. Based on the taxonomic classification of language modification is used to identify categories of hedging expressions by Salager-Meyer (1994), these expressions include the use of epistemic modals such as "may" or "suggest" to reduce the degree of factual certainty, with the aim of avoiding careless generalizations. In addition, there are approximators that soften rigid numerical boundaries by using vague quantifiers such as

"many" or "often," expressions that indicate the author's direct involvement and personal doubt, emotionally charged intensifiers, and layered evasive expressions that combine two or more mitigation devices to create multiple layers of protection for the author's academic position.

This negotiation structure operates mechanically through the interactive metadiscourse model developed by Ken Hyland in 2005. Hyland divides the dimensions of textual interaction into two main pillars. The first is the Attitude Apparatus, which focuses on the author's perspective to demonstrate their authority and intellectual rigor. Through this theoretical synthesis, withholding commitment is no longer viewed as a methodological weakness, but rather as a successful tool of interpersonal diplomacy and linguistic politeness that effectively reduces threats to the reader's self-image.

Previous research on hedging strategies has been extensive, but much of it still faces methodological and corpus-related challenges. Best practices in studying hedging are typically found in analyses of formal diplomatic communication, crisis-related press releases from national institutions, or purely academic articles, such as in the study by Noor et al. (2023), where mitigating claims are used carefully to avoid geopolitical confrontation between nations and to maintain scientific objectivity. On the other hand, analyses of the use of hedging expressions in spontaneous spoken communication or digital media, as seen in Azizah's (2021) study, often employ classical sociolinguistic frameworks to identify gender-based linguistic features. In contrast, macro-corpus-based studies, such as those conducted by Depraetere & Kaltenböck, (2023)

Based on a review of previous studies, three major gaps in the research have been identified that require further investigation. First, there is a gap in the corpus, meaning a lack of analysis of creative nonfiction genres that address ideologically sensitive issues such as gender and religion in a postcolonial context. As a result, the organic patterns of interpersonal negotiation found in critical literary texts have not received a commensurate amount of study. Second, there is a theoretical gap because previous studies on gender often stop at describing how linguistic features label women, without fully integrating Salager-Meyer's (1994) functional taxonomy of mitigation into Hyland's (2005) dialogic metadiscourse model. Third, there is an analytical gap because there is a tendency to separate micro-level pragmatic analysis from macro-level

sociological context. Consequently, previous research has rarely examined how the reduction of factual truth-commitment in language can function as a political strategy to challenge patriarchal hegemony and counter Western Orientalist stereotypes simultaneously. This study, which focuses on Marnia Lazreg's book "Questioning the Veil" (2009), is specifically designed to address these three gaps. It employs a descriptive qualitative approach that combines the Salager-Meyer taxonomy (1994) and Hyland's (2005) metadiscourse framework. The aim is to thoroughly examine the types of hedging used, the negotiation mechanisms of ideological conflict between SRP and WIA, and the rhetorical interaction strategies adopted by the authors to maintain their scientific credibility amidst dogmatic socio-religious content.

B. RESEARCH METHODS

1. Research Approaches and Types

The approach the researcher will use to conduct this study is a descriptive qualitative approach. The descriptive qualitative approach was chosen because this study focuses on the in-depth, systematic, and naturalistic collection, classification, and presentation of textual data in the form of written words, without any manipulation of variables. Through qualitative content analysis, this study aims to map the coding patterns of "hedging devices" while interpreting the rhetorical meanings within the text.

2. Object of the Study (Research Object)

The object of this study is the subject of observation or the primary focus of the researcher's analysis. Thus, in this study, the object determined by the researcher is the rhetorical phenomenon of interpersonal negotiation manifested through the use of "hedging" expressions as an interactional metadiscursive strategy in responding to socio-religious conflicts.

3. Data and Source of Data

The data sources in this study consist of The data sources in this study consist of primary and secondary data (Rahmadi 2011: 71).

- a.) Data : The data in this study consist of qualitative linguistic units, including words, phrases, clauses, and sentences that meet the criteria for "grammatical hedging". The characteristics of the data are based on the functional classification by Salager-Meyer (1994) and the mitigation indicators by Hyland (2005).
- b.) Data Sources : Primary data were obtained directly from a corpus of epistolary texts in the

creative nonfiction book "Questioning the Veil: Open Letters to Muslim Women" (2009) by Marnia Lazreg (specifically from the Introduction through Letter Five). Secondary data serves as a supplement and reinforcement, obtained from relevant external theoretical references.

4. Data Collection Technique

The data collection technique in this descriptive qualitative study centers on the researcher as the primary instrument (the human instrument). Drawing on the perspective of Miles et al. (2014), data collection in descriptive qualitative studies is aimed at obtaining rich, authentic, and unadulterated written records or documents from a naturalistic setting without any engineering or manipulation of variables. thus, data collection techniques must involve a comprehensive understanding of the social and situational context in which the text was produced:

a.) Documentary Technique

Data collection in this study was conducted using the documentation method. As stated by Miles and Huberman (1994), qualitative data can be collected from various sources, including written documents that provide in-depth descriptions and explanations of the research topic. Therefore, the use of the documentation method is considered appropriate for collecting written text data in this study

5. Data Collection Procedure

Based on the framework proposed by Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), the collection of qualitative data from written documents must follow a planned process so that researchers can capture in-depth descriptions and a complete contextual explanation. The data collection procedures in this study were carried out through the following four systematic stages:

- a.) Preparation and Sourcing : The procedure begins with downloading and preparing the electronic version (PDF) of the critical non-fiction book "Questioning the Veil: Open Letters to Muslim Women" (2009) by Marnia Lazreg as the primary textual corpus.
- b.) Skimming and Pre-reading : The second step involves skimming the entire book to grasp

the author's overall argument. The focus of the reading is then strictly narrowed to the designated textual sampling area, specifically from the Introduction to Letter five, where issues regarding women's autonomy (WIA) and socio-religious pressure (SRP) are debated (Lazreg, 2009).

- c.) Close-Reading and Examination : a meticulous examination is conducted to mark clauses, phrases, or sentences that express hedging expressions. This marking process is theoretically guided by Salager-Meyer's (1994) taxonomy of hedge forms as well as Hyland's (2005) indicators of stance and engagement
- d.) Extracting and Coding : The procedure concludes by extracting all the marked linguistic units from the original pages and systematically recording them in qualitative data sheets. In line with the qualitative data management techniques of Miles, Huberman, and Saldaña (2014), each text excerpt copied into the data sheet is immediately assigned a reference code (such as a data serial number, chapter, and page number) to facilitate the process of data condensation and verification in the subsequent data analysis stage.

Data code descriptions :

DT-01 : Data serial number (Data 1)

SH/AP/PD : Type of hedges (shield, Approximators, Personal doubt)

H02/H03 : Page number (page 2, page 3)

6. Data Analysis Techniques

Data analysis aims to understand and communicate research findings through an interactive and ongoing process until the data is considered saturated. The techniques used are based on Miles and Huberman and consist of three main stages:

- a.) Data Reduction : The process of filtering, summarizing, and focusing on important data, while eliminating irrelevant information to make the data clearer and more focused. Sentences found to contain relevant hedging elements will be retained, while irrelevant discourse is eliminated.
- b.) Data Presentation : Data is presented in narrative form to facilitate understanding and aid further analysis. In addition to qualitative

narratives, data is systematically mapped into a data classification table matrix.

- c.) Verification/Conclusions : Conclusions are drawn based on the reduced and presented data and must be supported by valid field evidence to ensure credibility. The verification process involves repeatedly cross-checking the findings against the original text to ensure the validity of the interpretation.

C. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

1. Findings

Based on the results of a qualitative textual analysis of a corpus of open letters (epistolary texts) in the book "Questioning the Veil: Open Letters to Muslim Women" (2009) by Marnia Lazreg, 100 linguistic data units containing hedging devices were identified. Objective findings regarding the frequency distribution of each type of hedging expression, based on the Salager-Meyer taxonomy (1994), are summarized in Table 1 as follows:

Table 4. 1 Frequency

No	Hedging Categories (Salager-Meyer, 1994)	Frequency (f)
1	Shields	41
2	Approximators	35
3	Authors' Personal Doubt	-
4	Compound Hedges	13
5	Emotionally-Charged Intensifiers	11
Total	Overall Corpus Data	100

Based on Table 1 above, the category of hedging devices that dominates Marnia Lazreg's critical discourse is "Shields" with 41 data points, closely followed by "Approximators" with 35 data points. Meanwhile, "Compound Hedges" and "Emotionally-Charged Intensifiers" provide complementary contributions in mitigating the discourse claims, with 13 and 11 data points, respectively. Interestingly, not a single expression classified as "Authors' Personal Doubt" was found, indicating that the author consistently projects her academic confidence without expressing personal uncertainty in an amateurish manner.

Through an in-depth qualitative analysis, the description of the linguistic characteristics and the operationalization of the rhetorical functions of each

type of hedging are presented in the following subsections:

1.) The Use of Shields in Reducing Absolutism of Claims

As the dominant type of qualifier (f=41), Shields—manifested through modal verbs (such as perhaps, may, might, could) and adverbs of probability—are used by the author as the primary mitigating device (stance mitigator). Lazreg employs Shields to weaken the illocutionary force of her social critique directed at patriarchal institutions and the hegemony of Western narratives regarding the hijab. By refraining from using absolute, categorical statements, the author successfully creates a safe rhetorical distance, projects intellectual honesty, and simultaneously opens up a flexible space for dialogue with the reader (dialogic space). The following is one of the data points analyzed to unravel these discursive dynamics:

"But perhaps such individuals need to resolve..." DT-02-SH-H02

In Data DT-02, the use of the epistemic adverb "perhaps" serves to soften the directive. The author refrains from making absolute judgments about what the social pressure group (SRP) should accomplish, so that the argument does not sound patronizing and the reader's attention is tactfully redirected toward alternative solutions.

"...acknowledging that veiling may reinforce..."DT-04-SH-H06

Meanwhile, in Data DT-04, the auxiliary verb "may" functions as a consensus-building tool. By stating that the wearing of the hijab "may" reinforce oppressive power structures, the author maintains her sociological objectivity. The use of "may" demonstrates the author's self-awareness in acknowledging that the social impact of the hijab is contextual and heterogeneous, rather than homogeneous or absolutely oppressive.

"I am only a woman," she seems to be saying."DT-33-SH-H52

Finally, in the DT-33 data, the epistemic verb "seems" is used to convey the author's deep appreciation for the vulnerability of women's agency, which is constrained by macrostructures. Through the use of "seems," the author refrains from taking a dogmatic stance in interpreting the voices of

female subjects, instead guiding the reader toward a tentative conclusion grounded in scientific empathy.

2.) The Use of Approximators in Modifying Degrees of Certainty

The findings from 35 Approximators indicate that Lazreg consciously employs strategies of quantification ambiguity and degree of state (non-specific quantity or degree). This use of epistemic hedging serves, pragmatically, to limit the scope of generalizations in the text that could potentially offend certain reader groups. When addressing the sensitivity of issues regarding women's individual autonomy (WIA), Approximators are used to acknowledge the diversity of subjective personal experiences among Muslim women across the globe without imposing a single, homogeneous conclusion. :

"To many in the Muslim world..." DT-01-AP-H02

In Data DT-01, the non-specific quantifier "many" was deliberately chosen to replace absolute generalizations such as the word "all." This interactional strategy preserves the author's sociological accuracy while inviting readers to explore the diversity of opinions within the Muslim community itself. .

"...some even argue that the veil..." DT-07-AP-H45

A more defensive rhetorical strategy is evident in Data DT-07, where the minimal quantifier "some" is used to limit the scope of the pro-hijab group. By narrowing the scope of that group to "some," the author subtly undermines the credibility of the dominant discourse, as if the movement did not enjoy universal support.

"...agreed at some level" DT-09-AP-H58

In the DT-09 data, the "degree modifier" "at some level" is used incisively to dissect the female subject's subconscious psychology. Rather than making a black-and-white judgment about the woman's compliance with the protective authority figure (guardian), the author chose this phrase to indicate the existence of inner compromise and complex agency negotiations behind that outward, one-sided compliance.

3.) Compound Hedges

Compound Hedges combine two or more hedging devices to create multiple academic hedges, combine several layers of mitigation at once into a single clause structure called compound hedges., express heightened skepticism, or convey profound irony.

Throughout Marnia Lazreg's book *Questioning the Veil*, 13 data points were found that operate a layered protection architecture. Three typical data points discussed are:

"...implementing what they might think is God's will..." DT01-CH-H12

In Data DT01, the combination of the modal *might* (Shield) and the mental verb *think* creates a powerful detachment strategy. The author establishes a firm critical distance from society's subjective claims regarding "God's will." This hedge protects the author's scientific objectivity from the theological bias of the subject under study.

"...although they may or may not be practicing..." DT02-CH-H25

In Data DT02, the use of the binary shield *may or may not* project a completely neutral stance from the researcher. The author refuses to make premature judgments about the subjects' religious status under the shadow of structural pressures, instead allowing the data to exist on a spectrum of honest fluidity.

"However plausible this process might seem..." DT05-CH-H54

Meanwhile, in Data DT05, the combination of *"might seem"* and *"might seem"* is used as a rhetorical concession strategy. The author intentionally gives in temporarily by acknowledging the *"plausibility"* of the opposing argument, before finally launching a more crippling academic counterattack.

4. Emotion- charged Hedges

This analysis reveals that the integration of affective elements into academic writing is not a random anomaly, but rather a deliberate rhetorical pattern adopted by Marnia Lazreg, appearing 11 times throughout *Questioning the Veil*. Three typical data points discussed are:

"It is tempting to interpret... intellectual masochism..." DT01-ECH-H7

In Data DT01, the phrases *"tempting"* and *"intellectual masochism"* are used by the

writer as indicators of an aggressive stance to criticize the boredom of Western liberal feminism theory. These emotionally charged words act as a boundary in interaction, resisting the simplification of Eastern women's reality through the biased Western conceptual lens.

"...given that the law does not codify men's attire." DT04-ECH-H63

Sociological tensions are clearly shown in Data DT04, where the use of negation phrases like *"does not codify"* highlights the structural injustice that women face. This passage makes readers feel the unfairness of the country's legal system (SRP), which is emotionally discriminatory because it strictly controls women's bodies and clothing, but has no legal rules at all for men's clothing.

"I am afraid, unwittingly that they have unwittingly linked up..." DT09-ECH-H91

Finally, in the Data DT09, the expression of academic fear *"I am afraid"* combined with the adverb *"unwittingly"* shows the researcher's reflective side. The author is not making a definite accusation or judgment, but instead sharing a deep concern about the broader impacts of the movement, which unknowingly connects with other oppressive structures. This measurable emotional loading actually builds reader trust because it shows intellectual humility.

2. DISCUSSION

After identifying the types of hedging used and their context, this section will interpret or further explain the meaning of the data mentioned. According to Hyland's theory (2005), authors use hedging not only because of doubt, but also to anticipate criticism or condemnation from readers (*"anticipating possible opposition, showing respect for alternative views, and opening a space for dialogue for readers"*). Therefore, all of Lazreg's words in the book actually question the veil is a tactic that has been used. To facilitate

understanding, this section is divided into two sub-chapters

a.) Epistemic Authority : Shields vs Personal Doubt

The use of hedging devices in this critical discourse corpus shows that academic writing is not just an empty space where facts are presented in a purely objective way. On the other hand, as outlined in Ken Hyland's interactive metadiscourse theory, the positioning of epistemic distance (stance) is very important in determining how academic authority is built within a text. In this analysis, the use of shields—such as low-probability modalities (like "may") and epistemic verbs (like "seems")—serves as a key area where epistemic authority is tested and negotiated closely in order to deal with socio-religious pressures.

The conceptualization of shields by Salager-Meyer as tools to reduce commitment to truth aligns well with how the writer positions themselves in the middle of a sensitive issue regarding the practice of wearing the hijab. When the writer chooses to avoid making absolute claims, this action is not really a sign of personal doubt or academic uncertainty about the data they have. On the other hand, using shields works as a form of intellectual honesty to deconstruct the claim of homogeneity that is often promoted by the dominant patriarchal discourse.

The author refuses to get caught in the trap of a binary opposition that categorizes the hijab in an extreme way, either as a symbol of absolute piety or as a tool of total oppression. The flexible space for dialogue created by these shields protects the author's academic position from possible counterarguments, while also showing that behind the apparent one-sided compliance of women, there is a complex inner space of compromise and agency that cannot be judged simply as good or bad. The authority here is not built through bossy claims, but through intellectual humility that acknowledges the fluid nature of the social reality of Muslim women.

b.) Rhetorical strategy in Claim Negotiation

Beyond just arranging authorities, the limiting tools in this text are deliberately manipulated as a sophisticated rhetorical strategy in claim negotiation to defend Women's Individual Autonomy against the pressures of macro-level structures. This negotiation strategy is carried

out in stages by combining Approximators, Compound Hedges, and Emotion-Charged Hedges.

By using Approximators, the author applies a non-specific quantification strategy (such as "many" or "some") to shift and reduce the legitimacy of dominant discourse in society. Macro-level generalizations often used by moral-religious institutions to control women's bodies are quietly reduced to specific claims that represent only a small part of the group, thus creating room for rhetoric that justifies women's individual agency. The complexity of this claim negotiation reaches its peak with the phenomenon of Compound Hedges, where multiple limiting tools are stacked together to create a very strong detachment strategy. By using this approach, the author intentionally steps back from dogmatic biases or community theological claims to maintain pure scientific objectivity, while also refusing to make premature moral judgments about the religious status of women who are trapped in oppressive social structures.

Finally, the most unique rhetorical contribution in this claim negotiation is shown through the use of emotion-charged hedges. Unlike traditional views that require academic writing to be completely emotionless and detached, the presence of attitude markers filled with emotion serves as a tool to build an emotional connection with the reader. The author's nervousness doesn't reduce their academic credibility; instead, it serves as a key rhetorical tool to pull readers into real sociological tensions—like when pointing out the structural gender law inequalities that tightly control women's clothing but leave men's behavior entirely without legal rules. By using this rhetorical strategy, the author effectively reduced the oppressive nature of strict religious moral institutions, while also supporting the rhetoric that gives recognition to the agency, survival tactics, and hidden autonomy that Muslim women use to navigate patriarchal public spaces.

D. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESION

A. Conclusion

- 1.) The measured rhetorical strategy in postcolonial discourse, as seen in Marnia Lazreg's book *Questioning the Veil* (2009), involves the use of limiting devices, or hedging, which does not reflect weak arguments or uncertain empirical evidence. On the other hand, this device is a carefully considered postcolonial rhetorical strategy designed to smooth out textual claims while systematically

avoiding dogmatic statements or binary oppositions.

- 2.) Based on the analysis of 100 pieces of data, the category of Shields, such as the use of modal verbs may or might, is the most common type with 41 findings. This position is followed by the Approximators category, which has 35 findings that help reduce overgeneralization in text. Lazreg uses interactive tools as a practical way to reduce social tensions between socio-religious pressures and women's individual autonomy.
- 3.) Breaking Down Without Direct Conflict: By using shields and compound hedges, the author successfully exposed patriarchal coercion and structural co-optation of women's bodies. This strategy can weaken the dominance without launching risky frontal attacks that might push readers away from the core teachings of the religion itself. Western Orientalism stereotypes are rejected by using approximators for quantities and frequencies, allowing the author to accurately map the fluidity of female agency. This also serves as a key tool in rejecting the monolithic stereotypes that are often emphasized by Western Orientalism.
- 4.) Academic stance setting is viewed through the lens of metadiscourse by Ken Hyland (2005), and this mechanism dynamically regulates the writer's stance. Using low-powered modal verbs and introspective expressions helps create an academic, objective, and humble intellectual persona, which reduces the reader's defensive resistance.
- 5.) At the same time, this restriction activates the Engagement dimension of readers. By using inclusive pronouns and rhetorical questions, this strategy turns stiff scientific text into an open space for dialogue.
- 6.) The interactive network created through this hedging eventually pushes readers—whether from conservative or Western backgrounds—to uncover their own biases and assumptions, and with empathy, recognize the complex psychological maze that Muslim women must navigate.

B. Suggestion

- 1.) Future researchers are encouraged to broaden their material focus by studying other works of postcolonial feminist literature, such as writings by Fatima Mernissi or Nawal El Saadawi, in order to test the consistency of this linguistic hedging strategy.
- 2.) Using a combination of methods (mixed methods) supported by corpus linguistic software (such as AntConc) is strongly recommended for analyzing larger and more extensive data sets.
- 3.) 3.Comparative Study Across Text Genres: Future research could conduct a comparative study to compare the function of hedging between creative nonfiction texts and formal, rigid institutional texts that both deal with gender issues.

DEDICATION SHEETS

This thesis is lovingly dedicated to my beloved parents, whose steadfast prayers have never failed me. To my lectures and supervisors, whose guidance and wisdom have illuminated this journey. To my boyfriend, whose always motivates and accompanies in every process. to myself—for choosing to keep growing, even in barren soil.

Everything I am, I owe to you.

REFERENSI

- Azizah, D. (2021). Hedges function in masculine and feminine feature's language: A pragmatics analysis. *Journal of Pragmatics Research*, 3(1), 59-69. <https://doi.org/10.18326/jopr.v3i1.59-69>
- Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document analysis as a qualitative research method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, 9(2), 27-40. <https://doi.org/10.3316/QRJ0902027>
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (1987). *Politeness: Some universals in language usage*. Cambridge University Press.
- Depraetere, I., & Kaltenböck, G. (2023). Hedged performatives in spoken American English: A discourse-oriented analysis. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 51(3), 207-235. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00754242231173419>
- Fraser, B. (2010). Pragmatic competence: The case of

- hedging. In G. Kaltenböck, W. Mihatsch, & S. Schneider (Eds.), *New approaches to hedging* (pp. 15-34). Emerald Group Publishing.
- Grice, H. P. (1975). Logic and conversation. In P. Cole & J. L. Morgan (Eds.), *Syntax and semantics 3: Speech acts* (pp. 41-58). Academic Press.
- Hyland, K. (1996). Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(4), 433-454.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/17.4.433>
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hyland, K. (2005). Stance and engagement: A model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445605050365>
- Lakoff, G. (1973). Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2(4), 458-508.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00262952>
- Lazreg, M. (2009). *Questioning the veil: Open letters to Muslim women*. Princeton University Press.
- Martin, P. (2003). The pragmatic rhetorical strategy of hedging in academic writing. *Revista Canaria de Estudios Ingleses*, (47), 47-56.
- Miles, M. B., Huberman, A. M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook* (3rd ed.). SAGE Publications.
- Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 1-35.
- Noor, M. M., Tarmizi, M. L. M., Suppiah, P. C., & Nair, S. S. K. S. (2023). Managing crises: Hedging strategies in Malaysian diplomatic press releases. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 29(4), 84-98. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2023-2904-06>
- Rabab'ah, G., & Abu Rumman, R. (2015). Hedging in political discourse: Evidence from the speeches of King Abdullah II of Jordan. *Prague Journal of English Studies*, 4(1), 157-185.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/pjes-2015-0009>
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(2), 149-171.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(94\)90013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(94)90013-2)
- Thomas, J. (1995). *Meaning in interaction: An introduction to pragmatics*. Longman.
- Varttala, T. (2001). *Hedging in scientifically oriented discourse: Exploring variation according to discipline and intended audience* (Acta Electronica Universitatis Tamperensis 138). Tampere University Press.
- Yule, G. (1996). *Pragmatics*. Oxford University Press