

AN EXPLORATION OF MODALITY AND HEDGING IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE: FOCUSING ON A KURDISH UNIVERSITY CONTEXT

Talib M. Omer

Assistant Lecturer, Erbil Polytechnic University-Soran Technical Institute, Department of Business Administration, Soran University, Faculty of Arts, Department of English Language, Soran, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

ABSTRACT: *Over the decades, Hedging and Modality have been discussed by linguists and researchers as a basic concept in English for academic purposes. There have been many studies conducted, of which purpose is to discuss hedging and modality as they are used in foreign contexts. Few of them have been conducted so as to understand their roles, functions and forms as they apply to academic writings in the Kurdish universities' English context. This study investigates the importance of using hedging and modality in academic discourse. It also explores how modality and hedging have been taught, and to what extent students are aware of the appropriate use of hedging and modality in their writing. With regards to data analysis and collection, the qualitative method was used for creating the research paradigm. The results from literature review and data analysis show that Kurdish students are not conscious of the use of hedging and modality as it is significant for L2 learners. The findings also revealed that students were taught modal auxiliary verbs and adverbs explicitly. This paper suggests that teaching hedging and modality by using inductive examples, and by focusing on forms and functions will help Kurdish learners to distinguish themselves by using more boosters and tentative language in their academic discourse.*

KEYWORDS: modality in academic discourse, forms and functions of modality, types of hedging, hedging as a grammatical communicative concept.

INTRODUCTION

Over the past decades, researchers and linguists have argued that hedging is a basic concept in English for academic purposes (EAP). Hedges can be important for second language (L2) students, because they help them to be conscious about the politeness and truthfulness of statements. Hyland argues that ‘hedging is the expression of tentative and possibility and it is central in academic writing where the need to present unproven proposition with caution and precision is essential’ (Hyland, 1996, p.433). Although hedges and modality are vital for academic discourse, they create a number of problems for university L2 learners because hedges have different types and forms as well as functions.

According to Salager-Meyer's (1994) study, the most frequent hedges that have been used in text types are *modal auxiliaries, quantifiers, frequent adverbs* and *compound hedges*. These types of hedges cover roughly 91% of total hedges. They can be taught through discourse grammar inductively and deductively.

In the Kurdistan university context, grammar teaching has been focused on specific forms of modal auxiliaries and frequency adverbs. The forms are taught explicitly and the functions and importance of other different kinds of hedges are often ignored by the curriculum and policy

of the ministry of higher education. Therefore, the vast majority – if not all – of L2 students who graduate and study abroad have major problems in conveying their ideas in writing academic texts.

This paper argues that teaching the most prevalent hedges and modality by focusing on forms and functions are crucial for Kurdish adult L2 learners at university level. The aim is to investigate the different types and functions of hedges and modality that are most significant for advanced Kurdish students, in order to enable them to distance themselves by using more boosters and tentative language in their academic writings. The results from the literature review and data analysis shows that a wide range of second language learners are unaware of using hedging accurately, but they have restricted knowledge of modality. The sections comprise of a literature review, concerning different theories and research on the importance of hedging and modality in academic discourse. This is followed by a section regarding the method including findings and discussions. Finally, the conclusion summarizes the main points.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Academic discourse and EAP

Over the last century, academic discourse has developed as a particular type of longer written text, and it has drawn the attention of many second language (L2) learners within the university context. However, the vast majority of learners in foreign countries may lack the skills for writing academic texts. English for academic purposes (EAP) refers to skills that are needed to study in formal academic organizations, while discourse has many definitions in English language use for academic purposes. Linguistically, discourse refers to different types of choice in written or spoken grammar. Discourse grammar refers to regularities and patterns of language “beyond the sentence”, and it can be coherent or somewhat vague (Thornbury, 2006; Hughes & McCarthy, 1998). This kind of grammar in academic discourse may help L2 learners to understand the arguments and express their feelings to a certain degree, so as to persuade readers to follow their statements.

Discourse grammar could be taught through inductive and deductive approaches. An inductive approach allows students to realize the rules of grammar from examples before practising, while the deductive approach presents rules and then learners apply these rules in practice activities. These methods work well in teaching and learning hedges in high academic educational institutions (Celce-Murica & Olshtain, 2000; Flowerdew, 2013; Thornbury, 2006); thus, academic writing is desirable and valuable for L2 learners. However, academic discourse is not straightforward for some students because of length and complexity. Research conducted by Hinkel shows that academic writing has become a major challenge for students at tertiary level. He argues that “the academic writing of even highly advanced and trained NNS (non-native speakers) students continues to exhibit numerous problems and shortfalls” (Hinkel, 2004, p.4).

Indeed, one of the major issues of EAP might be how students can communicate successfully in writing academic texts and also expressing the degree of certainty in appropriate ways. Furthermore, Jordan (1997) indicates that the focus on academic writing has shifted from sentence level to discourse communication. Learners need to know the characteristics of

academic writing, such as genre, and the level of formality and how to use actual grammatical items, for example when to use vague language, boosting, hedging and modality.

What is modality in academic discourse?

One of the aspects of teaching discourse in academic writing is called modality. The term modal or modality is considered a fundamental area of grammar. Modality has been discussed repeatedly by grammarians in applied linguistics. Generally, it is concerned with the degree of confidence of writers' opinions and attitudes toward a judgement of a proposition of a particular truth in a particular situation (Carter, *et al.* 2001; Vazquez&Giner,2008; Thornbury&Slade, 2006; Parrott,2000). Paul defines modality as "refer[ring] broadly to a speaker's attitude towards opinion or about the truth of a proposition expressed by a sentence towards the situation or event" (Paul, 1990,p.65).Mukundan(2011) asserts that modality is something regarding writers' opinion and attitude, a kind of attitude with a lack of vagueness or similar. It is obvious that modality is not a trivial element in English language teaching; rather, it is significant and has many forms and functions in either spoken or written academic texts.

The complexity of items of modality in the field of grammar in academic discourse may create a barrier to non-native speakers in using modals in an effective way. This is supported by Mukundan (2011). She stresses that a large proportion of Malaysian students have difficulty in using modal auxiliaries in academic writing. The reason could be semantic functions and various forms of modality. Take "could" as an example; it may be used to indicate an ability in the past and a hypothetical idea in the future. An example of an ability in the past is: "when I was a child, I *could* read by the time I was four"; and a hypothetical idea: "when you visit London, you *could* visit us, if you want to". In similar research conducted in India by Bose (2005, cited in Mukundan, 2011, p. 82), the students' problems with modal auxiliaries are related to the way that they are introduced to learners. He confirms that modal items are significant and need to be taught in a way that will enable students to use them correctly (Mukundan,2011). It is essential how presenting modal auxiliaries and focusing on forms and functions deductively and inductively may significantly help L2 learners.

Types of modality: Forms and functions of modal auxiliaries

As mentioned above, modality can take various forms in academic texts. Thornbury and Slade (2006) and Jordan (1990) have categorized different forms of modality; for example, modal verbs, such as "must" and "may", marginals like "need to" and semi-modals like "have to". They also mention the scale of lexical words – for example, noun, adjective, adverb, verb and quantity. Modals can also take other names and they can act differently; for example, epistemic and deontic modality. The former refers to writers' confidence (booster) or lack of confidence in the truth of the proposition (Paul, 1990;Bailey, 2006). However, deontic is concerned with the system of extending permissions via commitments. Besides obligation, the latter is expressed respectfully. Modal verbs might function like hedges in academic circumstances (Vazquez &Giner, 2008).

However, modal auxiliaries can sometimes be problematic for L2 learners in academic writing. In this case, learners need to know how to use forms and functions in a self-correcting way. The main forms of modal auxiliaries are "can", "could", "may", "would" and "might". Each of these forms has a variety of functions and meanings such as ability, reassurance, requesting,

probability and controlling (Parrott, 2000,;Carter,*et al.*, 2000). The table below illustrates examples of forms and functions in the use of modal verbs.

Table 1 Examples of forms and functions of modal verbs

Modal verb	Modality	Percentages	Examples
might	Probability	40%	You might win the game.
must	Controlling	98%	Water must be boiled before drinking.
would	Offering	75%	Would you like to close the door?
will	Reassurance	100%	They will be studying the English course by 2018.

It is evident that modality is to be used carefully in academic communication because it has similar meanings and functions.

Hedging as a grammatical communicative concept

As the example above elucidates, modal verbs might overlap with hedges in academic prose. Hyland (1994) argues that hedges are concerned with cognitive processes. He terms “hedges [as] devices like ‘*possible*’, ‘*might*’, ‘*perhaps*’ that indicate the writer’s decision to withhold a complete commitment to a proposition, allowing information to be presented as an opinion rather than accredited fact” (Hyland, 2005, p. 178). This means that academic writers need to be aware about their utterances, because such statements might be evaluated through different angles depending on different disciplinary expectations. Many linguists have defined hedges as grammatical devices that could be used to avoid involving absolute statements. The term hedge was first identified by Georg Lakoff in 1973. He used this term to apply to words that could make things vague or less fuzzy. It is sometimes called minimizing (Jordan, 1997; Hinkel, 2004; Hyland, 1994). Clearly, hedges are expressions of tentative language in academic writing. Hedges can also play a very significant role in providing another opportunity for other academics to dispute ideas differently and respectfully.

The work of Hinkel(2004) indicates that hedges are potentially important for displaying politeness in academic writing. This means that the opinions of writers towards readers could be conveyed indirectly. Hyland supports this view, and he states that hedging in the world of academia is crucial for maintaining the relationship between writers and readers. He argues that “[in] persuasive writing, hedges are an important means of both supporting writers’ positions and building the writer-reader relationship” (Hyland, 1994,p. 241).

However, research has found that most foreign learners, when they come to study abroad (e.g. in the UK), have a major problem in expressing their opinions. In other words, when they make a claim, they are very strong in expressing it – and this leaves no room for argument. For instance, Hinkel argues that “L2 academic text frequently contains overstatements, exaggerations, and forceful persuasion” (Hinkel, 2004,p.314). There are numerous reasons that L2 learners use overstatements, one being that students lack awareness of using hedges because they have not been taught them in their academic contexts. Studies have shown that in some areas, for example India, Malaysia and Kurdistan, little attention has been given to the importance of learning and teaching hedges in academic disciplines. Hinkel acknowledges that “NNS writers have a restricted lexical repertoire that often leads to a shortage of hedging devices employed in L2 writing text” (ibid.). In this case, it could be suggested that L2

academic writers should be assisted by provision of some academic activities and texts in order to make them conscious of how they can use a number of hedges in sentences logically and coherently. Thus, it is clear that being taught hedges could assist L2 learners to overcome some challenges in academic disciplines.

According to Hyland (1994 and 1996), hedges are used in all academic disciplines; for example, engineering, medicine and economics. Researchers assert that it is necessary to teach hedges seriously and systematically. However, it is not clear which types of hedging should be taught in medicine and engineering specifically. It seems difficult in some circumstances to hedge, because something might be real and it might have concrete evidence to prove that the claims are true. Recent research by Crompton has found that different hedges might be used in different fields, but at a different rate. He states “if you hedge, you try to avoid yourself in the answering of the question” (Crompton, 1997, p.271). This means that it is perhaps not possible to use hedging in every situation. For example, some scholars such as Bolsky (1988, cited in Vazquez and Giner, 2008, p.178) claim that academic writers could be more objective in order to provide the most accurate knowledge. From this point of view, hedges are expected not to be used in academic writing or when teaching grammar. Although it is hardly the case that this is accepted as absolute truth as hedges are vital and common in some disciplines, for example, in applied linguistics (Vazquez & Giner, 2008; Hyland & Milton 1997; Abdul Majeed, 2010). Despite the prevalence and importance of hedges in academic discourse, not much attention is given to distinguish between the different types and functions of hedges. For example, in the Asia and more specifically in the Kurdish context, not all students are familiar with the functions of hedging and modality.

Types of hedge

Salager-Meyer (1994) divided the taxonomy of hedges into five categories. He observed in his study that “shields” and “compound hedges” are the most repeated in hedging devices. In a similar way, Hinkel (2004) notes that the most useful hedges for advanced L2 learners are two common types such as “approximators” like “frequency”, e.g. “often”. The second one consists of the “quantifiers” such as “some” and “most”. The basis behind this reasoning is that this kind is not syntactically difficult. Furthermore, Hinkel suggests that teaching the meanings and functions of modal verbs like “may”, “can” and “seem” are potentially useful for L2 learners (Hinkel, 2004; Carter, *et al.* 2000, 2001; Thornbury, 1999; Borg & Burns, 2008). Table 2 below illustrates the classifications of hedges.

Table 2 Classifications of hedges according to Meyer (cited in Jordon 1997)

<i>Shield(modal verbs, lexical verbs, adverbs, nouns)</i>	e.g. all modal verbs expressing possibility: semi-auxiliaries like “to appear”; probability adverbs like “probably”; nouns like “certainty” or “possibility”.
<i>Approximators of degree, frequency, quantity</i>	e.g. "some", degree, “approximately”, “often”, “always”. "occasionally", "roughly", "generally".
<i>Expressions</i>	e.g. “I believe, to our knowledge.”
<i>Emotionally-charged intensifiers/ Boosting</i>	e.g. “extremely” interesting”, “unexpectedly”, “particularly encouraging” ; nouns like “certainty” or “possibility”; adjectives like “essential” "clearly",
<i>Compound hedges</i>	e.g. the juxtaposition of several hedges: “I may suggest that...”, “it seems reasonable to assume”, etc.

Meyer (1994,cited in Jordan,1997, p. 241) advocates that activities and exercises for L2 learners could be beneficial for students to increase their consciousness in using different strategies of hedges in academic writing.

METHOD

After reviewing the literature on hedging and modality in academic discourse, the data was collected in 2 weeks by distributing questionnaire to advanced Kurdish students regardless of their gender. The survey was mainly to investigate in 20 students' academic texts in advanced level in English departments by focusing on using lexical verbs, modal auxiliary verbs, adverbs, expressions, boosting and compound hedging in their writings. The researcher ensured that all participants had information about this study and agreed formally to participate by signing a consent form. Moreover, the researcher secured and saved the research ethics principles. This research focused on the key questions. The questions were about, to what extent are the advanced Kurdish students aware of using modality and hedging in academic discourse and how they were taught modality and hedging in their discipline? The data analysis of the qualitative method was carried out from this research study by researcher who conducted the evaluation texts. It was based on a number of students' text and activities allowing them to examine student's knowledge on using hedging and modality. The participants' extracted language from the students' piece of writing and used it to provide supportive evidence to the research paper.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

Findings

Generally, results from the data analysis of students' written discourse revealed that most Kurdish second language learners are not aware of using hedging and modality appropriately. However, the data shows that furthest advanced Kurdish learners have limited knowledge of modal auxiliary verbs as they were taught explicitly. All of the essays that were provided to modal auxiliary verbs such as, will, may, might, can, and adverbs like probably and possibly, occurred more frequently in students' pieces but it was hardly seen in lexical verbs and compound hedges. The results from the data collection demonstrates that most students, if not lack knowledge of hedging in academic discourses as their claims were overstatements.

Discussions

It is apparent that students in foreign context were taught adverbs of frequency because these words seemed to be grammatically simple and students could use them in their daily life conversations. They were also taught some types of modal auxiliaries explicitly, but they were never taught hedges and their functions.

L2 learners such as Kurdish university students often use modal auxiliaries in their texts. For example, one of the participants states "a teacher will not always be around when students will use languages" (Participant 1). It is clear that L2 students have restricted lexical items of accessible hedging; therefore, when it comes to writing academic essays, these types of

repetition can be easily noticed – which is often considered to be unnecessary in academic discourse. Research by Hinkel (2004) shows that teaching various lexical hedges such as “tend to” or “apparently” not only increases the students’ knowledge, but also helps them to know how to use them in an appropriate way, because lexical hedges have similar forms and functions as modality.

Having functions separated from forms could be extremely crucial for students because they would become aware of how to use them. For example, boosters like obviously or clearly (see Appendix1, Activity 2). However, it may be important for academics to express their statements confidently. As Hyland in his recent work shows that “Boosters can therefore help writers to present their work with assurance while effecting interpersonal solidarity” (Hyland, 2005, p.179). It seems that boosters and hedges embody academics’ opinions of particular arguments.

Using hedges and modality in academic discourse is vital for Kurdish university students because they help them not only to make claims that are proportionate to the evidence, but also to write their assignments effectively and accurately. Research conducted by Crompton (1997) discovered that the use of hedges as a politeness strategy is related to the features of academic discourse; for example, impersonal constructions and lexical verbs. It is obvious that hedges aid learners to facilitate discussions and also protect themselves against unpleasant claims. As there is a large number of hedging words and phrases, it is significant to select the most essential types of hedges for L2 learners which could be modal lexical verbs, adverbs, adjectives and compound hedges, but not the modal auxiliary. With the exception of “always” and “never”, frequency is concerned with the adverbs that are frequent and when used, demonstrated degrees of uncertainty such as “sometimes”. The second hedge type is quantity. This kind of hedging is considered to be a determiner of nouns or adjectives, for example, “little”, “some” and “few” (Hiller, 2004).

It is evident that if Kurdish teachers teach modal verbs after frequency and quantity, by focusing on both forms and functions inductively, students are helped to understand hedges appropriately. As Borg and Burns(2008) mentioned earlier, it is reasonable to present grammar through discourse texts, followed by practising and placing it in a meaningful context (see Appendix 2, Activity 1). Similarly, as Parrott (2000), Scrivener(2001) and Carter *et al.* (2000) have highlighted, hedges are various and complex in terms of functions. University tutors should pay attention not only to forms of syntax, but also to the functions of the modal auxiliaries. Teaching hedges, such as approximators of degree, and lexical modal verbs, as well as boosters are useful for a high level of advanced learners. In other words, presenting these types of hedges through discourse grammar inductively must be the most effective way; for instance, teachers can provide texts that contain hedges for students to find out the forms and functions of each word in its context (see Appendix 1, Activities 1, 2). However, teachers should be confident and knowledgeable in order to interpret texts clearly. Using a deductive approach can be effective for adverbs of frequency. The teacher should present the grammar point at the beginning of the lecture and then explain it to students explicitly, which would then be followed by practice activities– for example, sentence level forms – because these help teachers and learners to practise independently. These two approaches work well for helping students to understand hedging and modality in Kurdish academic institutes.

CONCLUSION

Learning and teaching hedges and modality for academic writing through discourse grammar is fundamentally important for L2 advanced Kurdish learners. Hedges are prevalent in academic discourse. Teaching hedges and modality through discourse grammar inductively can help students to explore their forms and meanings and also to write academic articles effectively. Most L2 learners use overstatements and exaggerations without being aware of them. Findings show that many L2 learners at a high level lack knowledge to use hedges in a suitable way. The results from a literature review in this paper reveal that there are different types of hedges and modality. The most commonly used hedges among L2 learners are modal auxiliary verbs and students in foreign context were taught adverbs of frequency. Results from the literature review showed that teaching hedges such as lexical modal verbs at discourse level is central for L2 learners. The aim of this paper is to investigate the importance of using and learning hedges in academic discourse for advanced Kurdish learners. It also explored how advanced learners would learn and how their opinions could be presented by using hedges in their written discourses in appropriate ways. This paper recommends that modal lexical verbs, adverbs, and auxiliary verbs as well as boosting should be paid more attention regarding their functions and forms. These could be taught to first year university students via teaching grammar in context, inductively and deductively. Owing to the limitations of this paper, further research needs to be done into the role of modality and hedging in academic discourse within the Kurdish university context, in order to improve students' ability to use hedges in academic texts effectively.

REFERENCES

- Abdul Majeed,R.(2010) Analysis of Grammatical Forms and Semantic Functions of Hedging in Political Discourse: American President Debate. *College of Education For Women*21(3): pp.751-770.
- Bailey, S. (2006) *Academic Writing: A Handbook for International Students*. London: Routledge.
- Borg,S., and Burns, A. (2008) Discourse in English Language Education Integrating Grammar in Adult TESOL Classrooms.*Applied Linguistics*29(3): pp. 456-482.
- Carter, R.,Goddard, A., Reah,D., Sanger,K., and Bowring, M. (2001) *Working With Texts*. London: Routledge.
- Carter, R., Hughes,R. and McCarthy, M. (2000) *Exploring Grammar in Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murica, M., and Olshtain, E. (2000) *Discourse and Context in Language Teaching: A Guide for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crompton, P. (1997) Hedging in Academic Writing: Some Theoretical problems. *English for specific purposes*.16(4): pp.221-287.
- Flowerdew, J. (2013) *Discourse In English Language Education*. London: Routledge.
- Hinkel, E. (2004) *Teaching Academic Vocabulary ESL Writing: Practical Techniques in Vocabulary and Grammar*. London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Hughes, R. and McCarthy, M. (1998) From Sentence to Discourse: Discourse Grammar and English Language Teaching. *Journal TESOL Quarterly* 32(2):PP. 263-287.
- Hyland, K. (2005) Stance and Engagement: A Model of Interaction in Academic Discourse.*Journal of Discourse Studies* 7(2): pp.173-192.
- Hyland,K. (1996) Writing Without Conviction? Hedging in Science Research Articles.*Journal for Applied Linguistics* 17(4): pp. 434-453.

- Hyland, K. (1994) Hedging in Academic Writing and EAP Textbooks. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes* 13(3): pp.339-256.
- Hyland, K. and Milton, J. (1997) Qualification and Certainty in L1 and L2 Students' Writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 6(2): pp. 183-205.
- Hillier, H. (2004) *Analysing Real Texts: Research studies in Modern English Language*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jordan, R. (1997) *English for Academic Purposes: A Guide and Resource Book for Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lakoff, G. (1973) *Adverbs and Modal Operators*. Indiana: Indiana University Press.
- Mukundan, J. (2011) Modal Auxiliary Verbs in Prescribed Malaysian English Textbooks. *English Language Teaching* 4(1): pp. 79-89.
- Parrott, M. (2000) *Grammar for English Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Paul, S. (1990) *The Writing Scholar Studies in Academic Discourse*. London: Routledge.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1994) Hedges and Textual Communication Function in Medical English Discourse. *Journal of English for Specific Purposes* 13(2): pp. 149-171.
- Scrivener, J. (2010) *Teaching English Grammar: What to Teach and How to Teach it*. Oxford, Macmillan Accuracy in Writing [online], available at: <http://www.baleap.org.uk/baleap/conference-events/pims/pim-reports/accuracy-> [Accessed 11 March 2016]
- Thornbury, S. (2006) *An A-Z of ELT: A Dictionary of Terms and Concepts*. Macmillan: Macmillan Education.
- Thornbury, S. (1999) *How to Teach Grammar*. Harlow: Pearson Education.
- Thornbury, S., and Slade, D. (2006) *Conversation From Description to Pedagogy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Vazquez, I. and Giner, D. (2008) Beyond Mood and Modality: Epistemic Modality Markers as Hedges in Research Article. A Cross-Disciplinary Study. *Journal for Revista Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses* 21 (2008): PP. 171-190.

APPENDIX 1

Activity 1

While the data in Figure 1, **suggest** that tertiary students **tend** not to speak English very frequently outside class, there are **apparently** several situations where spoken English has **some** degree of importance in the subjects' lives. As might be expected, the situation where the subjects need to speak the language most is on overseas holidays. As Cantonese is not **widely** spoken outside China, it is perhaps understandable that students need to communicate in English on trips to Europe, North America and other parts of Asia.

Adapted from{<http://www2.elc.polyu.edu.hk/CILL/eap/hedging.htm>}

Activity 2

Mode for assurance, possibility, modal verbs and adverbs

- (1) Clearly, for every sick patient with heart or lung disease, the doctors *will* use organs to help humans. The organs *will* be used as a bridge until doctors *can* find another human organ. The doctors and the surgeons *must* practise their skills on animals before they do any surgery on a human(Hinkel,2004: 321)

Activity3

(1)Ecological studies *may* give an answer to environmental problems in many countries(Hinkel,2004: 321)

(2)Statistics is *perhaps* the newest science of mathematics. In our society, it is *probably* used everywhere in *many* places for *many* purposes (Hinkel,2004: 321)

APPENDIX 2

Activity 1

Guessing jobs

Find some good large pictures of people who clearly have specific jobs, especially pictures where there are a number of tools or typical items (e.g. doctors).Cut picture into a number of pieces, like a jigsaw so that the items are separate. Tell the class that you will show them a part of the picture and they must guess what job the person does. Show a piece that does not immediately identify the specific job with certainty (e.g. a book). Collect students' guesses. Go on to show more pieces one by one until someone feels sure that they are certain what the job is and can say a *must* be sentence (*She must be a doctor*). This person should be able to state their logical reasons (*She has a doctor's bag. She has lots of medicine*) (Scrivener,2010).

Activity 2

Crime scene

The door is locked. There is a fireplace and chimney. Students must discuss and draw logical conclusions about what the crime might be and how it could have been done (*He can't have come through the door. He must have climbed down the chimney*) (Scrivener, 2010).