HEDGES USED BY THE WRITERS IN READERS' LETTER OF THE JAKARTA POST

JOURNAL ARTICLE

**Submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Degree of *Sarjana Sastra (S.S)*
in English Language Specialized in Linguistics**

BY:

**WIKEN GLADYSIA
(C11.2009.01057)**

**ENGLISH DEPARTMENT
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
DIAN NUSWANTORO UNIVERSITY
SEMARANG
2014**

HEDGES USED BY THE WRITERS IN READERS' LETTER OF THE JAKARTA POST

Wiken Gladysia
English Department, Dian Nuswantoro University

ABSTRACT

This thesis entitled *Hedges Used By The Writers in the Readers' Letters of the Jakarta Post*. This research has two objectives of the study. The first is to find out the taxonomy of hedges used by the writers in the readers' letter of the Jakarta Post. The second is to find out the reasons for hedging used by the writers in the readers' letter of the Jakarta Post.

This research employs a qualitative research design. It describes the types of hedges in the writers found in the Readers' Letter of The Jakarta Post on July 3 and 6, 2013 Edition. The unit of the analysis of this research is hedges produced by the writers in Readers' Letter which were taken from The Jakarta Post on July 3 and 6, 2013 Editon.

The findings show that Nicholas Herriman made the highest number in producing hedges in his writing with 48.97% or equal to 24 hedges. Then, it is followed by Sonita Lontoh with 18.36% or 9 hedges. Meanwhile, both Iaon Voicu and Sun Xi's have a similar place with 16.32% or 8 hedges for each. Based on the finding, it can be said that the writers named Sun Xi and Nicholas Herriman has more uncertainty in writing their comment dealing with the topic of the discussion of the newspaper. They tend to use some hedges to express their messeges. In addition, their cultural background also influence to the way they write. The writers named Sun Xi and Nicholas Herriman tend to be more careful in writing because they consider some words which might hurt the reader's feeling when they read the letter's comments. Meanwhile, the writers named Sonita Lontoh and Ioan Voicu tend to be less careful so they write with their own ways and they always use their own language that is English both spoken and written. So, it can be said that the writers named Sonita Lontoh and Ioan Voicu can use English without any hesitation.

Keyword: Hedges, Newspaper, Readers' Letters

Human is said to be a social creature if she/he is able to interact with others. In interaction human requires a device called a language to convey their intentions and goals. Language is very important in communication because with it human could convey their intention and goal to another easily and become more understandable. Communication is the exchange and flow of information and idea from one person to another. Wardhaugh (1992:15) states that "communication is a social activity which requires coordinated efforts of two or more individuals". Communication deals with social activity which involves more than one person. It usually occurs between the speaker and the hearer (receiver)". People cannot communicate without any tool of communication. They need language to

communicate with others. It is important because without it they will have difficulties in transferring information to the others. Generally language is divided into two main parts: written language and spoken language. Written language is as important as spoken language. It is the language used in all written form of communication.

Communication is a process that allows organism to exchange several methods. Communication can be done in oral or written form. Basically, all people need to have communication to each other to convey what they want to achieve, whether in informal or formal situations. Communication among people are possible because such knowledge is shared with others, although how it is shared (or even how it is acquired) is not well understood. When one speak, he must constantly make choices of many different kinds : what he wants to say, how he wants to say it, and the specific sentence types, words, and sounds that best unite the what and the how. Fiske (1990:1) said that communication is one of those human activities that everyone recognizes but few can define satisfactorily. Communication as a social interaction through messages in its own way.

It is known that communication does not only happen in individuals but also in organization. It can be seen that most organizations communicate to one another in order to achieve the goals. These goals can be achieved successfully from how good the communication has been done, because by doing good communication the organization will develop well in its interaction. Gumperz in Wardhaugh (1992:15), stated the definition of communication as follows:

Communication is a social activity which requires coordinated efforts of two or more individuals. Communication deals with social activity which involves more than one person. It usually occurs between the speaker and the hearer (receiver).

In communicating with others, people usually use language as a means of communication; whether it is a spoken language, written language or sign language. Through the use of language, interaction or communication between people becomes easier. It gives greater benefit when they interact by using the same language. Based on the Webster's New College Dictionary (1981:641), the definition of language is a systematic means of communicating ideas or feeling by the use of conventionalized signs, sounds, gesture, or marks having understood meanings. Another definition of language is stated by Hornby (1995:662), who defines language as the system of sounds and words used by human to express their thought and feelings. From those two definitions, the key word of language function is to express thought and feelings. In conducting this communication, people need strategies when they are communicating. One of the strategies is by using Face Saving Act Strategy or in other words, avoids Face Threatening Acts. In this situation, hedges are often used. (Hayland, 2000), Collins's opinion quoted by Markkanen (2000:1) explains: If you hedge against something unpleasant or unwanted that might affect you, you do something which will protect you from it. If you hedge or hedge a problem or question you avoid answering the question or committing yourself to a particular action or decision.

The use of hedges in the readers' letters will make the sentences understandable and it will make help the writers write their letter politely. That is

the reason why, the researcher are interested in analyzing hedges used by the writer because the researcher wants to know the use of hedges used by the writers' writings in the Readers' Letter of the Jakarta Post. Based on the reasons above, the research problems can be stated as follows: The statement of the problem in this research can be stated as follows: the first is what are the taxonomies of hedges used by the Writers in the Readers' Letter? And the second is What are the reasons of using those hedges?

Development of the Term Hedges

The study of hedges is well linked to pragmatics which Spencer-Otey and Zegarac (2002) define as the study of relationship between language forms, messages and language users. The use of hedge as a linguistic term goes back at least to the early 1970s, when G. Lakoff published his article entitled Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts. At that time, Lakoff was not interested in the communicative value of the use of hedges but was concern with the logical properties of words and phrases like rather, largely, in a manner of speaking, very, in their ability to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy (Lakoff, 1972:195).

Markkanen and Schröder (200:2-3) explained that the term of hedge has moved far from its origins, particularly since it has been adopted by pragmatists and discourse analysts. The term is no longer used only for expressions that modify the category membership of a predicate or a noun phrase. They then explained that in accordance with Lakkoff's main concern, however, the term later been defined, for example by Brown and Levinson as a particle, word or phrase that modifies the degree of membership that is partial or true only in certain respects, or that it is more true and complete than perhaps might be expected. They also quoted Vande Kople's view of hedges that considers the use of hedges as showing a lack of full commitment to the propositional content of an utterance. In other words, hedges (e.g. perhaps, seem, might, to certain extent) are by him seen as modifying the truth-value of the whole proposition, not as making individual inside it more imprecise.

Furthest away from the original concept of hedge are those approaches in which hedges are treated as realizations of an interactional/communicative strategy called hedging. Thus, Markkanen/Schröder (1989; 1992), who discuss the role of hedges in scientific texts, see them as modifiers of the writer's responsibility for the truth value of the propositions expressed or as modifiers of the weightiness of the information given, or the attitude of the writer to the information. According to them, hedges can even be used to hide the writer's attitude. Markkanen and Schröder also suggest that hedges offer a possibility for textual manipulation in the sense that the reader is left in the dark as to who is reponsible for the truth value of what is being expressed (Markkanen and Schröder, 2000:4).

As to the motivation for the use of hedges, a lot of the discussion has concentrated on their use in spoken discourse, and the most frequently mentioned motivating factor is politeness, as defined by Brown/Levinson (1987). In their view, hedges are mainly used for negative politeness in face-saving, in which they are put to elaborate use. In positive politeness they figure only in expressions of extremes, like marvellous and appalling, which are typical of this form of politeness, 'safely vague' because they leave it to the addressee to figure out how to interpret them.

Hedges can also be considered as the interactive elements which serve as a bridge between propositional information in the test and the writer's factual interpretation. As Skleton remarks, hedges can be viewed as part of the larger phenomenon called commentative potentials of any language.

Research on LSP (Language for Specific Purposes) has repeatedly shown that hedges are crucial in academic discourse because they are central rhetorical means of gaining communal adherence to knowledge claims. Indeed, scientific "truth" is as much the product of social as that of an intellectual activity, and the need to convince one's fellow scientific of the facticity of the experimental results explains the widespread use of hedges in this type of discourse. Hyland (1994), for example, asserts that hedging exhibits a level of frequency much higher than many other linguistic features which have received considerably more attention. Skelton (1988) argues that epistemic comments are equally common in the arts and sciences, occuring overall in between one third and one half of all sentences. Along the same lines,Gosden (1990) reports that writer's perception of uncertainty realized through modality markers constitutes 7.6% of grammatical subjects in scientific research papers. More specifically, modals appear to be the typical means of marking epictemic comment in research papers: Adams Smith (1984) found that they make up 54% all of the forms used to denote epistemic modality; Butler (1990) states that they account for approximately I word in every 100 in scientific articles; Hanania and Akhtar (1984) report that they make up 8.1% all af finite verbs (can and may being the most frequent); finally, modals were also found to constitute 27% of all lexical hedging devices in Hyland's (1994) corpus of biology articles.

Taxonomy of Hedges

Although not totally comprehensive nor categorically watertight, the scheme below represents the most widely used hedging categories, at least in scientific English. Typically, hedging is expressed through the use of the following "strategic stereotypes" (Salager-Meyer, 1997: 109-110) :

1. Modal auxiliary verbs

Modal auxiliary verbs are the most straightforward and widely used means of expressing modality in English academic writing, the most tentative ones being: may, might, can, could, would, should, for examples:

a. *Such a measure **might** be more sensitive to changes in health after specialist treatment.*

b. *Concerns that naturally low cholesterol levels **could** lead to increased mortality from other causes **may** well be unfounded. (Observe the cumulative hedging effect: the main and the subordinate clauses are both hedged).*

2. Modal lexical verbs

Modal lexical verb (or so called "speech act verb" used to perform act such as doubting and evaluating rather than they merely describing) of varying degree of illocutionary force: to seem, to appear (epistemic verbs), to believe, to assume, to suggest, to estimate, to tend, to think, to argue, to indicate, to propose, to speculate. Although a wide range of verbs can be used in this way (Banks, 1994), there tends to be a heavy reliance on the above-mentioned examples especially in academic writing, for example:

a. *Our analyses **suggest** that high doses of the drug can lead to relevant blood pressure reduction. (Here too we have a cumulative hedging effect).*

b. *These results **indicate** that the presence of large vessel peripheral arterial disease may reflect a particular susceptibility to the development of atherosclerosis. (Same cumulative hedging effect as above).*

c. *In spite of its limitations, our study **appears** to have a number of important strengths.*

d. *Without specific training, medical students' communication skills **seem** to decline during medical training.*

3. Adjectival, adverbial, and nominal modal phrases

These forms of hedges include probability adjectives: e.g., possible, probable, un/likely, nouns: e.g., assumption, claim, possibility, estimate, suggestion, and adverbs (which could be considered as non-verbal nouns): e.g., perhaps, possibly, probably, practically, likely, presumably, virtually, apparently. Example:

a. *Septicaemia is **likely** to result, which might threaten his life.*

b. ***Possibly** the setting of the neural mechanisms responsible for this sensation is altered in patients with chronic fatigue syndrome.*

c. *This is **probably** due to the fact that Greenland Eskimos consume diets with a high content of fish.*

4. Approximators of degree, quantity, frequency and time

This can be realized through for example: approximately, roughly, about, often, occasionally, generally, usually, somewhat, somehow, a lot of, for example:

a. *Fever is present in **about** a third of cases and sometimes there is neutropenia.*

b. *Persistent subjective fatigue **generally** occurs in relative isolation.*

5. Introductory phrases

Introductory phrases can be realized through phrases such as: I believe, to our knowledge, it is our view that, we feel that, which express the author's personal doubt and direct involvement.

Example:

***We believe** that the chronic fatigue syndrome reflects a complex interaction of several factors. There is no simple explanation.*

6. "If clauses"

This is usually realized through the use of the following phrases: if true, if anything, for example:

If true, then, our study contradicts the myth that fishing attracts the bravest and strongest men.

7. Compound hedges

These are phrases made up of several hedges, the commonest forms being: A modal auxiliary combined with a lexical verb with a hedging content (e.g., it would appear) and a lexical verb followed by a hedging adverb or adjective where the adverb (or adjective) reinforces the hedge already inherent in the lexical verb (e.g., it seems reasonable/probable). Such compound hedges can be double hedges (it may suggest that; it seems likely that; it would indicate that; this probably indicates); treble hedges (it seems reasonable to assume that); quadruple hedges (it would seem somewhat unlikely that, it may appear somewhat speculative that), and so on, for example:

a. *There are probably many Southeast Asia students who **would like to** study there, but who must choose Malaysia or Singapore instead for economic reasons.*
b. *That **may seem** a lot to accomplish in our country.*

As can be seen then, all the forms presented above imply that the statements in which they appear contain personal beliefs based on plausible reasoning (or empirical data). Without these "strategic stereotypes," readers would imply that information conveyed pertains to universally established knowledge.

Four Reasons for Hedging

Hedges are used for some purpose. Here are four reasons for hedging based on the theory of Salager-Myer:

1. Minimize the "thread-to-face"

Since one of the functions of hedges is to minimize the threat-to-face, the theory of Face Threatening Acts (FTAs) is very important to understand. The term "face" in linguistics refers to the respect that an individual has for him or herself, and maintaining that "self-esteem" in public or in private situations. Usually someone try to avoid embarrassing other person, or making them feels uncomfortable. In their book, Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage, Brown and Levinson (1987:61) explain the term face as follows:

Our notion of 'face' is derived from that of Goffman (1967) and from the English folk term, which ties face up with notions of being embarrassed or humiliated, or 'losing face'. Thus face is something that is emotionally invested, and that can be lost, maintained, or enhanced, and must be constantly attended to in interaction. In general, people cooperate (and assume each other's cooperation) n maintaining face in interaction, such cooperation being based on the mutual vulnerability of face.

Some acts which threaten a person's face are called face threatening acts (FTA's). FTA's are acts that infringe on the hearers' need to maintain his/her self esteem, and be respected. Yule (1996:36) explained that in most circumstances a person will want to minimize the threat of such an act. A person may, equally, employ a face saving act. For example, if a neighbour is playing very loud music you might say, 'I'm going to go and tell them to stop that noise right now,' proposing a face threatening act which imposes on the neighbour choice and freedom to act as well as express no closeness or solidarity. Your partner, however, might propose a 'face saving act' by saying, 'Perhaps you could just ask them if they're going to stop soon because it's getting late and people need to get to sleep'. Brown and Levinson (1987: 68) also explained:

In other words, people will take into consideration the relative weightings of (at least) three wants: (a) the want to communicate the content of the FTA's, (b) the want to be efficient or urgent, and (c) the want to maintain Hearer's face to any degree. Unless (b) is larger than (c), Speaker will want to minimize the threat of his FTA's.

We can draw the line between the theory of face threatening acts and hedges because the most widely accepted view is that hedging is the process whereby authors tone down their statements in order to reduce the risk of opposition and minimize the "thread-to-face" that lurks behind every act of communication. This position associated hedges with scientific imprecision and defines them as linguistic cues of bias which avoid personal accountability for statements, i.e., as understatements used to convey evasiveness, tentativeness, fuzziness, mitigation of responsibility and/or mitigation of certainty to the truth value of proposition. In this view, hedging is what Skelton calls "the politician's craft," not only a willed mitigation, but an obfuscation for dubious purposes. Kubui and Fand, for example states that hedges are used to signal distance and to avoid absolute statements which might put scientist (and the institution they work at) in an embarrassing situation if subsequent conflicting evidence or contradictory finding arise.

2. Be a way of being more precise in reporting results

Salager-Meyer and Banks claim that the exclusive association of hedges with evasiveness can obscure some important functions of hedging, and that expressing a lack of certainty does not necessarily show confusion or vagueness. Indeed, one could consider hedges as ways of being more precise in reporting results. Hedging may present the true state of the writers' understanding and may be used to negotiate an accurate representation of the state of the knowledge under discussion. In fact, academic writers may well wish to reduce the strength of claims simply because stronger statements would not be justified by the experimental data presented. In such cases, researcher are not saying less than what they mean but are rather saying precisely what they mean by not overstating their experimental results. Being too certain can often be unwise. Academics want

their readers to know that they do not claim to have the final word on the subject, choosing instead to remain vague in their statement.

Hedges are not a cover-up tactic, but rather a resource used to express some fundamental characteristics of modern science (uncertainty, skepticism and doubt) which reveal the probabilistic nature science started acquiring during the second half of the 19th century (during the 17th and the 18th centuries and the first half of 19th century, science was more deterministic). Moreover, because of the close inter-connection between different scientific fields, no scientist can possibly claim to wholly master the field of knowledge of given discipline. Thw seem/suggest combination of the example above could display the speaker's genuine uncertainty and thus allow him to offer a very precise statement about the extent of his confidence (or lack thereof) in the truth of the propositional information he presented.

3. Be positive or negative politeness strategies

According to Brown and Levinson, politeness strategies are developed in order to save the hearers' "face." In other words, politeness strategies are developed for the main purpose of dealing with these FTA's. Brown and Levinson in Paltridge (2000:49) also state that politeness is based on the notions of positive and negative face. The definitions of both face is stated as follows:

Positive face is refers to a person's need to be accepted, or liked, by others, and to be treated as a member of a group knowing that their wants are shared by others. Negative face refers to a person's need to be independent and not be imposed on by others.

Positive Politeness Strategy means that someone recognizes that someone else has a desire to be respected. It also confirms that the relationship is friendly and expresses group reciprocity. While Negative Politeness Strategy is a politeness strategy which similar to Positive Politeness in that someone recognizes that they want to be respected; however, it is also assumed that someone is in some way imposing on them. Some other examples would be to say, "I don't want to bother you but..." or "I was wondering if ..." For example:
"I'm sorry to bother you but, I just wanted to ask you if I could use one of those pens?"

In everyday conversation, there are ways to go about getting the things we want. When we are with a group of friends, we can say to them, "Go get me that plate!", "Shut-up!" However, when we are surrounded by a group of adults at a formal function, in which our parents are attending, we must say, "Could you please pass me that plate, if you don't mind?", "I'm sorry, I don't mean to interrupt, but I am not able to hear the speaker in the front of the room." In different social situations, we are obligated to adjust our use of words to fit the occasion. It would seem socially unacceptable if the phrases above were reversed. It is, however, possible to turn up the other side of the coin and emphasize the importance of hedges for the speaker's own face. Their use may be motivated, for example, by

the fear of being proved wrong later on. Being imprecise or mitigating one's commitment to the truth-value of a proposition or a claim makes it possible to say, if proved wrong, that the claim was only tentative or an approximation.

Myers (1989) argues that hedges are better understood as positive or negative politeness strategies, i.e., as sophisticated rational strategies" used to mitigate two central positions expressed in scientific writing: to present claims (or findings) pending acceptance by the international scientific community, and to deny claims presented by other researchers. Indeed, to express an opinion is to make a claim, and to make a claim is to try to impose one's opinion on others. The authors are usually presenting a claim to the scientific community while trying to convince their readers of the relevance of their findings. But, in doing so, they remain somewhat vague because they cannot claim to have final word on the subject. In the social interaction involved in all scientific publishing, hedges permit academics to present their claims while simultaneously presenting themselves as the "humble servants of the scientific community" (Myers, 1989:4). As soon as a claim becomes part of the literature, it is then possible to refer to it without any hedging, as the following example illustrates:

Influenza is the most important viral infection of the respiratory tract.

Thus because new result or conclusions have to be thoughtfully fit in to the existing literature, hedging is not simply a prudent insurance against overstating an assertion, but also a rational interpersonal strategy which both supports the writer's position and builds writer-reader (speaker/listener) relationships. A hedged comment could reflect a polite and diplomatic disagreement, or it might also display genuine uncertainty on the speaker's part (definition 2).

In a debate, it is important to consider the politeness strategy and politeness principles. This is because a good debater should deliver their opinion in such way in order to prevent insulting other debater and minimize possibility of confrontation, even though other debater might not have different social status or different range of age.

4.   Conform to an established writing style

Banks (1994) argues that a certain degree of hedging has become conventionalized, i.e., that the function of hedges is not necessarily to avoid face-threatening acts (definition No. 1), but simply to conform to an established writing style. This established style of writing arose as a consequence of the combination of the needs and stimuli mentioned in definition 1, 2 and 3 above. A totally unhedged style would not be considered seriously by journal editors.

It should be made clear at this stage that it is difficult to be sure in any particular instance which of the four above-mentioned concepts is intended nor need we assume that the authors of hedged utterances always know why they hedge their statements in the first place. (Salager-Meyer, 1994) stated that hedges are the first and foremost the product of a mental attitude and decisions about the function of a span of language are bound to be subjective.

Research Method

In conducting this research, it is important for the researcher to determine the research method that researcher would like to use. This chapter discusses the research method used in this research including research design, unit of analysis, source of data, technique of data collection, techniques of data analysis.

This study is descriptive and qualitative research. The descriptive research is research conducted to describe systematically the fact and the characteristic of given population or area of interest, factually, and accurately (Maxwell, 1996: 10). It describes the types of hedges used by the writers in the Readers' Letter of The Jakarta Post on July 3 and 6, 2013 Edition"

The qualitative research is a procedure of research, in which the collected data will not be created by statistic procedure. In this research, the collected data is often called 'soft data'. It usually reaches in people description that is not easy done by statistic procedure. So this research is not only limited on collecting and arranging the data orderly, but also analyzing and interpreting the meaning its data.

The Findings

In this part of sub chapter, the reseacher described and explained the findings and the analysis of each hedges used by the writers in the the readers' letter of the Jakarta Post edition July 3 and 6, 2013. For brief explanation it can be seen in the following Table 4.1 below:

The total numbers of hedges used in the data are 62. Those are Modal Auxiliary Verbs (MAV); Modal Lexical Verbs (MLV); Approximators of Degree, Frequency, Quantity and Time (APRX); Adjectival, Adverbial and Nominal Modal Phrases (ADJ, ADV, NOM), Introductory Phrases (I.P), If Clause (If C), and Compound Hedges (CH). The table below shows the distribution of hedges used by the writers in the Jakarta Post.

No.	The Writers' Name	Hedges Used by the Native and Non Native Writers							Total of Hedges Used by Writers	Percentage of Hedges Used by the Writers
		MAV	MLV	APRX	ADJ, ADV, NOM	I.P	If C	C H		
1	Sonita Lontoh	3	2	1	1	1	0	1	9	18.36%
2	Ioan Voicu	2	2	1	1	0	0	2	8	16.32%
3	Sun Xi's	1	1	2	0	2	1	1	8	16.32%
4	Nicholas Herriman	17	2	0	3	1	1	0	24	48.97%
	TOTAL	23	7	4	5	4	2	4	49	100%

It can be seen in the table above that the highest number of hedges produced by the writer is modal auxiliary verbs with 17. This was produced by a writer named Nicholas Herriman. In his writing, he made some comments dealing with some problems arised from subsidies. Then it is followed by modal lexical verb with 7 and Approximators of Degree, Frequency, Quantity and Time with 4 simultaneously. Meanwhile, it is found that Nicholas Herriman made the highest number in producing hedges in his writing with 48.97% or equal to 24 hedges. Then, it is followed by Sonita Lontoh with 18.36% or 9 hedges. Meanwhile, both Iaon Voicu and Sun Xi's have a similar place with 16.32% or 8 hedges for each. Based on the finding, it can be said the writers named Sun Xi and Nicholas Herriman has more uncertainty in writing their comment dealing with the topic of the discussion of the newspaper. They tend to use some hedges express their messeges. In addition to, their cultural background also influence to the way they write. The writers named Sun Xi and Nicholas Herriman tend to be more careful in writing because they consider some words which might hurt the reader's feeling when they read the letter's comments. Meanwhile, the writers named Sonita Lontoh and Ioan Voicu tend to be less careful so they write with their own ways and they always use their own language that is English both spoken and written. So, it can be said that the writers named Sonita Lontoh and Ioan Voicu writers can use English without any hesitation. For the brief description and analysis, it can be seen in the following discussion.

Conclusion

Some conclusions from the analysis of the previous chapter are drawn and provide in this last chapter. The conclusion includes the taxonomy of hedges and reason for hedging used by the writers in the data. From the data that had been analyzed, the results are as follows: The number of hedges used in the data is 49, while the distribution of the hedges is 9 or 18.36% produced by the writer named Sonita Lontoh; 8 or 16.32% produced by the writer named Ioan Voicu; 8 or 16.32% produced by the writer named Sun Xi; and 24 or 48.97% produced by the writer named Nicholas Herriman. From that analysis, it could be seen that Modal Auxiliary Verbs is the most commonly used hedges type in the data with 17 by the writer named Nicholas Herriman, while the most rarely used of hedges is If Clause. Based on the finding, it can be said the writers named Sun Xi and Nicholas Herriman has more uncertainty in writing their comment dealing with the topic of the discussion of the newspaper. They tend to use some hedges express their messeges. In addition to, their cultural background also influence to the way they write. The writers named Sun Xi and Nicholas Herriman tend to be more careful in writing because they consider some words which might hurt the reader's feeling when they read the letter's comments. Meanwhile, the writers named Sonita Lontoh and Ioan Voicu tend to be less careful so they write with their own ways and they always use their own language that is English both spoken and written. So, it can be said that the writers named Sonita Lontoh and Ioan Voicu writers can use English without any hesitation. The analysis reveals that the writers used hedges to minimize threat-to-face, be positive and negative politeness strategies, be more precise in reporting results and to establish writing

style. In other words, all of the four Salager Meyer's theory of reasons for hedging is applied in the data. This is because most of the writers are not too forceful and frontal in delivering their arguments or comments. They also often used hedges to hedge their arguments to be more polite.

References

Banks, D. 1994. *Write in Waters; Aspect of the Scientific Journal Article*. ERLA. Universite de Bretagne Occidentale.

Brown, Penelope. and Levinson, Stephen C. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* London: Cambridge University Press, 61-68.

Hayland, Ken. 2000. *Hedges, Boosters and Lexical Invisibility: Noticing Modifiers in Academic Texts*. Journal of English Linguistics. University of Hongkong.

Hornby, A. S. 1995. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. p.662.

Lakoff, G. 1972. *Hedges: A Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic of Fuzzy Concepts*. Chicago Linguistics Society Papers, 8: 183-228.

Leech, Geofry. 1993. *Principle of Pragmatics*. London: Longman.

Levinson, Steven C. 1995. *Pragmatics*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.

Markkanen, Raija. and Schröder. 2000. *Hedging: A Challenge for Pragmatics and Discourse Analysis*. Lehrstuhl für Sprachwissenschaft II, Europa-Universität Viadrina.

Nunan, David. 1992. *Research Method in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Paltridge, Brian. 2000. *Making Sense of Discourse Analysis*. Queensland: Antipodean Educational Enterprises, 49.

Salager – Meyer. 1994. *I Think That Perhaps You Should: a Study of Hedges in Written Scientific Discourse*. In Tom Miler. *Functional Approach to Written Text: Classroom Application*, 105-118.

Spencer-Otey, H. and Zegarac, V. 2002. *An introduction to Applied Linguistics*. London: Arnold.

Van Ek and Trim, Jacob.1991. *Pengantar Metodologi untuk Ilmu-ilmu Empiris*. Jakarta: Penerbit PT. Gramedia.

VolConVo.com. Downloaded From http://www.aboutus.org/volconvo.com//. May 3, 2008.

Wardhaugh, R. 1992. *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Oxford and Cambridge: Blackwell.

Yule, G. 1996. *Pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.