THE USE OF HEDGES AND BOOSTERS AS RHETORICAL DEVICES IN THE CONSTRUCTION OF SPEECHES

Farida Hidayati*   Ruswan Dallyono
Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia
farida.sutardi@gmail.com   dallyono@gmail.com

Abstract

The present study is a pragmatic analysis of the use of hedges and boosters in the speeches of three ministers on the government's policy of raising fuel prices during the second tenure administration of Susilo Bamband Yudhoyono (SBY). This study explores the distributions of hedges and boosters in the speeches and the pragmatic functions of those hedges and boosters. Data were obtained from three speeches delivered by Hatta Radjasa (HR), Jero Wacik (JW) and Armida Alisjahbana (AA). The theoretical framework of this study was based on Hyland's (1998a) and Hyland's (1998b) theories of hedging for categorizing the types of hedges and boosters and pragmatic functions. This study indicates that both hedges and boosters were used by two politicians: HR and AA with different distributions. This study confirms Hyland's (1998a) and (1998b) findings that hedges and boosters are used for mitigating and strengthening the truth values of propositions.

Keywords: *hedge, booster, function*

Abstrak

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji penggunaan hedge (piranti pemagaran) dan booster (piranti penguat) yang terdapat pada pidato tiga menteri saat mereka mengumumkan kebijakan pemerintah mengenai kenaikan harga bahan bakar minyak (BBM) pada masa pemerintahan Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY). Penelitian ini mempelajari sebaran piranti pemagaran dan piranti penguat yang terdapat pada pidato dari tiga menteri tersebut dan juga fungsi-fungsi pragmatik dari piranti pemagaran dan piranti penguat yang terdapat dalam pidato mereka. Data yang diperoleh dari pidato yang disampaikan oleh Hatta Radjasa (HR), Jero Wacik (JW) and Armida Alisjahbana (AA) diunduh dari dua laman. Teori yang digunakan dalam penelitian ini berdasarkan teori pemagaran dari Hyland (1998a) and Hyland (1998b) yang berfungsi untuk mengelompokkan jenis dan fungsi pragmatik dari piranti pemagaran dan piranti penguat yang terungkap dalam pidato ketiga menteri tersebut. Penelitian ini menegaskan teori pemagaran dari Hyland's (1998a) dan (1998b) bahwa piranti pemagaran dan piranti penguat digunakan secara instrumental untuk memperlemah dan memperkuat nilai kebenaran dari sebuah proposisi.

Kata kunci: *piranti pemagaran, piranti penguat, fungsi*

INTRODUCTION

Hedges and boosters refer to communicative strategies used for augmenting or lessening the strength of statements Hyland (1998a). It appears that their significance in creating discourse is in their role to articulate proper rhetorical senses based on their contexts by putting across both

epistemic and affective meanings, which means that they carry not only the speaker's or writer's degree of assurance in the truth value of statements, but also an attitude to the listener or reader.

A considerable number of studies have been conducted on hedges and boosters as rhetorical devices in academic texts (Varttala 2001; Hyland 1994; Hyland 1998b; Hyland 2000; Vázquez Orta & Giner, 2009). These studies primarily focus on the distributions and use of rhetorical functions of hedges and boosters in academic discourse. Other studies compare the use of hedges and boosters between native speakers of English and non-native speakers of English (see Hyland & Milton, 1997 as cited in Behnam, Naeimi, & Darvishzade, 2012). Meanwhile, there are also studies comparing the use of hedges and boosters between male and female speakers in conversation (Holmes 1990).

The use of hedges and boosters in political discourse appears to have been under-researched. Our search for works on the topic revealed that there were only a few scholars who have conducted research in the field. The first study was conducted by Taweel et al (2011). They investigated hedging in political discourse by drawing on data from selected televised interviews in Arabic television during the third gulf war. The second one was carried out by Šandová (2010) who examined the use of boosters and hedges in political interviews from the webpages of American and British TV and radio stations. The third one was a study of hedges and boosters as persuasive devices in political language (Crespo-Fernández & López-Campillo, 2012). The fourth one was a study undertaken by Jalilifar and Alavi (2012) on the use of hedging devices in political interviews. Finally, Garcia-Pastor (2008, in Jalilifar & Alavi 2012) investigated face mitigating devices in political debates in US political campaigns.

In fact, research on the use of hedges and boosters in political discourse is essential because hedges and boosters are devices which are often used by politicians to articulate their messages to the public. By investigating hedges and boosters, researchers are in a position to disclose the linguistic masks of politicians so that they can unveil the "actual" political messages politicians conveyed to the people.

This study aims to describe the use of hedges and boosters in three political texts by Hatta Radjasa (HR), Jero Wacik (JW), and Armida Alisjahbana (AA). We hoped to discover the distributions and functions of hedges and boosters in their speeches. These politicians' speeches were considered to be significant because they provided information about the raising of the fuel prices which was thought to cause a major impact on the people's economy. Thus, it is essential to discover how the three ministers crafted their messages by employing hedges and boosters because they conveyed information which might stir the people's anger.

METHODOLOGY

In this study we used a qualitative method with descriptive statistics. The purpose of using this method was to explore the issue in a more revealing manner. Rather than merely describing linguistic features being investigated, it is more significant to discover how these features are distributed in terms of frequencies and percentages and how these quantitative data establish pragmatic meanings. These quantitative data were used to discover the salience of occurrences of tokens in the texts. The data were interpreted in terms of how salient or rare linguistic features are used in the texts. The qualitative method was used to interpret the pragmatic functions of the hedges and boosters used by the three ministers.

Data Collection Procedure

We drew upon three transcripts of political speeches of Menko Perekonomian Hatta Rajasa (HR), Menteri Energi dan Sumber Daya Mineral (ESDM), Jero Wacik (JW) and Menteri PPN/Kepala Bappenas Armida Alisjahbana (AA) on June 21st 2013. The speech transcripts consisted of five pages of 1304 words. We decided to analyze these transcripts because we found that these ministers used hedges and boosters in their speeches in order to persuade both opponents and audiences to agree with them.

The transcripts were taken from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FNgdM_n4UUM for HR's speech and http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ThN1oezJN3E for JW and AA's speeches.

Data Analysis Procedure

To analyze the speeches, we drew upon Hyland's (1998a, 1998b) lexico-grammatical features and pragmatic functions of hedges and boosters. According to Hyland (1998a:1), hedges and boosters can be used as "communicative strategies for increasing or reducing the force of statements." This definition was used as the basis for analyzing the speeches of the three ministers while assuming that they had hedged and/or boosted their statements for various communicative purposes which were probably political in nature. Although Hyland used the definition to refer to academic works, we believe that communicative strategies are valid in all contexts, including in a political context where a speaker needs to draw on effective communicative strategies to assure the audience.

First, we established criteria for hedges and boosters based on Hyland's (1998a, 1998b) theories. Hyland (1998a; 1998b) classified hedges as downtoners which were divided into four categories, namely (a) compromiser e.g. *sangat* 'quite', *biasanya* 'usually' or 'normally'; (b) diminisher e.g. *sebagian* 'partially' and *sedikit* 'slightly'; (c) minimiser e.g. *jarang* 'rarely' and *sewaktu-waktu* 'occasionally'; (d) approximator e.g. *hamper* 'almost', *sebenarnya* 'virtually' and *secara relatif* 'relatively'. Meanwhile, boosters were defined as uptoners which consisted of two categories, namely (a) intensifier: *sangat* 'very', 'absolutely' or 'extremely', and (b) certainty: *pasti* 'must' or 'certain'. This categorization of hedges and boosters is summarized in Table 1 below. The lexico-grammatical features of both hedges and boosters, however, take various forms of word classes and grammatical units. With these established criteria, we were able to come up with well-categorized data along with quantitative information such as distribution frequencies and percentages.

Table 1. A Modified Version of the Functions of Hedges and Boosters (Hyland, 1998b:139)

No.	Rhetorical Devices	Functions	Features	Examples
1.	**Hedges**	**Downtoner**		
		compromiser:	adverbs, modality, agentless passives	quite, usually, normally, may, can, it is argued that
		diminisher:	adverbs, modality	partially, slightly, might,
		minimiser:	adverbs	rarely, occasionally
		approximator:	adverbs, modality	almost, virtually, relatively, will, shall
2.	**Boosters**	**Uptoner**		
		intensifier:	adverbs	very, absolutely, extremely
		certainty:	modals	must, certain

Afterward, we analyzed the data by labeling the words or phrases found in the speeches understudy as hedges or boosters. The data were also classified into the types of hedges or boosters to facilitate the process of identification. To identify the category of a certain word or phrase, we analyzed the co-texts and contexts in which it occurred.

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Hedges Used in the Speeches of HR, JW and AA Based on the Lexico-grammatical Features

The first speech in the series of three speeches was delivered by HR as the Minister of Economy. This part of findings and discussion start with the lexicogrammatical features of HR's speech. HR used both hedges and boosters, but first of all, the hedges will be highlighted.

Table 2 below indicates that HR used three tokens of hedges (0.70%) if divided by the number of words used. From the three tokens, it was discovered that he used two adverbs (66.67%) and 1 modality (33.33%). Compared to the total number of words used, namely 429 words, the use of only three hedges is relatively small. It is safe to state that HR's speech is only slightly hedged, which means that it may appear either reckless or confident in terms of its tone. It will be further shown in what context actually HR used these hedges. A qualitative account of this tendency is required to clarify the pragmatic functions of the hedges.

Table 2. The Percentages of Lexico-grammatical Features of Hedges in HR's Speech

Hedges	Lexico-grammatical Features
3 tokens/429 words (0.70%)	Adverb: 2 tokens (66.67%)
	Modality: 1 token (33.33%)

As earlier mentioned, in terms of lexico-grammatical features, HR used two types of hedges, namely adverbs and modalities. He used two adverbs, namely *kurang* twice and only one modality, namely *dapat*. In Indonesian, the adverb *kurang* is usually attached to an adjective which is intended to weaken the meaning of the adjective. The adjective *kurang* is translated as *not enough* into English. The clause *... tapi juga dirasakan kurang adil bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin* may be translated as *... but it is considered to be not fair enough by the poor.*

In the speech, HR was actually referring to the subsidy on oil price which was inappropriately enjoyed by rich people. The government was planning to decrease the subsidy and would allocate some financial support for poor people, which was known as "BLSM" or *Bantuan Langsung Sementara*. It is an amount of money, intended to relieve the people from the burden of the fuel hike. The amount of BLSM was Rp150.000 per month or Rp450.000 per three months.

The function of this hedge in the phrase *kurang adil* is apparently intended to minimize the strength of the meaning. This function will be elaborated to later parts of the report. Following is Table 3 presenting the lexico-grammatical features of hedges found in HR's speech:

Table 3. Lexico-grammatical Features of Hedges in HR's Speech

No.	Hedges	The Lexico-grammatical Features
1.	*... tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan **kurang** adil bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan ...*	Adverb
2.	*... bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan **kurang** mampu.*	Adverb
3.	*... dan dengan program-program tersebut yang satu paket maka kita **dapat** memberikan daya dorong ...*	Modality

Table 3 shows that the use of *kurang* in sentence 2 might have been intended to refer to the same thing, namely as a minimiser. The phrase *kurang mampu* refers to those poor people or those who might be deeply affected by the fuel hike. The phrase may be translated as *not capable enough* into English. HR was referring to the magnitude of the impact of the increase in the fuel price on economically weak people.

The second type of hedges that was used in the speech was modality, namely *dapat*. In English, this modality is comparable to *can* or *could*. Hyland (1998b:102-107) categorizes modality as one of the features of hedges. In English the meaning of *can* and *could* refers to either capability or possibility, depending on the context in which the modality is used. In Indonesian, the word *dapat* means either capable or obtain. It is categorized into a modality because it appears to function like a modal auxiliary. In English, modal auxiliaries are used as independent auxiliaries and do not need other auxiliary verbs. In Indonesian, it is possible to construct a sentence such as *Dapatkah kau menari*? which is similar to the English equivalent *Can you dance?* In addition, the word *dapat* is considered to be a modality because in terms of meaning, it expresses both ability and possibility.

As a modality, however, it only means 'capable'. In sentence 2 above, HR says … *dan dengan program-program tersebut yang satu paket maka kita dapat memberikan daya dorong*. In the sentence, HR actually stated that with all the programs that the government planned to implement, they would be able to lift the poor from the financial impact they were likely to have from the fuel prices' hike. HR used the word *dapat* to imply that there was a potential of "usefulness" for this financial support to alleviate the economic burden of poor people. In this case, he was careful in paraphrasing his sentence so as to avoid criticisms from his political opponents. Today, economic and political analysts were highly critical of the government's policies, especially those involving the fuel hike.

No hedges were found in JW's speech. Apparently, JW did not wish to tone down his statements. He just delivered what he was expected to convey to the people. The main reason why he did not use any hedges was that he was not in a position to opinionate. He was merely reading a report which was technical in nature. There was no need to hedge because he was only presenting facts. JW only conveyed the contents of the final draft as an extension of the government's policy of securing the National Budget.

Next, it is imperative to discuss the lexico-grammatical features of the next speech which was delivered by AA, who was the Minister of PPN and the Head of *BAPPENAS*. Table 4 demonstrates the hedges percentages and the lexico-grammatical features of hedges in AA's speech.

Table 4. The Percentages of Lexico-grammatical Features of Hedges in AA's Speech

Hedges	Lexico-grammatical Features
19 tokens/734 words (25.88%)	Adverbs: 8 tokens (42.1%)
	Modality: 5 tokens (26.3%)
	Agentless Passive: 5 tokens (26.3%)
	Adjectives: 1 token (5.26%)

Table 4 indicates that AA used nineteen tokens of hedges or 25.88% if divided by the number of words used. From the nineteen tokens, it was discovered that she used hedges more variously than HR. In her speech, AA used eight adverbs, five modalities, five agentless passives, and one adjective. Compared to HR's speech, there were more hedges in AA's speech. Hyland (1998b:102-107; 1998:186) says that modalities and agentless passives are categorized as hedges. This fact suggests that AA's way of speaking was more careful and thorough than the two other speakers because the content of her speech consisted of both detailed information about the programs to reduce the effect of fuel hike and persuasive explanation to convince the public, especially those who were less fortunate.

In Table 5, the use of lexico-grammatical features of hedges in AA's speech is displayed to describe their uses in context.

Table 5. Lexico-grammatical Features of Hedges in AA's Speech

No.	Hedges	The Lexico-grammatical Features
1.	*Pada kesempatan ini saya **akan** menyampaikan ...*	Modality
2.	*... dampak penyesuaian harga BBM **khususnya** terhadap....*	Adverb
3.	***Secara garis besar** ada dua kelompok ... ...*	Adverb
4.	*...... masyarakat miskin **dapat** mengakses pendidikan.....*	Modality
5.	*...... mencakup **hampir** 30% dari....*	Adverb
6.	*...... harga BBM yang diperkirakan **sekitar** empat.....*	Adverb
7.	*...... sekaligus juga **akan** membantu pemenuhan......*	Modality
8.	*...... selanjutnya **secara ringkas** saya....*	Adverb
9.	*...... juga mencakup kelompok **rentan** miskin*	Adjective
10.	*...... ditingkatkan menjadi **rata-rata** sebesar 1.8 juta rupiah....*	Adverb
11.	*......**akan** saya ......*	Modality
12.	*...... yang **akan** ......*	Modality
13.	*......**diberikan** pada 15.5 juta.........*	Agentless passive
14.	*.......yang **dirancang** dalam bentuk program percepatan perluasaan......*	Agentless passive
15.	*.....daya air lainnya di **sekitar** 4 ribu desa*	Adverb
16.	*... telah **diperkenalkan** kartu perlindungan sosial......*	Agentless passive
17.	*...... yang **diberikan** kepada...*	Agentless passive
18.	*...... infrastruktur dasar **dilakukan** dengan......*	Agentless passive
19.	*.....pokok-pokok penjelasan yang **dapat** saya sampaikan .....*	Modality

As shown in Table 5, AA used modalities for expressing possibilities, capabilities or even potentials which were not necessarily always the case in reality. For instance, when someone says *BLSM akan membantu masyarakat*, the speaker is merely talking about the potential or possibility that the aid will help the people. It is not a certainty that the people feel assisted by the aid.

In addition, there was also an effort of evading responsibility on the part of the speaker. Agentless passives were heavily distributed across the speech, suggesting that the speaker wished to avoid assuming the responsibility of raising oil prices and that she was distancing herself from actions reported in the speech. She appeared to be saying that all these actions were beyond doubt necessary to be taken.

Meanwhile, adverbs were mostly used to express approximators and diminishers. AA generally used approximators because she did not want to state things precisely. This is a strategy of evasion of being truthful. She used the adverbs *secara garis besar*, *hampir, diperkirakan sekitar, secara ringkas rata-rata* to refer to entities which are not certain when she was explaining her points. She hoped that she would not be judged as biased in indicating numbers. For instance, she said that *Ini penting karena pangan mencakup hampir 30%.* It appears that she did not want to be particularly precise in mentioning this percentage.

AA only used one adverb (*khususnya*) to indicate a diminisher, namely when she stated *dampak penyesuaian harga BBM khususnya terhadap....* By using the adverb *khususnya* (particularly), it appears that she intended to limit the case to only a particular issue. Her statement suggests that she did not want to generalize her point. For instance, in the speech, AA said *saya akan menyampaikan program-program yang dirancang untuk mengatasi dampak penyesuaian harga BBM khususnya terhadap masyarakat berpenghasilan rendah*. In this utterance, it is apparent that she wanted to assert that the impact of the fuel hike only occurred to those people with lower incomes. Thus, it was not meant to refer to all the people.

To summarize, Table 6 displays the number of hedges found in the speeches of the three ministers:

Table 6. Hedges in the Speeches of the Three Ministers

No.	The Ministers	The Number of Hedges	Percentage
1.	HR	3 tokens/429 words	0.69%
2.	JW	0 token/141 words	0%
3.	AA	19 tokens/734 words	2.59%

Table 6 shows that AA used hedges the most frequently, namely 25.88%, followed by HR, 0.69%. JW, as stated earlier, did not use any hedges in his speech due to the genre of the spoken text that he delivered, namely informational speech.

Boosters Used in the Speeches of HR, JW, and AA Based on the Lexico-grammatical Features

HR's speech is clattered with boosters all over the text. He used 14 boosters per 429 words or 3.26%. The types of boosters range from determiners to adverbs. Table 7 shows the percentages of boosters and the lexico-grammatical features of hedges deployed in HR's speech. As shown in Table 7, from 14 occurrences of boosters in HR's speech, the highest percentage occurs in adverbs (35.7%). The second goes to modalities (21.4%), and the third goes to determiners (14.3%). In addition, three other features, namely modalities plus particles, adverbs plus

particles, and particles have the same number of percentages, namely 7.14%. All these boosters were used to suggest that the speaker wished to convey his conviction that the fuel hike was inevitable due to the increasing world oil prices.

Table 7. The Percentages of Lexico-grammatical Features of Boosters in HR's Speech

Boosters	Lexico-grammatical Features
14 tokens per 429 words (3.26%)	Determiners: 2 (14.3%)
	Modalities plus particles: 1 (7.14%)
	Adverbs plus particles: 1 (7.14%)
	Particles: 1 (7.14%)
	Modalities: 3 (21.4%)
	Adverbs: 5 (35.7%)

The lexico-grammatical features of boosters in HR's speech are displayed in Table 8. This table shows that there are two determiners, one particle, three modalities, five adverbs, one adverb plus particle and 1 modality plus particle used in his speech.

Table 8. Lexico-grammatical Features of Boosters in HR's Speech

No.	Booster	Lexico-grammatical Features
1.	***Seluruh** rakyat Indonesia yang kami cintai, para wartawan yang saya muliakan, ...*	Determiner
2.	*... **marilah** pada kesempatan yang baik dan Insya Allah penuh berkah ini, ...*	Interjection + Particle
3.	*Kita juga **patut** bersyukur, sebagaimana kita fahami bersama, ...*	Modality
4.	*Saudara sekalian yang saya cintai, APBN perubahan ini **amatlah** penting bagi kita, ...*	Adverb + Particle
5.	*... dan kesinambungan fiskal kita, APBN kita, tetapi juga perekonomian kita **secara keseluruhan**.*	Adverb
6.	*... dan membengkaknya konsumsi BBM, akibat **tentu saja** dari meningkatnya hasil pembangunan ...*	Adverb
7.	*... mengakibatkan defisit anggaran kita melampaui 3% yang **tentu** tidak dibenarkan oleh ...*	Adverb
8.	*Besarnya subsidi BBM ini dan berpotensi terus **akan membengkak** di samping ...*	Modality
9.	*... di samping **lebih dari** 70% tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan ...*	Determiner
10.	*Pemerintah **tentu** menyadari bahwa kebijakan tersebut ...*	Adverb
11.	*... bahwa kebijakan tersebut **akan** menimbulkan inflasi yang ...*	Modality
12.	*Ini adalah pilihan yang **amat** sulit dan ...*	Adverb
13.	*... penyesuaian harga BBM ini pemerintah mengambil kebijakan haruslah **disertai** dengan ...*	Modality + Particle
14.	*... kita dapat melindungi masyarakat kita yang **tentu** terkena dampak tersebut dan ...*	Adverb

The table above suggests that HR was represented as the minister who was responsible for this policy. There are a number of boosters in the speech such as *seluruh* and *secara keseluruhan*. He said, *Seluruh rakyat Indonesia yang kami cintai ...* He addressed the audience as "all our beloved people" in order to gain sympathy. There was no guarantee that he was truthful in saying this. The determiner *all* referred to each and everyone in the country. There was no way that he could love all Indonesian citizens.

HR said that the fuel hike had affected the Indonesian economy as a whole, as reflected in the following statement: *... tetapi juga perekonomian kita secara keseluruhan*. Through this statement, HR suggested that he was fully aware of the impact of the fuel hike. He knew that the policy had a detrimental effect on the people's economy.

In addition, to a significant extent, there is an impression of empathy in the use of adverbs to boost statements as in *Ini adalah pilihan yang **amat** sulit dan ...* There is this sense of regret on the part of the government to raise fuel prices. He said, "it is a very difficult choice and …" HR seemed to be saying that he actually hated to take this option of raising fuel prices, considering the people's current financial difficulties. The government had to make this policy because it had to; otherwise, the National Budget would "bleed."

In order to invite the audience to thank God for His blessings, HR used the combination of interjection and particle as in *marilah pada kesempatan yang baik dan Insya Allah berkah ini, kita memanjatkan puji dan syukur ke hadirat Tuhan YME*. By using this hedge, HR wanted to gain sympathy. Apparently, he wanted to create an impression that both HR and the audience were religious people. Accordingly, the modal verb *patut* which means 'should' refers to emphasize the same purpose, namely a sense of religiosity as in *kita patut bersyukur* (we should be thankful).

In HR's speech he used the adverb *tentu* twice. It appears he intended to assert that something is fact that presumably both HR and the audience believe in. There is no doubt about it. For instance, HR said *kita dapat melindungi masyarakat kita yang **tentu** terkena dampak tersebut dan ....* HR was aware that the raising of the fuel prices would affect the people's economy. He understood the consequences of this policy. He wanted the people to know that he had empathy with them.

Interestingly, JW's speech did not contain any boosters at all. This finding implies that he did not wish to tone up his message to the audience. As stated earlier, he also did not tone down his speech either. It is possible that he did not boost or hedge in his statements because he had no political interests in his rhetorical style. He seemed to be indifferent whether people would react positively or negatively. In addition, the nature of JW's speech was both technical and informational. There was no need to convince the audience because all the arguments justifying the policy to raise oil prices were given extensively by HR and AA. JW's task was only to announce the new prices of fuel; thus, he did not need to boost or hedge because the prices had been calculated by the government.

The following table presents the number of boosters in AA's speech. Different from HR, AA used less boosters compared to hedges in her speech.

Table 9. The Percentages of Lexico-grammatical Features of Boosters in AA's Speech

Boosters	Lexico-grammatical Features
13 tokens per 734 words (1.77 %)	Verbs: 3 (23%)
	Adverb: 4 (30.8%)
	Adjective: 3 (23%)
	Modality: 1 (7.7%)
	Idiom: 1 (7.7%)

The table shows that the use of these types of boosters was amounted to thirteen. This finding suggests that the speaker wished to convey her certainty to the audience that all the programs prepared by the government would be able to ease the people's burden due to the fuel hike.

The lexico-grammatical features of boosters in AA's speech are presented in Table 10.

Table 10. The Lexico-grammatical Features of Boosters in AA's Speech

No.	Booster	Lexico-grammatical Features
1.	*... yaitu dengan **memastikan** bahwa....*	Verb
2.	*... ... dimaksudkan untuk **memastikan** agar mereka...*	Verb
3.	*... memperoleh kebutuhan yang **paling**...*	Adverb
4.	*...**mendasar** yaitu pangan*	Verb
5.	*Ini **penting** karena ....*	Adjective
6.	*... ... membantu masyarakat **khususnya** masyarakat miskin.....*	Adverb
7.	*...tersebut tanpa **harus** berdampak negatif...*	Modality
8.	*... perumahtangga **sangat** miskin pertahun*	Adverb
9.	*... sumber daya air yang **terutama** dialokasikan untuk...*	Adverb
10.	*... tepat sasaran, **khusus** untuk ketepatan...*	Adjective
11.	*... sosial ekonomi **terendah** sesuai ...*	Superlative adjective
12.	*... yaitu 25% **terendah**, pendistribusian...*	Superlative adjective
13.	*...dengan **sebanyak mungkin** melibatkan...*	Idiom

The above table indicates that there are a number of boosters in AA's speech such as *memastikan, paling, mendasar, penting, khususnya, harus, sangat, terutama, terendah* and *sebanyak mungkin*. She mentioned the word *memastikan* twice in her speech namely, *... yaitu dengan memastikan bahwa….* and *... dimaksudkan untuk memastikan agar mereka…* She intended to convince the people, especially those who were less fortunate, to believe that the programs offered by the government, such as BLSM and PKH, could cut off the poverties' chain. She assured that those programs would enable the poor to get access to education and health. Furthermore, the addition of supply of rice for poor people could provide the most basic necessity, that is, food.

In her speech, AA also mentioned the word *terendah* twice. This word is a superlative adjective meaning 'the lowest'. Armida used the word in two contexts, namely *... sosial ekonomi terendah sesuai ...* and *... yaitu 25% terendah, pendistribusian….* By using this words, she emphasized that 'kartu perlindungan sosial' or social protection card would only be given to people in the lowest socio-economic strata. She wanted to make sure that the cards would not go to the wrong hands that do not deserve them.

Another finding in AA's speech is that she used the phrase *sebanyak mungkin* meaning 'as many as possible' in the context ... *sementara untuk pelaksanaan infrastruktur dasar dilakukan dengan sebanyak mungkin melibatkan masyarakat setempat agar memperoleh tambahan kesempatan kerja*. AA said that the government would ask the local people to get involved actively in *pelaksanaan infrastruktur dasar* or 'the development of basic infrastructure' so that they would get bigger chances to get jobs.

To summarize, Table 11 below presents the number of boosters found in the speeches of the three ministers:

Table 11. Boosters in the Speeches of the Three Ministers

No.	The Ministers	The Number of Boosters	Percentage
1.	HR	14 tokens/429 words	3.26%
2.	JW	0 token/141 words	0%
3.	AA	13 tokens/734 words	1.77%

Table 11 shows that HR used boosters the most frequently, followed by AA. HR used boosters fourteen tokens in 429 words. HR prefers toning up his statements to toning them down because his position as "the leader" or "the representative" of the government forced HR to convince the people that the government policy about fuel hike was the best alternative among the worst. HR might feel that the need to eliminate people's doubt was more important than to speak in a careful way. He was probably confident because he assumed that it was a president mandate to announce the hike; therefore, his main duty was to tone his statements up, not to tone them down.

Hedges and Boosters in the Speeches of HR, JW and AA and Their Distributions of Lexico-grammatical Forms

Table 12 shows a comparison between the use of hedges and boosters in HR's speech. As shown in Table 12, it is evident that the comparison of hedges with boosters in HR's speech is three to fourteen. HR used three hedges per 429 words (0.70%) meanwhile he used fourteen tokens of boosters in 429 words (3.26%). It means that HR used more boosters compared to hedges. This fact constitutes a piece of the evidence that he is in a position to influence or to convince the people to agree with the fuel hike. He did not use hedges as many as boosters because his main duty was to influence the audience.

Table 12. Hedges and Booster in HR's Speech

No.	Hedges	Booster
1.	*... tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan **kurang adil** bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan ...*	***Seluruh** rakyat Indonesia yang kami cintai, para wartawan yang saya muliakan, ...*
2.	*... bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan **kurang mampu**.*	*... **marilah** pada kesempatan yang baik dan Insya Allah penuh berkah ini, ...*
3.	*... dan dengan program-program tersebut yang satu paket maka kita **dapat** memberikan daya dorong ...*	*Kita juga **patut** bersyukur, sebagaimana kita fahami bersama, ...*
4.		*Saudara sekalian yang saya cintai, APBN perubahan ini **amatlah** penting bagi kita, ...*

5.	*... dan kesinambungan fiskal kita, APBN kita, tetapi juga perekonomian kita **secara keseluruhan.***
6.	*... dan membengkaknya konsumsi BBM, akibat **tentu saja** dari meningkatnya hasil pembangunan ...*
7.	*... mengakibatkan defisit anggaran kita melampaui 3% yang **tentu** tidak dibenarkan oleh ...*
8.	*Besarnya subsidi BBM ini dan berpotensi **terus akan membengkak** di samping ...*
9.	*... di samping **lebih dari** 70% tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan ...*
10.	*Pemerintah **tentu** menyadari bahwa kebijakan tersebut ...*
11.	*... bahwa kebijakan tersebut **akan** menimbulkan inflasi yang ...*
12.	*Ini adalah pilihan yang **amat** sulit dan ...*
13.	*... penyesuaian harga BBM ini pemerintah mengambil kebijakan **haruslah disertai** dengan ...*
14.	*... kita dapat melindungi masyarakat kita yang **tentu** terkena dampak tersebut dan ...*

Compared to JW and AA, HR's speech appears to stir up the audience's emotion more. The use of hedges tends to weaken the arguments. HR seemed to be aware of whom he was addressing. Apparently, he attempted to persuade the audience by using many hedges in his speech. In other words, he was trying to establish a discourse of emotional appeal rather than a discourse of logic.

JW did not use any boosters or hedges in his statements. Apparently, there was no need to boost or hedge. There are a number of possible reasons why he decided to avoid using both hedges and boosters. First, he probably had no political interests in conveying his messages. He appeared to be indifferent whether the people would react positively or negatively. Secondly, he might want to appear professional as Minister of Energy and Natural Resources; he wanted to give a neutral impression to the people. Thirdly, he was not in a position to opinionate. He was merely reading a report which was technical in nature. There was no need at all to hedge or to boost because he was only presenting facts. In fact, JW merely articulated the contents of the final draft of the government's policy under the framework of safeguarding the National Budget.

Table 13 shows how AA used hedges and boosters in her speech. The table also displays the comparison between the use of hedges and boosters in context. As shown in Table 13, AA used nineteen tokens of hedges per 734 words (25.88%) meanwhile she used thirteen tokens of boosters in 734 words (1.77%). Different from HR in his speech, AA used more hedges compared to boosters. This is probably because AA conveyed government programs to minimise the effects of the fuel hike. There are always two possibilities when programs are

implented: success or failure. She appeared to be careful in putting forward these programs to the people to avoid criticisms. Some people might endorse them; others might reject them.

AA's speech contains adverbs that were used to qualify adjectives or verbs that express meanings. By using adverbs, she was actually minimizing the impact of these meanings. She was actually aware that there might be an error or the number is not the same in all places. Her use of modalities further imply that the best she could say was all about possibilities, capabilities or even potentials that are not necessarily always the case in reality. She was merely talking about the potential or possibility that the aid will help the people. It is not a certainty that the people feel assisted by the aid. In addition, there is also an effort of evading responsibility on the part of the speaker. Agentless passives are significantly distributed across the speech, giving the impression that the speaker wishes to avoid assuming the responsibility of raising oil prices and that she was distancing herself from actions reported in the speech. She appeared to be communicating that all these actions were, beyond doubt, necessary to be taken.

At the same time AA was also a government's representative who had the capacity to convince the people, especially those who were less fortunate to believe that the programs offered by the government such as BSM and PKH were in a position to end the poverties' chain. She assured the people that those programs would help the poor in order to be able to access education and health. Meanwhile, an added supply of rice for poor people has been assured to provide the most basic necessity, namely, food. By using boosters, AA hoped to be able to put an emphasis that the social protection cards would only be given to people in the lowest socio-economic strata and would not go to the wrong hands that did not deserve to get them.

Table 13. Hedges and Boosters in AA's Speech

No.	Hedges	Booster
1.	*Pada kesempatan ini saya **akan** menyampaikan ...*	*... yaitu dengan **memastikan** bahwa....*
2.	*... dampak penyesuaian harga BBM **khususnya terhadap**....*	*... ... dimaksudkan untuk **memastikan** agar mereka......*
3.	***Secara garis besar** ada dua kelompok ... ...*	*... memperoleh kebutuhan yang **paling***
4.	*...... masyarakat miskin **dapat** mengakses pendidikan.....*	*... **mendasar** yaitu pangan*
5.	*...... mencakup **hampir** 30% dari....*	*Ini **penting** karena ....*
6.	*...... harga BBM yang diperkirakan **sekitar** empat.....*	*... ... membantu masyarakat **khususnya** masyarakat miskin.....*
7.	*...... sekaligus juga **akan** membantu pemenuhan......*	*...tersebut tanpa **harus** berdampak negatif...*
8.	*...... selanjutnya **secara ringkas** saya....*	*... perumahtangga **sangat** miskin pertahun*
9.	*...... juga mencakup kelompok **rentan** miskin*	*... sumber daya air yang **terutama** dialokasikan untuk...*
10.	*...... ditingkatkan menjadi **rata-rata** sebesar 1.8 juta rupiah....*	*... tepat sasaran, **khusus** untuk ketepatan...*
11.	*......**akan** saya ......*	*... sosial ekonomi **terendah** sesuai ...*
12.	*...... yang **akan** ....*	*... yaitu 25% **terendah**, pendistribusian...*
13.	*......**diberikan** pada 15.5 juta..........*	*...dengan **sebanyak mungkin** melibatkan...*

14.	*.......yang **dirancang** dalam bentuk program percepatan perluasaan......*
15.	*.....daya air lainnya **di sekitar** 4 ribu desa*
16.	*... telah **diperkenalkan** kartu perlindungan sosial......*
17.	*...... yang **diberikan** kepada...*
18.	*.......... infrastruktur dasar **dilakukan** dengan......*
19.	*.... pokok-pokok penjelasan yang **dapat** saya sampaikan...*

The Pragmatic Functions of Hedges in the Construction of the Speeches of the Ministers

In this study we used the classification of the pragmatic functions of hedges by Hyland (1998b:139), which is presented in Table 1. Hyland (1998b) defines that hedges function as compromisers, diminishers, minimisers and approximators. Those four functions were used as categories to classify the data of the study.

Table 14 shows the functions of hedges in HR's Speech. HR used hedges mostly for minimizing the effect of his utterances. In addition, HR used hedges for compromising. A detailed description of the functions of hedges used by HR is presented in Table 15 below:

Table 14. Functions of Hedges in HR's Speech

Functions of Hedges		No.	Items Found in Speech
	▪ **Compromiser:** quite, usually, normally	1.	*... dan dengan program-program tersebut yang satu paket maka kita **dapat** memberikan daya dorong ...*
Downtoner	▪ **Diminisher:** partially, slightly	2.	*X*
	▪ **Minimiser:** rarely, occasionally	3.	*... tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan **kurang** adil bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan ...* *... bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan kurang mampu.*
	▪ **Approximator:** almost, virtually, relatively	4.	*X*

In his speech, HR tends to use hedges for minimising, for example, *... tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan **kurang** adil bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan ...* and *... bagi masyarakat kita yang miskin dan **kurang** mampu*. HR used the word *kurang* instead of *tidak* to show that he wishes to minimise the impact of his statement. The same thing applies when he said *kurang mampu*. It seems that these hedges represent a sense of politeness from an Indonesian perspective.

Meanwhile for compromising, HR used the word *dapat*, which means 'can', in *... dan dengan program-program tersebut yang satu paket maka kita **dapat** memberikan daya dorong ....* The use of the word *dapat* in the above context makes HR appear to be polite and humble. Instead of saying *program-program tersebut yang satu paket maka kita **akan** memberikan daya*

dorong … that appears to be presumptuous, he uses a compromistic word by applying the word *dapat* that is more modest and acceptable for Indonesian culture.

Different from JW who did not use any hedges when he announced the fuel hike, AA used many hedging devices in her speech. As for the functions of hedges used by AA, the table below summarizes the distribution of these hedging functions, categorising them into five functions, namely compromiser, approximator, future, capability and avoiding responsibility.

Table 15. Functions of Hedges in AA's Speech

Functions of Hedges		No.	Items Found in Speech
Downtoner	**Compromiser:** quite, usually, normally	1.	***Secara garis besar*** *ada dua kelompok … …* *… dampak penyesuaian harga BBM **khususnya** terhadap….*
	Diminisher: partially, slightly	2.	X
	Minimiser: rarely, occasionally	3.	X
	Approximator: almost, virtually, relatively	4.	*…… mencakup **hampir** 30% dari….* *…… harga BBM yang diperkirakan **sekitar** empat…..* *…… selanjutnya **secara ringkas** saya….* *…… juga mencakup kelompok **rentan** miskin* *…… ditingkatkan menjadi **rata-rata** sebesar 1.8 juta rupiah….* *…..daya air lainnya di **sekitar** 4 ribu desa*
Future		5.	*Pada kesempatan ini saya **akan** menyampaikan …* *…… sekaligus juga **akan** membantu pemenuhan……* *……**akan** saya ……* *…… yang **akan** …*
Avoiding Responsibility		6.	*……**.diberikan** pada 15.5 juta………* *…….yang **dirancang** dalam bentuk program percepatan perluasaan……* *… telah **diperkenalkan** kartu perlindungan sosial……* *…… yang **diberikan** kepada…* *…… infrastruktur dasar **dilakukan** dengan……*

Table 15 outlines the functions of hedges in AA's speech. The table shows that she used hedges for compromising, approximating, showing future and capability and avoiding responsibility. For the sake of cautiousness, AA used hedges mostly for approximating. She used the words such as *hampir* 'almost', *sekitar* 'approximately', *secara ringkas* 'briefly', *rentan* 'vulnerable', and *rata-rata* 'average'. For example, the word *rata-rata* found in AA's speech, namely *… ditingkatkan menjadi rata-rata10 sebesar 1.8 juta rupiah…* shows that the speaker did not want to be careless to say that the budget increase for *Program Keluarga Harapan* (PKH) or Family Hope Program now amounts to exactly 1.8 million rupiahs per family per year. By saying *rata-rata*, AA wants to play safe if the actual practices might turn out to be different.

This study reveals that there are two particular functions of hedging that were not found in Hyland's criteria, namely avoiding responsibility and expressing the future. Arguably, these functions still belong to the nature of hedging in general because the use of these functions may have a lessening impact of statements. To avoid responsibility, AA used five agentless passives in her speech, such as *...diberikan pada 15.5 juta..., ...yang dirancang dalam bentuk program percepatan perluasaan..., ...telah diperkenalkan kartu perlindungan sosial..., ... yang diberikan kepada...,* and *...infrastruktur dasar dilakukan dengan....* AA used agentless passives to hide or to conceal the agent, namely the government. By using agentless passives, the impact of statements is lessened because the illocution does not attack anyone in a direct way. This function of agentless passives is reflected in sentence (b) in comparison to sentence (a) below:

a. *X merancang program infrastruktur dasar dalam bentuk program percepatan perluasaan pembangunan infrastruktur permukiman dengan jumlah total desa tambahan yaitu sebesar 11. 750 desa atau kelurahan dengan jumlah alokasi dana 250 juta perdesa atau perkelurahan.*
b. *Program infrastruktur dasar yang dirancang dalam bentuk program percepatan perluasaan pembangunan infrastruktur permukiman dengan jumlah total desa tambahan yaitu sebesar 11. 750 desa atau kelurahan dengan jumlah alokasi dana 250 juta perdesa atau perkelurahan.*
(AS's Speech 2013 transcribed from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ThN1oezJN3E)

In sentence (a), it is clear who is going to be responsible for the success or the failure of *Program Infrastruktur Dasar* or Basic Infrastructure Program, namely X. Meanwhile, in sentence b, it is not clear who is to blame if there is embezzlement, abuse or even corruption in the programs. No one knows who is going to take the responsibility for the success of the programs, whether it is X, Y or Z. The use of agentless passives tends to give some spaces for avoiding responsibility. If the programs fail, it will be easier for the government to accuse or to blame other parties or sides.

After discussing the hedging function to avoid responsibility, it is imperative to discuss the future function. Examples of the use of *akan* are shown below:

a. *Pada kesempatan ini saya **akan** menyampaikan ... sekaligus juga **akan** membantu...*
b. *...pemenuhan......, ...**akan** saya .... yang **akan** ...*

The word *akan* that has been stated for four times in the above examples has the same meaning as *will* in English. The use of *will* in the two sentences above provides the speaker with a sense of the future. If all elements involved could support the programs, the programs would be achieved. Therefore, the implied meaning is that what has been proposed has the possibility to fail unless the conditions are fulfilled. There are many aspects to the programs to work.

The Pragmatic Functions of Boosters in the Construction of the Speeches of the Ministers

In this study we used the definition of the pragmatic meanings of boosters by Hyland (1998b:139). According to Hyland (1998b), boosters function as intensifiers and certainty. Those two functions of boosters were employed as categories to classify our data of the study.

This study revealed the functions of boosters used by HR in his speech as shown in the following table. Table 16 shows that there are two functions of boosters discovered: intensifiers and certainties. As shown in Table 16, HR used boosters in his speech to express intensifiers and certainties. Intensifiers were used to strengthen the magnitude of his statements. Meanwhile, certainties were used to assert his conviction about the truth of his statements. It was significant for HR to use boosters which function as intensifiers and certainties because he was in a position to convince the audience about the need to raise fuel prices.

Table 16. Functions of Boosters HR's in Speech

Functions of Boosters		No.	Items Found in Speech
Uptoner	**Intensifier:**	1.	***Seluruh*** *rakyat Indonesia yang kami cintai, para wartawan yang saya muliakan, ...* *...**marilah** pada kesempatan yang baik dan Insya Allah penuh berkah ini, ...*
		2	*Kita juga **patut** bersyukur, sebagaimana kita fahami bersama, ...*
			*Saudara sekalian yang saya cintai, APBN perubahan ini **amatlah** penting bagi kita, ...*
			*...dan kesinambungan fiskal kita, APBN kita, tetapi juga perekonomian kita **secara keseluruhan**.*
			*Besarnya subsidi BBM ini dan berpotensi **terus** akan membengkak di samping ...*
			*...di samping **lebih dari** 70% tidak tepat sasaran tapi juga dirasakan ...*
	Certainty:	3.	*...bahwa kebijakan tersebut **akan** menimbulkan inflasi yang ...*
			*Ini adalah pilihan yang **amat** sulit dan ...*
			*...dan membengkaknya konsumsi BBM, akibat **tentu saja** dari meningkatnya hasil pembangunan ...*
			*...mengakibatkan defisit anggaran kita melampaui 3% yang **tentu** tidak dibenarkan oleh ...*
			*Pemerintah **tentu** menyadari bahwa kebijakan tersebut ...*
			*...kita dapat melindungi masyarakat kita yang **tentu** terkena dampak tersebut dan ...*

As for AA's speech, it was discovered that AA used boosters in some parts of her speech. As shown in Table 17, there are two functions of boosters in AA's speech, namely intensifiers and certainties. AA used some words namely *paling* 'most', *mendasar* 'basic'**,** *penting* 'important'*, harus* 'must'*, sangat* 'very', and *terutama* 'particularly' to intensify her statements. In essence, these intensifying boosters were used to highlight certain qualities or entities such as need and poverty. These issues are often used in speeches made by politicians to win the audience's hearts. In this speech, it appears that AA intended to show sympathy that she cared for the people.

Table 17. Functions of BoosterAA's Speech

Functions of Booster		No.	Items Found in Speech
Uptoner	**Intensifier:**	1.	*...memperoleh kebutuhan yang **paling mendasar** yaitu pangan*
		2.	*...Ini **penting** karena ....*
		3.	*...tersebut tanpa **harus** berdampak negatif...*
		4.	*...perumahtangga **sangat** miskin pertahun*
		5.	*...sumber daya air yang **terutama** dialokasikan untuk...*
	Certainty:	7.	*...tepat sasaran, **khusus** untuk ketepatan...*
		8.	*...sosial ekonomi **terendah** sesuai ...*
		9.	*...yaitu 25% **terendah**, pendistribusian...*

10.	*…dengan **sebanyak mungkin** melibatkan…*
11.	*…yaitu dengan **memastikan** bahwa….*
12.	*…dimaksudkan untuk **memastikan** agar mereka……*
13.	*…membantu masyarakat **khususnya** masyarakat miskin…..*

CONCLUSIONS

This study has indicated that both hedges and boosters were employed in the speeches of AA and HR. This finding appears to confirm Hyland's (1998b) theory of hedging that these two pragmatic tools are useful for mitigating and strengthening the truth values of propositions.

The significant contribution of this study is that that hedges and boosters have been proven to be functional for mitigating and strengthening propositions when the issues being raised are sensitive. On the one hand, there was a need for these politicians to mitigate the effect of the fuel hike. For this purpose they resorted to hedges. On the other hand, they also wanted to accentuate their optimism that the government's programs such as the cash assistance program for poor people would succeed. For this purpose, they used boosters. As a matter of fact, the topics discussed in this study pertain to the government policy of raising oil prices, which were most worrying because it was announced at a bad time as Ramadan was drawing close and the new academic year was commencing in which parents needed money to purchase their children's books, shoes and schoolbags.

The policy to raise the fuel prices is unsettling, yet unavoidable, due to the global economic influences. It is hard to implement because it is an unpopular policy. People generally reject raising fuel price policy because it will hurt many of them financially. Thus, there are three issues at work here: first, they wanted to show empathy to the people on lower incomes; second, they wanted to convince the people that the policy was necessary to be taken and if not, a crisis would occur; and third, they wanted to assert that the policy would not do any harm to poor people because the government has prepared programs to minimize the impact of the fuel prices' hike. HR and AA intelligently articulated these three issues by manipulating hedges and boosters in their speeches.

Future researchers are recommended to analyze the grammatical structure of hedges and boosters in the sense that they might be examined through analyses of various grammatical levels such as morphological and syntactic levels. This linguistic pursuit aims to describe the grammatical structures of hedges and boosters by analyzing grammatical elements and how those elements work together to form hedges and boosters. The two pragmatic tools, in fact, not only take the form of lexicons, but also phrases, and sentences. It would be more revealing to investigate the grammatical aspect of hedges and boosters because this perspective will highlight the formal parts of hedges and boosters. It would be interesting to examine the relationships between the pragmatic insights and the structural insights.

Alternatively, researchers might also discover more pragmatic functions of hedges and boosters. Instead of saying, for instance, that hedges function to mitigate statements and boosters function to strengthen them, future researchers are challenged to identify the various senses of hedges such as to insinuate and to evade responsibility. Meanwhile, those boosters which may be found might include, among others, to brag and to overstate. These various senses of hedges and boosters may be discovered, for example, through approaches such as discourse analysis. In addition, future researchers are suggested that they should use concordance software if they work with a large number of texts. Using concordance software will enable them to describe hedges and boosters more accurately in terms of their distribution in larger texts.

NOTE

REFERENCES

Behnam, B., Naeimi, A., & Darvishzade, A. (2012). A Comparative Genre Analysis of Hedging Expressions in Research Articles: Is Fuzziness Forever Wicked? *English Language and Literature Studies*, *2*(2). doi:10.5539/ells.v2n2p20

Crespo-Fernández, E. & López-Campillo, R.M. (2012). Boosters and hedges as persuasive devices in George Ridpath's political language. In *At a Time of Crisis: English and American Studies in Spain*, 317-322. Retrieved from http://www.aedean.org/pdf_ atatimecrisis/Crespo_LopezCampillo_AEDEAN35.pdf,

Holmes, J. (1990). Hedges and Boosters in Women's and Men's Speech. *Language and Communication, 10,* 185-205

Hyland, K. (1994). Hedging in academic writing and EAF textbooks. *English for specific purposes*, *13*(3), 239–256.

Hyland, K. (1998a). Boosting, hedging, and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text, 18*, 349–382.

Hyland, K. (1998b). *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary Discourses: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. London: Longman.

Jalilifar, A. & Alavi, M. (2012). Power and Politics of Language Use: A Survey of Hedging Devices in Political Interviews. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills*, *3*(3), 43–66.

Radjasa, Hatta. (2013). *Pengumunan kenaikan BBM*. Downloaded in June 2013 from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FNgdM_n4UUM

Šandová, J.K. (2010). *Speaker's Involvement in Political Interviews* (Doctoral Dissertation). Masarykova Univerzita. Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/th/237939/ff_d/Priloha_k_ disertacni_praci.pdf

Taweel, A.Q., Saidat, E. M., Rafayah, H.A., & Saidat, A.M. (2011). Hedging in Political Discourse. *The Linguistics Journal*, *5*(1). Retrieved from http://www.linguisticsjournal. com/June-2011-ts.pdf

Varttala, T. (2001). Hedging in scientifically oriented discourse. Exploring variation according to discipline and intended audience. Retrieved from http://tampub.uta.fi/handle/ 10024/67148

Vázquez Orta, I. & Giner, D. (2009). *Writing with conviction: the use of boosters in modelling persuasion in academic discourse*s. Retrieved from http://rua.ua.es/dspace/handle/ 10045/13822

Wacik, Jero & Alisjahbana, Armida. (2013). *Pengumuman kenaikan BBM*. Downloaded from http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ThN1oezJN3E   for Jero Wacik and Armida Alisjahbana's speeches.