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ABSTRAK


Ungkapan ajakan atau persuasif dalam teks tertulis terutama dalam journal internasional merupakan sesuatu yang menarik untuk di analisis. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk mengklasifikasikan strategi-strategi persuasive dan mendiskripsikan strategi hedging yang terdapat dalam kalimat-kalimat persuasive yang digunakan oleh penulis-penulis natif dan non-natif bahasa inggris dalam jurnal internasional. Jenis penelitian dalam tesis ini adalah deskriptif kualitatif. Teknik pengumpulan data menggunakan metode dokumentasi dengan teknik kontan analisis. Sumber data adalah jurnal-jurnal internasional yang terdiri dari 25 penulis natif dan 25 penulis non-natif yang dipilih secara acak dan dianalisis menggunakan teori strategi persuasive oleh Aristotle dan strategi hedging oleh Hyland. Temuan dalam penelitian ini menunjukkan bahwa penulis natif menggunakan 481 strategi persuasif (100%) yang terdiri dari 186 Ethos (37,63%), 132 Pathos (27,44%), dan 168 Logos (34,93%). Dan di penulis non-natif ditemukan 397 strategi persuasif (100%) yang terdiri dari 157 Ethos (39,55%), 32 Pathos (8,06%), dan 208 Logos (52, 39%). Sementara dalam penggunaan strategi hedge, penulis natif menggunakan 803 hedges (100%), yang terdiri dari 62 Attribute Hedges (7,72%), 463 Reliability Hedges (57,66%), 149 Writer Oriented hedges (18,56%), dan 129 Reader Oriented Hedges (16,06%). Di sisi lain, penulis non-natif menggunakan 702 hedges (100%), yang terdiri dari 46 Attribute Hedges (6,54%), 411 Reliability Hedges (58,46%), 113 Writer-Oriented hedges (16,07%), dan 133 Reader Oriented Hedges (18,92%). Penelitian ini juga mengungkapkan beberapa kemiripan dan perbedaan dalam penggunaan strategi persuasive dan strategi hedging oleh penulis natif dan non-natif dalam menulis jurnal internasional.
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Persuasive in written texts especially in international journals is very interesting to be analyzed. The objectives of the research are to classify the persuasive strategies and to describe hedging strategies applied in persuasive sentences used by native and non-native English author in international journals. The type of the research is descriptive qualitative. The data collecting method used in this research is documentation method by using content analysis techniques. The data sources are international journals, which consist of 25 journals written by native English author and 25 journals written by non-native English author which are chosen randomly and analyzed by using Aristotle’s persuasive strategies theory and Hyland’s hedges strategies theory. The research findings shows that native authors use 481 persuasive strategies (100%) which consist of 186 Ethos (37,63%), 132 Pathos (27,44%), and 168 Logos (34,93%) application. And in non-native authors found 397 persuasive strategies (100%) which consist of 157 Ethos (39,55%), 32 Pathos (8,06%), and 208 Logos (52, 39%) application. While in the use of hedges strategies, the native authors use 803 hedges (100%), which consist of 62 Attribute Hedges (7,72%), 463 Reliability Hedges (57,66%), 149 Writer Oriented hedges (18,56%), and 129 Reader Oriented Hedges (16,06%). On the other hand, non-native authors used 702 hedges (100%), which consist of 46 Attribute Hedges (6,54%), 411 Reliability Hedges (58,46%), 113 Writer-Oriented hedges (16,07%), and 133 Reader Oriented Hedges (18,92%). This study also discovers some similarities and differences of persuasive and hedging strategies used by native and non-native English authors in writing international journals.

Keywords: Hedging strategies, International Journals, Native and Non-native English, Persuasive strategies.

1. Introduction

The development of technology and science is influenced by the development of research. The research reports are published to the public as paper, thesis, dissertation or journal. Leithauser and Bell (1987) defines a scientific paper is a written and published report describing original research results. That short definition must be qualified, however, by noting that a scientific paper must be written in a certain way and it must be published in a certain way, as defined by three centuries of developing tradition, editorial practice, scientific ethics, and the interplay of printing and publishing procedures. A scientific journal is a periodical publication intended to further the progress of science,
usually by reporting new research (Meadows, 1979). The ways researchers reveal and explain their research result are implemented in the research findings and discussion of the research in the research or journals. In order to interest reader to read, agree and believe with the result of the research, they should use persuasive sentences.

The ways of which authors persuade readers are different. Each author uses different ways to convince readers. Based on this background, it is interesting to analyze the usage of persuasive sentence by authors of international journals. This research will analyze the usage of persuasion strategies and hedging strategies in the journals.

There are some researchers who have done the research about persuasion or hedges, such as Patpong (2008), Jalilifar and Alavi (2011), Nasiri (2012), Metsämäki (2012), Srum, et all (2012), Sundquist (2013), Pellby (2013), Ye (2013), Yue and Wang (2014) and Mills and Dooley (2014). However five of them analyzed only persuasion and the other five only hedges, most of them were analyzed oral products and advertisements and none of them studied both of the topics and the object is written in the journals. It is important to conduct the study because this study analyzed international journals and compare between native and non-native English user and also it is the first. Hopefully this research can develop and expand the previous research.

2. Literature Review

In order to provide an overview of the relevant research underlying the rationale behind the current study, this chapter reviews the theories which used in this study

2.1 Pragmatics

2.1.1. The Notion of Pragmatics

Pragmatics is one of approaches of discourse analysis. It is a sub disciple of linguistic. It has correlation between language use and language user in situational context. Pragmatics deals with the study of meaning as a communication by speaker and interpreter by listener. It has more to do with analysis of what people mean their sentence that the word or phrase in those sentences mean by themselves. Therefore, the notion of pragmatics is the study aspect of meaning not conveyed in semantic certainly has some cogency.

Pragmatics is concerned with the study of meaning as communicated by a speaker (or writer) and interpreted by a listener (or reader). Pragmatics is the study of meaning (Yule, 1996:3). Pragmatics is about explaining how we produce and understand such everyday but apparently rather peculiar uses of language (Grundy,
And another linguist said that pragmatics is the study of the aspects of meaning and language use that are dependent on the speaker, the addressee and other features of the context of utterance. (Levinson, 1983:5)

2.1.2 Principle of Pragmatics

The study of pragmatics is concerned with many principles to make sense of what somebody hear and read. Pragmatics involves some focuses to study like deictic, reference entailment, implicative, speech act, and so on. Deictic is one of them that take some elements of it makes from situation. Example: (speaker, time, place and address) of the utterance in which is used. Reference is an act in which speaker or writer, uses linguistic forms to enable listener or reader to identify something. Entailment is something that logically follows from what is asserted in the utterance. Implicative is a matter of utterance meaning, and not of sentence meaning. Speech act are actions performed via utterances recognized by hearer. Among those areas of the study the research, the writer focuses on speech act.

2.2 Speech Acts Theory

2.2.1 The Notion of Speech Act Theory

Speech acts theory is the theory in the field of pragmatics. To communicate is to express a certain attitude, and the type of speech act being performed corresponds to the type of attitude being expressed. As an act of communication, a speech act succeeds if the audience identifies, in accordance with the speaker's intention, the attitude being expressed.

Speech act theory is theory which perceived that every utterance constituted some sort of act. Yule (1996) defines speech acts as an action performed by the use of utterances to communicate.

2.2.2 Kinds of Speech Acts

To develop the idea, every speech event constitutes a speech acts. Speech act consist of three separate acts an act of saying something, an act of doing something, and act of affecting something. In Principles of Pragmatics, the terminologies from Austin, the kinds of speech acts are Locutionary act, Illocutionary act, and Perlocutionary act (Leech, 1983:199).

Locutionary act is the act of simply uttering a sentence from a language; it is description of what the speaker says (Leech, 1983:199). Which is the basic act of utterance, or producing a meaningful linguistic expression (Yule, 1996:48).
Illocutionary act is the act in which the speaker intends to do something by producing an utterance. Illocutionary acts would include stating, promising, thanking, congratulating, apologizing, threatening, predicting, ordering, and requesting (Leech, 1983:199). Mostly we don’t just produce well-formed utterances with no purpose. We form utterance with some kind of function in mind (Yule, 1996:48).

Perlocutionary act is the act done by the hearer affected by what the speaker has said. Perlocutionary acts would include effects such as: get the hearer to think about, bring the hearer to learn that, get the hearer to do, persuading, embarrassing, intimidating, boring, irritating, or inspiring the hearer (Leech, 1983:199).

For the example if the father utters this sentence to his school age son, ”you’d better do your homework”, in that utterance the perlocutionary act might be one of irritating, especially if this speech act is a daily occurrence.

2.2.3 The Type of Speech Acts

According to Searle (1979) in Yule (1996:53-55), the five general performed by speech act are:

a) Declarations are those kinds of speech acts that change the world via utterance. It means that the speaker must have a specific institutional role, in specific contexts, to show declaration exactly.

b) Representatives are those kinds of speech acts that state that the speaker believes to be the case or not, in using representatives, the speaker makes words fit in the world (of believe). i.e. stating, suggesting, boasting, complaining, claiming, and reporting.

c) Expressives are those kinds of speech acts that state what the speaker feels (express psychological states and can be statement of pleasure, pain, likes, dislikes, joy, or sorrow. The speaker uses an expressive to make fit the world (of feeling) i.e. thanking, congratulating, pardoning, blaming, praising, condoling etc.

d) Directives are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to get someone else to do something (express what speakers
want). The speaker attempts to make the world fit via the hearer. i.e. commanding, requesting, advising, recommending, and ordering.

e) **Commissives** are those kinds of speech acts that speakers use to commit themselves to some future action (express what the speaker intends). i.e. vowing, offering, treating, promising.

2.3 Persuasion

In the types of Speech Acts, it is in Representative type. Persuasion is the way people to convince hearer or reader to interest and agree with the speaker or writer. Persuasion is typically defined as “human communication that is designed to influence others by modifying their beliefs, values, or attitudes” (Simons, 1976, p. 21).

Aristotle argued that there were three basic ways to persuade an audience of your position: ethos, logos, and pathos. It is known as Persuasion Rhetoric. Rhetoric can be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever. (This is the function of no other of the arts, each of which is able to instruct and persuade in its own special subject: thus, medicine deals with health and sickness). But Rhetoric so to (speak) appears to be able to discover the means of persuasion in reference to any given subject. That is why we say that as an art its rules are not applied to any particular definite class of things. (Aristotle in Metsämäki, 2012)

What this shows is that awareness of rhetoric helps us resort to its tools in many fields of society. The following section will define the key terms of persuasion in more detail. Aristotle (in Metsämäki, 2012) distinguishes three kinds of proofs or structural principles: persuasion by moral character (ethos), persuasion by putting the hearer into a certain emotional frame of mind (pathos), and persuasion by the speech itself (logos). On the basis of this analysis, we can draw the following conclusion: persuasive talk consists of the speaker, the message, and the listener(s)/audience.

Ethos (Greek for character) refers to the trustworthiness or credibility of the writer or speaker. Ethos is often conveyed through the tone and style of the message (Aristotle in Metsämäki, 2012). Ethos is often conveyed through tone and style of the message and through the way the writer or speaker refers to differing views. It can also be affected by the writer's reputation as it exists independently from the message his or her expertise in the field, his or her previous record or integrity, and so forth. The impact of ethos is often called the argument's 'ethical appeal' or the 'appeal from credibility.' According to Cockcroft (in Metsämäki, 2012) ethos can be divided into two
aspects: personality and stance. Personality is recognizable in any spoken exchange which gives us confidence in the person we are talking to, whereas the notion of stance refers to a wider framework of attitudes, a sense of the persuader’s position or viewpoint about what is being discussed (Cockcroft in Metsämäki, 2012). Aristotle (in Metsämäki, 2012) identifies the following qualities as communicating ethos: trust, benevolence and constructive competence, which means that success has been achieved with the help of right vocabulary, intonation, and structural organization. In addition, ethos involves that the persuader has taken a persuader’s stance and has positioned him/herself as a persuader.

Pathos (Greek for suffering or experience) is often associated with emotional appeal. For achievement of success in persuasion, emotional appeals both towards audience and topic are needed. Emotional engagement can be created by a variety of linguistic means, the right language choice, and through imagination (Cockcroft in Metsämäki, 2012). An appeal to pathos causes an audience not just to respond emotionally but to identify with the writer's point of view to feel what the writer feels. The values, beliefs, and understandings of the writer are implicit in the story and conveyed imaginatively to the reader.

According to Aristotle, logos means persuading by the use of reasoning. The Greek word logos means word and it refers to the internal consistency of the message, the clarity of the claim, the logic of its reasons, and the effectiveness of its supporting evidence. The impact of logos on the audience is sometimes called the argument’s logical appeal (Aristotle in Metsämäki, 2012). In logical appeal, you can use inductive logic by giving your readers a bunch of similar examples and then drawing from them a general proposition. Or, you can use the deductive enthymeme by giving your readers a few general propositions and then drawing from them a specific truth. Dictionaries give a wide range of meanings for the word logos, and at different periods it has had many meanings directly relevant to rhetoric. In many contexts logos has been defined as plea, arguments leading to a conclusion, thesis, reason or ground of argument, inward debate, speech, and verbal expression (Cockcroft in Metsämäki, 2012).

According to Aristotle’s definition, rhetoric is the ability, in each particular case, to see the available means of persuasion (Aristotle in Metsämäki, 2012). The persuasive message should consist of a clearly uttered main issue and the ideas supporting it.
2.4. Hedges

2.4.1 Hedges definitions

The concept of hedges was firstly put forward by Lakoff (1972: 485) in his paper Hedges: a Study in Meaning Criteria and the Logic off Fuzzy Concept, in which hedges was defined as “words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy”. However, different scholars made different definitions. Crystal (1997) defined it as a number of words showing uncertainty or limitation in his Modern Linguist Dictionary. In his English Pragmatic Structure, Weinreich (1966) explained how to deal with hedges and refer to it as mea language, such as true, red, so, etc. Yule (1996) defined it as cautious, annotative expression of words. While Hyland said a hedge is “any linguistic means used to indicate either a lack of complete commitment to the truth of a proposition or a desire not to express that commitment categorically” (Hyland, 1998: 2-3).

2.4.2 A pragmatic analysis of hedging

![Figure 1: model of scientific hedging in scientific research by Hyland (1998)](image)

2.4.2.1 Content-oriented hedges

In his book, Hyland (1998: 162) defined content-oriented hedges as,

Content-oriented hedges serve to mitigate the relationship between propositional content and a non-linguistic mental representation of reality; they hedge the correspondence between what the writer says about the world and what the world is thought to be like.

He classify the motivation for content hedges falls into two overlapping categories, concerning the writer’s interest in (1) starting propositional accord with reality, or (2) seeking self protection from the negative consequences of poor judgment. He also referred to these two forms of motivation as Accuracy and Writer-oriented hedges.
2.4.2.1.1 Accuracy-oriented hedges

It refers to the writer’s desire to express propositions with greater precision in areas often characterized by television and reinterpretation. Hedging here is an important means of accurately stating variable results or uncertain claims with appropriate indications of reality (Rounds and Skelton in Hyland, 1998: 162). Almost all academic discourse is a balance of fact and evaluation, as writer to present information as fully, accurately and objectively as possible. Accuracy-oriented hedges are running contribution to the evaluation of the weight of statements in truth-seeking talk. There are two types of accuracy-oriented hedges; they are attribute hedges and reliability hedges.

**Attribute Hedges:** The ability of words to represent an objective domain of non-linguistic facts, however, it is mediated and organized by cognitive processing and crucially dependent on relevant background knowledge (Hyland, 1998: 163). Some words and phrases which included in attribute hedges are: normal, generally, essentially, quite, more or less, almost, barely, approximately, in a strict case, and point of view.

**Reliability Hedges:** These hedges acknowledge writer’s uncertain knowledge and indicate the confidence he or she is willing to invest in the validity of a claim. Reliability hedges thus express simple subjective uncertainly in a proposition and are motivated by the writer’s desire to explicitly convey the extent to which, and in which, it corresponds to his or her understanding of ‘truth’ (Hyland, 1998: 166). Some words and phrases which included in reliability hedges are: however, possible, might be, suspect, could, may, probably, presumably, likely, intuitively, apparently, at least, implies, and alternatively.

2.4.2.1.2 Writer-Oriented Hedges

It creates a clear pragmatic contrast with other content hedges: Accuracy-oriented hedges are proposition-focused and seek to increase precision by referring to the exact state of knowledge or to how the proposition is to be understood; writer-oriented hedges are writer-focused and aim to shield the writer from the possible consequences of negotiability by limiting personal commitment (Hyland, 1998: 170).

Some words and phrases which included in writer-oriented hedges are: although, assumed, indicate, suggest, we propose, believe.
2.4.2.2 Reader-Oriented Hedges

Core examples of reader-oriented hedges thus address the various dimensions of the social relationship between writer and reader in this genre (Hyland, 1998: 177). Some words and phrases which included in attribute hedges are: only, in spite, we conclude, result, our analysis, our/her investigation.

2.5 Present Studies

Related to the study above, the first previous researcher examined the types of speech acts produced by intermediate Spanish learners as well as their selection of pragmalinguistic forms to communicate these acts, then the second previous researcher investigated hedges in relation to political power, face, and politeness are tremendously few, the third previous study examined the frequency and different types of hedging devices in Discussion sections of Research Articles (RAs) in the area of Psychology, the fourth previous study investigated the use of persuasive strategies in multinational university students’ EFL debate, the fifth previous researcher analyzed the application of theory of persuasion to marketing and advertising, the sixth previous researcher investigates the use of hedges (mitigating expressions like I think or sort of) in the speech of learners of English at multiple proficiency levels as well as of native speakers, the seventh previous researcher investigate the usage of hedges in political discourse in the Tampa City Council for the purpose of examining whether or not women hedge more than men in this area, the eighth previous researcher examined how Chinese philosophical values and rhetorical traditions that contribute to coherence differ from those prevalent in English, the ninth previous researcher analyzed the use of hedges in business email and electronic communication, and the last previous researcher identified two persuasive writing techniques – hedging and intensification – that pose difficulty for students in the middle years. From the previous researchers, 5 of them were analyzed persuasive and 5 of them have studied about hedges and most of them were analyzed spoken object, while the writer develop the study not only about persuasion but also analyze the use of hedges applied in international journal. The writer expected this research can expand the knowledge and develop the previous research. Specifically, this study aims to address the following research questions:

1. What are the persuasive strategies used by native English authors?
2. What are the persuasive strategies used by non-native English authors?
3. What are the hedging strategies in persuasive utterances applied by native English authors?
4. What are the hedging strategies in persuasive utterances applied by non-native English authors?

3. Methodology

3.1 Participants

The data of the research are the persuasive utterances in international journals. The data sources are international journals, which consist of 25 journals written by native English authors and 25 journals written by non-native English authors. The native English authors are from British, American and Australian. While the non-native authors are from Asia’s and other countries outside of those three countries.

3.2 Data Collecting Method

The method in collecting data which the researcher uses is documentation method by using content analysis techniques. Content analysis has been defined as a systematic, replicable technique for compressing many words of text into fewer content categories based on explicit rules of coding (Berelson, 1952; GAO, 1996; Krippendorff, 1980; and Weber, 1990 in Stemler, 2001).

The Coding unit that is applied in this study is sampling units. The samples were taken from 25 native English authors and 25 non-native English authors which chosen randomly. For coding the data the writer uses certain system as follows:

1/SD/USA/2014

Notes: 1 : Number Data
SD : Initial of Author Name
USA : Country of the author
2014 : Year of the Journal

3.3 Data Analyzing Technique

The researcher analyzes the data after all the intended data have been collected, and within the process of analyzing the data, the researcher makes some procedures as follows:

1) The researcher analyzes the persuasive strategies used by native English authors by using Aristotle’s theory.
2) The researcher analyzes the persuasive strategies used by non-native English authors by using Aristotle’s theory.
3) The researcher describes the hedging in persuasive utterances strategies applied by native English authors by using Hyland’s theory.

4) The researcher describes the hedging strategies in persuasive utterances applied by non-native English authors by using Hyland’s theory.

4. Findings and Discussion

4.1. Research findings

4.1.1 The Persuasive Strategies Used by Native English Authors.

Persuasive strategies applied in the research were Aristotle’s persuasive strategies: ethos, pathos, and logos. According to the analysis of the native data there are 481 strategies (100%) which consist of 186 Ethos (37.63%), 132 Pathos (27.44%), and 168 Logos (34.93%) application.

a. Ethos

The appeal of ethos in native English data is demonstrate by following sample:

- We argue that the intensity of interaction in our SA population contributed to their relative success at maintaining gains made while in the target environment. (12/JCFK&MHB/USA/2014)

The sample above show the writer’s personal stance and personal argument. The sample which use phrases “our study”, “we argue”, “we envisage” and “We acknowledge” show the writer’s personal judgments and opinions about the topic and analysis. It is used to convince readers by showing their personal stances and beliefs.

b. Pathos

The appeal of pathos in native English data is shown by the following sample:

- Who is to judge what constitutes a sufficient number of instances, and on what basis? There is no acceptable way of answering this question. A complete descriptive grammar has to account for all observed usages, and, arguably, to predict potential future usages. If a linguistic form violates a rule, the rule is incomplete, or must have changed, and so must be restated accordingly. (25/MG/UK/2013)

In the sample above the writer illustrates the feelings and emotions by inviting readers to involve in the research by giving question which reader’s may think. The question ‘Who is to judge ...’ is an additional marker of emotional appeal.
c. Logos

The appeal of logos in native English data is shown by the following sample:

- Again interactants tried to put a positive spin on the interactants’ comments e.g., the motor rider trying to be funny (25 responses), Sergio stating a preference for Chinese food (42 responses) or the lady with coupons demonstrating her knowledge about Mexicans (26 responses). (10/GM/UK/2012)

The data above supports their argument by giving numbers of data as a reason, it is one kind of logos strategies in giving strong reason of writer’s arguments.

4.1.2 The Persuasive Strategies Used by Non-Native English Authors.

In the Non-native data analysis, the application of persuasive strategies found different results. According to the analysis of the non-native data there are 397 strategies (100%) which consist of 157 Ethos (39.55%), 32 Pathos (8.06%), and 208 Logos (52.39%) application.

a. Ethos

The appeal of ethos in non-native English data is demonstrate by following sample:

- I feel that it is important to consider my findings within the context of the current state of TESOL thinking, specifically the claim that we are in the ‘post-methods’ pedagogical paradigm. (22/JM/GRECE/2013)

The use of subjects “I” and “the present study” are additional markers of author’s stances.

b. Pathos

The appeal of pathos in non-native English data is shown by the following sample:

- We can hypothesize from interviews with the professor as well as from the evidence of his interactants’ second-pair moves that he did not perceive any impoliteness in his interactants’ moves. (07/JH/GRMN/2012)

The appeals of Pathos in the non-native data are still dominated by the use of plural subjects in single author. Also the use of question by the authors to illustrate the feelings and emotions to readers still dominate the use of Pathos strategy.

c. Logos

The appeal of logos in non-native English data is shown by the following sample:
The frequency of translating the English past perfect aspect into Arabic simple past + simple present came fourth, viz. 4.7% of the renderings exhibited this strategy. This strategy features the verb "be" in Arabic which is simple past replacing the verb “be” in English and a present Arabic verb replacing the main verb in English. By way of illustration, consider the following examples below: … (20/MMO/JORDAN/2014)

The use of statistic and percentage of data are adding the Logos appeals in non-native data, as shown in the example above.

4.1.3 The Hedging Strategies in Persuasive Utterances Applied by Native English Authors.

In the research, the hedging strategies are classified into 4 parts, they are Attribute hedges and Reliability hedges which included in Accuracy-oriented, then Writer-oriented hedges which included in Content Oriented with Accuracy-oriented, and the last is Reader Oriented hedges.

According to the analysis of the data, found 803 hedges (100%), which consist of 62 Attribute Hedges (7.72%), 463 Reliability Hedges (57.66%), 149 Writer Oriented hedges (18.56%), and 129 Reader Oriented Hedges (16.06%).

a. Attribute Hedges

The ability of words to represent an objective domain of non-linguistic facts, however, it is mediated and organized by cognitive processing and crucially dependent on relevant background knowledge (Hyland, 1998: 163). Some words and phrases included in attribute hedges are: normal, generally, essentially, quite, more or less, almost, barely, approximately, in a strict case, and point of view. According to the analysis of the data, found 62 hedges (7.72%). The application of Attribute hedges in native English data is shown by the following excerpt:

- Also Australians are direct in communicating, whereas Sri Lankans generally are not so direct in communicating as a way of being polite. (18/ADA/AUS/2012)

In this example, the use of hedge “generally” is as the comparison between two variables in terms of a particular feature.

b. Reliability Hedges

These hedges acknowledge writer’s uncertain knowledge and indicate the confidence he or she is willing to invest in the validity of a claim. Some words and phrases which included in reliability hedges are: however, possible, might be, suspect,
could, may, probably, presumably, likely, intuitively, apparently, at least, implies, and alternatively. According to the analysis of the data, found 463 hedges (57.66%). The application of Reliability hedges in native English data is shown by the following excerpt:

- In this paper we have argued that what learners themselves notice about pragmatic behavior in their new context can provide crucial insights into the content and activities that might be relevant to that context. (22/LY&GM/AUS/2015)

  In this example the writer make clear that they have reservations concerning whether the stated situations actually obtain.

c. Writer-Oriented Hedges

  Writer-oriented hedges are writer-focused and aim to shield the writer from the possible consequences of negotiability by limiting personal commitment (Hyland, 1998: 170).

  Some words and phrases included in writer-oriented hedges are: although, assumed, indicate, suggest, we propose, believe. According to the analysis of the data, found 149 hedges (18.56%). The application of Writer-Oriented hedge in native English data is shown by the following excerpt:

    A reference to inadequate knowledge often suggests a propositional hedge. It is used as a springboard into speculation here suggests a more writer-focused motivation.

    - Although some participants told family members about their own role in the relationship problem (only after they reconciled), this admission was never used as an excuse. (17/MCM/UK/2010)

d. Reader-Oriented Hedges

  Core examples of reader-oriented hedges thus address the various dimensions of the social relationship between writer and reader in this genre (Hyland, 1998: 177). Some words and phrases which included in attribute hedges are: only, in spite, we conclude, result, our analysis, our/her investigation. According to the analysis of the data, found 129 hedges (16.06%).

    By specifying a personal source however, the writer shifts the interpretive frame, drawing attention to the relation of the work to the investigator, and signaling that the claim is left open the reader’s judgment.
The results of our investigation thus suggest that one strength of data elicited via a DCT is the wide range of interactional formulaic sequences that it provides. (03/GAS&SA/UK/2005)

4.1.4 The Hedging Strategies in Persuasive Utterances Applied by Non-Native English Authors.

Based on the analysis of the data there are 702 hedges (100%), which consist of 46 Attribute Hedges (6.54%), 411 Reliability Hedges (58.46%), 113 Writer-Oriented hedges (16.07%), and 133 Reader Oriented Hedges (18.92%).

a. Attribute Hedges

The application of Attribute hedges in native English data is shown by the following excerpt:

- It was expected that for Koreans, favor asking messages with an apology would be perceived as more normal, more positive, more credible and … (11/MF&RRRS/MAL/2009)

b. Reliability Hedges

The application of Reliability hedges in native English data is shown by the following excerpt:

- However, it could be understood as a form of “hyper-sensitivity”; these learners were more proficient in listening, and thus, more sensitive to their poor performance in dictation. (05/ST/JPN/2014)

c. Writer-Oriented Hedges

The application of Writer-Oriented hedges in native English data is shown by the following excerpt:

- JLE have developed universal pragmatic knowledge to express refusal strategies in the target language although they were often inhibited by limited pragmalinguistic resources. (14/AW/INDO/2014)

d. Reader-Oriented Hedges

The analysis of data is illustrated in the following example:

- As a result of gender stereotyping, Omarosa’s relatively masculine behavior, albeit politic in this masculine context, is asses … (23/CCMS/CHINA/2012)

4.2 Discussion of the Findings

In this part, the writer presents the discussion of the data analysis. In this research the writer analyzes the persuasive strategies in international journals used by native and
non-native English authors. Also the writer analyzes the use of hedging strategies in persuasive utterances applied by native and non-native English authors.

The persuasive utterances in international journals can be found in the “discussion” or “research finding and discussion” chapter and “conclusion”. These are where the author of the journal wrote their arguments and analysis results of the research. In these chapters we can find different style and model of persuasive arguments of the authors to convince readers about their research.

The persuasive strategies used in this research are persuasion strategies conducted by Aristotle they are: persuasion by moral character (ethos), persuasion by putting the hearer into a certain emotional frame of mind (pathos), and persuasion by the speech itself (logos). It is known as Persuasion Rhetoric. Rhetoric can be defined as the faculty of discovering the possible means of persuasion in reference to any subject whatever. (This is the function of no other of the arts, each of which is able to instruct and persuade in its own special subject: thus, medicine deals with health and sickness). But Rhetoric appears to be able to discover the means of persuasion in reference to any given subject. That is why we say that as an art its rules are not applied to any particular definite class of things (Aristotle in Metsämäki, 2012).

According to Cockcroft (in Metsamaki, 2012), the focus of ethos is on the persuader and his/her personal stance, and the best way to understand stance is to stretch the imagination and powers of empathy by trying to speak in such a way that the possible audience is convinced. In the research, both native and non-native English data almost got equal result with 37, 63% for native and 39, 55% for non-native. Ethos appeal dominates by personal opinions or arguments of the authors about the topic. In ethos, the authors of the journals show their stances and their point of views about their research. The markers of ethos or writer’s personal stances are by the appearance of words or phrases “our study”, “we argue”, “we envisage” and “We acknowledge”, etc. also the use of sentences which states writer’s personal opinions or arguments to persuade readers are include in Ethos strategy as shown in the non-native data analysis examples which didn’t use any subject but still count as personal opinion of the writer. The use of subjects “I” and “the present study” are additional markers of author’s stances.

The next strategy is Pathos, or emotional appeal, seeks to appeal to the needs, values, and emotional sensibilities of the audience. Argumentation emphasizes reason, but when used properly there is often a place for emotion as well. According to Cockcroft (in
Metsamaki, 2012), emotional engagement or pathos includes the need to orient emotional appeals towards the audience and the topic. In brief, persuasion is implemented by using rhetorical speech and by putting the hearer into a certain emotional frame of mind. According to the analysis results, the use of Pathos in Native data got 27.44%. It is relative balance with other strategies. While in the non-native data, the appeals of Pathos surprisingly low, it is only got 8.06% in the usage. It is show that non-native authors didn’t play significant role in the usage of emotional appeals. An appeal to pathos causes an audience not just to respond emotionally but to identify with the writer's point of view to feel what writer’s feels. The values, beliefs, and understandings of the writer are implicit in the story and conveyed imaginatively to the reader.

Then the last strategy is Logos. Logos or the appeal to reason relies on logic or reason and often depends on the use of inductive or deductive reasoning. The term refers to the internal consistency of the message, the clarity of the claim, the logic of its reasons, and the effectiveness of its supporting evidence (Aristotle in Metsamaki, 2012). Logos means word and it refers to the internal consistency of the message, the clarity of the claim, the logic of its reasons, and the effectiveness of its supporting evidence. Based on the research analysis, the appeals of logos got significant result both in native and non-native data. In native data, it got 34.93%, while in non-native data it got 52.39% application. The use of logos is very helpful in supporting arguments or opinions to persuade because it is followed by the proof and strong evidences.

The research also discovers the hedging strategies in persuasive utterances used by native and non-native English authors. The use of hedging strategies analysis which used in the research is a model of scientific hedging in scientific research by Hyland. Hyland (1998: 2-3) said a hedge is “any linguistic means used to indicate either a lack of complete commitment to the truth of a proposition or a desire not to express that commitment categorically”. In the research, the hedging strategies classified into 4 parts, they are Attribute hedges and Reliability hedges which included in Accuracy-oriented, then Writer-oriented hedges which included in Content Oriented with Accuracy-oriented, and the last is Reader Oriented hedges. Then here the writer analyzes attribute, reliability, writer-oriented, and reader-oriented hedges.

According to the analysis of the native data, found 803 hedges (100%), which consist of 62 Attribute Hedges (7.72%), 463 Reliability Hedges (57.66%), 149 Writer Oriented hedges (18.56%), and 129 Reader Oriented Hedges (16.06%). While in non-
native data, found 702 hedges (100%), which consist of 46 Attribute Hedges (6.54%), 411 Reliability Hedges (58.46%), 113 Writer-Oriented hedges (16.07%), and 133 Reader Oriented Hedges (18.92%).

Attribute hedges define as the ability of words to represent an objective domain of non-linguistic facts, however, it is mediated and organized by cognitive processing and crucially dependent on relevant background knowledge (Hyland, 1998: 163). In both data the application of this hedges are low. Some words and phrases which included in attribute hedges criteria are: normal, generally, essentially, quite, more or less, almost, barely, approximately, in a strict case, and point of view. The application of hedges which got more numbers are in the use of “quite” and “almost”, “quite” is items hedging deviations from “ideal” correlations, causes, behavior, and so on, while “almost” forms of “ideal” correlation which realize the greatest effect almost negate the force of the term modified.

The next strategy is Reliability Hedges, these hedges acknowledge writer’s uncertain knowledge and indicate the confidence he or she is willing to invest in the validity of a claim. Reliability hedges thus express simple subjective uncertainly in a proposition and are motivated by the writer’s desire to explicitly convey the extent to which, and in which, it corresponds to his or her understanding of ‘truth’ (Hyland, 1998: 166). Some words and phrases which included in reliability hedges are: however, possible, might be, suspect, could, may, probably, presumably, likely, intuitively, apparently, at least, implies, and alternatively. In both data, the application of Reliability hedges is the highest more than 50% of the whole hedges. In both data the application of “however”, “could”, and “may” are the most often. The use of “however” in the data show that the writers make clear that they have reservations concerning whether the stated situations actually obtain, while “could” and “may” are the most common means of expressing reliability accuracy-oriented content hedges is by conventional epistemic forms in the main grammatical classes, principally modal verbs, modal adjectives and nouns, and content disjunct adverbs expressing propositional uncertainty. But in native data there is one more hedge which common used, it is “likely” where these comment on the probability of the content of a proposition being true and include both adverbs of certainty, which simply convey doubt on the information of mental perception, which show how results are understood.
Then the third is Writer-Oriented hedges, it creates a clear pragmatic contrast with other content hedges: Accuracy-oriented hedges are proposition-focused and seek to increase precision by referring to the exact state of knowledge or to how the proposition is to be understood; writer-oriented hedges are writer-focused and aim to shield the writer from the possible consequences of negotiability by limiting personal commitment (Hyland, 1998: 170). Some words and phrases which included in writer-oriented hedges criteria are: although, assumed, indicate, suggest, we propose, believe. According to the analysis of the data, the most frequently used in both data are “although” and “indicate”. The use of “although” is as a reference to inadequate knowledge often suggests a propositional hedge, it is used as a springboard into speculation here suggests a more writer-focused motivation, while “indicate” is a common strategy which is the construction of “abstract rhetors”, by minimalising a personal projection, it is suggest that the situation described is independent of human agency. But in native data there is “suggest” as one of the most common used hedges.

Then the last is Reader-Oriented Hedges, the core examples of reader-oriented hedges thus address the various dimensions of the social relationship between writer and reader in this genre (Hyland, 1998: 177). Some words and phrases which included in attribute hedges are: only, in spite, we conclude, result, our analysis, our/her investigation. Based on the analysis of the data there are two hedges which commonly used by native and non-native authors, first, the use of impersonal expressions to comment on other’s work indicates a writer-oriented hedge: “only”. And second by specifying a personal source, the writer shifts the interpretive frame, drawing attention to the relation of the work to the investigator, and signaling that the claim is left open the reader’s judgment by the use of “result”.

In summary, both native and non-native authors show clear differences in applications of persuasive strategies and the use of hedges. Native English authors show balance application of ethos, pathos, and logos, while non-native English authors show the lack of pathos strategy. In the applications of hedging strategies, both native and non-native authors show low frequency in Attribute hedges and high frequency in the usage of Reliability hedges, but in native data show higher frequency in the use of writer-oriented hedges, and non-native data got higher frequency in reader-oriented hedges. Based on these analysis results we can see the differences on native and non-native English author’s style to persuade readers in writing journals.
5. Conclusion

In conclusion, the use of persuasion strategies and hedges between native and non-native English authors show clear differences. Native English authors show balance applications of ethos, pathos, and logos, while non-native English authors show the lack of pathos strategy. Native English authors expressed their personal stances, emotional engagements and supported reasons or evidences together, while non-native English authors are stressing in using logical reasons and evidences as the main supporters to their personal stances. In the application of hedging strategies, both native and non-native authors show low frequency in Attribute hedges and high frequency in the use of Reliability hedges, but in native data show higher frequency in the use of writer-oriented hedges, and non-native data got higher frequency in reader-oriented hedges. Both data applied the same common hedges markers, such as: “however”, “could”, “may”, “although”, “indicate”, “only”, and “result”. This study also discovered that both native and non-native English authors have different styles to persuade readers in writing journals.

There are few recommendations made in order to improve the way of writing persuasive utterances in the journals. First, students need to maximize the use of emotional appeals and logical reasons to support their own arguments or stances. The researcher’s stance is important, but it will be perfect if it supported with emotional engagement and strong evidences. Second, writers must not only consider the plausibility of a proposition, but also its likely effect on colleagues’ attitudes as both interested researchers and as disciplinary members.
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