Jordan Journal of Modern Languages and Literatures Vol.15, No. 3, 2023, pp 783-796

JJMLL

On the Use of Hedges and Boosters in Different Sections of Research Articles Published in National and International Journals

Marzieh Ranjbar, Hooshang Yazdani*, Moussa Ahmadian, Majid Amerian
Department of English Language and Literature, Arak University, Iran

Received on: 25-5-2021 **Accepted on: 2-11-2021**

Abstract

This study was conducted to investigate the frequency of the use of hedges and boosters in academic writings of both Farsi and English writers. To do so, 200 articles from four qualified journals were selected to create four different corpora. The corpora were then analyzed for the presence of hedges and boosters completely, using Ant Conc analyzer free ware. Descriptive statistics and chi-square tests helped us to discuss the findings. The findings suggested that Iranian native writers made less use of hedges in their writings compared to English native writers, which means that nonnative writers are less conservative in claiming their results. The results of the chi square test showed that the difference between Persian and English writers was significant. The pattern of using hedges and boosters in different parts of the articles is also different. The results and discussion sections of the articles had the highest frequency of the presence of hedges and boosters, and the methodology section had the least frequency. The results of this study can help material developers for graduate and post graduate courses or course designers to focus more on the pragmatic part of language teaching. Nonnative writers want to publish their articles in prestigious journals in order to reach academic identity, so the results of this study can help them to learn the pattern of writings in English. Language teachers can stress this cross-cultural difference in their classes to increase the level of self-confidence of their students and help them to clarify their points while communicating, without becoming disappointed.

Keywords: Discourse, Discourse markers, Hedges, Boosters, Research papers, Academic writing.

1. Introduction

Writing academic articles is one way through which researchers around the world can communicate with each other and exchange their points of view. Hyland (2004) believes that, in academic writing, the writer's duty is not only to present propositional statements but also to consider their readers' expectations and to provide them with credible and intelligible statements. In order to be recognized by readers of a specific genre, they need to follow specific conventions and rules of writing which certify the fact that members of different disciplines recognize and understand each other's works.

* Doi: https://doi.org/10.47012/jjmll.15.3.2
* Corresponding Author: **H-yazdani@araku.ac.ir**

One of the conventions that is helpful to be followed in writing is employing metadiscourse markers (Hyland 2004). Metadiscourse is a "cover term for self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meanings in a text, assisting the writer (or speaker) to express a view point, and engage with readers as members of a particular community" (Hyland 2005a, 37).

According to Hyland (2005a), metadiscourse markers are divided into two groups of **stance** and **engagement.** Stance refers to the extent the writers want to commit themselves in their texts and consists of **hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention.** Researchers employ different strategies to satisfy their readers regarding their points of view. Hedges and boosters which are two aspects of stance markers in Hyland's (2005a) model of interaction are considered as tools for convincing the readers. Knowing how to use these elements in the text can help novice writers to write well-organized and easy-to-follow texts.

The term hedge was first introduced by Lackoff (1972, 485) who argued that hedges are "words whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy". They are elaborated on by Crystal (1997) as tools which show uncertainty. Hyland (1998, 2-3), however, states that hedges are "any linguistic means used to indicate either a lack of complete commitment to the truth of the propositions or a desire not to express that commitment categorically". Vassileva (2001, 85) referred to them as "an interpersonal means of expressing detachment. They withheld the writer from reporting statements in terms of factual truth. Their duty is to show the readers that the stated statements are more based on reasining rather than unchangeable facts (Hyland 2005a). Hyland (2005a) argued that claim-making is risky and may bring about lots of contradictions in the literature.

Boosters, on the other hand, are called tools for expressing certainty. They are the intensifiers for increasing the force of the statements which are also called *strengtheners* (Brown and Levinson 1987) or *upgraders* (House and Kasper 1981). Hedges and boosters show that every statement contains signs for showing the writer's attitude. It is the writer who should decide on the amount of certainty and commitment toward what he or she is writing about. Khedri and Kritsis (2018) argued that boosters are present in the text to avoid possible objection.

A great deal of research has been conducted to check the use and distribution of hedges and boosters in research articles (Atai and Sadr 2008; Behnam, Naeimi and Darvishzade 2012; Hu and Cao 2011; Hyland 1998), but there exist many contradictions in the literature, and different studies report different results. This study endeavors to find the pattern of the use of hedges and boosters in different sections of scientific articles written by Farsi and English native speakers to shed more light on this issue. Hyland (1996) indicates that the more we understand such features, the better and more effectively we can argue in scientific research articles. There is a need to investigate this issue in a wider corpus, however. So, the main concern in this study are hedges and boosters which are the main categories of stance markers. These tools decrease the strength or the level of certainty of statements and have both epistemic and affective values. It means that they convey both the level of certainty of writers and their attitude toward what is being said.

2. Review of Related Literature

The presence of hedges predicts the presence of objections toward the claims. Hyland (1996) believes that information about hedging is necessary for knowing the rules of evidential reasoning. It is part of Toulmin's (1958) structure of argumentation as well. Based on Toulmin's model, elements of reasoning are the *ground* (the data), the *Warrant* (facts supporting the hypothesis), the *qualifier* (degrees of uncertainty), the *claim* (suggested conclusions), and *rebuttal* (doubts concerning the suggestion of claims). In this model, he was concerned with the level of certainty of the writers on what they claim. Hedges and boosters are tools for taking care of this fact in the text.

In the words of Hyland (1994), even competent English speakers find using hedges and boosters in academic texts difficult and problematic. Yates (2010) argues that one aspect of pragmatic competence is the ability to use vague language which is an indicator of politeness or solidarity, and this vagueness can be expressed by means of hedges. The importance of the use of hedges and boosters is not hidden to anyone these days, and as Myere (1989, 13) states "a sentence that looks like a claim but has no hedging is probably not a statement of new knowledge". He argues that precision is not always acceptable and sometimes we need to be vague in our writings and speaking. Hedging is necessary for effective argument by the use of which writers predict and avoid negative objection and complete commitments.

Hedges and boosters are polypragmatic and can have different functions simultaneously. Hedges show that there are differences between factual statements and inferences of the writer. Writer-based hedges show that the writer has anticipated the negative consequences of the presented propositions. They help the writer to avoid responsibility against overstatement (Hyland 1996). Lexical verbs, adjectives, adverbs, and modals are devices for showing certainty or uncertainty of the writers in the text.

The pattern of the employing hedges and boosters in different sections of research articles is different. Hyland (1996) maintains, hedges mostly occur in the discussion part of research articles, since it is in the discussion part that writers express their conservative claims. He expressed that only four percent of hedges occurs in method section and about sixty percent of them occurs in the discussion part.

Jalilfar (2007) investigated the presence of hedges in abstract part of research articles written by native speakers of English, native speakers of Farsi, and other languages. He created a corpus of 552 abstracts from different disciplines and counted the frequency of hedges. He did not find any variation across disciplines. According to Sundquist (2013), hedges can have different functions such as *vagueness, equivocation, evasion,* or *politeness.* He continued that in case of quantities, this vagueness shows less assertive language. Hedges are used as a kind of face-saving strategy as well. Drave (2002) believes that this kind of vague language can also show rapport since there is a close relationship between the writer and the reader; there is no need for preciseness and being exact.

According to Sundquist (2013), nonnative speakers usually underuse hedges compared with the native speakers of English. He further argued that learners with higher levels of proficiency make use of hedges more which is comparable with the use of them by native sparkers. He believes that pragmatic competence is a necessary concept in successful communication. It is defined by Fraser (2010, 15) as "the ability to communicate your intended message with all its intended nuances in any socio-cultural context

and to interpret the message of your interlocutor as it was intended". As it was mentioned earlier, there exist contradictions on the use of hedges and boosters in different sections of research articles

Questions of the Study

The following questions are addressed in this article:

1- What are the differences between the use of hedges and boosters in English and Persian speakers' writings in different sections of research articles in four qualified journals from 2013 to 2019?

2- Is there any significant difference in using hedges and boosters in different sections of research articles?

3. Method and procedure

The study is a descriptive one. The data of the study is collected from four prestigious journals in the field of TEFL namely, TESOL Quarterly, ELT, IJLTR, and JTLS.

In order to have a wide access to articles written by Farsi native speakers, Iranian journal of language teaching research (IJLTR) was selected. This journal is a double-blind review journal published on behalf of Urmia University.

The second national journal selected for the analysis is the Journal of Teaching Language Skills (JTLS) from Shiraz University. It has published articles since 2009, by Iranian writers only. It has four issues each year. There are about 190 articles published there from 2009 and about 80 articles from 2013 (n=80). Fifty articles were selected by means of random purposive sampling from 2013 to 2019 volumes.

Davis (as cited in Mauko 2014, 7) provided us with a definition of native speaker as "anyone who is adequately exposed to the language before a critical age (usually agreed to be nine)". As a result, the language background of the authors of these articles was scrutinized thoroughly. Furthermore, writers' resumes available on the net, and their affiliations of these writers were also checked, and the selected articles were from original English-speaking countries such as the US, England, and Australia. TESOL Quarterly journal provided the writers bio data; so they were checked, as well. The name of the authors, the countries in which the articles were published, the universities, and the authors educational backgrounds, the bio data of articles, checking the pictures of authors in the net, and responses of the authors to mail were used as helping tools in determining the appropriate data for the study.

After realizing which articles are appropriate for the purpose of the study, fifty articles from each journal were randomly selected and uploaded in the discourse analyzer program from each journal.

The reference parts, appendixes, writers' names and affiliation, titles, and the tables were deleted from the articles. Content analysis technique was used to explore this large amount of data. The data was categorized into groups of native and nonnative speaker articles.

A list of about one hundred and fifty hedges and boosters was taken from Hyland (2005b) book and searched in the articles one by one by means of Ant Conc. corpus analysis tool. It is a freeware corpus analysis tool created by Laurance Anthony (2014). With the help of this freeware, the results can be checked in contexts and frequencies can be counted. The key words will be identified in the selected texts and their functions can be checked as well.

In order to check the functions of these words and make sure the words have the function of hedge in the study, they were double checked by two experts in the field of TEFL and an inter-rater reliability of about.85 was achieved. Crompton's (1997, 282) test was used to consider whether the words were hedge or not. He stated that, "if the proposition can be restated in such a way that it is not changed but the author's commitment to it is greater than at the present, then the proposition is hedged."

Since the number of words used in these research articles in each of the four journals was different, the frequency of hedges was calculated per 1000 words.

4. Results and Discussion

First the frequency of hedges was calculated and their functions in the text were checked. Table (1) shows the word types and tokens in each section of the journal articles separately.

Table 1: The Frequency of Word Types and Tokens in Each Section of Articles

	Introduction	LR	Method	R&D
ELT	51392	-	39359	106389
TESOL	76923	28342	92513	194642
IJLTR	35469	56727	46265	96518
JTLS	40529	62489	78428	136426

LR= literature Review, R&D=Results and Discussion

As it is clear in Table 1, the number of words used in each section of the articles and also in different journals are different. In order to find the frequency of hedges and boosters in the four journals, the frequency and functions of hedges and boosters were checked and counted. Table 2 shows the frequency of them in each journal separately.

Table 2: Total Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in Each Journal

Journal	Raw frequency of hedges	Distribution of hedges per 1000 words	Raw frequency of Boosters	Distribution of Boosters per 1000 words
TESOL	4172	10.63	1869	5.15
IJLTR	2286	9.72	1501	6.38
ELT	2354	11.94	1042	5.28
JTLS	3024	9.51	1579	4.9

As Table 2 reveals, overall, English native speakers in the international journals have made use of hedges more in their writings. ELT journal had the highest frequency of hedges and JTLS had the lowest frequency of the presence of hedges. Boosters were used less than hedges in these articles. IJLTR and JTLS Journals had the most and the least occurrences of boosters respectively. In order to check whether the distribution of hedges and boosters in different journals are significantly different or not, a chi square test was run. Table 4 and Table 5 show the results of the chi-square test.

Table 3: The Results of Chi Square Test

			VAR00001				
			TESOL	IJLTR	ELT	JTLS	Total
VAR00002	1.00	Count	4172_a	2286_b	2354_a	3024_c	11836
		% within VAR00001	69.1%	60.4%	69.3%	65.7%	66.4%
	2.00	Count	1869_a	1501_b	1042_a	1579_c	5991
		% within VAR00001	30.9%	39.6%	30.7%	34.3%	33.6%
Total		Count	6041	3787	3396	4603	17827
		% within VAR00001	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Each subscript letter denotes a subset of VAR00001 categories whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the.05 level.

Table 4: Level of Significance of Chi Square Test

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	94.976[a]	3	.000
Likelihood Ratio	93.846	3	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.801	1	.094
N of Valid Cases	17827		

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1141.27.

The results of the chi square test (see Table 5) showed that the use of hedges and boosters across different journals is significant. We can conclude that different journals may have different norms of writing.

To check the pattern of use of hedges in different journals separately, the following tables were created.

Table 5: The Pattern of Use of Hedges and Boosters in IJLTR (Urmia)Journal

IJLTR	Introduction	LR	Method	R&D
Frequency of Hedges	414	547	281	1044
Distribution of Hedges per 1000 words	11/67	9/64	6/07	10/81
Frequency of Boosters	210	372	142	777
Distribution of Boosters per 1000 words	5.92	6.55	3.06	8.05

As it is clear in Table 5, in IJLTR, most of the hedges happened in the introduction part of research articles followed by results and discussion sections. The least amount of the use of hedges happened in the method section. The same results can be reported for boosters. Most use of boosters happened in the results and discussion parts and the least of them happened in method section.

Table 6 shows the distribution of hedges and boosters across sections of TESOL quarterly journal.

Table 6: The Pattern of the Use of Hedges and Boosters in TESOL Quarterly

TESOL	Introduction	LR	Method	R&D
Frequency of Hedges	873	678	324	2297
distribution per 1000 words	11/34	11.42	7.07	11/80
Frequency of Boosters	389	174	145	1161
Distribution of Hedges per 1000 words	5.07	6.13	1.51	5.96

Table 6 shows that, in TESOL Quarterly journal, hedges happened mostly in the results and discussion sections followed by the introduction section. The least amount of use happened in the methodology section.

In TESOL Quarterly, most cases of boosters happened in review of the literature part. This is probably due to the fact that in this section writers review the facts and claims of the other scholars and are not worried about the responsibility of what has been said previously.

Table 7 shows the distribution of hedges and boosters in different sections of JTLS.

Table 7: The Pattern of the Use of Hedges and Boosters in JLTS (Shiraz) Journal

JTLS	Introduction	LR	Method	R&D
Frequency of Hedges	408	559	537	1520
Frequency per 1000 words	10/06	8/94	6/84	11/14
Frequency of Boosters	180	363	231	805
Distribution per 1000 words	2.66	5.80	2.94	5.9

In JTLS journal, results and discussion sections had the highest frequency of hedges followed by the introduction section and literature review (see Table 7). The least amount happens in the method section. The same results happened in ELT Journal. In JTLS Journal, the Results and Discussion, and the review of literature part had the highest frequencies of boosters.

Table 8 shows the pattern of use of hedges in ELT journal.

Table 8: The Pattern of the Use of Hedges in ELT Journal

ELT	Introduction	LR	Method	R&D
Frequency of Hedges	627	-	339	1338
Distribution per 100 words	12/200	-	8/61	13/04
Frequency of Boosters	249	-	109	684
Distribution per 1000 words	4.84	-	2.76	6.42

The same as with the other journals, the results and discussion sections of ELT journal had the highest frequency of hedges and boosters (see Table 8).

To check the differences between the writings of native and nonnative writers, Table 9 was created. As you can see in Table 9, overall, the use of hedges was more in English speaking writers.

Table 9: The Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in National and international Journals

	National	International
Raw Frequency of Hedges	5310	6526
Per1000words	9.60	11.66
Raw Frequency of Boosters	3080	2911
Per 1000 words	5.57	5.2

In order to check whether the writings of native English speakers and Persian native speakers are significantly different in terms of the distribution of hedges and boosters, another chi square test was run. Table 10 shows the results of the chi-square test.

Table 10: The Results of the Chi Square Test

VAR00002 * VAR00001 Cross-tabulation

			VAR00001		
			National	International	Total
VAR00002	1.00	Count	5310_a	6526_b	11836
		% within VAR00001	63.3%	69.2%	66.4%
	2.00	Count	3080_a	2911_b	5991
		% within VAR00001	36.7%	30.8%	33.6%
Total		Count	8390	9437	17827
		% within VAR00001	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%

Each subscript letter denotes a subset of VAR00001 categories whose column proportions do not differ significantly from each other at the.05 level.

Table 11: Level of Significance of Chi Square

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	Df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	68.441[a]	1	.000		
Continuity Correction[b]	68.178	1	.000		
Likelihood Ratio	68.390	1	.000		
Fisher's Exact Test				.000	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	68.437	1	.000		
N of Valid Cases	17827				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2819.57.
b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

In the whole corpus, the analysis showed that native speakers of English used hedges more than nonnative speakers. The results are in line with what sundquist (2013) concluded.

In all journals there were no signs of hedges as *doubtful, in my view, presumable, beyond doubt, conclusively, decidedly, doubtless, indisputable, indisputably, incontestable, incontrovertible, undisputable, without doubt, and noncontroversial.*

The most frequent hedge-word in *TESOL Quarterly* was the word *may*. In IJLTR journal, the most frequent words are *should* and *may* with frequencies of 410 and 337 respectively. The third frequent word goes to the word *found*.

The modal verb *may* was used more frequently than might in the four journals which is in line with Hashemi and Shirzadi's (2016) article. It happens may be because of the perceived formality of the word *may* in an academic genre (Hyland 1996) and its "possibility/probability" reference (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, and Svartvik 1985).

The word *would* has frequency of 155 and 293 in JTLS and TESOL quarterly journal respectively which is higher than other hedges. According to Hashemi and Shirzad (2016), the use of past tense can show the concept of probability more.

The less use of *must* in scientific articles is due to the fact that writers avoid even weak versions of conviction and according to Hyland (1996), it is usually replaced by *could*.

Hedges are used in the discussion and results parts to decrease the force of the statements (Hyland, 2005). It shows that writers have the rhetorical and academic knowledge of where to employ these markers.

The findings of this study are in line with Vassileva (2001) who conducted a study to examine the writings of English, Bulgarian, and Bulgarian English in case of their similarities and differences in using interpersonal discourse markers. The findings of his study also showed that the distribution of hedges and boosters in writings of native and nonnatives are different due to different cultural background. The use of these discourse markers in different parts of the articles was different as well. The results signify the fact that different sections of the articles have different rhetorical functions. Such facts can help writers tolerate culture related differences when they are writing in a language different from their mother tongue.

Jalilfar (2007) also concluded that the employment of hedges in different parts of the articles is different, but in his study the differences were not significant.

The results of this study are also in line with the study of Rezanejad, Lari, and Masouli (2015) who argued that native speaker authors made use of hedges more than nonnative ones. Hinkel (2005) also refers to the underuse of hedges in the writings of nonnative speakers.

In Sundquist's (2013), learners of English underused hedges compared with native speakers. He also concluded that learners with higher levels of proficiency use more hedges in their writings and proficient learners can use hedges in the same way as native speakers. According to him, proficiency level is a significant element when investigating the use of discourse markers by nonnative speakers of a language.

In modern approaches of writing, there is a shift from accuracy toward appropriate language which can be achieved through the use of discourse markers. Hedges are one aspect of the interpersonal category of metadiscourse and are considered as a communicative strategy. Researchers prefer to be cautious when they are presenting information. In this study, all journals made use of hedges in their articles frequently. Atai and Sadr (2008, 12) also reached to the same results and argued that "this makes discussion section

of English native writers more in conformity with the rules of discourse community of applied linguistics (RAs)".

Hyland (2005a) concluded that hedges are by far the most frequent type of metadisourse markers used in articles written in different discipline. It shows that writers of research articles are cautious in claiming their ideas. They are aware of the responsibilities that are on their shoulders in the process of adding to the existing knowledge.

Akbas and Hardman (2018) argue that native speakers of English had a conservative approach for claiming their results and they use hedges more frequently compared with other types of metadiscours markers.

Afshar et al. (2014) concluded that in soft sciences usually writers are more cautious compared with hard sciences. In their ideas, it is natural to have more hedges in soft science articles. In the field of TEFL, which is considered as a soft science, professional writers prefer to be more conservative. Abdi (2002) states that writers in soft sciences such as ELT prefer to express possibilities rather than unchanging facts. Pragmatic competence is defined as "the ability to communicate your intended message with all its intended nuances in any socio-cultural context and to interpret the message of your interlocutor as it was intended." (Fraser 2010, 15) and is considered an important part of language learning and communicative competence. One of the reasons that learners of a language cannot express their points in the second language effectively is that they are not familiar with the pragmatic patterns of that language well.

The correct use of hedges as a "rhetorical strategy" (Fraser 2010) can make our writings more native like.

The results of the study conducted by Mirzapour and Mahand (2012) showed that there is no significant difference between natives and nonnatives in the case of using hedges and boosters. They also concluded that the conclusion parts of research articles are heavily loaded with hedges compared with the abstract and introduction sections. Farrokhi and Emami (2008) stated that since different sections of articles have different rhetorical purposes, it is understandable that the use of hedges and boosters is different in these sections. West (1980) stated that the rhetorical purposes of writing the introduction part is to present the gap in the literature, state the problem, and elaborates on the significance of the study. So, there is no need for the use of boosters or hedges. He further explained that in results and discussion sections writers present the results of the study and their comments about them, so it is not surprising that hedges and boosters occur more in this section.

Conclusion

Hyland (1998) stated that if writers want to gain acceptance of the discourse community, they have to present their claims with appropriate forms of hedges and boosters. He explained that by the use of boosters there is little room for interpretation, but in case of hedges different interpretations can be inferred from the sentences. The results of this study showed that both native and nonnative speakers made use of hedges and boosters in their writings, but Farsi native speakers made use of them less than

the other group. Different sections of articles have different rhetorical purposes, and it is not surprising that the use of hedges and boosters is different in all these sections. The results of this study showed that the Results and Discussion sections are heavily equipped with hedges and boosters and the method section has the least use of them. By making learners aware of the conventions of writing in each section of research articles, language teachers can help second language learners produce more nativelike pieces of writings. Because most of second language learners try to produce objective texts, they limit the use of intensifiers in their writings, so further genre analysis can shed more light on this issue to help novice nonnative writers write effectively.

استخدام مفردات «الشكّ» و«اليقين» في المقالات العلميّة المكتوبة بيد كُتاب اللغتين الفارسيّة والإنجليزيّة في المجلات الوطنيّة والدوليّة

مرضية رنجبر، هوشنك يزداني، موسى أحمديان، مجيد عامريان
قسم اللغة الإنجليزيّة وآدابها، جامعة آراك، إيران

الملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة الى البحث عن كثرة مفردتي «الشكّ» و«اليقين» في المقالات العلميّة المكتوبة بيد كُتاب اللغتين الفارسيّة والإنجليزيّة. لقد اختير مئتا مقالٍ من أربع مجلات معتبرة وتشكلت أربع مجموعات مختلفة. تمّ تحليل مجموعة المكتوبات بصورة كاملة حسب وجود مفردتي «الشكّ» و«اليقين» باستخدام برمجية « Ant Conc ». تحكي النتائج أن المتكلمين بالفارسيّة يستخدمون هاتين المفردتين أقل من المتكلمين بالإنجليزيّة وذلك بمعنى أن الفرس ليسوا محافظين في تبيين النتائج الدراسيّة، فبعض النتائج تعلن أن كلا الفريقَين يختلف عن الآخَر بصورة ذات دلالة، ويفرق نموذج استخدام المفردتين «الشكّ» و«اليقين» في أقسام مختلفة، حيث إن قسم تحليل البيانات في المقالات يحتوي على أكثر مدى المفردات وقسم طريق البحث أقل عدداً، ويمكن لنتائج هذا البحث أن تُعين منتجي المحتوى حتى يركّزواعلى براغماتيّة لغة التعليم تركيزاً أكثر، ويريد غير المتكلمين باللغة الأم أن تطبع مقالاتهم في مجلات معتبرة، بغيةَ صُنع هويتهم الجامعيّة. كما يمكن أن تساعدنا نتائج البحث لنتعلم النماذج المكتوبة لمتكلمي اللغة الأم، ويستطيع المعلّمون أن يرفعوا ثقة الطلاب بأنفسهم بتسليط الضوء على الفروق الثقافيّة ويساعدوهم على أن ينقلوا مضامينهم بصورة واضحة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الخطاب، دالّة الخطاب، مفردات الشكّ، مفردات اليقين، المقالات العلميّة، كتابة جامعيّة.

References

Abdi, Reza. 2002. Interpersonal Metadiscourse: An Indicator of Interaction and Identity. *Discourse studies* 4 (2): 139-145.

Afshar, Hassan Soodmand, Mohamad Moradi, and Raouf Hamzavi. 2014. Frequency and Type of Hedging Devices Used In The Research Articles Of Humanities, Basic Sciences And Agriculture. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences* 136: 70-74.

Akbas, Erdem, and Jan Hardman. 2018. Strengthening or Weakening Claims in Academic Knowledge Construction: A Comparative Study of Hedges and Boosters in Postgraduate Academic Writing. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice* 18 (4).

Atai, Mahmoodreza, and Lela Sadr. 2006. A Cross-Cultural Genre Study on Hedging Devices in Discussion Section of Applied Linguistics Research Articles. In *Proceedings of the conference of Pan-Pacific Association of Applied Linguistic*: 42-57.

Behnam, Biook, Amin Naeimi, and Ali Darvishzade. 2012. A Comparative Genre Analysis of Hedging Expressions in Research Articles: Is Fuzziness Forever Wicked?. *English Language and Literature Studies* 2 (2): 20.

Brown, Penelope and Stephen C. Levinson. 1987. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage* 4. Cambridge university press.

Crismore, Avon, Raija Markkanen, and Margaret S. Steffensen. 1993. Metadiscourse in Persuasive Writing: A Study Of Texts Written By American And Finnish University Students. *Written Communication* 10 (1): 39-71.

Crompton, Peter. 1997. Hedging in Academic Writing: Some Theoretical Problems. *English for Specific Purposes* 16 (4): 271-287.

Crystal, David.1998. On Keeping One's Hedges in Order. *English Today* 4 (3):46-47.

Drave, Neil. 2002. "Vaguely speaking: A corpus approach to vague language in intercultural conversations." In *New frontiers of corpus research*, pp. 25-40. Brill Rodopi.

Farrokhi, Farahman, and Safoora Emami. 2008. Hedges and Boosters in Academic Writing: Native Vs. Non-Native Research Articles in Applied Linguistics and Engineering. *Journal of English Language Pedagogy and Practice* 1 (2): 62-98.

Fraser, Bruce. 2010. "Pragmatic competence: The Case of Hedging". In *New approaches to hedging*: 15-34. Brill.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. An Introduction to Functional Grammar (1st ed.). London: Edward Arnold.

Hashemi, Mohammad R., and Danial Shirzadi. 2016. The Use of Hedging in Discussion Sections of Applied Linguistics Research Articles with Varied Research Methods. *Journal of Teaching Language Skills* 35 (1): 31-56.

Hinkel, Eli. 2005. Hedging, Inflating, and Persuading in L2 Academic Writing. *Applied Language Learning* 15 (1/2): 29.

House, Juliane, and Gabriele Kasper. 2011. Politeness Markers in English and German. In *Conversational routine*, pp. 157-186. De Gruyter Mouton.

Hu, Guangwei, and Feng Cao. 2011. Hedging and Boosting In Abstracts of Applied Linguistics Articles: A Comparative Study of English-And Chinese-Medium Journals. *Journal of pragmatics* 43 (11): 2795-2809.

Hyland, Ken. 1994. Hedging in Academic Writing and EAF Textbooks. *English for Specific Purposes* 13 (3): 239-256.

Hyland, Ken. 1996. Writing without Conviction? Hedging in Science Research Articles. *Applied Linguistics* 17 (4): 433-454.

Hyland, Ken. 1999. Disciplinary Discourses: Writer Stance in Research Articles. *Writing: Texts, Processes and Practices*: *99121*.

Hyland, Ken. 2001. Bringing in the Reader: Addressee Features in Academic Articles. *Written Communication* 18 (4): 549-574.

Hyland, Ken. 2002. Authority and Invisibility: Authorial Identity in Academic Writing. *Journal of Pragmatics* 34 (8): 1091-1112.

Hyland, Ken. 2004. "Perspectives on Genre". In K. Hyland (Ed.), *Genre and Second Language Writing* (pp. 24-50). Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, Ken. 2004. *Disciplinary Discourses, Michigan Classics ed.: Social Interactions in Academic Writing*. University of Michigan Press.

Hyland, Ken. 2017. Metadiscourse: What Is It and Where Is It Going?. *Journal of pragmatics* 113: 16-29.

Hyland, Ken. 1998. *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Vol. 54. John Benjamins Publishing, 1998.

Hyland, Ken.2005a. Stance and Engagement: A Model of Interaction in Academic Discourse. *Discourse Studies* 7 (2): 173-192.

Hyland, Ken. 2005b. *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Bloomsbury Publishing.

Jalilifar, Alireza, and Mohammad Alipour. 2007. How explicit instruction makes a difference: Metadiscourse markers and EFL learners' reading comprehension skill. *Journal of College Reading and Learning* 38 (1): 35-52.

Khedri, Mohsen, and Konstantinos Kritsis. 2018. "Metadiscourse in Applied Linguistics and Chemistry Research Article Introductions." *Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics* 9 (2): 47-73.

Kopple, William J. Vande. 1985 Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse. *College composition and communication*: 82-93.

Lakoff, George. 1972. Hedges: A study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts." In *Contemporary research in philosophical logic and linguistic semantics*, pp. 221-271. Springer, Dordrecht.

Mauko, I. 2014. The native speaker of English-A clash of conceptualisations: A comparative analysis of self-ascribed and non-elective native/non-native English speaker identity. MA thesis, University of Helsinki

Mirzapour, Fatemeh, and Mohammad Rasekh Mahand 2012. Hedges and boosters in native and non-native library and information and computer science research articles. *3L: Language, Linguistics, Literature*® 18 (2).

Myers, Greg. 1989. The pragmatics of Politeness in Scientific Articles. *Applied linguistics* 10 (1): 1-35.

Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik. 1985. A Comprehensive English Grammar. *London and New York: Longman*.

Rezanejad, Atefeh, Zahra Lari, and Zahra Mosalli. 2015. A Cross-Cultural Analysis of the Use of Hedging Devices in Scientific Research Articles. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 6 (6): 1384.

Sundquist, Colleen. 2013. The Use of Hedges in the Speech of ESL Learners. *ELIA. Estudios de Lingüística Inglesa Aplicada* 2013 (13): 149-174.

Toulmin, Stephen. 1958. *The Uses of Argument.* Cambridge university press.

Varttala, Teppo. 2001. *Hedging in Scientifically Oriented Discourse. Exploring Variation According to Discipline and Intended Audience*. Tampere University Press.

Vassileva, Irena. 2001. Commitment and Detachment in English and Bulgarian Academic Writing. *English for Specific Purposes* 20 (1): 83-102.

Vassileva, Irena. 2011. Hedging in English and Bulgarian academic writing. In *Culture and styles of academic discourse*, pp. 203-222. De Gruyter Mouton, 2011.

West, Gregory K. 1980. That-nominal Constructions in Traditional Rhetorical Divisions of Scientific Research Papers. *TESOL quarterly* 14 (4): 483-488.

Yates, Linda. 2010. "Pragmatic Challenges for Second Language Learners". In *Pragmatics across languages and cultures*, pp. 287-308. De Gruyter Mouton.