RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF HEDGES AND BOOSTERS IN ACADEMIC ARTICLES WRITTEN BY EFL WRITERS

Keivan Seyyedi

Department of Translation, Cihan University-Erbil, Kurdistan Region, Iraq.
Email: keivan.seyyedi@cihanuniversity.edu.iq

ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT

This study investigates the use of hedges and boosters, linguistic devices employed to express uncertainty or confidence, in academic writing, mainly focusing on the gendered differences in the context of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) research articles. The primary objectives are to explore variations in the application of hedges and boosters between descriptive and experimental EFL articles and to investigate disparities in their use among male and female EFL writers. Twenty EFL articles from Iranian international journals were selected, focusing on the rhetorical sections of Abstract, Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion. The study employed descriptive data analysis, calculating the frequency and percentage of hedges and boosters per 1,000 words to examine the distribution and usage patterns across different sections and genders. The analysis revealed nuanced patterns in the distribution of hedges and boosters across rhetorical sections, with the discussion and conclusion sections exhibiting higher frequencies. Gender differences were identified, indicating that female writers tended to use more hedges, expressing uncertainty in their interpretations. In contrast, male writers exhibited greater confidence, particularly in the introduction and conclusion sections. This research contributes valuable insights into the rhetorical strategies of academic writing, emphasizing the role of hedges and boosters in shaping scholarly discourse. The study's focus on gendered language use in the EFL context provides a

foundation for future research and considerations in language instruction and academic writing pedagogy. Despite limitations, including a specific geographical focus and a relatively small sample size, the study enriches our understanding of linguistic strategies in academic writing and calls for further exploration in diverse EFL contexts.

1. Introduction

Writing encompasses the art of suitably expressing thoughts and the creative process of discovering or inventing those thoughts (Loghmani et al., 2019; Seyyedi et al., 2020). Ignacia and Diana (2008) further expanded on this notion by emphasizing that writing involves not just the subject matter itself but also the writer's self-portrayal, relationship with the reader, dedication to the content, and assessment of the reader's knowledge and beliefs.

In academic writing, one of the paramount aspects is how authors navigate the claims they present. This entails striking a balance by tempering uncertain or potentially risky assertions, highlighting what they believe to be accurate, and fostering a collegial rapport with their readers (Hyland, 2007). The expression of doubt and certainty in writing is often described as using hedges and boosters, a concept initially introduced by Holmes in 1984.

Hedges and boosters are integral components of language that significantly influence how messages are perceived. These linguistic tools introduce doubt or qualification into a statement (hedges) or emphasize confidence, strength, or importance (boosters). The scope of study on hedges and boosters spans linguistics, communication, psychology, and related fields. This study aims to shed light on the hedges and boosters and their functions and implications for various aspects of communication.

Hedges and boosters, as communicative strategies, are instrumental in either fortifying or softening the impact of statements. Scholars contend that these strategies serve three primary functions: 1) minimizing potential threats by indicating a level of distance and steering clear of absolute statements, 2)

accurately conveying the certainty of knowledge, and 3) facilitating politeness in interactions between writers and editors (Nivales, 2010).

Hyland's argument underscores the rhetorical role of hedges in the distribution across various sections of articles, underscoring the pivotal role of research articles as the primary means of communication in academic discourse. Additionally, it is worth noting that personal factors, including gender differences, seem to influence the expressions of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) learners. This study seeks to illuminate these nuances, paving the way for further research and deepening our comprehension of foreign language teachers and learners. Our primary focus is on gender differences and communicative strategies in writing across various rhetorical sections of research articles, with the ultimate goal of comparing the use of hedges and boosters in Iranian EFL contexts.

2. Functions of Hedges and Boosters

Hedges and boosters are linguistic devices that serve various functions within language, encompassing the art of moderating certainty and enhancing emphasis. Hedges, for instance, find utility in softening the firmness of assertions, conveying politeness, and expressing modesty. They are invaluable tools for managing situations where face-saving and a sense of tentativeness or deference in communication are essential. In contrast, boosters act as intensifiers, injecting vigor and conviction into statements, rendering them more persuasive (Hu & Cau, 2011).

Understanding the influence of hedges and boosters on persuasion has occupied a central place in linguistic and communication research. Messages containing hedges tend to be perceived as less convincing than those bereft of these linguistic devices (e.g., Akbas, 2012). Conversely, boosters lend greater persuasiveness and credibility to messages (Mirzapour & Mahand, 2012). These effects assume particular significance in fields such as marketing, advertising, and public relations, where the strategic use of language plays a pivotal role in molding consumer attitudes and behaviors.

Hedges or boosters can significantly influence the evaluation of a source's credibility. Hedges may cast shadows of doubt on the trustworthiness of the communicator, while boosters enhance their perceived expertise and reliability (Jalilifar, 2011). These dynamics extend their reach into both interpersonal communication and the credibility of experts and authorities in public discourse. In social interaction, hedges and boosters serve as instruments of influence. Hedges are deftly employed to navigate delicate social situations, mitigate face threats, convey politeness, and foster cooperative exchanges (Brown & Levinson, 2018). Conversely, boosters assume a contrasting role by promoting assertiveness, underscoring the significance of a message, and potentially altering power dynamics in conversations.

3. Previous Studies

Hyland (2007) argued that incorporating hedges is pivotal in academic writing and critical in constructing persuasive arguments. By employing rhetorical techniques, writers aim to secure reader acceptance of the veracity of their statements while preemptively addressing potential objections. Consequently, hedges become a valuable tool for academics. These expressions of doubt and certainty are commonly known as hedges and boosters, a concept outlined by Holmes in 1984.

In 2005, Hinkel conducted a study exploring the types and frequencies of hedges and intensifiers in native and non-native academic essays. Her findings revealed that non-native (L2) writers tended to use a limited range of hedges, resembling more informal spoken language. Clyne (1991) delved into cross-cultural differences in using hedges, focusing on German and English scholars' academic texts. His research demonstrated variations in hedge usage, with Germans employing more hedging in academic writing. Modal auxiliaries emerged as a primary hedging device in both German and English.

According to Hyland (2007), boosters empower writers to convey confidence in their assertions and showcase their engagement with the subject and audience. Comparative investigations between native English speakers and second

language writers have been conducted in empirical studies; one example is Hatzitheodorou and Mattheoudakis's (2007) study on Greek university students learning English. They observed that non-native students utilized more lexical chunks and fewer adverbs as boosters in their writing, employing boosters for different rhetorical purposes. Similarly, Kobayashi (2009) explored boosters in texts by Japanese EFL learners and native English writers, finding that Japanese EFL learners used fewer lexical variations of boosting devices than native English writers.

4. Context of the Study

The current study aims to contribute to empirical evidence relevant to academic writing and English instruction for specific purposes. The primary focus is on examining the use of hedges and boosters in scholarly articles written by EFL authors, with a specific investigation into the linguistic choices of Iranian male and female EFL writers in their academic research articles. The study has two main objectives:

1. To explore differences in the application of hedges and boosters between descriptive and experimental EFL articles and
2. To investigate disparities in hedges and boosters among male and female EFL writers in "descriptive" and "experimental" articles.

5. Methodology

5. 1 Research Procedure

Based on the objectives of the present study, twenty EFL articles, including ten articles belonging to those with experimental design and ten articles belonging to those with descriptive research design, were selected based on the following criteria:

- The chosen articles were published in prominent Iranian international journals within the last decade, with the majority being from the past ten years.

- Authors were exclusively male or female, although some articles had multiple writers as long as they were of the same gender.
- All selected research articles adhered to a consistent structure, comprising the rhetorical sections of Abstract, Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion. Tables, figures, footnotes, and bibliography were excluded from the analyzed data.
- The articles were categorized based on their experimental or descriptive design.

While an effort was made to select articles with a single author, the prevalent practice in EFL resulted in many articles having multiple writers. Article length was disregarded, and the frequency of hedges and boosters was calculated per 1,000 words to ensure data uniformity. Data analysis occurred following the selection of articles based on the outlined criteria. To achieve the goals above, the following step-by-step procedures were implemented:

- First, twenty research articles, with ten each from the EFL field, were categorized into experimental and descriptive designs to represent the two main types of EFL research articles.
- Within each EFL article type, five articles were authored by males and five by females. The number of writers in each article was not a factor, but each article had to be exclusively written by either males or females.

5.2 Statistical Analyses

The primary objective of this study is to investigate the presence of hedges and boosters in two types of EFL research articles (descriptive and experimental) across four rhetorical sections: Abstract, Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion. The second objective is to discern differences in the use of hedges and boosters between male and female writers across the two EFL article types. Descriptive data, such as frequency and percentage of occurrence, were

employed for this purpose. This approach is justified by its effectiveness in revealing dissimilarities and similarities between male and female writers in using various hedges and boosters and variations between the two types of EFL research articles.

6. Findings

6. 1 Hedges and Boosters in EFL Descriptive and Experimental Articles

In this section, the study investigated the occurrence of linguistic devices of hedges and boosters within four distinct areas of EFL descriptive and experimental articles. These sections were the Abstract, Introduction, Discussion, and Conclusion. Table 1 illustrates the data specifically for EFL descriptive articles. According to the data presented in this table, the discussion section exhibits the highest frequency of boosters, with a rate of 10.36 per 1000 words, while hedges are most commonly used in the conclusion and discussion sections, with rates of 28.65 and 22.11 per 1000 words, respectively.

Table (1): Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in EFL Descriptive Articles

Total Words	Abstract		Introduction		Discussion		Conclusion		Total	
	1294		4989		7234		1780		15297	
Total Devices	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster
	27	10	105	40	160	75	51	16	343	141
Frequency Per 1000	20.86	7.72	21.04	7.15	22.11	10.36	28.65	8.98	22.42	9.21

The analysis of how hedges and boosters are distributed across the four rhetorical sections of EFL experimental articles, as indicated in Table 2, reveals that hedges are predominantly employed in the conclusion and discussion sections, with rates of 29.13 and 28.63 per 1000 words, respectively. Similarly, boosters are notably prevalent in the conclusion and discussion sections, with rates of 14.56 and 11.96 per 1,000 words, respectively.

Table (2): Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in EFL Experimental Articles

Total Words	Abstract		Introduction		Discussion		Conclusion		Total	
	1645		7983		6601		1991		18220	
Total Devices	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster
	40	13	225	62	189	79	58	29	512	183
Frequency Per 1000	24.31	7.9	28.18	7.76	28.63	11.96	29.13	14.56	28.10	10.04

In summary, the tables above illustrate a higher frequency of hedges and boosters in the discussion and conclusion sections of research articles than in the introduction and abstract sections. This observed pattern can be ascribed to the unique purposes served by each section within the articles. For example, as highlighted by DeKeyser and Brown (1989), the primary goal of an abstract is to provide a concise summary of the entire article. Consequently, there is less need for extensive use of hedges and boosters in abstracts, given their typical encapsulation of the problem statement, subject characteristics, research methodology, findings, and a brief conclusion. Nevertheless, it is crucial to note that certain hedges or boosters may still find utility even in summarizing results. Concerning the introduction section, scholars such as West (1980) and Swales (2004) underscore its role in setting the context for the study, referencing prior research, and highlighting research gaps. The purpose of the introduction sections restricts the use of boosters, but a cautious approach, mainly when introducing hypotheses, may warrant the use of hedges. The analysis of the introduction in the current study aligns with the perspectives of these scholars, as well as Hyland (2007), who argues that hedging in this section speculates on the study's significance and tentatively introduces the study's findings.

On the contrary, the discussion and conclusion sections predominantly focus on data analysis, presenting claims, and either reinforcing or mitigating those claims (Farrokhi & Emami, 2008). The higher frequency of hedges and boosters in these sections aligns with scholars' viewpoints, including Hyland (2007), who suggests that authors aim to provide more interpretation and establish academic credibility by going beyond the data in the discussion section. Similarly, the conclusion section also tends to feature a greater use of hedges and boosters.

According to Farrokhi & Emami (2008), in this section, authors commonly comment on the information presented in the articles, summarize the results, and make claims about future developments. The varied use of hedges and boosters in different sections of research articles can be attributed to each section's distinct functions and objectives within the research publication.

6. 2 Hedges and Boosters in EFL Descriptive Articles among Male and Female Writers

This section involved the calculation of the frequency of hedges and boosters in four rhetorical sections (abstract, introduction, discussion, and conclusion) of Iranian EFL descriptive articles authored by both male and female writers. As presented in Table 3, the analysis results indicate that in articles written by females, the highest occurrence of hedges is observed in the discussion section (30.57 per 1,000 words) and the abstract section (29.96 per 1,000 words). Additionally, boosters are most prevalent in the discussion section (12.22 per 1,000 words) and the introduction section (7.54 per 1,000 words).

Table (3): Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in EFL Descriptive Articles Written by Females

Total Words	Abstract		Introduction		Discussion		Conclusion		Total	
	801		3312		4252		899		9264	
Total Devices	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster
	24	7	90	25	130	52	20	8	264	92
Frequency Per 1000	29.96	8.73	27.17	7.54	30.57	12.22	22.24	8.89	28.49	9.93

A similar analysis for the articles by males in Table 4 indicated that the conclusion (24.26 per 1,000 words) section is hedged chiefly, and the highest incidence of boosters is in the discussion (9.21 per 1,000 words) section.

Table (4): Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in EFL Descriptive Articles Written by Males

Total Words	Abstract		Introduction		Discussion		Conclusion		Total	
	573		1893		3255		989		6710	
Total Devices	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster
	5	4	29	8	49	30	24	6	107	48
Frequency Per 1000	8.72	6.98	15.31	4.22	15.05	9.21	24.26	6.06	15.94	7.15

This part of the analysis reveals a similarity in the rhetorical distribution of boosters in articles authored by females and males. Specifically, the discussion section exhibited the highest boosters in both genders. In contrast, the introduction section contained the lowest occurrence of boosters in both male and female articles. However, differences emerged between the two genders when examining the distribution of expressions of doubt. In articles by female EFL writers, the discussion and abstract sections displayed the highest incidence of hedges. In contrast, the corresponding sections in articles by male writers had the lowest incidence of doubt.

This indicates that the discussion section of research articles by female writers featured numerous expressions of doubt and certainty. In contrast, articles by male writers had the lowest number of hedges and the highest number of boosters in the discussion section. According to Parker's (2010) study, this finding may be attributed to the indirectness of females in presenting their claims. In other words, male EFL writers expressed their claims more confidently in the discussion section of research articles with a descriptive design compared to females. Farrokhi and Emami (2008) argue that hedges assist writers in conveying uncertainty regarding the interpretation of findings in the discussion section. Using only categorical assertions, they contend, leaves no room for dialogue with readers and may imply that writers have the final say in that field. In summary, females tend to leave more room for further interpretation than males in research articles' discussion or interpretation section. However, identifying the similarities and differences between males and females in using

categories of hedges and boosters in EFL research articles is a nuanced matter and warrants further investigation.

6. 3 Hedges and Boosters in EFL Experimental Articles among Male and Female Writers

The frequency of the expressions of doubt and certainty across the rhetorical sections: abstract, introduction, discussion, and conclusion in Iranian EFL articles with experimental design is depicted in Tables 5 and 6. The findings showed that the highest occurrence of hedges is in the discussion section (35.38 per 1,000 words), and the highest incidence of boosters is in the conclusion section (25.35 per 1,000 words). Table 5 indicates the results more clearly.

Table (5): Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in EFL Experimental Articles Written by Females

Total Words	Abstract		Introduction		Discussion		Conclusion		Total	
	866		4011		2798		986		8661	
Total Devices	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster
	24	9	111	43	99	32	32	25	266	109
Frequency Per 1000	27.71	10.39	27.67	10.72	35.38	11.43	32.45	25.35	30.71	12.58

In the subsequent analysis phase, the distribution of hedges and boosters across four rhetorical sections of male EFL research articles was examined. The results for the distribution of hedges and boosters in experimental research articles by male Iranian EFL writers revealed that the introduction section (29.19 per 1,000 words) and conclusion section (30.02 per 1,000 words) contained the highest number of hedges, while the discussion section (12.90 per 1,000 words) had the highest occurrence of boosters.

These results indicate a similarity between male and female EFL writers using boosters in experimental design. Specifically, the highest incidence of boosters in both genders was observed in the discussion and conclusion sections, with the lowest in the abstract and introduction sections. However, a notable difference emerged in the use of hedges between the two genders. The analysis presented

in Table 5 demonstrates a significant disparity in the use of hedges in the four rhetorical sections. In female articles, the highest occurrence of hedges is in the discussion and abstract sections. In contrast, in male articles, the frequency of hedges is high across all sections, including the introduction, conclusion, discussion, and abstract.

As discussed earlier, this discrepancy suggests that female writers tend to interpret findings more indirectly than males. Conversely, male writers exhibit more uncertainty about other researchers' findings, as evidenced by their increased use of expressions of doubt in the introduction compared to the conclusion section. This finding aligns with the results of previous studies by Hyland (1998), Vartella (2001), and Farrokhi & Emami (2008).

Table (6): Frequency of Hedges and Boosters in EFL Experimental Articles Written by Males

Total Words	Abstract		Introduction		Discussion		Conclusion		Total	
	890		4042		3798		966		9696	
Total Devices	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster	Hedge	Booster
	17	5	118	27	90	49	29	8	254	89
Frequency Per 1000	19.10	5.61	29.19	6.67	23.69	12.90	30.02	8.28	26.19	9.17

7. Conclusion

In conclusion, the analysis of hedges and boosters in academic articles authored by EFL writers, with a specific focus on the context of Iranian speakers, offers valuable insights into the rhetorical techniques employed in scholarly communication. This study seeks to comprehend how linguistic devices, such as hedges and boosters, are utilized by writers to navigate the intricacies of academic discourse, taking into account factors such as gender-based variations in expression. The literature review establishes the importance of hedges and boosters in academic writing, highlighting their role in managing certainty and emphasis. Scholars like Holmes and Hyland emphasize that these linguistic tools play a critical role in shaping the perception of assertions, influencing credibility, and facilitating polite discourse within academic settings. The study's findings

uncover nuanced patterns in using hedges and boosters across different sections of scholarly articles. Notably, the discussion and conclusion sections emerge as critical areas where writers deploy these linguistic devices, aligning with the expected functions of these sections in presenting and interpreting data. The observed variations between male and female writers in their use of hedges and boosters underscore the impact of personal factors on language expression, contributing to the broader conversation on gendered language use in academic discourse. The study makes a noteworthy contribution to understanding academic writing strategies, particularly within the EFL context. By shedding light on the distribution of hedges and boosters in different sections and among different genders, this research lays the groundwork for further exploration and consideration in language instruction and academic writing pedagogy. However, it is essential to acknowledge the study's limitations. The exclusive focus on Iranian EFL writers may constrain the generalizability of the findings to other EFL contexts. Additionally, the relatively small sample size and the selection of articles from a specific geographical region may impact the study's external validity. Future research endeavors could address these limitations by broadening the scope to include various EFL writers and contexts. In conclusion, this rhetorical analysis significantly contributes to the broader comprehension of linguistic strategies in academic writing, particularly emphasizing the role of hedges and boosters in shaping scholarly discourse. The findings provide a solid foundation for future research in the field of EFL writing and offer valuable insights to language instructors, researchers, and students seeking a deeper understanding of effective communication in academic settings.

References:

1. Akbas, E. (2012). Exploring metadiscourse in master's dissertation abstracts: Cultural and linguistic variations across postgraduate writers. International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature, 01(01), 12–26. https://doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v1n1p12

2. Brown, P., & Levinson, S. C. (2018). Studies in interactional sociolinguistics: Politeness: Some universals in language usage series number 4: Some universals in language usage. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511813085

3. Clyne, M. (1991). The socio-cultural dimension: The dilemma of the German-speaking Scholar (H. Schroder, Ed.). Walter de Gruyurt.

4. DeKeyser, R., & Brown, J. D. (1989). Understanding research in second language learning: A teacher's guide to statistics and research design. Language, 65(4), 876. https://doi.org/10.2307/414953

5. Farrokhi, F., & Emami, S. (2008). Hedges and Boosters in Academic Writing: Native vs. Non-native Research Articles in Applied Linguistics and Engineering. The Journal of Applied Linguistics, 1(2), 62–98.

6. Hatzitheodorou, A. M., & Mattheoudakis, M. (2007). The projection of stance in the Greek Corpus of Learner English (GRICLE). In Proceedings of the Corpus Linguistics conference.

7. Hinkel, E. (2005). Hedging, Inflating, and Persuading in EFL Academic Writing. Applied Language Learning, 15, 29–53.

8. Holmes, J. (1984). Hedging your bets and sitting on the fence: Some evidence for hedges as support structures. Te R Eo, 27(1), 47–62.

9. Hu, G., & Cau, F. (2011). Hedging and boosting in abstracts of applied linguistics articles: A Comparative Study of English and Chinese medium journals. Journal of Pragmatics, 43, 2795–2869.

10. Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulation in academic discourse. Applied Linguistics, 28(2), 266–285.

11. Hyland, K. (1998). Boosting, hedging, and the negotiation of academic knowledge. Text - Interdisciplinary Journal for the Study of Discourse, 18(3). https://doi.org/10.1515/text.1.1998.18.3.349

12. Ignacia, V., & Diana, G. (2008). Beyond mood and modality: epistemic modality markers as hedges in research articles: a cross-disciplinary study, Ravista. Alicantina de Estudios Ingleses, 21, 171–190.

13. Jalilifar, A. R. (2011). World of Attitudes in Research Articles Discussion Sections: A cross-Linguistic perspective. Journal of Technology & Education, 5(3), 177–186.

14. Kobayashi, Y. (2009). Extracting characteristics of English essays written by Japanese EFL Learners. In Proceedings of Jinmonkon Symposium series of Information Processing Society of (pp. 261–268).

15. Loghmani, Z., Ghonsooly, B., & Ghazanfari, M. (2019). Textual engagement of native English speakers in doctoral dissertation discussion sections. Journal of Research in Applied Linguistics, 10, 78–107.

16. Mirzapour, F., & Mahand, M. (2012). Hedges and boosters in Native and non-native Library and Information and Computer Science Research Articles. The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies, 18(2), 119–128.

17. Nivales, M. L. (2010). Hedging in college Research Papers: Implications for Language Instruction. In Asian EFL Journal, 35–45.

18. Parker, J. R. (2010). Algorithms for image processing and computer vision. John Wiley& Sons.

19. Seyyedi, K., & Hamad Amin, N. The Effect of Immediate and Delayed Error Correction on Accuracy Development of Intermediate EFL Learners' Writing (March 1, 2020). IJLLT 3(2):100-108, Available at SSRN: https://ssrn.com/abstract=3546837 or http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3546837

20. Swales, J. (2004). Research genres: Exploration and applications. Cambridge University Press.

21. Varttala, T. (2001). Hedging on scientifically oriented discourse: exploring Variation according to Discipline and intended audience. Electronic doctoral dissertation. In Acta Electronica Universities Tamperensis 138.

22. West, G. K. (1980). That-nominal constructions in traditional rhetorical divisions of scientific research papers. TESOL Quarterly, 14(4), 483. https://doi.org/10.2307/3586236

شیکاری ڕیتۆریکی بۆ هێج و بووستەرەکان لە بابەتەکانی ئەکادیمیدا لەلایەن نووسەرانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی

پوختـە:

ئەم توێژینەوەیە دەکۆڵێتەوە لە بەکارهێنانی هێج و بووستەرە کان، ئەو ئامێرە زمانییانەی کە بۆ دەربڕینی نادڵنیایی یان متمانە بەکاردەهێنرێن لە نووسینی ئەکادیمیدا، کە بە شێوەیەکی سەرەکی سەرنج دەخاتە سەر جیاوازییە ڕەگەزییەکان لە چوارچێوەی بابەتەکانی توێژینەوەی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی. ئامانجە سەرەکییەکان بریتین لە لێکۆڵینەوە لە گۆڕانکارییەکان لە بەکارهێنانی هێج و بووستەرەکان لە نێوان بابەتەکانی توێژینەوەی وەسفیی و ئەزموونی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی و لێکۆڵینەوە لە جیاوازییەکانی بەکارهێنانیان لە نێوان نووسەرانی نێر و مێی زمانی ئینگلیزی. لەم توێژینەوەیەدا بیست وتاری زمانی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی لە گۆڤارە نێودەوڵەتییەکانی ئێرانەوە هەڵبژێردراون، کە تیشکیان خستۆتە سەر بەشە ڕیتۆریکییەکانی پوختە، پێشەکی، باس و ئەنجام. توێژینەوەکە شیکاری داتای وەسفکەری بەکارهێناوە، کە ڕێژەی سەدی هێج و بووستەرەکانی بۆ هەر ١٠٠٠ وشە هەژمار کردووە بۆ پشکنینی شێوازەکانی دابەشبوون و بەکارهێنان لە سەرانسەری بەشە جیاوازەکان و ڕەگەزەکاندا. شیکارییەکە شێوازی دابەشکردنی هێج و بووستەرەکان لە سەرانسەری بەشە ڕیتۆریکەکاندا ئاشکرا دەکات، لەگەڵ بەشەکانی باس و ئەنجام کە ڕێژەی بەرزتریان پیشان دا. لەم توێژینەوەیە جیاوازی ڕەگەزی دەستنیشانکراوە، ئەمەش ئاماژەیە بۆ ئەوەی کە نووسەرانی ژن زیاتر مەیلیان هەیە کە هێج بەکاربهێنن، ئەمەش نادڵنیایی لە لێکدانەوەکانیاندا دەردەبڕیت.

له بەرامبەردا نووسەرانی پیاو متمانەی زیاتریان نیشان دا، بەتایبەتی له بەشی پێشەکی و کۆتاییدا. ئەم توێژینەوەیه بەشداری له تێڕوانینێکی بەنرخ دەکات بۆ ستراتیژییه ڕیتۆریکییەکانی نووسینی ئەکادیمی، جەخت لەسەر ڕۆڵی هێج و بووستەرەکان دەکاتەوه له دارشتنی گوتاری زانستیدا. گرنگیدانی توێژینەوەکه لەسەر بەکارهێنانی زمانی ڕەگەزی له چوارچێوەی ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی دا. بنەمایەک بۆ لێکۆڵینەوه و ڕەچاوکردنی داهاتوو له فێرکردنی زمان و پێداگۆجی نووسینی ئەکادیمیدا دابین دەکات. سەرەڕای سنووردارکردنەکان، لەوانەش فۆکۆسی جوگرافیای تایبەت و قەبارەیەکی نمونەیی تاڕادەیەک بچووک، توێژینەوەکه تێگەیشتنمان له ستراتیژییه زمانەوانییەکان له نووسینی ئەکادیمیدا دەوڵەمەند دەکات و داوای گەڕانی زیاتر دەکات له چوارچێوەی جۆراوجۆری ئینگلیزی وەک زمانێکی بیانی.

التحليل البلاغي للتحوطات والمعززات في المقالات الأكاديمية التي كتبها كتاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية

الملخص:

تبحث هذه الدراسة في استخدام التحوطات والمعززات، والأجهزة اللغوية المستخدمة للتعبير عن عدم اليقين أو الثقة، في الكتابة الأكاديمية، مع التركيز بشكل رئيسي على الاختلافات بين الجنسين في سياق المقالات البحثية للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية (EFL). الأهداف الأساسية هي استكشاف الاختلافات في تطبيق التحوطات والمعززات بين المقالات الوصفية والتجريبية للغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية والتحقيق في التفاوتات في استخدامها بين كتاب اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من الذكور والإناث. تم اختيار عشرين مقالة باللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية من المجلات الدولية الإيرانية، مع التركيز على الأقسام البلاغية للملخص والمقدمة والمناقشة والاستنتاج. استخدمت الدراسة تحليل البيانات الوصفية، وحساب التكرار والنسبة المئوية للتحوطات والتعزيزات لكل 1000 كلمة لفحص أنماط التوزيع والاستخدام عبر الأقسام والأجناس المختلفة. وكشف التحليل عن أنماط دقيقة في توزيع التحوطات والمعززات عبر الأقسام البلاغية، حيث أظهرت أقسام المناقشة والاستنتاجات ترددات أعلى. تم تحديد الفروق بين الجنسين، مما يشير إلى أن الكاتبات يملن إلى استخدام المزيد من التحوطات، معبرين عن عدم اليقين في تفسيراتهن. في المقابل، أظهر الكتّاب الذكور ثقة أكبر، خاصة في قسمي المقدمة والخاتمة. يساهم هذا البحث برؤى قيمة حول الاستراتيجيات البلاغية للكتابة الأكاديمية، مع التركيز على دور التحوطات والمعززات في تشكيل الخطاب العلمي. يوفر تركيز الدراسة على استخدام اللغة بين الجنسين في سياق اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية أساسًا للبحث والاعتبارات المستقبلية في تعليم اللغة وطرق تدريس الكتابة الأكاديمية. على الرغم من القيود، بما في ذلك التركيز الجغرافي المحدد وحجم العينة الصغير نسبيًا، فإن الدراسة تثري فهمنا للاستراتيجيات اللغوية في الكتابة الأكاديمية وتدعو إلى مزيد من الاستكشاف في سياقات اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية متنوعة.