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# Article summary:

1. The use of hedging and boosting in academic writing varies across cultures, languages, and disciplines.

2. This study compares the use of hedges and boosters in English research articles by Anglo-American, Iranian, and Burundi academics.

3. The study found significant differences in the frequency, distribution, and type of hedging and boosting markers used by the three groups of authors.

# Article rating:

May be slightly imbalanced: The article presents the information in a generally reliable way, but there are minor points of consideration that could be explored further or claims that are not fully backed by appropriate evidence. Some perspectives may also be omitted, and you are encouraged to use the research topics section to explore the topic further.

# Article analysis:

The article "Hedging and Boosting in the Introduction and Discussion Sections of English Research Articles: A Cross-cultural Study of Papers Written by Native and Non-native Academics" by Fatemeh Mahdavirad provides a comprehensive overview of the use of hedging and boosting devices in academic writing across different cultures, languages, and disciplines. The study aims to compare the use of these metadiscourse strategies in research articles written by Anglo-American, Iranian, and Burundi academics.

Overall, the article is well-written and informative, providing a thorough review of previous studies on the topic. However, there are some potential biases that should be noted. Firstly, the author's choice to focus only on Applied Linguistics research articles may limit the generalizability of the findings to other academic fields. Additionally, while the author acknowledges that religious affiliations may influence academic writing styles, there is no discussion or analysis of how this may impact the results.

Furthermore, while the study aims to compare the use of hedging and boosting devices across different groups of writers, there is a lack of discussion on potential confounding variables such as language proficiency or educational background. This could potentially impact the validity of the results.

Additionally, while the article provides a detailed methodology for data analysis using frameworks developed by Hyland (1998a, 2005a) and Hinkel (2005), there is no discussion on potential limitations or weaknesses of these frameworks.

Overall, while this article provides valuable insights into cross-cultural differences in academic writing styles, it is important to consider potential biases and limitations when interpreting its findings.

# Topics for further research:

* Religious affiliations and academic writing styles
* Cross-cultural differences in academic writing beyond Applied Linguistics
* Impact of language proficiency on the use of hedging and boosting devices
* Educational background and academic writing styles
* Limitations of Hyland and Hinkel's frameworks for data analysis
* Critiques of the use of hedging and boosting devices in academic writing
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