

# A Comparative Study of Hedges and Boosters in English and Jordanian Arabic: Economic Newspaper Articles as a Case Study

Helen A. Al-Ghoweri

The World Islamic Science & Education University (WISE), Amman, Jordan

Murad M. Al Kayed

Al-Balqa Applied University, Salt, Jordan

**Abstract**—The study investigated English and Jordanian economic newspaper articles. It sheds light on the similarities and differences in terms of the frequencies and percentages of using hedges and boosters. To this end, the researcher selected 60 newspaper articles. 15 articles were randomly chosen from recent issues published in 2016-2017 in two English newspapers, "The New York Times" and "The Guardian". The study compared the frequencies of hedging and boosting devices in these newspapers to the frequencies of hedging and boosting devices in two Jordanian newspapers "Alrai" and "Alghad". The findings of the study revealed that language plays a role in using these devices. Significantly, English economic articles used modal auxiliaries and approximates most, while Arabic economic articles used approximates and lexical verbs most.

**Index Terms**—hedging devices, Arabic and English newspapers, economic articles, Jordanian Arabic.

## I. INTRODUCTION AND LITERATURE REVIEW

Hedges are devices that writers use to convey vagueness. They play a major role in writing and speaking due to their importance in interpreting spoken and written messages. In this paper, the researcher analyzed the use of hedges in exploring whether cultural differences play a role in their employment or not. On the other hand, boosters enable writers to assume a shared ground with their readers, and to emphasize a common group membership. In addition, boosters may contribute to the social negotiation of knowledge and writers' efforts to convince readers of truth or the correctness of their claims which could enable the writer to achieve community acceptance and solidarity with the audience. Accordingly, writers/speakers employ boosters in order to indicate their assertion of the proposition's truth, and convince the audience with the conclusions drawn by the writer.

Martin (2000) referred to hedges and boosters by using the term "epistemic modalities". He stated that writers employ epistemic modalities to communicate their academic knowledge in a way which permits them to get community acceptance of their academic contributions excluding the risk of Face Threatening Acts. Furthermore, hedging is sometimes used intentionally in discourse to convey politeness, be it positive or negative politeness, which functions as a redressive method as a result of committing a Face Threatening Act (FTA). In other words, it is employed to mitigate FTA committed towards the other's face. However, the main difference between the two types of politeness is that the positive politeness indicates solidarity with the group, for example, "*I wondered if I could have a word with you*", while the negative politeness attempts not to infringe on other's wants or freedom. For example, "*I just came to borrow you lawnmower*" (Brown and Levinson, 1987). Hedges, such as *might*, *suggest*, *probably*, are self-reflective linguistic expressions that are used to show epistemic modality and modify the speakers force of speech acts. Moreover, hedges can be used: to express the writer's commitment to a proposition, to illustrate uncertainty about the truth of an assertion, to refrain from commitment and open dialogue by recognizing alternative viewpoints or the subjectivity of one's own position, and/or to lessen the force of a speech for the sake of politeness (Hu & Cao, 2011).

Importantly, convincing the audience to believe a certain view and expressing the writer's degree of confidence could be achieved through the help of linguistic devices (boosters), such as "clear", "certainly" or "definite". By using these linguistic devices, writers express the level of their commitment depending on the epistemic status of propositions as accredited interpretations. Thus, boosters might be considered as complementary strategies to hedging and are used to indicate being assertive and straightforward. Jalilifar and Alavi-Nai (2012) classified boosters into (1) propositional boosters which include intensifiers and personal involvement pronouns, (2) illocutionary force boosters which include boosting epistemic commitment, (3) content oriented boosters which include source tagging and bounding emphatics, and (4) hearer oriented boosters which aim at seeking solidarity and presupposing verification.

Aquino (2014) conducted a study on hedges in campus journalistic articles written by high school students in the Philippines, and published in their newspaper issues. The data were collected from the recent published newspaper issue for 2011. The study identified the frequencies of forms, the functions and the implications of hedging used in these

articles. The findings of the study manifested that hedges were used mostly in editorial which were modulated and mitigated articles. In addition, reliability hedges which indicate the amount of writers' certainty or uncertainty in a proposition were used widely 37 (40.22%), but attribute hedges which refer to the writers' desire to express proposition with greater precision had a higher occurrence 62 (7.39%).

## II. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the present paper is to examine the frequencies and percentages of hedging and boosting devices in English and Jordanian Arabic economic newspaper articles and to compare them against each other since economic newspaper articles employ diverse linguistic devices including hedging and boosting.

## III. METHODOLOGY

In order to fulfill the purpose of the present study, the researcher selected 15 economic newspaper articles from each English newspaper. The 15 economic articles appeared in recent issues of "The New York Times" during the years 2016-2017, and the same number of newspaper articles was also selected from the English newspaper "The Guardian" in the same period. Conveniently, the American English newspaper "The New York Times" is accessible online through <https://www.nytimes.com>; likewise, the content of the British English newspaper "The Guardian" is digitized and accessible online through <https://www.the-guardian.com>.

Similarly, 15 economic newspaper articles were selected from recent issues of the Jordanian Arabic daily newspaper, "Alrai" published between 2016 and 2017. The same number of articles was also selected from the Jordanian Arabic daily newspaper, "Alghad". Thus, the total number of English and Jordanian newspapers articles that were investigated was 60. The Jordanian Arabic daily newspapers "Alrai" and "Alghad" are accessible online through <https://www.alrai.com> and through <http://www.alghad.com/> respectively.

The researcher selected the articles randomly. Then, these articles were read carefully to find out instances of hedges and boosters (e.g. textual analysis). The English sample articles from "The New York Times" and "The Guardian" were compared for the use of hedges and boosters against the same linguistic devices in the two Jordanian Arabic newspapers, "Alrai" and "Alghad".

For the purpose of analyzing the results quantitatively, the number of hedges and boosters were counted manually and calculated in each article and in each language separately to find out the frequencies of occurrence of hedges and boosters across the economic articles in the two languages. That is, the researcher counted all occurrences of hedges and boosters in the English economic in each of the newspapers. Then, she compared them to the Arabic counterpart.

The researcher classified the types of hedges in these newspaper articles based on the framework outlined by Salager-Meyer (1997), whereas the framework outlined by Hyland (2005) was used to analyze boosters.

### A. Framework for Hedges Analysis

Salager-Meyer (1997) proposed the following types of hedges:

- (1) Modal auxiliary verbs of which the most tentative ones being: may, might, can, could, would, should.
- (2) Lexical verbs or the so-called speech act verbs which are used to perform acts such as doubting and evaluating rather than describing the varying degree of illocutionary force such as, to seem, to appear, to sound, to believe, to assume, to suggest, to estimate, to tend, to think, to argue, to indicate, to propose, to speculate, to doubt, to expect and to consider.
- (3) Adjectival, adverbial and nominal modal phrases:
  - (a) Adjectives: e.g., possible, probable, un/likely.
  - (b) Nouns: e.g., assumption, claim, possibility, estimate, suggestion.
  - (c) Adverbs: e.g., perhaps, possibly, probably, likely, presumably.
- (4) Approximators of degree, quantity, frequency and time such as approximately, roughly, about, generally, in general, almost, mostly, some of, the majority, many, more than, bigger, less than, tens, hundreds, a lot of, something between, few, little, somewhat, somehow, a lot of, often, sometimes, occasionally and usually respectively.
- (5) Introductory phrases such as I believe, to (our) knowledge, it is (our) view that, (we) feel that, which express the author's personal doubt or direct involvement.
- (6) If clauses, e.g., if true, if nothing.
- (7) Compound hedges which are made up of several hedges, the commonest forms being: a modal auxiliary combined with a lexical verb with a hedging content (e.g. it would appear), and a lexical verb followed by a hedging adverb or adjective (e.g. it seems probable) where the adverb reinforces the hedge already inherent in the lexical verb. Such compound hedges can be double hedges (it may suggest that; it seems likely that; it would indicate that; this probably indicates); triple hedges (it seems reasonable to assume that); quadruple hedges (it would seem somewhat unlikely that, it may appear somewhat speculative that), and so on.

### B. Framework for Boosters Analysis

On the other hand, Hyland (1998a; 2005) classified boosters into three types:

- (1) Universal pronouns which refer to a general audience, such as no- and every- words.

(2) Amplifiers which function to increase the size or effect of statements such as very, clearly, always, never, completely, fully, extremely, totally, absolutely and entirely etc.

(3) Emphatics which are used to emphasize force or writer's certainty in message such as sure, stress, emphasize, for sure, no way, in fact, etc.

#### IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

This section presents the frequencies and percentages of using hedging and boosting devices in Arabic and English. Here, we summarize these results in light of the research objective.

##### A. Frequency and Percentage of Hedging Devices in English and Arabic Newspapers

This section will present the results of the frequencies and percentages of hedging devices in the English and Arabic newspapers articles.

Hedging devices in English and Arabic economic articles

Table (1) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using hedging devices in economic articles in "The New York Times".

TABLE 1.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF HEDGING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES:  
"THE NEW YORK TIMES"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Modal auxiliary verbs (e.g. may)	6	10	7	5	15	10	9	7	8	1	5	31	5	9	8	136	48,9
Lexical verbs (e.g. seem)	0	1	0	1	3	4	0	2	4	0	1	7	2	2	1	28	10,1
Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases (e.g. likely)	2	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	0	11	4,0
Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency (e.g. lower than..)	6	7	3	1	4	3	1	2	6	11	8	5	7	3	6	73	26,26
Introductory phrases (e.g. we)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
If clauses (e.g. if it..)	1	0	3	1	4	5	1	0	3	1	2	4	0	0	1	26	9,4
Compound hedges (e.g. would seem)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	4	1,44
Total	15	18	13	9	28	22	11	11	22	13	18	48	17	17	16	278	100

As evident from Table 1, modal auxiliary verbs are the most commonly used hedging devices with a percentage of 48.9%. Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency rank second with a percentage of 26.26%. By contrast, introductory phrases are not used at all, whereas compound hedges have the second lowest percentage (1.44%). Table (2) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using hedging devices in the economic articles of "The Guardian".

TABLE 2.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF HEDGING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES:  
"THE GUARDIAN"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Modal auxiliary verbs (e.g. may)	3	9	5	4	9	3	10	10	9	4	15	8	12	4	3	108	34.4
Lexical verbs (e.g. seem)	3	3	4	2	0	6	1	4	8	0	6	2	1	1	9	50	15.9
Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases (e.g. likely)	1	1	1	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	5	1	0	16	5.1
Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency (e.g. lower than..)	4	0	2	5	3	4	6	5	7	12	15	8	8	7	9	95	31.53
Introductory phrases (e.g. we)	0	9	2	2	0	2	3	0	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	21	6.68
If clauses (e.g. if it..)	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	3	5	3	1	1	1	18	5.73
Compound hedges (e.g. would seem)	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	6	1.911
Total	1 3	2 2	1 4	1 3	1 6	16	20	22	26	21	43	22	29	14	23	314	100

As shown in Table 2, and similar to "The New York Times", modal auxiliary verbs are the most commonly used hedging devices with a percentage of 34.4%. Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency rank second with a percentage of 31.53%. By contrast, compound hedges are used least (1.91), whereas adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases have the second lowest percentage (5.1%).

Table (3) summarizes the frequency and percentage of hedging devices in economic articles of both "The New York Times" and "The Guardian".

TABLE 3  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF HEDGING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "THE NEW YORK" TIMES AND "THE GUARDIAN"

Newspaper	The New York Times	The Guardian	Total	
			Freq.	%
Modal auxiliary verbs	136	108	244	41.20
Lexical verbs	28	50	78	13.2
Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases	11	16	27	4.6
Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency	73	95	168	28.4
Introductory phrases	0	21	21	3.5
If clauses	26	18	44	7.4
Compound hedges	4	6	10	1.7
Total	278	314	592	100

Table 3 shows that the modal auxiliary verbs are the most commonly used hedging devices with a frequency of 244 and a percentage of 41.2%, followed by approximates of degree, quantity and frequency with a percentage of 28.4%, while lexical verbs rank third with a percentage of 13.2%. Introductory phrases and compound hedges are least used with a percentage of 3.5% and 1.7% respectively.

Now we move to the Arabic articles. Table (4) below shows the frequencies and percentages of using hedging devices in the economic articles of "Alghad" newspaper.

TABLE 4.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF HEDGING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "ALGHAD"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Modal auxiliary verbs (e.g. ربما 'maybe')	0	1	5	1	1	0	2	8	6	0	1	1	2	0	1	29	15.3
Lexical verbs (e.g. يتوقع 'expects')	2	4	0	5	0	0	0	4	4	1	4	2	2	3	5	36	19.0
Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases (e.g. محتمل 'possible')	4	1	1	5	1	3	5	1	1	1	5	4	4	0	1	37	19.6
Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency (e.g. تقريباً 'nearly')	8	5	2	4	5	5	7	3	2	6	5	8	3	6	14	83	43.9
Introductory phrases (e.g. نحن 'we')	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1.05
If clauses (e.g. اذا 'if')	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.5
Compound hedges (e.g. ان امكن 'if possible')	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	0.5
Total	14	11	8	15	8	8	14	17	14	8	15	16	11	9	21	189	100

As shown in Table 4 above, approximates of degree, quantity and frequency are the most commonly used hedging devices with a percentage of 43.9%. Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases come in the second place with a percentage of 19.6%. By contrast, introductory phrases have the second lowest percentage (1.05%), whereas compound hedges and if-clause used least with a percentage of (0.5%).

The second Arabic newspaper investigated is "Alrai". Table (5) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using hedging devices in the economic articles of "Alrai".

TABLE 5.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF HEDGING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "ALRAI"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Modal auxiliary verbs (e.g. ربما 'maybe')	0	1	1	5	3	3	0	9	1	0	1	0	4	6	1	35	17.5
Lexical verbs (e.g. يتوقع 'expects')	4	1	7	3	3	8	5	4	4	3	4	2	3	2	2	55	27.0
Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases (e.g. محتمل 'possible')	3	2	2	3	5	4	2	1	5	3	5	2	1	1	0	39	19.1
Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency (e.g. تقريباً 'nearly')	8	4	9	3	4	2	14	1	7	11	0	0	4	1	4	72	35.3
Introductory phrases (e.g. نحن 'we')	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1.47
If clauses (e.g. اذا 'if')	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Compound hedges (e.g. ان امكن 'if possible')	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Total	16	8	9	14	15	17	21	17	17	17	10	4	12	10	7	204	100

As shown in Table 5, approximates of degree, quantity and frequency are also the most frequently used hedging devices with a percentage of 35.29%. Lexical verbs rank second with a percentage of 27%. By contrast, introductory phrases have the second lowest percentage (1.47%), while compound hedges and if-clauses are not used at all.

Table (6) summarizes the frequency and percentage of hedging devices in the economic articles of both the "Alghad" and "Alrai" newspapers.

TABLE 6.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF HEDGING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES:  
"ALGHAD" AND "ALRAI"

Newspaper	Alghad	Alrai	Total	
			Freq.	%
Modal auxiliary verbs	29	35	64	16.3
Lexical verbs	36	55	91	23.2
Adjectival, nominal and adverbial phrases	37	39	76	19.3
Approximates of degree, quantity and frequency	83	72	155	39.4
Introductory phrases	2	3	5	1.3
If clauses	1	0	1	0.25
Compound hedges	1	0	1	0.25
<b>Total</b>	<b>189</b>	<b>204</b>	<b>393</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 6 shows that the most frequently used hedging devices in "Alghad" and "Alrai" are *approximates of degree, quantity and frequency* with a percentage of 39.4%. *Lexical verbs* have the second highest occurrences with a percentage of 23.2%. By contrast, the *compound hedges* and *if clauses* are used the least with a percentage of 0.25% each.

### B. Boosting Devices in English and Arabic Newspapers

This section presents the results of the frequencies and percentages of boosting devices in the English and Arabic newspapers investigated in this research.

Frequency and percentage of boosting devices in English and Arabic economic articles

Table (7) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using boosting devices in the economic articles of "The New York Times".

TABLE 7  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF BOOSTING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "THE NEW YORK TIMES"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Universal Pronouns (e.g. everyone)	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5
Amplifiers (e.g. certainly)	3	2	2	2	4	1	1	0	4	5	3	0	2	5	0	34	85
Emphatics (e.g. sure)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	4	10
<b>Total</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

As shown in Table 7 above, *amplifiers* are the most frequently used boosting devices with a percentage of 85%. *Emphatics* come in the second place with a percentage of 10%. By contrast, *universal pronouns* have the least percentage (5%).

Table (8) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using boosting devices in the economic articles of "The Guardian" newspaper.

TABLE 8.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF BOOSTING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "THE GUARDIAN"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Universal Pronouns (e.g. everyone)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Amplifiers (e.g. certainly)	0	3	1	3	4	6	4	1	6	0	4	2	2	0	2	38	81
Emphatics (e.g. sure)	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	8	17
<b>Total</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>100</b>

Table.8 shows that amplifiers are again the most frequently used boosting devices with a percentage of 80%. Emphatics rank second with a percentage of 17%. By contrast, universal pronouns are used least with a percentage of 2%. This is exactly similar to "The New York Times" newspaper.

Table (9) summarizes the frequency and percentage of boosting devices in economic articles, in both "The New York Times" and "The Guardian".

TABLE 9.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF BOOSTING DEVICES IN ENGLISH ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "THE NEW YORK TIME" AND "THE GUARDIAN"

Newspaper	The New York Times	The Guardian	Total	
			Freq.	%
Universal Pronouns	2	1	3	3.4
Amplifiers	34	38	72	82.8
Emphatics	4	8	12	13.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>47</b>	<b>87</b>	<b>100</b>

Table 9 suggests that the two English newspaper tend to use amplifiers most with a percentage of 82.8%. By contrast, the two newspapers seem not to use universal pronouns very much since the percentage is only 3.4%. Emphatics are used relatively little with a percentage of 13.8%.

Now, we turn to the Arabic newspapers. Table (10) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using boosting devices in the economic articles of "Alghad" newspaper.

TABLE 10.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF BOOSTING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "ALGHAD"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Universal Pronouns (e.g. كل 'every')	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	5	2.34
Amplifiers (e.g. حتماً 'definitely')	1	2	1	2	5	4	6	8	7	0	0	4	8	5	1	54	25.35
Emphatics (e.g. في الحقيقة 'in fact')	1 0	6	11	16	6	15	14	4	7	4	9	16	14	5	17	154	73.30
<b>Total</b>	<b>1 1</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>100</b>

As shown in Table 10 above, emphatics are the most frequently used boosting devices with a percentage of 73.30%. Amplifiers rank second with a percentage of 25.35%. This is the reverse of the results the researcher found in the English newspapers. By contrast, universal pronouns have the least percentage of 2, 34%.

Table (11) below presents the frequencies and percentages of using boosting devices in economic articles in "Alrai".

TABLE 11.  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF BOOSTING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "ALRAI"

Article No.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	Total	
																Freq.	%
Universal Pronouns (e.g. كل 'every')	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0
Amplifiers (e.g. حتماً 'definitely')	6	6	10	1	0	3	2	13	0	4	4	2	1	0	4	56	26.2
Emphatics (e.g. في الحقيقة 'in fact')	18	4	20	5	1	30	9	9	2	8	7	11	12	14	8	158	74.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>100</b>

As evident from Table 11 above, *emphatic* are again the most frequently used boosting devices with a percentage of 74.8%. *Amplifiers* rank second with a percentage of 26.2%. By contrast, *universal pronouns* are not used at all. This is very similar to the results found in "Alghad" newspaper.

Table (12) summarizes the frequency and percentage of boosting devices in the economic articles of both "Alrai" and "Alghad" newspapers.

TABLE 12:  
FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF OCCURRENCE OF BOOSTING DEVICES IN ECONOMIC ARTICLES: "ALRAI" AND "ALGHAD"

Newspaper	Alghad	Alrai	Total	
			Freq.	%
Universal Pronouns	5	0	5	1.2
Amplifiers	54	56	110	25.8
Emphatics	154	158	312	73
<b>Total</b>	<b>213</b>	<b>214</b>	<b>427</b>	<b>100</b>

It seems that both “Alrai” and “Alghad” newspapers tend to use emphatics most, with a percentage of 73%. Amplifiers rank second with a percentage of 25.8%. On the other hand, universal pronouns are used least with a percentage of 1.2%.

#### V. CONCLUSION

This paper discussed the use of hedges and boosters in English and Arabic newspapers articles. It revealed that there were some similarities and differences between the two languages. The study compared the frequencies of hedging and boosting devices in two English newspapers to the frequencies of hedging and boosting devices in two Jordanian Arabic newspapers. The study concludes with the fact that the language plays a role in using these devices. While English economic articles used modal auxiliaries and approximates most, Arabic economic articles used approximates and lexical verbs most. In terms of boosting devices, English articles used amplifiers most whereas Arabic articles used emphatics most. Both languages barely used universal pronouns.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Aquino, B. (2014). Hedges in Campus Journalistic Articles. *E-International Scientific Research Journal*. [www.eisrjc.com/.../hedges-in-campus-journalistic-articles-eisrjc\\_1417955706/](http://www.eisrjc.com/.../hedges-in-campus-journalistic-articles-eisrjc_1417955706/) (accessed 25/7/2018).
- [2] Brown, P. and Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [4] Hickey, L. (1998). *The Pragmatics of Translation*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- [5] Holmes, J. (1990). Hedges and boosters in women's and men's speech. *Language and Communication*, 10.3, 185-205.
- [6] Hu, G. and Cao, 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– 2809.
- [7] Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse*. London: Continuum.
- [8] Martin, J. (2000). Epistemic Modality in English and Spanish Psychological tests. *Pragmatics*, 43, 2795– 2809.
- [9] Salager-Meyer, F. (1997). Scientific multilingualism and “lesser languages”. *Interciencia*, 22. 4, 197–201.
- [10] Yegaeh, Y., Sawari, H. and Heravi, S. (2015). Hedge and Booster in Newspaper Articles on Iran's Presidential Election: A Comparative Study of English and Persian Articles. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 192, 679-683.

**Helen Ahmad AL-Ghoweri** got her Ph.D. in Linguistics (English) from The University of Jordan 2018. She is working as an English lecturer (full time) at The World Islamic Science and Education University. She worked at University of Jordan as an English Lecturer (part time). She has taught several linguistic and skill courses such as: Introduction to Linguistics, Sociolinguistics, Language Acquisition, Speech and Pronunciation, Grammar and Syntax.

Murad M. Al Kayed holds a PhD in linguistics from the University of Jordan. He is a full time lecturer at Al Balqa Applied University/ Ajloun University College since 2013. He is interested in different fields in linguistics, such as pragmatics, sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. He taught many courses in linguistics, such as introduction to linguistics, semantics, pragmatics, and psycholinguistics.