



Scientific Publishing Unit



# Buhūth

**Journal of Humanities,  
Social Sciences & Education**

A peer reviewed Academic Journal

**Issue 10 October 2021- Part 3**

ISSN 2735-4822 (Online) \ ISSN 2735-4814 (print)



Editor-in-Chief

**Prof. Dr. Amira Ahmed Youssef**  
Professor of Linguistics  
Ain Shams University

Co-Editor-in-Chief

**Prof. Hanan Mohamed Elshair**  
Professor of Educational Technology  
Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University

Managing Editor

**Dr. Sara Mohamed Amin Ismail**  
Lecturer in Educational Technology  
Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University

Assistant Editor

**Ms. Heba Mamdouh Mukhtar Mohamed**

Website

**Ms. Nagwa Azzam Ahmed Fahmy**

**Ms. Doaa Farag Ghreab**

Buhūth is a peer-reviewed academic e-journal published by the Faculty of Women, Ain Shams University. Buhūth encourages submission of original research from a wide range of disciplines such as social sciences, humanities and education



## Age and Gender Differences in L2 Metadiscourse Markers of Stance in Facebook Interactions: A Corpus-Based Study

Dina Gamal El-Din Hosney Ayad

(PHD)Degree –English Department

Faculty of Management, Sadat Academy for Management Sciences- Egypt

[Dinagamal1912@yahoo.com](mailto:Dinagamal1912@yahoo.com)

Prof. Salwa Farag

English Department, Faculty of Arts

Helwan University - Egypt

[salwa\\_farag@arts.helwan.edu.eg](mailto:salwa_farag@arts.helwan.edu.eg)

Prof.Hala Tawfik Maklad

English Department, Faculty of

Languages and Translation- SAMS- Egypt

[Hala.Tawfik@gmail.com](mailto:Hala.Tawfik@gmail.com)

Assoc. Prof. Amany Y. A. A. Youssef

English Department, Faculty of Arts

Helwan University - Egypt

[amany\\_youssef@arts.helwan.edu.eg](mailto:amany_youssef@arts.helwan.edu.eg)

### Abstract

One of the most popular social networking sites nowadays is Facebook where millions of users have found a suitable platform to sketch their personal experiences; present their own perspectives, comments, and reflections; and express their own feelings. This study investigates the use of certain features of authorial stance, namely hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention, in 1500 Facebook status update posts written in English by 200 Egyptian male and female (M/F) students as well as 200 Egyptian M/F academic staff. The theoretical and analytical framework for this study is Hyland's (2005a, b) Model of Interaction which was originally proposed for academic texts. The present study involves extending the application of this model to online Facebook interactions. The freeware corpus analytic toolkit *AntConc* (version 3.5.8) is used for concordancing and posts' analysis. The results revealed only marginal age differences regarding the frequency of using boosters and attitude markers, where students topped academic staff albeit with a narrow margin. Gender differences were observed in the higher use of self-mention by the female groups as opposed to the male groups, and in gender-related preferences of certain categories of hedging and certain markers of attitude.

**Keywords:** Age, Gender, L2 metadiscourse, stance markers, Facebook interactions, corpus analysis

## 1. Introduction

In the last few years, computer-mediated communication (CMC) has become an integral part of literacy practices. Social networking sites (SNS) have become popular channels of communication, permeating almost all aspects of people's lives. SNS are modern communication channels through which people connect to one another, share ideas, experiences, pictures, messages and information. According to Boyd and Ellison (2007), social networking sites are: (1) web-based services that allow individuals to “construct a public or semipublic profile within a bounded system, (2) articulate a list of other users with whom they share a connection and (3) view and traverse their list of connections and those made by others within the system” (pp.78-100).

One of the most popular SNS nowadays is Facebook where users create online profiles by listing personal information and interests, link up with other users and share updates of the information posted on daily basis (Boyd & Ellison, 2007). The discourse of SNS has communicative purposes in that it enables young adults to build social relations by sharing their stance toward life.

The aim of the present study is threefold. First, it qualitatively investigates the potential effects of the age and gender variables on the linguistic realizations of selected markers of authorial stance (hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention) in 1500 Facebook status update posts written in L2 (English) by four participant groups affiliated to Sadat Academy of Management Sciences: Egyptian male and female (M/F) students as well as Egyptian M/F academic staff. Second, while assuming an initial null hypothesis, the study quantitatively examines the potential effects of the age and gender variables on the frequency of using the identified expressions of stance in the Facebook interactions under study. Finally, the study explores application of Hyland's (2005b) Model of Interaction to electronic social media discourse, especially that the model was originally proposed for published academic discourse. In the present data, on the other hand, students and academic staff often engage in casual conversations or formal/informal discussions about their personal everyday life experiences as well as specialized academic matters. To these aims, the study addresses the following research questions:

- 1- To what extent would age and gender differences between Egyptian M/F students and academic staff at Sadat Academy of Management

Sciences influence their linguistic realizations of markers of stance in the Facebook interactions under study?

- 2- To what extent would age and gender differences between the participant groups affect the frequency of using the identified expressions of stance?
- 3- How successful would Hyland's Model of Interaction be when applied to electronic social media discourse?

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 CMD and Internet Linguistics

Various terms have been used to refer to (CMC): computer-mediated discourse (CMD), Internet language, Net speak, electronic discourse and cyber speak, though each term has a distinct implication (Denis 2005, Herring 1999 and 2001). CMC is generally defined as a type of communication that occurs via electronic devices (e.g. email, chatrooms, text messaging). According to Herring (1996), CMC refers to the kind of communication that "takes place between human beings via instrumentality of computers" (p.1). Later, Herring (2002) uses the term CMD "as a specialization within the broader interdisciplinary study of CMC, distinguished by its focus on language and language use in computer networked environments" (p.10). Crystal (2001) emphasizes that CMC deals with the medium itself, while electronic discourse focuses on the interactive and dialogue elements only. Crystal explicates that the term "net speak" involves "writing as well as talking, and 'speak' suffix also has respective elements including listening and reading" (p.19).

Herring (2007) states that it is "a whole new fractured language definitely not as elegant or polished as English used to be" (p.6). Herring supports Murray (1988) who has asserted that internet language often contains non-standard features because users of synchronous CMD tend to "delete subject pronouns, determiners, and auxiliaries, use abbreviations, and do not correct typos" (p.44) in order to economize on typing, mimic spoken language features, or express themselves creatively. Herring (1999) relates the non-standard features of computer-mediated language to errors caused by inattention or lack of knowledge of the standard language forms.

The linguistic study of internet language or internet linguistics is defined by Crystal (2005) as “the synchronic analysis of language in all areas of Internet activity”, which include “areas of computer-mediated communication (CMC), such as SMS messaging texting” (p.4). Various researchers adopt different perspectives and approaches to CMD for studying how individuals use linguistic resources to construct identities in online discourse. Androutsopoulos and Beibwenger (2008) and Herring (2001) state that research on Internet linguistics has started with the publication of Ferrara et. al (1991) on what they termed “interactive written discourses (IWD)”.

## 2.2 Metadiscourse: Stance Features

According to Kopple (1985), metadiscourse is “discourse about discourse” and refers to the writer’s or speaker’s linguistic presence in his text to interact with his readers. Kopple (1985) adds that metadiscourse is “the linguistic material which does not add propositional information, but which signals the presence of an author” (p. 37). Metadiscourse is defined by Hyland (2005b) as “a cover term for self-reflective expressions used to negotiate interactional meaning of text” (p.37). According to Hyland (2005b), it is the methods in which writers and speakers interact through their use of language with readers and listeners, and it includes “features of language which describe not only how we organize our ideas, but also how we relate to our readers or listeners” (p.16).

Metadiscourse comprises some linguistic expressions in a text which illuminate the text itself, rather than its propositional content (Thompson, 2003). Later, Hyland (2005b) considers metadiscourse as a “social and communicative process” between writers and their readers (p. 14). Tajeddin and Alemi (2012) claim that metadiscourse is used by writers to permit readers to recognize the attitude of the authors towards the topics presented. The way thoughts are presented and understood can be influenced by the interaction between authors, readers, speakers and listeners, which are considered as social acts (Amiryousefi and Rasekh, 2010).

One of the essential devices in Hyland’s (2005b) model of interaction comprises stance features which relate to ones’ own authority, opinion, commitments, disguisable involvement, and tentativeness in the texts. Hyland (2005b) identifies stance as the way in which “writers intrude to stamp their

personal authority onto their arguments or step back and disguise their involvement” (p. 174). Stance is further sub-divided in Hyland’s study (2005b) into: evidentiality, affect, and presence. Evidentiality permits an author to state the degree of his/her obligation towards the precision and reliability of a proposition through increasing or decreasing the strength of statements. This is done by means of using boosters/intensifiers (e.g., clearly, of course, demonstrate) and hedges/down toners (e.g., possible, might, perhaps), respectively.

According to Hyland (2005a), by decreasing the strength of statements, hedges enable writers to convey perspectives and consequences with more accuracy and attentiveness. This helps in decreasing the threat of resistance, and in opening a discursive space with readers. However, booster-enhanced propositions imply the writer’s convincingly confident understanding, other voices being debilitated or dismissed. Youssef (2016) states that due to function overlap of metadiscursive markers, “boosters also appeal to shared knowledge with the reader. They affect functions through attitude markers (e.g., agree, fortunately, important) to further assist writers in expressing a position towards their material and enhancing solidarity with the reader” (p. 76). Existence, or self-mention, simply points the range to which the writer intends to be noticeable in the text. It is recognized through the use of first-person pronouns.

### 2.3 Gender and Online Communication

With the increasing popularity of SNS, a forceful innovative area of research is being conducted to reconnoiter the relationship between gender and computer-mediated communication. A significant subject here is whether “established trends in gender and language research are reproduced or transformed” in an online environment (Weatherall, 2008).

Recently, research on gender and CMC has focused explicitly on (i.e. family, friends, significant others) and scenarios where relationships tend to be the fundamental gendered communication patterns on SNS. Again, this research has largely supported findings on gendered CMC in general; that is, the use of SNS mirrors the broad use of CMC for both men and women (Bond, 2009). For instance, research paper has found that there are gender differences in reasons for using SNS, i.e., men reported using SNS for forming new relationships

while women reported engaging in more SNS activities that enable preservation of prevailing relationships (Muscanell & Guadagno, 2012).

An extremely limited amount of research has been conducted to examine gender patterns of communication and behavior on the world's most popular SNS, Facebook.

### 3. Hyland's (2005a, b) Model of Interaction

Hyland's (200a, b) Model of Interaction constitutes the theoretical and analytical framework in this study. The model (Figure 1) focuses on the interactional dimensions of metadiscourse as encircling the genuine communicative functions that create an author's stance and enables him/her to involve with the reader. It was originally proposed for academic texts; the present study extends its application to online written discourse with regard to stance features and attitudinal positioning.

Stance features are related to ones' own authority, opinion, commitments, disguisable involvement, and tentativeness in the texts. Hyland (2005b) identifies stance as the ways that "writers intrude to stamp their personal authority onto their arguments or step back and disguise their involvement" (p.174).

Hyland (2005b) classifies stance devices into sub factors. He subcategorizes them as hedges, boosters, markers and self-mention.

**Figure (1)** Source: (Hyland, 2005b, p. 175)

#### *Hyland's Model of Interaction*

##### **A- Hedges:**

Hedges refer to words or phrases "whose job is to make things fuzzier or less fuzzy" (Lakoff 1973, p.471). According to Hickey and Stewart (2005), hedging can be defined in terms of keeping face of the interactions; they define it as a key linguistic resource for face protection, whether that of self or the other. According to Brown and Levinson (1987), hedges are linguistic expressions which weaken the illocutionary force of a statement: by means of attitudinal predicates like: I don't think, I think, I mean ... etc., or adverbs like 'actually'. Hyland (2005a) asserts that "hedges allow academics to take a

rhetorical stance, to downplay their statements and anticipate audience responses by the degree of certainty” (p.478).

### **B. Boosters**

According to Watts (2003), “boosters are linguistic expressions enhancing the force of the illocution in some way” (p.169). Boosters are usually used to add more intensity to the addressee's statement (such as: surely, clearly, of course, etc.). Salager-Mayer (1997) views the term boosters as those lexical items by means of which the writer can show strong confidence for a claim. Hyland (2005a) views boosters as “a tool which strengthens the claim by showing the writer's certainty, conviction, and commitment, helping the writers affect interpersonal solidarity” (p. 480).

### **C. Attitude Markers**

Hyland (2005b) clarifies that writers may use different comparatives; progressive particles; certain attitude verbs, adjectives or adverbs (e.g., agree, prefer, remarkable, important) to try to persuade readers of having an agreement with them or to indicate their effectiveness rather than epistemic attitude.

### **D. Self-mention**

According to Hyland (2001, 2005a), the writer's identity, style and interpersonal information can be achieved by self-mention. Some academics consciously avoid using this feature in order not to cause misunderstanding, or they suppose that one should use passive verbs because they afford to be accepted by discourse community members, and their voice can be heard by the whole study's outcomes adapting "disciplinary situated authorial identity" (Hyland 2005a, p.495).

Stance features discussed in the present study refer to how each Facebook status of students and academic staff refers to the self and others and how they employ hedging and boosting devices as well as attitude markers.

## **4. Methodology**

This section discusses the methodological procedures of the study. Specifically, it comprises the design of the study, the type and profile of data under examination, and the rationale and criteria for choosing the data. In addition, it describes the process of data processing and the methodology used to identify and analyze stance markers in the data.

#### 4.1 Data

The data comprises 1500 Facebook status update posts written in English by 200 Egyptian male and female undergraduate students as well as 200 male and female academic staff. The whole data is composed of 108,489 words for analysis (see Table 1). Posts are presented in two forms to enable both qualitative and quantitative analyses:

-As images/screenshots of authentic Facebook interactions, for a qualitative analysis of the selected samples, where all the formatting features are present.

-As readable plain text files format to enable corpus analysis. This is attained by converting the posts into plain text format to be fed to the concordance program, the freeware corpus analytic toolkit, AntConc (version 3.5.8).

Students' posts address general topics including instances that Facebook users have or comments about social experiences. In terms of content, the posts are about social relationships, personal experiences, daily activities, expressing beliefs, personal occasions, sports, birthday wishes and sharing the educational experiences. Posts of academic staff, on the other hand, address diverse topics related to personal opinions, marking exams, personal experiences, expressing gratitude to friends and criticizing others, complaining about negative social practices, birthday wishes, congratulations, giving advice, and expressing feelings and emotions towards people and issues. Totals are tabulated for presenting the four corpora of M(ale)/F(emale) students and M/F academic staff in Table 1:

**Table 1**

*Total Number of Participants and Word Counts*

No. of participants	Total no. of posts	No. of words	Average length of posts
100 FSs	350 status updates (3 statuses for every user)	2913 5	82

100 MSs	400 status updates (4 statuses for every user)	2422 1	60
100 FAS	400 status updates (4 updates for every user)	3006 5	75
100 MAS	350 status updates (3 updates for every user)	2506 8	71
400	1500	108,4 89	

As shown in the above table, gender seems to affect the average length in Ss's posts but not in the AS's.

The selected posts and status updates were written between the years 2017-2020. Only those written in English were included; those which were written in Arabic or Franco-Arabic were excluded. Hence, the study targeted participants with the intention to reveal their identity as bilingual speakers (Emara, 2017) and/or to extend ties with an international audience. According to Klimanova (2013), the choice of second language may give Facebook users the possibility to present themselves in a way that is more appealing to the audience they are addressing. Others (Huffaker & Calvert, 2006 and Ruiz, 2009) postulate that the use of the second language rather than the first language may be an act of revolution against local standards and a trial to interact and engage in recognized second language personalities. Moreover, the selection of English posts facilitates the analysis of the linguistic devices related to age and gender. It also helps in comparing the findings of the present study to the findings of the previous studies conducted on online discourse of English data.

## 4.2 Participants

The participants of the study are Egyptian undergraduate male and female students at Sadat Academy for Management Sciences (to be referred to as SAMS) as well as Egyptian male and female academic staff. The participants are drawn from a specific group of users in the researcher's list of Facebook

friends and friends of friends. They are classified into two representative groups:

100 males (to be referred to as MSs) and 100 females (to be referred to as FSs). All of them are undergraduate college students enrolled at SAMS.

100 male academic staff (to be referred to as MAS) and 100 female academic staff (to be referred to as FAS). They are lecturers and teaching assistants in the fields of marketing, business administration, economics, and management.

Being a Facebook friend of participants allows the researcher to track posts by scrolling back through the participants' "timelines" to gather screenshots of their posts, and permission is granted to linguistically analyze the Facebook status updates they posted in FB. For ethical considerations, the personal information of the participants is cropped for hiding their names and personal profiles' photos. Then, the corpus is analyzed through the concordancing tool in AntConc.

The researcher also uses the search function available at the top of the site to select status update posts that are written in English. Participants' posts include general social issues, particular political events, general topics (usually situations that Facebook users experience), special occasions, daily activities as well as personal instances or comments about social issues.

### 4.3 Procedures

The following procedures are used for having a balanced and accurate processing of data. First, conscientious reading of the data is accomplished for highlighting the extracts of status updates that are investigated. Second, the lists of metadiscursive stance markers are taken from previous research studies specifically Hyland (1998a, 1998b, 2005a, 2005b) as well as from the most frequent features in the corpora. Third, when Hyland's Model of Interaction (2005a, b) is applied, the metadiscursive markers are extracted from the corpus through AntConc, a corpus analysis toolkit for concordance and text analysis. Fourth, the frequent occurrences of stance markers in the corpora are tabulated for the subsequent analysis and interpretation. Fifth, screenshots of a variety of the subjects' status update posts are gathered by means of the snipping tool program. The screenshots of posts are first transformed and saved in plain text

format, which is the required format for AntConc. In plain text files, all figures, emoticons, symbols and all quotation marks are removed in order to reduce false hits.

Sixth, the lexical and grammatical stance markers are fed into the software to come up with a total frequency count of such markers. A false hit marks a linguistic expression that is not functioning as metadiscourse in a specific context. Therefore, manual screening is conducted for each occurrence of the targeted markers to decide whether an item has a metadiscursive function or should be ignored. Seventh, search items are frequently fed as wild cards for AntConc together with all the potential completions of the word under investigation.

In order to provide significant explanation of the results, the relative frequency (R) and normalized density of tokens are calculated. The relative frequency (R) indicates the frequency proportion of the counts in each corpus in relation to the total counts across the four corpora. While the density (D) of tokens indicates their frequency within each single corpus. The relative frequency reflects the individualized behavior of each group of subjects (MS, FS, MAS, or FAS) in relation to that of other groups. The density (D) is calculated per each 1000 words, which is a well-established method in previous corpus studies (Biber et al., 1999, Hyland 2005b, Semaie et al., 2014 & Youssef, 2016).

To provide the frequency of metadiscursive markers across the corpora, the researcher uses a standardized size of 1000 words. Since the number of posts in each group varies, converting the raw scores into significant figures and calculating the frequency per each 1000 words.

## 5. Analysis and Discussion

### 5.1 Corpus Results of Stance Markers in Status Updates

This section presents the analysis and discussion of corpus findings of stance markers used by the four groups of the study. Raw frequencies are supported with descriptive statistical analysis by providing normalized frequencies (per 1000 words), and percentages of stance markers in each sub-corpora, as well as when collapsing groups by gender and status (i.e., student vs. academic staff).

For corpus analysis, the markers are investigated by using the latest version of the software concordance tool AntConc. With regard to the English status updates, Hyland's (2005a, b) interactional model of four types of stance markers is adopted. The list of stance markers provided by Hyland (2005a, b) is employed as a baseline for the comparison between stance markers in writings by students and academic staff. Hyland's (2005a, b) list of stance markers has been adopted in several previous studies (Lee, 2012; Taki & Jafarpour, 2012; Sanjaya, 2013; Akinci, 2016).

The features analyzed here are hedges (Section 5.1.1), boosters (Section 5.1.2), attitude markers (Section 5.1.3), writer's presence (Section 5.1.4). The analysis examines how all subjects use hedging devices to reveal tentativeness or uncertainty and boosting devices to indicate emphasis, and how each of them uses adjectives and adverbs as attitude markers. This is presented through the analysis of five linguistic features: hedging devices to examine the writer's mitigation of sentence force, boosting devices to investigate the writer's sense of assertion, pronouns to investigate the implications of reference to the self and others, and both adjectives and adverbs used to express his/her attitude towards a certain proposition.

The present study applies the analysis of stance markers with the help of AntConc software to answer the research questions. The software AntConc helps the researcher in analyzing the most frequent words in the four sub-corpora. The researcher uses four tools: word list, collocates, concordance, and clusters in the software to investigate the stance features in the four sub-corpora.

### 5.1.1 Hedges

Hedging devices, or tentative expressions, identified in the present corpus include tentative linking verbs such as *seem*, *tend* and *appear*, modals suggesting uncertainty such as *could*, *maybe*, and *might*, and introductory verbs such as *suggest* and *imply*. Hedges highlight the subjectivity of a position by permitting information to be presented as a view rather than a fact and, therefore, expose that position to negotiation. Hedges, therefore, suggest that a statement is created on the writer's reasonable perceptive rather than convinced knowledge, signifying the degree of declaration. By marking statements in posts as conditional with hedges, therefore, students and academic staff intend to

transport respect and admiration for readers' assessments and to include them in the approval of their claims.

Table 2 illustrates the use of all hedging categories used in every 1000 words in the Facebook status updates across the four participant groups.

**Table 2**

*All Hedging Categories Across the Four Participant Groups*

Categories	Participant groups								Totals
	FSs		MSs		FAS		MAS		
	T	D	T	D	T	D	T	D	
Modals	363	13	296	12	334	11	281	11	1274
Lexical Verbs	67	2.3	80	3.3	59	2	97	3.9	303
Reliability Hedges	17	0.5	60	2.4	18	0.5	36	1.4	131
Attribute Hedges	63	2.1	68	2.8	68	2.2	65	2.5	264
T	510		504		479		479		1972
R%	26%		25.50%		24.30%		24.30%		
R% Ss vs. AS	51.5%				48%				
R% Females vs. Males	50%				50%				

From the above table, it is observed that of the four hedging categories, modal hedging devices are the highest used followed by epistemic lexical hedging verbs by a wide margin. Then, attributive adverbs come in third place, and finally reliability adverbs. Plentiful use of the hedging modal verbs in the posts is consistent with earlier findings reported by Akinci (2016), Sanjaya (2013), and Yu (2019). Based on the calculated totals (Table 2), it can be observed that participants in all four groups have almost equally resorted to hedging devices; neither gender nor age distinctions is observed.

A closer look at preferences of specific hedging categories reveals that FSs and FAs have demonstrated a strong tendency to use more hedging modal

verbs like *can*, *would*, *may*, and *should* as illustrated in the examples to follow. Both female groups have used hedging modal verbs in their posts to present their stance with uncertainty so as to give space to their audience to dispute their views.

In the following examples, the posts show that by marking statements in posts as conditional with hedges, FSs and FAs transported respect and admiration for readers' assessments and include them in the approval of their claims. In examples (1-4) by FSs and FAs, the highlighted hedging modal verbs are used to express the proposition in a more tentative way by showing a lower degree of probability.

Ex. 1 (FS): It *may* be said that the responsibility of everything was less than before.

Ex.2 (FAS): It *would seem* that individuals were carrying the responsibility of being entitled to actions that would actually affect another person.

Ex.3 (FS): A drop in relation *may* result from unreliable partner but is unlikely to occur if responsibility is existed.

Ex.4 (FS): It was expected that the final episode *would* be more satisfying, but this end *could* have been due to the second season.

Further gender effects are observed with regard to the use of hedging epistemic lexical verbs and reliability adverbs where both male groups (MSc and MAs) are in the lead. According to the findings of previous studies of Hyland (1996) and Youssef (2016), this indicates some degree of doubt and may suggest that male writers write with more caution and precision by expressing less confidence in the certainty of their propositions. With regard to attribute hedges, however, neither age nor gender differences can be observed.

### 5.1.2 Boosters

Several categories of boosting devices, or intensifiers are used by all participant groups to indicate emphasis and certainty in what they say. Hence, boosters allow writers to close down alternatives and head off conflicting views. Boosters propose that the writer identifies possibly diverse positions but has chosen to narrow this diversity rather than broaden it, opposing alternatives with

a single, confident voice (Hyland, 1999a). The boosting devices found in the status updates can be divided into four categories: epistemic lexical boosting verbs such as *show*, *find*, *establish*, *decide* and *realize*; degree modifiers such as *so*, *just*, *very* and *too*; intensifying adverbs such as *really*, *definitely*, *genuinely*, *absolutely*, *actually* and *always*; and intensifying adjectives such as *awesome*, *sure* and *amazing*.

**Table 3**

*All Boosting Categories Across the Four Participant Groups*

Categories	Participant groups								Totals
	FSs		MSs		FAS		MAS		
	T	D	T	D	T	D	T	D	
Adverbs	319	10.9	407	16.8	243	8.1	300	12	1269
Degree Modifiers	326	11.2	328	13.5	286	9.5	295	12	1235
Verbs	187	6.4	185	7.6	186	6.2	200	8	758
Adjectives	67	2.3	116	4.8	38	1.3	81	3.2	302
T	899		1036		753		876		3564
R%	25%		29%		21%		25%		
R% Ss vs. AS	54.0%				46.0%				
R% Females vs. Males	46.0%				54.0%				

By comparing total counts of all boosting markers used by each participant group as shown in Table 3, and then adding counts of Ss vs. AS and Females vs. Males, only marginal numerical differences could be observed. Student participants produce slightly higher (54 %) tokens of all boosting devices than the academic staff (46%). Looking closer across categories of boosting devices, it can be observed that boosting adverb markers are the most commonly used, followed by degree modifiers, then verbs, and finally adverbs.

Moreover, when comparing the boosting marker preferences of each group, it can be observed that degree modifiers are the most preferred category for both female groups irrespective of age. These findings are in line with the study of Rahimpour (2014) who suggests that blog writers mark their positions and certainty in academic blogs by using boosting adverb markers. The results also support the findings of Emara (2017) who concludes that college students are frequent users of boosting categories. However, she finds that females are more frequent users of boosters than their male counterparts on their writings on Facebook. Plentiful use of intensifying adverbs by females in their posts as in examples (5, 6 and 7) is consistent with the previous study of Thelwall et al. (2009) which shows that females have the tendency to use more positive and emotional words in their comments on Facebook than do males.

Ex. 5 (FAS): *Actually*, I *just* post this short notice to *really* express my appreciation and thank you all for your great hospitality. *Really*, it was *really really* nice to see you, and it *always* will be a pleasure to see you again.

Ex. 6 (FS): I *just* want to say I love you, I *just* want to express my appreciation, and I am *very very* grateful for your support.

Ex. 7 (FS): I *just* want to tell you that you are my everything, you are my soul, you are my life, and you have been *always really* my great choice.

### 5.1.3 Attitude Markers

Attitude markers suggest the author's affective, rather than epistemic attitude to propositions, transferring agreement, surprise, significance, and so on, rather than commitment (see Table 4 below for exact tokens). According to Hyland (2005b), attitude is conveyed explicitly during a text using "attitude verbs (e.g., agree, prefer), sentence adverbs (unfortunately, hopefully), and adjectives (appropriate, logical, remarkable)" (p. 180). Authors can use English attitude markers to convey not only their attitude toward the proposition, but also to build an indirect contact and solidarity with the readers by sharing similar feelings and views.

**Table 4**

*Attitude Markers in Participant Groups (per 1000 words)*

No.	Attitude Markers	Participant groups				Totals
		FSs	MSs	FAS	MAS	
1	even	65	71	65	56	257
2	amazing	27	13	12	5	57
3	important	10	16	7	22	55
4	agree*	9	4	7	2	22
5	unfortunately	4	6	1	4	15
6	interesting	1	4	0	5	10
7	unexpected	3	2	0	3	8
8	disappointed	3	1	1	2	7
9	expected	2	0	4	1	7
10	usual	0	1	1	4	6
11	essential	1	1	2	1	5
12	prefer	1	2	2	0	5
13	surprised	1	1	3	0	5
14	hopeful	2	0	1	1	4
15	importantly	1	0	2	1	4
16	appropriate	1	0	2	0	3
17	disagree*	1	1	0	1	3
18	amazingly	3	0	0	0	3
19	unusual	2	0	0	1	3
20	shockingly	1	0	1	0	2
21	unbelievable	0	0	1	1	2
22	shocked	0	0	1	1	2
23	hopefully	0	2	0	0	2
24	surprisingly	0	1	1	0	2
T		138	126	114	111	489
D		4.7	5.2	3.8	4.4	

R %	28%	26%	23%	23%
R% Ss vs. AS	54%		46%	
R% Females vs. Males	51%		49%	

With regard to results on attitude markers (Table 4), students irrespective of gender used slightly more attitude markers than academic staff irrespective of gender. Female students use slightly more attitude markers (a total of 138) than female academic staff (a total of 114). Likewise, MSs produce slightly more attitude markers (a total of 126) than male academic staff (a total of 111). Combined totals suggest marginal age and gender differences.

With regard to preferred attitude markers, the adverb *even*, which suggests writers' surprise or unexpectedness in a more indirect way, is the most used marker by all participant groups. On the other hand, explicit affective expressions such as *amazing*, *interesting*, *important*, and *unfortunately* are more varied and diverse. Other attitudinal verb markers (e.g., *agree*, and *prefer*) are used as position categories which concern the method writers position themselves and view works and arguments.

These results support earlier findings by Akinci (2016) and Hyland and Jiang (2016) who report that 'important' and 'even' are recognized as the two most frequently used attitude markers in the English corpus. They are the most favored stance markers, with 12.48% and 10.11% of the total attitude markers, respectively, among participants of the English applied linguistics community because they permit writers "not only to express a stance toward something but also to align that stance with the interests of their community" (Hyland & Jiang, 2016, p. 262).

In example 8 below, the participant tries to indicate her position and signals her opinion by using positive attitude adjectives (*amazing*, *important*, and *interesting*) to convey her agreement, surprise, and importance rather than commitment. This is in line with the study of Yu (2019) who finds that positive attitude markers (e.g., *important*, *essential*) are used in English research articles to place a positive value on the work significance. The four groups use different attitude markers to make explicit their attitudes to what they are discussing. However, gender differences are not observed across FAS and MAS. Both

groups produce 23% of the tokens. In examples (9-11) by FSs and FAs, the highlighted attitudinal markers are used to express participants' affective position and assessment toward the proposition.

Ex. 8 (FAS): A group of my students presented an *interesting*, *amazing*, and *important* presentation in that they had an important marketing's campaign's idea to be done.

Ex. 9 (FAS): What is happened for me was *surprisingly* well estimated.

Ex. 10 (FS): I think the results of today's quiz is *unexpected*.

Ex. 11 (FS): *Even* at universities, *surprisingly*, college students are not allowed to express their opinions.

#### 5.1.4 Self-mention

Writer's presence can be manifested in the sub-corpora by the use of first-person pronouns. Self-mention "refers to the degree of explicit author presence in the text measured by the frequency of first-person pronouns and possessive adjectives (I, me, mine, exclusive we, our, ours)" (Hyland, 2005a, p.53). Explicit and implicit self-reference has a great importance in writing as it indicates how authors feel in relation to their arguments, disciplines, and readers. Self-mention, according to Hyland (2001), is influential and has a significant function in extending the interaction between writers' speech and the discourse community they belong to. The use of pronouns highlights factors such as proximity or distance and directness or indirectness between the writer and the reader. For example, the use of the inclusive pronoun 'we' may, in certain contexts, imply intimacy and solidarity between the author and the audience, whereas the generalized 'you' can sometimes refer to anyone and may indicate that the individual addressed is different and distant from the author. The pronouns analyzed here are the pronouns which have been used in the selected Facebook status update posts.

First person singular pronouns are the most obvious expression of participants' presence in their posts in the current study. However, no cases were identified of expressing self-mention by means of the exclusive pronoun 'we' in the sub-corpora. Table 5 illustrates the use of self-mention across the four groups in every 1000 words in the Facebook status updates.

**Table 5**

*Self-Mention Across the Four Participant Groups*

FB participant groups						Totals
No.	Markers	FSs	MSs	FAS	MAS	
1	I	794	682	870	550	2896
2	my	382	159	304	154	999
3	me	223	162	186	161	732
T		1399	1003	1360	865	4627
D		48	41.4	45.2	34.5	
R %		30.20%	21.60%	29.30%	18.60%	
R. Ss vs AS		52.%		48.%		
R% Females vs. Males		60%		40%		

As shown in Table 5, First person singular pronouns in the Nominative, Accusative, and Genitive forms (i.e., as subjects, objects, and possessive adjectives, respectively) are the exclusive means of expressing participants' presence in their posts. The ordering of these pronominal forms in the table reflects the descending frequency of their presence in the data, with subject forms being the most frequently used, followed by the possessive adjective, and finally the object forms. This suggests that self-mention occurred mostly in dynamic agentive contexts. As indicated by the self-mention counts of the four groups in the table, FSs are the leading group in the use of self-mention, followed by FAS, then by both MSs and MAS. The combined total suggests gender effects with the female groups resorting to self-mention (60%) more often than do their male counterparts (40%), regardless of age. Both female groups show a tendency for self-presentation in online settings.

The high frequency of using the subject form of the First-person singular pronoun 'I' in the sub-corpora, is due to the grammatical constraint of English requiring an overt subject. This structural feature of English seems to promote participants' construction of authorial identity explicitly in the

text. This is in line with the findings of Yu (2019) who concludes that “structural feature of English seems to promote the frequent use of self-mention in English language” (p.85). This helps participants to build their authorial voice explicitly in the posts. Similarly, Khedri et al (2015) concludes that, self-mentions are used to help authors to present themselves into the text explicitly, to direct their authorial persona and authority and to make their work prominent. This is obviously observed in the examples below. The strategic use of self-mention in these posts helps participants to keep such authority by stating their views and pursuing acknowledgement of their involvement.

Participants’ choice of using hedges or boosters with self-mention in the examples below can affect the strength of authorial presence as they can reduce or increase the participant’s self-mention. In the following examples, the participants use hedges and boosters to gain acceptance of their ideas to achieve their authorial commitment and contribution in their writings. In Ex 12, the MS participant tends to be more authoritative in his status update using the obligation marker ‘must’ which emphasizes the expression of authority by a person with power. This is in line with the study of Wang & Zeng (2021), who conclude that participants use first-person pronouns in collocation with other lexical devices, mainly hedges or boosters. They suggest that this can fine-tune the role of authorial commitment in a text. In Ex 13, on the other hand, a FS uses self-mention with a negated hedging modal verb, hence mitigating the power of self-mention.

Ex 12: (MS) *I must think* of blocking anyone adding me on any private group without taking my permission.

Ex 13: (FS) *I couldn’t believe* that this can be happened [*Sic.*] in my college

## 5.2 An Overview of Stance Markers

This section presents a brief overall view of the relative frequency (R) of the total counts of stance markers across the four FB participant groups. Collapsing all categories of stance and combining the counts of all instances per participant group, Figure 2 shows that FSs are in the lead, albeit by a narrow margin.

## Figure 2

### *Relative Frequency of All Stance Markers*

**Table 6**

### *All Stance Markers in Sub-Corpora Across the Four Participant Groups*

All categories of stance markers						
No.	markers	FSs	MSs	FAS	MAS	T
1	<i>Hedges</i>	510	504	479	479	1972
2	<i>Boosters</i>	899	1036	735	876	3546
3	<i>Attitude Markers</i>	138	126	114	111	489
4	<i>Self-Mention</i>	1399	1003	1360	865	4627
T		2946	2669	2688	2331	10634
D		101.1	110.1	90	93	
R%		28%	25%	25.20%	22%	
R% Ss vs. AS		53%		47%		
R% Females vs. Males		53.2%		47%		

## Figure 3

### *All Stance Markers*

Table 6 reveals counts under the compositional categories of stance per group. Self-mention is the most used category, followed by boosters, then hedges, and finally attitude markers. This is illustrated by Figure 3.

## 6. Findings and Conclusion

The present study offered a corpus-based investigation of the effect of the age and gender variables on the linguistic realizations and frequency of selected metadiscourse markers of authorial stance (hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention) within Hyland's (2005a, b) Model of Interaction in 1500

Facebook status update posts written in L2 English by 200 Egyptian M/F students and 200 M/F academic staff.

As per the first and second research questions, the study showed how each group of participants managed to reflect their authorial stance and demonstrate the degree of commitment toward their propositions through hedges, boosters, attitude markers, and self-mention. The results indicated only marginal age differences regarding the frequency of using boosters and attitude markers, where students topped academic staff albeit with a narrow margin. Gender differences were observed in the higher use of self-mention by the female groups as opposed to the male groups, and in gender-related preferences of certain categories of hedging and certain markers of attitude. For example, female participants (FSs & FAS) preferred hedging through modal verbs while male participants (MSs & MAS) preferred hedging via epistemic lexical verbs and reliability adverbs. The results of the present study further indicated that modal hedging verbs are the most common hedging device in the entire corpus of all groups. Plentiful use of the hedging modal verbs in the posts was consistent with earlier findings reported by Akinci (2016), Sanjaya (2013), and Yu (2019). On the overall, self-mention was the most used category of stance. When collapsing all categories of stance, i.e., totals per participant groups, female students were found to be the most frequent users of stance markers. Finally, Hyland's Model of Interaction has successfully been applied to electronic social media discourse.

## References

- Akinci, S. (2016). *A Cross-disciplinary Study of Stance Markers in Research Articles Written by Students and experts* [Master thesis, graduate theses and dissertations] Iowa State University.
- Amiryousefi, M., & Rasekh, M. (2010). Metadiscourse: Definitions, issues and its implications for English teachers. *English Language Teaching*, 3(4), 159-167. <https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v3n4p159>
- Androutsopoulos, J., & Beibwenger, M. (2008). Introduction: data and methods in computer-mediated discourse analysis. *Language@Internet*, 5, article 2. (urn:nbn:de:0009-7-16090)
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finnegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Pearson.
- Bond, B. (2009). He posted, she posted: Gender differences in self-disclosure on social network sites. *Rocky Mountain Communication Review*, 6(2), 29-37.
- Boyd, D. , & Ellison, N.. (2007). Social network sites: Definition, history, and scholarship. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication*, 13(1), article 11.
- Brown, P., & Levinson, S. (1987). *Politeness: Some language universals in language use Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press.
- Cameron, D., McAlinden, F. and O'Leary, K. (1989). Lakoff in context: the social and linguistic functions of tag questions. In D. Cameron & J. Coates, (Eds.), *Women in Their Speech Communities*. (PP.74-93). Longman.
- Crystal, D. (2001). *Language and the Internet*. Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2005, February). The scope of Internet linguistics (pp. 17–21). In Proceedings of American Association for the Advancement of Science Conference; American Association for the Advancement of Science Conference, Washington, DC, USA.
- Denis, M. (2005). *Mcquail's Mass Communication Theory*. (5th ed). London: SAGE Publications
- Emara, I. (2017). Gender identity construction in Facebook statuses of Egyptian young adults.force in language change. *Visible Language*, 18, 118-141.

- Ferrara, K., Brunner, H., & Whittemore, G. (1991). Interactive written discourse as an emergent register. *Written Communication*, 8(1), 8-34. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0741088391008001002>
- Herring, S. (1999). Interactional coherence in computer-mediated communication. *Journal of Computer-Mediated Communication* 4(4). Retrieved from: <http://jcmc.indiana.edu/vol4/issue4/herring.html>
- Herring, S. (2002). Computer-mediated communication on the internet. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology*, 36, 109-168.
- Herring, S. (2007). A Faceted Classification Scheme for Computer-mediated Discourse. *Language@Internet* (4). Retrieved from: <http://www.languageatinternet.de/articles/2007>
- Hickey, L. and Stewart, M. (2005). *Politeness in Europe*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd
- Huffaker, D.A. & Calvert, S.L. (2006). Gender, identity and language use in teenage blogs. *Journal of computer-mediated communication*, 10(2), 1-22.
- Hyland, K. (1996). Writing without conviction? Hedging in science research articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 17(4), 433-454.
- Hyland, K. (1998a). Boosting, hedging and the negotiation of academic knowledge. *Text*, 18, 349-382.
- Hyland, K. (1998b). *Hedging in Scientific Research Articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Hyland, K. (1999). Disciplinary discourses: Writer stance in research articles. In C. Candlin & K. Hyland (Eds.), *Writing: Texts, Processes and Practices* (pp. 99-121). Longman.
- Hyland, K. (2001). Bringing in the reader: addressee features in academic writing. *Written Communication*, 18(4), 549-74.
- Hyland, K. (2005a). *Metadiscourse: Exploring Interaction in Writing*. Continuum.
- Hyland, K. (2005b). Stance and engagement a model of interaction in academic discourse. *Discourse Studies*, 7(2), 173-192.
- Hyland, K. (2008). Persuasion, interaction and the construction of knowledge: Representing self and others in research writing. *IJES*, 8 (2), 1-23.
- Hyland, K. (2010). Constructing proximity: Relating to readers in popular and professional science.

- Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 9(2), 116-127.
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. (2021). Academic naming: changing patterns of noun use in research writing. *Journal of English Linguistics*, 49(3), 255–282. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00754242211019080>
- Hyland, K., & Jiang, F. K. (2016). Change of attitude? A diachronic study of stance. *Written Communication*, 33(3), 251–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0741088316650399>
- Jiang, F. K., & Hyland, K. (2020). Prescription and reality in advanced academic writing. *Iberica*, 39, 15–42.
- Khedri, M., Chan, S. H. and Helen, T. (2015). Interpersonal-driven features in research article abstracts: Cross-disciplinary metadiscoural perspective. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 23(2), 303-314.
- Klimanova, L. (2013). *Second Language Identity Building through Participation in Internet-Mediated Environments: A Critical Perspective*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Iowa]. <https://doi.org/10.17077/etd.6lho05ff>
- Kopple, W.V. (1985). Some exploratory discourse on metadiscourse, *College Composition and Communication* 36: 82-93.
- Lakoff, R. (1973). Hedges: a study in meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. *Journal of Philosophical Logic*, 2, 458-508.
- Latif, F& Rasheed, M. (2020). An analysis of gender differences in the use of metadiscourse markers in Pakistani academic research articles. *Sci.Int.Lahore*, 32(2), 187-192, 2020
- Lee, J. (2012). Hakswul theyksuthuey nathanan hankwuke heyci phyohyen senceng yenkwu (A study on teaching Korean hedging Expression for KAP learners). *icwungenehak (Bilingual Research)*, 49, 269-197.
- Lo, Y., Othman, J. & Lim, J. (2021). Mapping the Use of Boosters in Academic Writing by Malaysian First-Year Doctoral Students. *Pertanika Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*. 29 (3), 1917-1937. [10.47836/pjssh.29.3.23](https://doi.org/10.47836/pjssh.29.3.23).
- Murray, D. (1988). The context of oral and written language: A framework for mode and medium switching. *Language in Society*, 17(3), 351-373.
- Muscanell, N., & Guadagno, R. (2012). Make new friends or keep the old: Gender and personality differences in social networking use. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 28(1), 107-112.

- Onomo, A.A. (2012). People power.. 15 social media. *The Guardian*, pp. 38.
- Perez, Sarah. (February 2009). Top & Web 2.0 Security Threats. *Read Write Enterprise*. Retrieved March 9, 2011, from World Wide Web: <http://www.readwriteweb.com/enterprise/2009/02/top-9-web-20-security-threat.php>.
- Rahimpour, S . (2014). Blogs: A resource of online interactions to develop stance-taking. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1502-1507.
- Ruiz, J. (2009). Sociological discourse analysis: methods and logic. *Qualitative Social Research*, 10(2),1-22. Art. 26. Retrieved from <http://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0114-fqs0902263>
- Sanjaya, N. (2013). *Hedging and Boosting in English and Indonesian Research Articles* [Doctoral dissertation ,The Pennsylvania State University] The Graduate School College of the Liberal Arts.
- Salager-Mayer F., (1997). *I Think That Perhaps You Should: a Study of Hedges in Scientific Dis- course*. In: *Functional Approaches to Written Text: Classroom Applications*. – Washington: United States Information Agency
- Samaie, M., Fereshteh K., & Mahnaz B. (2014). The frequency and types of hedges in research article introductions by Persian and English native authors. *Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 98, 1678 – 1685.
- Tajeddin, Z. & Alemi, M . (2012). L2 Learners' Use of Metadiscourse Markers in Online Discussion Forums. *Issues in Language Teaching (ILT)*, 1(1), 93-121.
- Taki, S., & Jafarpour, F. (2012). Engagement and stance in academic writing: A study of English and Persian research articles. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 3(1), 157-168.
- Thelwall, M. (2009). *MySpace Comments*. *Online Information Review*, 33, 58-76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/14684520910944391>
- Thompson, S. E. (2003). Text-structuring metadiscourse, intonation and the signalling of organisation in academic lectures. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(1), 5-20.
- Wang, J., & Zeng, L. (2021). Disciplinary recognized self-presence: self-mention used with hedges and boosters in phd students' research writing. *SAGE Open*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211005454>

- Watts, R. (2003). *Politeness*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Weatherall, A. (2008). Gender and Discourse. *The International Encyclopedia of Communication*. Donsbach, Wolfgang (ed). Blackwell Reference Online.
- Youssef ,A. (2016). Disciplinary and gender interactions: corpus analysis of stance and engagement in L2 research articles . *International Journal of Arabic-English Studies (IJAES)* , 16, 77-104.
- Yu, L. S. (2019). *A Cross-linguistic and Cross-cultural Study of Stance Markers in Research Articles in English and Korean*. [Doctoral dissertation, University of Hawai'i at Manoa].

## دراسة تأثير الاختلاف في النوع والعمر على التعبير عن الموقف على موقع التواصل

الاجتماعي فيسبوك: دراسة قائمه على المتن اللغوي

دينا جمال الدين حسني عياد

باحث دكتوراه - قسم اللغة الانجليزية

كلية العلوم الاداريه، اكايميه السادات للعلوم الاداريه، مصر

[Dinagamal1912@yahoo.com](mailto:Dinagamal1912@yahoo.com)

أ.د. هالة توفيق مقلد

أستاذ اللغويات

قسم اللغة الإنجليزية، كلية اللغات والترجمة

أكاديمية السادات للعلوم الإدارية- مصر

[Hala.Tawfik@gmail.com](mailto:Hala.Tawfik@gmail.com)

أ.د. سلوى فرج

أستاذ اللغويات

قسم اللغة الانجليزية، كلية الآداب

جامعة حلوان - مصر

[salwa\\_farag@arts.helwan.edu.eg](mailto:salwa_farag@arts.helwan.edu.eg)

أ.م.د. أماني يوسف

أستاذ اللغويات المساعد- قسم اللغة الانجليزية

كلية الآداب- جامعة حلوان - مصر

[amany\\_youssef@arts.helwan.edu.eg](mailto:amany_youssef@arts.helwan.edu.eg)

### المستخلص:

فيسبوك، كواحد من أشهر مواقع التواصل الاجتماعي، أتاح لملايين المستخدمين منصة مناسبة للتعبير عن تجاربهم الشخصية ومشاعرهم، ووجهات نظرهم، وتعليقاتهم، وتأملاتهم. في ضوء ذلك، تبحث الدراسة الحالية استخدام بعض سمات التعبير عن الموقف مثل الاحتياط، المعززات، علامات الموقف والاتجاه والإشارة إلى الذات المستخدمة من قبل الطلاب وأعضاء هيئة التدريس المصريين من الإناث والذكور من خلال تحليل ١٥٠٠ من المشاركات في تحديثات الحالة في منشورات الفيسبوك المكتوبة باللغة الإنجليزية (كلغة ثانية). تتبني الدراسة نموذج هايلاند (أ،ب، ٢٠٠٥) التفاعلي والذي تم اقتراحه واستخدامه في الأصل لتحليل نصوص الكتابة الأكاديمية، وتقدم الدراسة مقترح للتوسع في تطبيق نموذج هايلاند التفاعلي ليشمل المنشورات التفاعلية على موقع التواصل الاجتماعي فيسبوك. تم استخدام برنامج الحاسوب لتحليل النصي ومحرر النصوص المجاني AntConc (version 3.5.8) لإجراء تحليل المتن اللغوي في انشاء التوافقات ومجموعات من الكلمات حسب تكرار ظهورها في منشورات الفيس بوك المستخدمة. وتشير نتائج الدراسة الي ان المنشورات المختارة توظف النص لتبرز سمات التعبير عن المواقف التفاعلية. كما تشير نتائج الدراسة أيضا عن وجود تأثيرات هامشية بسبب الفروق العمرية في عينة الدراسة، هامشية، حيث فاق الطلاب أعضاء هيئة التدريس فيما يتعلق بتكرار استخدام المعززات وعلامات التعبير عن الموقف، كما تشير النتائج الي وجود فرق هامشي بين الذكور والاناث في زيادة استخدام ذكر الذات من قبل مجموعات الاناث والتفضيلات المتعلقة بالنوع لبعض سمات الاحتياط وبعض سمات مؤشرات وعلامات الموقف وتكرار الظهور في استخدام سمات ما وراء الخطاب.

**الكلمات الدالة:** العمر، النوع، سمات الموقف التفاعلية، التعبير عن الموقف، التواصل الاجتماعي فيسبوك، المتن اللغوي