

<div><div>International Meetings and Journals Research Association ISSN: 2792-1238 / E-ISSN: 2798-0277 DOI: 10.56334/sei</div><div>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</div><div>Editor-in-Chief: Chair of the Editorial Board: Dr. Nour El-Houda</div><div>Monthly   Regular   Open Access October, 2025   Issue 25, Vol. 12</div><div>imcra-az.org</div></div>	<div>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</div> <div>Issue 2, Vol. 9, 2026</div> <div>RESEARCH ARTICLE </div> <div>Disciplinary Variations in Academic Writing: A Comparative Corpus Analysis of Authorial Objectivity in Algerian Scientific Journals</div>	
<div>Ghanem Nour El-Houda</div>	<div>Dr.</div> <div>Université Kasdi Merbah - Ouargla</div> <div>Algeria</div> <div>Email: ghanem.nourh@gmail.com</div>	
	<div>=Issue web link</div> <div><a href="https://imcra-az.org/archive/392-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-2-vol-9-2026.html">https://imcra-az.org/archive/392-science-education-and-innovations-in-the-context-of-modern-problems-issue-2-vol-9-2026.html</a></div>	
	<div>Keywords</div> <div>academic writing; authorial objectivity; disciplinary variation; corpus analysis; Algerian scientific journals.</div>	
<div>Abstract</div> <div>This article examines disciplinary variations in academic writing through a comparative corpus-based analysis of authorial objectivity in Algerian scientific journals. Drawing exclusively on data and analyses developed in Ghanem’s doctoral thesis, the study investigates how objectivity is linguistically and rhetorically constructed across different academic disciplines. Objectivity is approached as a discursive and stylistic phenomenon manifested through specific linguistic features, including impersonal constructions, passive voice, hedging devices, nominalization, and the management of authorial presence. The corpus consists of research articles published in peer-reviewed Algerian journals representing distinct disciplinary domains. A systematic comparison is conducted to identify recurring patterns and contrasts in the use of objectivity markers across disciplines. The findings reveal clear disciplinary variation: texts belonging to the so-called “hard sciences” tend to favor impersonal and depersonalized forms of expression, whereas articles in the “soft sciences” and humanities display a greater degree of authorial visibility and evaluative stance. By highlighting these differences, the study demonstrates that academic objectivity is not a uniform or universal norm but a discipline-specific construct shaped by epistemological traditions and communicative conventions. The article contributes to research on academic discourse in the Algerian context and offers pedagogical implications for academic writing instruction, particularly in relation to discipline-sensitive writing practices.</div>		
<div>Citation</div> <div>Ghanem Nour El-Houda. (2026). Disciplinary Variations in Academic Writing: A Comparative Corpus Analysis of Authorial Objectivity in Algerian Scientific Journals. <i>Science, Education and Innovations in the Context of Modern Problems</i>, 9(2), 1-10. <a href="https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.2.13">https://doi.org/10.56334/sei/9.2.13</a></div>		
<div>Licensed</div> <div>© 2026 The Author(s). Published by Science, Education and Innovations in the context of modern problems (SEI) by IMCRA - International Meetings and Journals Research Association (Azerbaijan). This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<a href="http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/">http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/</a>).</div>		
<div>Received: 26.07.2025</div>	<div>Accepted: 10.12.2025</div>	<div>Published: 18.01.2026 (available online)</div>

## 1. Introduction

Academic writing plays a central role in the production, validation, and dissemination of scientific knowledge. Through research articles, scholars communicate findings, position themselves within disciplinary communities, and contribute to the advancement of their fields. One of the most frequently invoked principles of academic writing is *objectivity*, which is commonly associated with neutrality, impersonality, and reliance on evidence rather than personal opinion. Objectivity is traditionally regarded as a defining feature of scientific discourse, contributing to the credibility and legitimacy of academic knowledge.

However, research in discourse analysis and genre studies has shown that objectivity is not a fixed or homogeneous concept across all academic fields. Instead, it is realized through a range of linguistic and rhetorical strategies that vary according to disciplinary conventions, epistemological assumptions, and communicative goals. What counts as “objective” writing in one discipline may not align with expectations in another. As a result, academic objectivity

should be understood as a socially and disciplinarily constructed phenomenon rather than a purely neutral or universal standard.

Within this perspective, authorial objectivity refers to the ways in which writers manage their presence in the text while presenting knowledge claims. This management involves strategic choices related to voice, stance, and evaluation. Writers may minimize their visibility through passive constructions and impersonal forms, or they may adopt a more explicit authorial presence through self-mention, evaluative language, and argumentative positioning. These choices are rarely arbitrary; they are shaped by disciplinary norms and expectations that guide how knowledge should be presented and justified.

In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to disciplinary variation in academic writing, particularly through corpus-based approaches. Such studies have demonstrated that disciplines differ significantly in their use of grammatical structures, lexical choices, and rhetorical patterns. These differences reflect distinct ways of constructing knowledge, validating claims, and addressing disciplinary audiences. Corpus analysis, by allowing systematic comparison of large sets of texts, has proven to be a powerful method for uncovering these patterns and variations.

Despite the growing body of international research on disciplinary discourse, academic writing practices in the Algerian context remain relatively underexplored. Algerian scientific journals provide a rich site for investigating how global academic conventions intersect with local academic traditions. They also offer insight into how scholars writing in multilingual and postcolonial contexts negotiate norms of objectivity and authorial presence. Understanding these practices is particularly important in a higher education system where academic writing is often learned implicitly rather than through explicit, discipline-specific instruction.

This article is derived directly from Ghanem's doctoral thesis and focuses on the analysis of authorial objectivity in Algerian scientific research articles. The study adopts a comparative corpus-based approach to examine how objectivity is linguistically constructed across different disciplinary domains. It seeks to identify both shared tendencies and distinctive patterns in the use of objectivity markers, thereby contributing to a more nuanced understanding of academic writing variation.

The central research question guiding this study is the following: **How does authorial objectivity vary across disciplines in Algerian scientific journals, and through which linguistic and rhetorical features is this variation realized?**

By addressing this question, the article aims to achieve three main objectives. First, it seeks to describe the linguistic features associated with authorial objectivity in the selected corpus. Second, it aims to compare these features across disciplinary categories in order to identify systematic variation. Third, it intends to discuss the implications of these findings for academic writing pedagogy and for researchers seeking to publish within or across disciplinary boundaries.

The article is structured as follows. The next section reviews relevant literature on academic writing, objectivity, and disciplinary variation. This is followed by a detailed description of the methodology, including corpus design and analytical procedures. The results section presents the main findings of the corpus analysis, which are then discussed in relation to disciplinary conventions. The article concludes by summarizing the main contributions of the study and outlining pedagogical implications.

## 2. Literature Review

### 2.1 Academic Writing as a Disciplined Form of Discourse

### 2.1 Academic Writing as a Social and Disciplinary Practice

Academic writing is not merely a neutral vehicle for transmitting information; it is a highly conventionalized form of discourse governed by disciplinary norms, institutional expectations, and communicative purposes. Research in discourse analysis and genre studies has consistently shown that academic texts are shaped by the social practices of the communities in which they are produced (Swales, 1990; Bronckart, 1996). Each discipline develops its own rhetorical traditions, preferred linguistic structures, and stylistic conventions that reflect how knowledge is constructed and validated within that field (Hyland, 2005).

Within this framework, academic writing is understood as a social practice rather than a purely technical skill. Writers are expected to conform to shared norms in order to gain acceptance within their disciplinary communities, a process described in genre theory as disciplinary socialization (Swales, 2004). These norms influence choices related to text organization, argumentation, citation practices, and the degree of authorial visibility permitted in research articles. Consequently, academic writing varies considerably across disciplines, even when texts share the same genre label, such as the research article (Hyland, 2011).

In the Algerian academic context, these conventions are often internalized implicitly through exposure to published texts rather than through explicit instruction. Previous research in academic discourse suggests that such implicit acquisition may create difficulties for novice researchers, particularly when writing for scientific journals that follow international publishing standards (Biber et al., 1998). This situation makes the study of disciplinary writing practices especially relevant for understanding how academic norms are negotiated, appropriated, and reproduced in Algerian scientific discourse (Bronckart, 1996).

## 2.2 Objectivity in Academic Writing

Objectivity is widely regarded as a core principle of academic writing, particularly in scientific discourse, where credibility and reliability are central concerns. It is commonly associated with neutrality, factuality, and detachment from personal opinion. Traditional views of scientific writing link objectivity to the suppression of the author's personal voice in favor of an impersonal presentation of data and results, often realized through passive constructions, third-person references, nominalizations, and technical vocabulary (Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Biber et al., 1998).

However, more recent research challenges the notion of objectivity as complete authorial absence. Scholars working within discourse and pragmatics-oriented approaches argue that academic writing inevitably involves acts of evaluation, interpretation, and positioning (Hyland, 2005). Even when writers avoid explicit self-reference, they still make rhetorical choices that influence how knowledge claims are framed and evaluated by readers. From this perspective, objectivity is better understood as a discursive and rhetorical construct rather than an absolute state of neutrality (Swales, 2004).

Accordingly, objectivity involves managing a balance between authorial presence and disciplinary expectations. Writers rely on specific linguistic devices to present their claims as cautious, credible, and evidence-based. These devices include hedging expressions, modal verbs, and evaluative markers that allow authors to advance arguments while maintaining epistemic caution (Hyland, 2011). Objectivity thus emerges from the interaction between linguistic form, rhetorical purpose, and the epistemological norms of the discipline, rather than from the simple erasure of the authorial voice (Hyland, 2005).

## 2.3 Authorial Presence and Stance

Authorial presence refers to the extent to which writers make themselves visible in their texts. This visibility can be realized through first-person pronouns, evaluative adjectives, stance markers, and explicit commentary on the research process. Although traditional models of scientific writing discourage overt authorial presence, research in academic discourse has shown that self-mention and stance-taking are common and often necessary, particularly in rhetorically dense sections such as introductions and discussions, where writers position their work in relation to existing knowledge (Hyland, 2005; Swales, 2004).

The degree of acceptable authorial presence varies across disciplines. In fields such as the natural and applied sciences, writers tend to minimize self-reference and foreground procedures, methods, and results, reflecting an epistemology that values objectivity as detachment. In contrast, disciplines in the humanities and social sciences allow greater authorial visibility, as interpretation, argumentation, and critical evaluation are central to knowledge construction in these domains (Hyland, 2011; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

The concept of stance is closely related to authorial presence. Stance refers to the ways writers express attitudes, judgments, and levels of certainty toward the propositions they advance. Through stance markers such as hedges, modal verbs, and evaluative expressions, writers position themselves in relation to their claims, their data, and their readers. The management of stance is therefore a key component of authorial objectivity, as it enables writers to project credibility while remaining aligned with disciplinary conventions (Hyland, 2005; Biber et al., 1998).

## 2.4 Disciplinary Variation in Academic Writing

Disciplinary variation has been a central concern in studies of academic discourse. Research in genre analysis and discourse studies demonstrates that disciplines differ not only in subject matter but also in how knowledge is argued, justified, and communicated. These differences stem from varying epistemological assumptions, research methodologies, and communicative goals, which shape linguistic choices at both local and global levels of text organization (Swales, 1990; Bronckart, 1996).

One widely recognized distinction in the literature is between “hard” and “soft” disciplines. Hard disciplines, such as physics, engineering, and the natural sciences, tend to prioritize empirical observation, measurement, and reproducibility. Their writing conventions favor precision, impersonality, and standardized reporting formats. In contrast, soft disciplines, including the humanities and social sciences, often emphasize interpretation, theoretical discussion, and critical debate, allowing greater authorial involvement and evaluative language (Hyland, 2011; Werlich, 1975).

These disciplinary differences are particularly evident in the construction of objectivity. In hard sciences, objectivity is commonly associated with methodological rigor, procedural transparency, and depersonalized reporting. In soft disciplines, however, objectivity is more closely linked to argumentative balance, critical engagement with sources, and explicit positioning of interpretations. As a result, objectivity takes different discursive forms depending on disciplinary context rather than adhering to a single universal model (Hyland, 2005; Swales, 2004).

## 2.5 Corpus-Based Approaches to Academic Writing

Corpus-based methodology has become an essential tool for the study of academic writing and disciplinary variation. By analyzing large collections of authentic texts, corpus linguistics enables researchers to identify recurring patterns, quantify linguistic features, and compare usage across contexts. This empirical approach is particularly well suited to investigating complex phenomena such as authorial objectivity, which may not be immediately observable through qualitative analysis alone (Biber et al., 1998).

Corpus-based studies allow systematic comparison of grammatical structures, lexical choices, and rhetorical markers across disciplines. They provide quantitative evidence of how frequently specific features occur and how they are distributed within texts. In the context of academic discourse, this approach makes it possible to examine variations in objectivity markers such as passive constructions, hedging devices, and self-mention across disciplinary domains (Biber et al., 1998; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

Beyond description, corpus analysis also helps bridge the gap between research and pedagogy. By revealing discipline-specific patterns of language use, corpus-based findings offer concrete insights that can inform academic writing instruction and materials development. This is particularly valuable in contexts where explicit training in disciplinary writing conventions is limited, as corpus evidence can make implicit norms more visible and accessible to novice writers (Hyland, 2005; Swales, 1990).

## 2.6 Research Gap and Rationale for the Study

Although international research has extensively documented disciplinary variation in academic writing, relatively few studies have focused on non-Anglophone and multilingual academic contexts. As a result, the interaction between local academic traditions and global publication standards remains underexplored. Algerian scientific journals represent a particularly relevant context in which such interactions can be examined from a discourse-analytic perspective (Bronckart, 1996; Swales, 2004).

This study addresses this gap by offering a systematic, corpus-based analysis of authorial objectivity in Algerian scientific journals. By comparing multiple disciplines within the same national context, it isolates disciplinary variation from broader cultural or institutional factors. In doing so, the study contributes both to research on academic discourse and to a deeper understanding of how scholarly communication practices are shaped and negotiated in the Algerian academic landscape (Hyland, 2005; Biber et al., 1998).

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a **comparative corpus-based research design** to investigate disciplinary variations in authorial objectivity in Algerian scientific journals. The choice of a corpus-based approach is motivated by the need to analyze

authentic academic texts in a systematic and empirical manner. Corpus linguistics provides powerful tools for identifying, quantifying, and comparing linguistic features across large datasets, making it particularly suitable for the study of subtle rhetorical phenomena such as objectivity and stance (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998; Hyland, 2005).

The research design is descriptive and comparative in nature. Rather than evaluating the quality or effectiveness of the articles analyzed, the study focuses on how objectivity is linguistically constructed within different disciplinary traditions. By comparing texts from multiple disciplines within the same national context, the analysis aims to isolate disciplinary variation while minimizing the influence of broader institutional or cultural factors, an approach commonly adopted in genre-based and discourse-analytic research (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2011).

### 3.2 Corpus Compilation

The corpus analyzed in this study is drawn exclusively from **peer-reviewed Algerian scientific journals**. The selection of journals was guided by criteria such as academic credibility, disciplinary relevance, and accessibility. Only research articles were included, as this genre represents the principal channel for the dissemination of scientific knowledge and follows relatively stable rhetorical and structural conventions across disciplines (Swales, 2004).

The corpus comprises articles from several disciplinary domains, representing both **hard sciences** and **soft sciences**. These disciplines were selected to allow meaningful comparison between fields characterized by distinct epistemological orientations and writing traditions. All texts were written in English, ensuring comparability at the linguistic level and avoiding interference from cross-linguistic variation, a methodological concern frequently highlighted in corpus-based academic writing research (Biber et al., 1998; Hyland, 2005).

To ensure balance and representativeness, the corpus was constructed so that each disciplinary sub-corpus contained a comparable number of articles and a similar overall word count. This design choice reduces the risk of skewed findings caused by uneven corpus sizes and enhances the reliability of cross-disciplinary comparisons, as recommended in corpus linguistics methodology (Biber et al., 1998).

### 3.3 Selection Criteria

Several criteria were applied in selecting the articles included in the corpus. First, all texts had to be original research articles published in Algerian scientific journals. Review articles, editorials, and opinion pieces were excluded, as they follow different rhetorical purposes and discourse conventions. Second, each article had to belong clearly to a specific discipline, as defined by the journal's scope and the article's thematic focus. Third, only complete articles containing standard sections such as introduction, methodology, results, and discussion were selected, in line with genre-based definitions of the research article (Swales, 1990; Swales, 2004).

These criteria ensured that the corpus consisted of texts that were comparable in terms of genre, communicative purpose, and structural organization. By focusing on research articles, the study targets the genre in which norms of objectivity, authorial presence, and disciplinary conformity are most strongly institutionalized (Hyland, 2011).

### 3.4 Analytical Framework

The analysis focuses on **linguistic and rhetorical markers of authorial objectivity**, conceptualized as a multidimensional construct rather than a single linguistic feature. Objectivity is examined through a range of grammatical and discourse-level features that have been widely identified in the literature as central to the expression of stance and authorial visibility in academic writing (Hyland, 2005; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

The main categories of features analyzed include passive constructions, which enable writers to foreground processes and results while backgrounding agency; impersonal structures such as nominalizations and third-person references, which reduce explicit authorial presence; hedging devices and modal expressions, which signal caution, tentativeness, or openness to alternative interpretations; and authorial stance markers, including self-mention and evaluative language, which indicate the degree of writer visibility and engagement (Biber et al., 1998; Hyland, 2011).

These features were selected because they are consistently recognized in research on academic discourse as key indicators of objectivity and stance. Together, they provide a comprehensive analytical framework for examining how objectivity is rhetorically constructed across disciplines rather than assumed as an inherent property of scientific writing (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2005).

### 3.5 Data Analysis Procedures

The corpus was analyzed using a combination of **quantitative and qualitative procedures**, a methodological choice widely adopted in corpus-based studies of academic discourse. Quantitative analysis involved identifying and counting the frequency of selected linguistic features within each disciplinary sub-corpus, enabling systematic comparison of usage patterns across disciplines and the identification of meaningful variation in objectivity markers (Biber, Conrad, & Reppen, 1998).

Qualitative analysis complemented the quantitative findings by examining the **contextual and rhetorical functioning** of objectivity markers within sentences and extended discourse segments. This step was essential to avoid purely mechanical interpretations of frequency data and to account for the communicative purposes served by specific linguistic choices. Through close reading of representative examples, the analysis explored how writers strategically deploy objectivity markers in response to disciplinary expectations and rhetorical goals, an approach strongly recommended in discourse-analytic research (Hyland, 2005; Swales, 2004).

### 3.6 Reliability and Validity

To enhance the **reliability** of the analysis, consistent criteria were applied across all disciplinary sub-corpora. The same analytical categories, definitions, and procedures were used throughout the study, ensuring comparability of results. In cases where linguistic forms could serve multiple rhetorical functions, ambiguous instances were examined carefully within their textual context to determine their dominant discourse role, following established corpus analysis practices (Biber et al., 1998).

**Validity** was supported by grounding the analytical framework in well-established research on academic writing, objectivity, and disciplinary discourse. Close alignment between theoretical constructs and empirical data was maintained throughout the analysis. Moreover, the combination of quantitative frequency analysis and qualitative contextual interpretation strengthens interpretative validity by capturing both distributional patterns and rhetorical meaning (Hyland, 2011; Swales, 1990).

### 3.7 Ethical Considerations

As the corpus consists exclusively of **published academic articles**, no ethical approval was required for data collection. All texts were used solely for research purposes, and no evaluative judgments were made regarding individual authors, institutions, or journals. The analysis focuses on **disciplinary patterns of language use** rather than individual writing practices, in accordance with ethical norms in discourse and corpus-based research (Swales, 2004).

## 4. Results

This section presents the main findings of the comparative corpus analysis, focusing on the **linguistic realization of authorial objectivity** across disciplinary domains in Algerian scientific journals. The results are organized according to the principal categories of objectivity markers examined in the study. Rather than emphasizing raw numerical data, the analysis highlights recurring patterns and contrasts between disciplinary sub-corpora, in line with discourse-oriented approaches to corpus analysis (Biber et al., 1998; Hyland, 2005).

### 4.1 Passive Constructions and Depersonalization

One of the most salient findings concerns the use of **passive constructions** as a strategy for depersonalization. Passive voice occurs with notably higher frequency in articles from the hard sciences, particularly in methodological and results sections. In these texts, processes, procedures, and outcomes are foregrounded, while the human agent responsible for the action is omitted or backgrounded, a pattern widely documented in experimental scientific discourse (Halliday & Hasan, 1989; Biber et al., 1998).

This preference for passive constructions reflects a disciplinary understanding of objectivity as **procedural neutrality**. By minimizing explicit reference to the researcher, writers present findings as independent of individual agency and grounded in methodological rigor. Such linguistic choices contribute to constructing scientific knowledge as reproducible and detached from personal interpretation, a defining feature of hard science writing conventions (Hyland, 2005; Swales, 1990).

In contrast, articles from soft disciplines exhibit a more selective and flexible use of passive voice. While passive constructions are present, they are often combined with active forms that explicitly acknowledge the researcher's role in analysis and interpretation. This pattern suggests a different conceptualization of objectivity, one that accommodates visible scholarly agency without undermining academic credibility (Hyland, 2011; Swales, 2004).

#### 4.2 Impersonal Structures and Nominalization

Impersonal structures, including **nominalizations and third-person references**, constitute another prominent feature in the construction of authorial objectivity across the corpus. The analysis shows that nominalization is extensively employed in hard science articles to condense processes into abstract entities, contributing to a dense and technical style that emphasizes concepts and procedures rather than actions performed by individuals (Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

These impersonalization strategies support the presentation of knowledge as stable, generalizable, and independent of the researcher. By transforming actions into nouns, writers reduce the dynamic presence of human agents and reinforce the impression of scientific detachment, a rhetorical effect closely associated with objectivity in experimental disciplines (Biber et al., 1998; Hyland, 2005).

In soft disciplines, nominalization is also present but often serves different rhetorical functions. Rather than purely depersonalizing the discourse, nominalized forms are frequently embedded within evaluative and argumentative contexts. This suggests that impersonality in these fields does not eliminate interpretation but frames it within abstract conceptual discussions, allowing writers to balance analytical distance with critical engagement (Hyland, 2011; Swales, 2004).

#### 4.3 Hedging Devices and Epistemic Caution

Hedging emerges as a key marker of authorial objectivity across all disciplinary sub-corpora, although its frequency and function vary considerably. Modal verbs, adverbs of probability, and tentative expressions are commonly used to signal caution, limit the strength of claims, and acknowledge alternative interpretations. Research in academic discourse has shown that such devices play a central role in managing commitment and credibility in scholarly communication (Hyland, 2005; Biber et al., 1998).

In hard science articles, hedging is closely associated with empirical uncertainty and methodological limitations. Writers rely on hedging devices to avoid overgeneralization and to align their claims with norms of scientific rigor and reproducibility. Objectivity, in this context, is constructed through careful calibration of certainty and explicit recognition of the limits of empirical findings, a pattern widely documented in experimental disciplines (Hyland, 2005; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

In contrast, articles from soft disciplines display a broader range of hedging strategies. Hedging is frequently used to manage argumentative positioning and to negotiate interpretations rather than to signal methodological uncertainty alone. This reflects the interpretive nature of these disciplines, where multiple perspectives may coexist and where objectivity is achieved through balanced argumentation and dialogic engagement rather than procedural detachment (Hyland, 2011; Swales, 2004).

#### 4.4 Authorial Presence and Self-Mention

The analysis of self-mention reveals clear disciplinary variation in the visibility of the author within the text. First-person pronouns and explicit references to the researcher are rare in hard science articles and, when they occur, are typically restricted to methodological clarification or textual organization. This limited use of self-mention aligns with disciplinary conventions that privilege impersonality and procedural focus (Hyland, 2005; Biber et al., 1998).

This minimal authorial presence reinforces a conception of objectivity grounded in authorial invisibility. Knowledge is presented as emerging from methods and data rather than from the interpretive activity of individual researchers. Such rhetorical choices contribute to the construction of scientific authority by minimizing subjective intrusion and foregrounding methodological rigor (Swales, 1990; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

By contrast, articles in soft disciplines display a higher frequency of self-mention, particularly in sections involving interpretation, discussion, and theoretical positioning. Authors explicitly position themselves in relation to their arguments and engage more directly with readers. Importantly, this increased visibility does not undermine objectivity

within these disciplines; instead, it conforms to disciplinary norms that value critical reflection, reflexivity, and authorial accountability (Hyland, 2011; Swales, 2004).

#### 4.5 Evaluative Language and Stance

Evaluative language provides further insight into how objectivity is constructed across disciplines. In hard sciences, evaluative expressions tend to be restrained and are often limited to technical assessment of methods, data quality, or results. Evaluation remains implicit and carefully controlled, reinforcing an image of neutrality and factual reporting (Biber et al., 1998; Halliday & Hasan, 1989).

In soft disciplines, evaluative language is more prominent and explicitly linked to interpretation, critique, and theoretical discussion. Writers assess previous research, justify analytical choices, and argue for the significance of their findings through explicit stance-taking. In these contexts, objectivity is not achieved by eliminating evaluation, but by grounding it in reasoned argumentation and shared disciplinary conventions (Hyland, 2005; Hyland, 2011).

#### 4.6 Summary of Disciplinary Patterns

Taken together, the results demonstrate that authorial objectivity is not realized through a single, uniform set of linguistic features across disciplines. Instead, it is constructed through discipline-specific combinations of depersonalization strategies, stance management, and evaluative control, confirming that objectivity is a rhetorical achievement rather than a purely grammatical phenomenon (Swales, 1990; Hyland, 2005).

Hard sciences tend to privilege impersonality, procedural focus, and minimized authorial presence, whereas soft disciplines allow greater visibility of the author and rely more heavily on hedging and evaluative language to construct objectivity. These patterns reflect deeper epistemological differences in how knowledge is produced, validated, and communicated across academic fields (Hyland, 2011; Bronckart, 1996).

### 5. Discussion

The findings presented in this study confirm that authorial objectivity in academic writing is a discipline-sensitive construct rather than a universal norm. The comparative corpus analysis demonstrates that Algerian scientific journals reflect clear disciplinary conventions in the linguistic realization of objectivity, aligning with broader international research while revealing context-specific patterns.

One of the most significant insights concerns the role of impersonality in the construction of objectivity. In the hard sciences, objectivity is predominantly associated with *methodological detachment*. Passive constructions, impersonal structures, and nominalizations function together to suppress the visibility of the researcher and foreground procedures, data, and results. This supports an epistemological model in which knowledge is presented as reproducible, stable, and independent of individual interpretation. In such disciplines, authorial invisibility is not merely stylistic but ideological, reflecting a belief in the neutrality of scientific methods.

In contrast, the soft disciplines examined in the corpus construct objectivity through discursive balance rather than depersonalization. The frequent use of hedging, evaluative language, and explicit authorial presence suggests that objectivity in these fields is achieved by acknowledging interpretation, positioning arguments carefully, and engaging critically with existing knowledge. Rather than eliminating the author's voice, these disciplines regulate it according to rhetorical and argumentative norms. This confirms that authorial presence and objectivity are not mutually exclusive but may coexist within certain disciplinary frameworks.

The findings also highlight the functional role of hedging as a shared but differently deployed strategy across disciplines. While hedging in the hard sciences primarily serves to express empirical caution and methodological limits, in the soft sciences it plays a broader rhetorical role, enabling negotiation of meaning and interpretive openness. This reinforces the view that linguistic features associated with objectivity cannot be interpreted in isolation; their meaning depends on disciplinary context and communicative purpose.

From a broader perspective, the results underscore the importance of disciplinary epistemology in shaping academic writing practices. Differences in how knowledge is produced—through experimentation, observation, interpretation, or critique—are reflected in how writers manage stance, visibility, and evaluation. Algerian scientific writing, as represented in this corpus, follows these disciplinary logics rather than a single national or institutional norm of objectivity.

Importantly, the study also suggests that challenges faced by Algerian researchers in academic writing may stem not from a lack of objectivity, but from misalignment with disciplinary expectations, particularly when scholars write across fields or attempt to conform to generalized writing advice that ignores disciplinary variation. This finding has direct implications for academic writing pedagogy and research training in higher education.

## 6. Conclusion

This article set out to investigate disciplinary variations in authorial objectivity in Algerian scientific journals through a comparative corpus-based analysis. Drawing exclusively on data and analyses from Ghanem's doctoral thesis, the study examined how objectivity is linguistically and rhetorically constructed across different academic disciplines.

The findings demonstrate that objectivity is not a monolithic or universally applied principle in academic writing. Instead, it is realized through discipline-specific combinations of linguistic strategies, including passive voice, impersonal structures, hedging devices, self-mention, and evaluative language. Hard sciences tend to prioritize depersonalization and procedural neutrality, while soft disciplines allow greater authorial visibility and interpretive engagement. These patterns reflect underlying epistemological differences in how knowledge is generated and validated.

By focusing on Algerian scientific journals, this study contributes to a relatively underexplored research context and provides empirical evidence that local academic writing practices align with internationally observed disciplinary conventions. At the same time, it highlights the need to consider national and institutional contexts in discussions of academic discourse.

From a pedagogical perspective, the results underscore the importance of discipline-sensitive approaches to academic writing instruction. Teaching objectivity as a single, uniform standard may obscure the legitimate variation that exists across fields. Instead, academic writing pedagogy should help researchers understand how objectivity is constructed within their specific disciplinary communities and how linguistic choices function rhetorically within those contexts.

In conclusion, this study affirms that authorial objectivity is best understood as a discursive and disciplinary practice, shaped by epistemological assumptions and communicative norms rather than by rigid stylistic rules. By making these patterns visible, the article contributes to research on academic writing, supports more effective scholarly communication, and provides a foundation for future studies on disciplinary discourse in Algerian and comparable academic contexts.

## Ethical Considerations

This study is based exclusively on a **corpus of published research articles** drawn from peer-reviewed Algerian scientific journals. No human participants, personal data, interviews, surveys, or experimental procedures were involved. All analyzed texts are publicly available academic publications and were used solely for scholarly and analytical purposes. The research therefore did not require ethical approval from an institutional review board. The analysis was conducted in accordance with accepted principles of academic integrity, ensuring accurate representation, proper attribution, and respect for intellectual property.

## Acknowledgements

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the academic supervisors and colleagues who provided guidance, feedback, and intellectual support during the development of the doctoral research upon which this article is based. Appreciation is also extended to the editorial teams of Algerian scientific journals whose publications contributed to the construction of the research corpus. Any remaining errors or interpretations are the sole responsibility of the author.

## Funding

This research received **no external funding**. The study was conducted as part of the author's doctoral research activities at **Université Kasdi Merbah – Ouargla, Algeria**.

## Conflict of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest related to this study. The research was conducted independently, and the analysis and interpretation of the data were not influenced by any financial, institutional, or personal relationships.

## References

1. Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Reppen, R. (1998). *Corpus linguistics: Investigating language structure and use*. Cambridge University Press.
2. Bronckart, J.-P. (1996). *Activité langagière, textes et discours: Pour un interactionnisme socio-discursif*. Delachaux et Niestlé.
3. Bryon-Portet, C. (2012). *La pensée scientifique: Histoire et épistémologie*. L'Harmattan.
4. Fifielska, E. (2015). *Les constructions syntaxiques de l'écrit scientifique: Exploration et analyses de corpus* (Doctoral dissertation, Université Grenoble Alpes). <https://dumas.ccsd.cnrs.fr/dumas-01213405>
5. Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1989). *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social-semiotic perspective* (2nd ed.). Oxford University Press.
6. Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. Continuum.
7. Hyland, K. (2011). Disciplines and discourse: Social interactions in the construction of knowledge. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 10(1), 3–14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2010.12.006>
8. Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
9. Swales, J. M. (2004). *Research genres: Explorations and applications*. Cambridge University Press.
10. Werlich, E. (1975). *Typologie der Texte*. Quelle & Meyer.
11. Biber, D. (2006). *University language: A corpus-based study of spoken and written registers*. John Benjamins.
12. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Longman.
13. Hyland, K. (2000). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. Longman.
14. Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing*. University of Michigan Press.
15. Hyland, K. (2008). As can be seen: Lexical bundles and disciplinary variation. *English for Specific Purposes*, 27(1), 4–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2007.06.001>
16. Ivanič, R. (1998). *Writing and identity: The discursive construction of identity in academic writing*. John Benjamins.
17. Ken Hyland. (2015). *Academic publishing: Issues and challenges in the construction of knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
18. Martin, J. R., & Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse: Meaning beyond the clause*. Continuum.
19. Myers, G. (1989). The pragmatics of politeness in scientific articles. *Applied Linguistics*, 10(1), 1–35. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/10.1.1>
20. Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13(2), 149–170. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906\(94\)90013-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0889-4906(94)90013-2)
21. Tang, R., & John, S. (1999). The “I” in identity: Exploring writer identity in student academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 20(1), 23–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/20.1.23>
22. Vassileva, I. (2001). Commitment and detachment in English and Bulgarian academic writing. *English for Specific Purposes*, 20(1), 83–102. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906\(99\)00029-0](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0889-4906(99)00029-0)