

Contents

Acknowledgements	11
1. Introduction	13
1.1. Mapping discipline-specific values.....	14
1.2. Outline of contents.....	16
2. Theoretical background	19
2.1. Academia and the disciplines.....	19
2.2. Discourse communities.....	29
2.3. Academic English and ELF	34
2.4. Research genres	37
2.4.1. The research article	40
2.5. The values of academia	42
2.6. Evaluation and stance	53
2.7. Working with corpora.....	58
3. Materials and data.....	65
3.1. Disciplinary fields.....	65
3.2. Source journals	66
3.3. Text selection.....	68
4. Methodology.....	73
4.1. Corpus data	73
4.2. Selection of candidate items	75
4.3. Additional candidate items	78
4.4. Assessing value-marker status	79
4.5. Pilot study	81
4.6. Linguistic analysis	83
4.6.1. Distribution of values across disciplines	83
4.6.2. Qualified entities	84
4.6.3. Collocational evidence	85
4.7. Interpretation of data.....	86

5. Goodness markers.....	89
5.1. Identification of value-marker status	89
5.2. Preliminary results	93
5.3. Additional items.....	94
5.4. Overall results	95
5.5. Distribution across disciplines	98
5.6. Different parts of speech.....	103
5.7. Qualified entities and realisations	104
5.7.1. Group A.....	105
5.7.2. Group B.....	113
5.7.3. Group C.....	114
5.7.4. Group D.....	115
5.7.5. Group E.....	117
5.8. Discussion.....	119
5.8.1. Saliency of goodness	119
5.8.2. Type of marker and qualified entity	121
6. Size markers	123
6.1. Selection of candidate items	124
6.2. Additional items	125
6.3. Overall results	126
6.3.1. Predicative vs. attributive uses	127
6.4. Distribution across disciplines	129
6.5. Qualified entities and realisations	133
6.5.1. Group A.....	133
6.5.2. Group B.....	135
6.5.3. Group C.....	137
6.5.4. Group D.....	140
6.6. Discussion.....	141
6.6.1. Saliency of size.....	142
6.6.2. Type of marker	143
6.6.3. Qualified entities and collocations	144
6.6.4. Vagueness vs. precision	145
7. Novelty markers	147
7.1. Why novelty matters.....	148

7.2. Selection of candidate items	149
7.3. Additional items.....	151
7.4. Overall results	152
7.4.1. Predicative vs. attributive uses	154
7.5. Distribution across disciplines	154
7.6. Qualified entities and realisations	156
7.6.1. Group A	157
7.6.2. Group B	164
7.6.3. Group C	166
7.7. Discussion	168
7.7.1. Saliency of novelty	169
7.7.2. Type of marker	170
7.7.3. Qualified entities and collocations	172
8. Relevance markers.....	175
8.1. Selection of candidate items	176
8.2. Additional items.....	177
8.3. Overall results	179
8.3.1. Predicative vs. attributive uses	180
8.4. Distribution across disciplines	181
8.5. Qualified entities and realisations	184
8.5.1. Group A	184
8.5.2. Group B	190
8.5.3. Group C	193
8.5.4. Group D	198
8.5.5. Group E	200
8.6. Discussion	202
8.6.1. Saliency of relevance.....	203
8.6.2. Type of marker	204
8.6.3. Qualified entities and collocations	206
9. General discussion	209
9.1. Analytical basis.....	209
9.2. Evaluative lexis and value markers.....	211
9.3. Academic values signalled in the corpus	213
9.3.1. Interdisciplinary variation	213

9.3.2. Intradisciplinary variation	218
9.3.3. Axiological profile of disciplines	219
9.4. Lexical resources encoding value	220
9.4.1. Syntactic position of adjectives	222
9.4.2. Lexical transparency of markers	223
9.5. Variation among qualified entities	224
9.5.1. Goodness referents	224
9.5.2. Size referents	225
9.5.3. Novelty referents	226
9.5.4. Relevance referents	227
9.6. Final remarks	228
10. Conclusions	231
10.1. Theoretical insights	231
10.2. The role of academic values	235
10.3. Methodological considerations	239
10.4. Directions for further research	241
References	245
Appendices	271
Appendix 1. Corpus texts	271
Appendix 2. Corpus outline	280
Appendix 3. Candidate value-marking items	282
Index	285