

li124

Linguistic Insights  
Studies in Language and Communication

Davide Simone Giannoni

# Mapping Academic Values in the Disciplines

A Corpus-Based Approach

Peter Lang

## 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 |