

A Corpus-Based Approach to Teaching Reporting Verbs and Linking Adverbs in Undergraduate Literature Reviews

Mark Brooke
National University of Singapore, Singapore
(Email: elcmb@nus.edu.sg)

Received: 16 October 2020; Accepted: 1 December 2021; Published: 1 March 2022
<https://doi.org/10.46451/tc.20220101>

Abstract

The research applies a corpus linguistics approach to analyse and then teach language specific to the IMRAD (Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion) genre in the Social Sciences, and in particular the literature review section in the field of the Sociology of Sport. Using NVivo 12, corpus analyses of the module's twelve published articles from ranked journals (13, 777 words), as well as analyses of student drafts (13, 949 words), were conducted and comparisons made. Students' texts differed considerably in their use of reporting verbs whereas for linking adverbs, students' range and frequency was relatively similar. With these findings, a teacher-fronted text deconstruction was implemented to raise students' awareness of the differences. The paper provides evidence from the intervention. Following students' redrafting of their literature reviews, a second corpus analysis of students' texts was conducted, and the post-intervention texts (corpus size of 16, 334) compared with the students' originals and the published articles. Students' range and coverage ratio of reporting verbs developed considerably to be more similar to the journal articles from the input session. This improvement demonstrates that presenting students with corpus findings, and comparing their texts with published ones, can be effective for student learning of academic writing.

Keywords

Corpus linguistics, Introduction-Method-Results-Discussion (IMRAD) genre, linking adverbs, reporting verbs, action research

Introduction

The purpose of the research is to analyse the effectiveness of explicitly teaching the use of reporting verbs and linking adverbs in a literature review of an IMRAD paper in the Sociology of Sport. Through analysis of students' texts in an academic writing module, it was found that students needed support on using reporting verbs in the literature review section; less need was found for linking adverbs, but some significant differences were nonetheless found in the language of published journal articles and those of the undergraduate students on the module. An action research case study was conducted to raise awareness of these issues. A teacher-fronted analysis of a student was conducted to discuss an extract of a prior student's literature review. Students provided feedback on how the text might be improved. After this, there was a teacher-fronted input session on reporting verbs and linking adverbs in a literature review section of an IMRAD in the Sociology of Sport, and in particular, results from the two corpora developed were presented. Students observed differences in their own writing and the published texts through the corpus analyses. Next, a post-intervention study of students' literature reviews was conducted, and the results compared to the first drafts. Significant changes were found demonstrating the benefit of data-driven pedagogy.

Literature Review

Halliday's (1978) work on Theme

Halliday (1985, p. 54) categorised Theme in accordance with the 3 metafunctions: textual, interpersonal, and topical. The term unmarked is given to normal topical Themes. These function as Subject, belonging to the ideational metafunction and are most commonly construed as nominal groups in declarative clauses. For example, 'The opium of the people' is the topical Theme in the declarative proposition: 'The opium of the people is now football' (Eagleton, 2010). However, marked Themes are very common in literature review sections of an IMRAD. Markedness means that the theme is not typically realised as above. In a marked information structure, a new topical referent, or a reference to a prior point is realised. Marked topical Themes in literature reviews are commonly circumstantial Adjuncts construed as prepositional phrases (e.g., *With the rise of Women's Mixed martial Arts*), or adverbial group (e.g., *According to + noun*). They can also be found in the form of reporting verbs (Milton & Hyland, 1996) making up projecting clauses (Halliday, 1994, p. 216) and conjunctive Adjuncts, also known as linking adverbs. In the example 'Eagleton (2010) points out that sport is today the opium of the people', the 'that' clause, underlined is projected. It introduces research that someone else has said or thought at a different time from the present. Milton and Hyland (1996) argue that the appropriate use of reporting verbs will provide 'maximum interpersonal and persuasive effect' (p. 147). Reporting verbs can be categorised based on Hyland's (2004) work: research acts, cognition acts, and discourse acts such as 'investigate', 'think', and 'argue' respectively. Additionally, textual marked Themes are often found in the form of conjunctive Adverbs or linking adverbs at the start of a sentence connecting information throughout a text. They are normally categorised as additive, adversative, causal and sequential (Gao, 2016), for example, 'additionally', 'however', 'therefore', and 'next'. These adverbs are used to condense what has gone on before, add information to prior content and contrast or sequence propositions. As Gao (2016) states, they play an instrumental role in making a text logically cohesive and are vital for 'logical lucidity' (p. 15). A list of these linking adverbs can be found in Halliday and Matthiessen (2014, pp. 108-109 and pp. 313-314).

Research on academic English language teaching and learning

Effective use of Theme and thematic progression has been cited as an essential characteristic of successful writers of academic English, as it is paramount in producing a cohesive text (Alonso & McCabe, 2003; Bloor & Bloor, 2013; Christie & Dreyfus, 2007; Schleppegrell, 2003; Wang, 2007). Problems in Theme use are reported to correlate with lower scores in examinations (Bamberg, 1983). Wang (2007) remarks that, without discourse cohesion, 'there is no clear signpost directing the reader, who therefore cannot easily follow the progression of an idea or argument' (p. 167). Much of the research projects conducted on learner errors are corpus-based enquiries and explore interlanguages (Gao, 2016; Green et al., 2000, Jing, 2015; Zhang & Hu, 2008). Several issues have been raised from these studies with Asian and European academic English writers. For example, it was found that French writers tend to overuse positive addition, for example, 'in fact' and 'actually' (Granger & Tyson, 1996) and Chinese (Green et al. 2000; Ishikawa, 2009) learners of English have also been reported to overuse 'besides' and 'moreover' as topic-fronting linking adverbs. Research (Pecorari, 2008) on the use of reporting verbs in projecting clauses demonstrates that often students have difficulty selecting the most suitable verb, and this, as Bloch (2010) points out, can have a strong impact on meaning. For these reasons, Myers (1996) argues that it is important to explicitly bring up the use of reporting verbs to make sure students are aware of their accurate use. From a study of six Master's theses at a top Malaysian university, Manan and Noor (2012) found that research act reporting verbs made up 44.8%, compared to cognition acts (30.2%) and discourse acts (25.0%). In research acts, 'found' occurred most frequently; for cognition

acts, it was ‘suggest’, and for discourse acts, ‘states’. However, to this author’s knowledge, no corpus linguistics approaches to research have yet been conducted in tertiary academic writing programmes in the Singaporean context, the location for this project. Singapore is interesting as learners use English as a lingua franca in academic contexts. The studies mentioned above all focus primarily on L2 English learners. Thus, the language level of analysis is considerably high. Students’ levels of academic English ranges from IELTS 7 to 9.

The Study

Context

This research was conducted over one semester during the Academic Year (AY) 2020-2021 (August to December). The course belongs to a programme entitled Ideas and Exposition (I&E) which belongs to a framework of Content and Language Integrated learning (CLIL). The courses are primarily taught by content specialists (lecturers with PhDs in sociolinguistics, film, literature, cultural studies, and bioethics). Students select those that interest them. Several of the modules have the same outcome, an academic research paper of 1900-2200 words. The literature review normally comprises around 400-500 words. The module for this research focuses on the Sociology of Sport. It comprises forty-eight classroom contact hours. Two sessions of two hours are conducted each week over twelve weeks. The students are from multiple faculties, including Science; Engineering; Business; Law; Mathematics; and Accountancy; Business; Arts and Social Sciences (e.g., Economics, History, and Psychology).

The research cycle began by producing two corpora for comparison. The first constructed comprised the students’ draft literature reviews. The second was made up of the literature reviews of the module readings. Then, based on observations from these two initial corpora, activities were designed to raise students’ awareness of the differences. The linguistic aim was to analyse the use of reporting verbs in projecting clauses and linking adverbs as marked Theme in these literature review sections. A post-intervention corpus of students’ literature review sections was then built to observe the impacts of the intervention.

Phase 1

The corpus of 12 IMRAD academic journal research articles comprised 13,777 words. The 18 linking adverbs from the corpus are provided below in table 1.

The next stage was to build a corpus of the students’ literature reviews and to compare these with the module reading corpus. 30 student literature review drafts were selected randomly after consent had been granted. The corpus overall comprised 13, 949 words, which was a similar size to the published text corpus. It was hoped that as the sizes were similar, the findings comparing the frequency and coverage ratios of the linguistic resources would be more reliable.

It can be seen from this data in tables 1 and 2 that the range of linking adverbs was similar between the published and students’ texts (18 versus 19 types). However, students tended to overuse these linking adverbs in their literature reviews ($n=96/0.501$ versus $n=128/0.918$). The main difference was the overuse of ‘however’ ($n=35/0.250$), and the uses of ‘hence’ ($n=23/0.164$) and ‘furthermore’ ($n=11/0.078$), which did not appear in the journal articles. Moreover, rather than overusing ‘however’, the published writers also used other adversative linking adverbs such as ‘in contrast’ ($n=6/0.043$ versus $n=2/0.014$), and ‘instead’ ($n=5/0.036$ versus $n=1/0.007$). In the students’ corpus, the coverage ratio for ‘hence’ was 0.164, which is significantly higher than the use of ‘hence’ (0.019) explored by Gao (2016) in both English native and Chinese users of English in his corpus of academic texts from multiple disciplines.

Moreover, Gao (2016) found that ‘furthermore’ had a coverage of 0.011. Again, in the students’ corpus, this was significantly higher (0.078).

Table 1

Frequency Count of Linking Adverbs (N=96/0.501 Coverage Ratio) From the Literature Reviews of the Module’s Reading Corpus

Linking adverbs	Frequency (number of instances in the reading corpus)	Coverage ratio
1. However	18	0.130
2. Thus	11	0.079
3. Although	8	0.058
4. For example	8	0.058
5. Therefore	7	0.050
6. For instance	6	0.043
7. In contrast	6	0.043
8. Instead	5	0.036
9. Similarly	5	0.036
10. In addition	4	0.029
11. Moreover	3	0.021
12. Finally	3	0.021
13. Additionally	3	0.021
14. Also	2	0.014
15. Furthermore	1	0.007
16. On the other hand	1	0.007
17. At the same time	1	0.007
18. As such	1	0.007

Table 2

Frequency Count of Linking Adverbs (N=128/0.918 Coverage Ratio) From the First Drafts of Students’ Literature Reviews

Linking adverbs	Frequency (number of instances in the reading corpus)	Coverage ratio
1. However	35	0.250
2. Hence	23	0.164
3. Furthermore	11	0.078
4. Thus	10	0.071
5. Although	9	0.064
6. Moreover	7	0.050
7. Therefore	7	0.050
8. On the other hand	5	0.035
9. For example	3	0.021
10. In addition	3	0.021
11. Additionally	3	0.021
12. Similarly	2	0.014
13. For instance	2	0.014
14. In contrast	2	0.014
15. As such	2	0.014
16. Instead	1	0.007
17. Finally	1	0.007
18. In such a case	1	0.007
19. Also	1	0.007

Next, a corpus was constructed of the number of projecting clauses as marked Theme to introduce research in the literature reviews of the journal articles (see table 3).

Table 3

Word Frequency Count of Projecting Verbs (N=69/0.501 Coverage Ratio) From the Literature Reviews of the Module's Reading Corpus

Reporting verb + that	Frequency	Coverage ratio
1. Argue	10	0.072
2. Suggest	9	0.065
3. Defend	3	0.021
4. Discuss	3	0.021
5. States	3	0.021
6. Observe	3	0.021
7. Show	3	0.021
8. Acknowledge	2	0.014
9. Emphasise	2	0.014
10. Explains	2	0.014
11. Identify	2	0.014
12. Asserted	2	0.014
13. Claimed	2	0.014
14. Noted	2	0.014
15. Demonstrate	2	0.014
16. Remark	2	0.014
17. Conclude	2	0.014
18. Propose	2	0.014
19. Report	2	0.014
20. Agree	1	0.007
21. Add	1	0.007
22. Claim	1	0.007
23. Demonstrate	1	0.007
24. Establish	1	0.007
25. Highlight	1	0.007
26. Maintain	1	0.007

The students' texts were also analysed. The results are shown below in table 4. It can be seen with regards to reporting verbs that the range is significantly different ($n=26$ versus $n=16$). Also, the coverage ratio difference between the published and students' texts is significant (0.501 versus 0.193). 'Reveal' and 'posit' only appeared in the students' drafts and had the highest occurrences ($n=4/0.028$). Moreover, in this study, 'suggest' did not occur in the student corpus but was the second most frequent reporting verb in the published texts. 'Suggest' was also the second most common in the research acts category for Manan and Noor's (2012) study of Malaysian English learners. Similarly, to Manan and Noor's (2012), study, research act reporting verbs such as 'ascertain', 'claim', 'demonstrate', 'find', 'highlight', 'identify', 'maintain', 'note', 'observe', 'postulate', 'propound', 'posit', 'reveal', 'show', 'state', 'suggest') made up the majority of these corpora. These were followed by discourse acts ('agree', 'argue', 'acknowledge', 'defend', 'discuss') and then cognition ('believe', 'hypothesise'). These findings are similar for discourse acts also. However, they differ from those of Manan and Noor (2012) who found that cognition acts made up 30.2% of the reporting verbs. No cognition acts were present in the published texts and only two cognition acts

occurred in the students' texts ('believe' and 'hypothesize'), making only 12.5% of the total. In contrast to Taşçi and Oztürk's (2021) corpus of academic written English, 'feel' was not present in the student corpus of this study. Another noteworthy point is the lack of 'find' in the published corpus, which was the most common research act reporting verb in Manan and Noor's (2012) work. In the students' texts, it appeared three times and represented 18.75% of the total number of reporting verbs and 0.021 of the coverage ratio.

Table 4

Word Frequency Count of Projecting Verbs (N=27/0.193 Coverage Ratio) From the First Drafts of Students' Literature Reviews

Reporting verb + that	Frequency (number of instances in the reading corpus)	Coverage ratio
1. Reveal	4	0.028
2. Posit	4	0.028
3. Find	3	0.021
4. Claim	2	0.014
5. Propound	2	0.014
6. Note	2	0.014
7. Highlight	1	0.007
8. Identify	1	0.007
9. Believe	1	0.007
10. Observe	1	0.007
11. Acknowledge	1	0.007
12. Argue	1	0.007
13. Ascertain	1	0.007
14. Hypothesise	1	0.007
15. Postulate	1	0.007
16. Show	1	0.007

Phase 2

To raise students' awareness of the characteristics of their texts, a detailed reading (Rose, 2004) was conducted deconstructing a less successful student's text from a prior cohort. The main focus was linguistic features related to referencing other authors in the literature review using reporting verbs as projecting clauses. A subsidiary focus was to explore the use of linking adverbs in the literature sections to connect ideas in terms of additive, adversative, causal and sequential (Gao, 2016). Less focus on linking adverbs was based on the fact that no significant differences had been observed between the corpora. The classroom intervention is explained in detail below.

The method of the detailed reading (Rose, 2004) is in general made up of three discourse moves: 'prepare'; 'identify' and 'elaborate'. The 'prepare' focuses students' attentions on the text; the 'identify' guides them to notice essential elements of the text; the 'elaborate' elicits reflection and helps students make connections to their prior knowledge. As Martin and Rose (2007a) affirm, this cycle is different to the Initiation-Response-Feedback pattern (Sinclair & Coulthard, 1992). First, the initial 'prepare' is not to solely elicit a response but is carefully planned by the teacher so that all students should be able to respond successfully; second, the 'feedback' seeks to be affirming rather than negating as it might with an error correction.

An extract from the student text used is provided below:

‘Extreme sports participation could bring profound transformations (Holmbom et al., 2017). Skiing as an extreme sport increases resilience (Hetland et al. 2018). Freeriding fulfils the need for autonomy (Frühauf et al., 2017). Little or no research in the field looks at confidence-building. My research paper aims to demonstrate this potential benefit from the extreme sport of bungee jumping’.

Students were first asked to suggest how the text might be improved in terms of citing the authors’ research. They were asked if the sentence ‘Holmbom et al. (2018) claim that extreme sports participation could bring profound transformations’ carried the same meaning as ‘Extreme sports participation could bring profound transformations’ (Holmbom et al., 2017). Students reported that it did not as ‘claim’ is a verb that distances the writer from the research. Students provided other examples and explained their differences regarding distancing and aligning with other authors’ work. Having affirmed these responses, the ‘elaborate’ stage commenced. For this, it was noted that reporting verbs can help to carry interpersonal meaning. Students were also told about Hyland’s (2004) framework of reporting verbs and in particular the three main categories: research acts, cognition acts, and discourse acts. Then a list of reporting verbs was provided, and students asked to categorize them into Hyland’s (2004) framework.

After this, the last two sentences were focused on:

‘Little or no research in the field looks at confidence-building. My research paper aims to demonstrate this potential benefit from the extreme sport of bungee jumping.’

Students were asked if the connection between these ideas could be better. A student proposed an adversative linking adverbs such as ‘However’ before ‘Little or no research in the field’, others proposed ‘notwithstanding’, ‘nonetheless’ and ‘despite this’, all of which would function effectively in this context. Students were asked to think of a linking adverb to connect the final sentence to the penultimate effectively. At this stage, several responses for causal Adjuncts were raised including ‘therefore’, ‘thus’ and ‘hence’. The emergence of ‘hence’ opened up the window to ‘elaborate’ by comparing the corpus analyses of the student and academic journal literature corpora for comparison. I also presented other main differences such as the overuse of ‘however’ and ‘furthermore’ highlighting that other adversative linking adverbs such as ‘in contrast’ ($n=6/0.043$ versus $n=2/0.014$), and ‘instead’ ($n=5/0.036$ versus $n=1/0.007$) were more common in the published texts of the corpus.

Apart from that, a very similar range of linking adverbs had been utilised across the two corpora. This similarity was not as significant regarding the use of reporting verbs between the student and journal articles texts. It was clear that the range and coverage of reporting verbs was significantly different ($n=69/0.501$ versus $n=27/0.193$). At this stage and to clearly demonstrate the differences in usage, I presented tables 1 to 4 from the corpora findings on both projecting clauses and linking adverbs.

Following the text focus, a more open-ended task for the students ensued. Students searched the module’s readings and identified examples of reporting verbs and linking adverbs from the literature review sections of these journal articles. Some examples were:

‘Thus, Harris asserts that athletics becomes an easily distinguishable form of possible achievement for African American males and that the consequences differ for African American and Whites’ (p. 285 in Beamon, KK. (2009). Are

sports overemphasized in the socialization process of African-American males? A qualitative analysis of former collegiate athletes' perception of sport socialization. *Journal of Black Studies*, 4(2), 281–300.).

‘They observed that men and women conform to gender stereotypes by displaying masculine or feminine characteristics. For example, the females often have long hair, and dress fashionably with tight fitting clothing, before the session females often discuss boys and clothes whereas the boys discuss judo, sport and their performance (p. 528 in in Velija, P., Mierzewski, M., & Fortune, L. (2013). ‘It made me feel powerful’: women’s gendered embodiment and physical empowerment in the martial arts. *Leisure studies*, 32(5), 524-541).

Students were then encouraged to think about the meanings that they wanted to convey in their own literature review drafts and to emulate the variety of projecting verbs; they were also encouraged not to overuse some linking adverbs such as ‘hence’, and to look out for others in the articles that they read independently while reading for their own research papers.

Phase 3

The final phase was a corpus analysis of students’ second literature review draft one to two weeks after the detailed reading. The second corpus comprised 16, 334 words. As students’ texts were relatively similar to the published ones in terms of usage of linking adverbs, the corpus analysis involved only reporting verbs in projecting clauses. It can be observed in table 5 below that there were substantial differences in the students’ second corpus.

From this second corpus, it can be observed that the overall range is much closer to the published text articles with $n=26$ versus $n=31$ types. Moreover, the coverage ratio is very similar ($n=69/0.501$ versus $n=81/0.496$). ‘Suggest’ is now one of the most frequent reporting verbs, a characteristic of the published texts.

These results are also similar to other corpora studies (Biber et al., 1999; Taşçi & Oztürk, 2021). Biber et al. (1999) found that ‘suggest’ was the most used reporting verb in their academic corpus for the Longman grammar of spoken and written English. Moreover, Biber et al. (1999) found that ‘show’ was a high frequency verb; thus, although it has now 10 occurrences (0.061), which is substantially higher in number (0.021) than the academic journal texts, this high coverage relates to other corpus studies. Therefore, it is possible that students found this verb in other readings. ‘Argue’ is still less frequent than the published texts but has been utilised more in the second drafts ($n=4/0.024$) compared to the first ($n=1/0.007$).

Furthermore, it can be seen in the second table that ‘reveal’ remains but in less frequency ($n=2/0.012$) as does ‘posit’ ($n=2/0.012$). In both corpora, research act reporting verbs make up the majority as is common in Gao’s (2012) study. New discourse reporting verbs used are ‘contend’, ‘concede’, ‘defend’, ‘discuss’, ‘support the claim that’, and ‘argue in response’. The linking adverbs ‘support the claim that’ is a common reporting phrase as can be seen through a simple google scholar search. In contrast, ‘argue in response’ seems to be very infrequently used as observed from another google scholar search. Finally, a new cognition reporting verb used is ‘deduce’.

Table 5

Word Frequency Count of Projecting Verbs (N=81/0.496 Coverage Ratio) From the Second Drafts of Students' Literature Reviews

Reporting verb + that	Frequency (number of instances in the reading corpus)	Coverage ratio
1. Show	10	0.061
2. Suggest	10	0.061
3. Show	5	0.030
4. Conclude	5	0.030
5. State	4	0.024
6. Find	4	0.024
7. Argue	4	0.024
8. Note	4	0.024
9. Propose	3	0.018
10. Reveal	2	0.012
11. Assert	2	0.012
12. Claim	2	0.012
13. Posit	2	0.012
14. Observe	2	0.012
15. Report	2	0.012
16. Contend	2	0.012
17. Indicate	2	0.012
18. Postulate	2	0.012
19. Propound	2	0.012
20. Mention	1	0.006
21. Hypothesise	1	0.006
22. Maintain	1	0.006
23. Support the claim that	1	0.006
24. Identify	1	0.006
25. Propose	1	0.006
26. Argues in response	1	0.006
27. Agree	1	0.006
28. Acknowledge	1	0.006
29. Assert	1	0.006
30. Concede	1	0.006
31. Deduce	1	0.006

Conclusion

The purpose of the research has been to provide an overview of a corpus linguistic approach to explicitly teaching the use of reporting verbs in projecting verbs and linking adverbs in a literature review of an IMRAD paper. The research occurred in a Content and Language Integrated learning (CLIL) setting which aims to teach academic English writing through the medium of a Sociology of Sport module. One limitation of the research is the small corpus size. Only 12 academic journal papers were used comprising 13,777 words. Clearly, a more extensive corpus would provide a greater range and more information about the most frequently used linguistic resources in this area. Therefore, it is the author's intention to extend the corpus as an ongoing project as different academic papers are used for the module.

In sum, comparing students' use of linguistic items as a corpus in tabular form with published articles is an effective way to approach teaching. Being able to present to students the data

collected from their texts and the module readings' literature reviews in tabular forms, as part of a corpus, enabled students to view the range and coverage ratios of their writing and to compare them with published authors. Moreover, the interventions demonstrated how noticing might occur and this encouraged students to do the same in their own time as they continued their own independent study. From their feedback in consultations, it was relayed that independent noticing had been facilitated. Data-driven pedagogy can be stimulating for both teacher and student as the language discussed is modelled by published, expert writers, and the improvements students can make are based on actual authentic usage.

References

- Alonso, I., & McCabe, A. (2003). Improving text flow in ESL learner compositions. *The Internet TESL Journal*, 9(2), 1-10.
- Bamberg, B. (1983). What makes a text coherent? *College Composition and Communication*, 34(4), 417-429.
- Biber, D. (1999). A register perspective on grammar and discourse: Variability in the form and use of English complement clauses. *Discourse Studies*, 1(2), 131-150. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461445699001002001>
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The functional analysis of English*. Routledge.
- Christie, F., & Dreyfus, S. (2007). Letting the secret out: Successful writing in secondary English. *Australian Journal of Language and Literacy*, 30(3), 235-247.
- Coffin, C. (2010). Language support in EAL contexts. Why systemic functional linguistics? *Special Issue of NALDIC Quarterly*. Retrieved March 2022 from <http://oro.open.ac.uk/25026/>
- Don, Z. M., & Srinivas, S. (2017). Conjunctive Adjuncts in Undergraduate ESL Essays in Malaysia: Frequency and Manner of Use. *Moderna språk*, 111(1), 99-117.
- Eagleton, T. (2010). Football: a dear friend to capitalism. *The Guardian*, 15. Retrieved March, 2022 from <http://www.julietdavis.com/COM443/articles/Football%20-%20A%20dear%20friend%20to%20capitalism%20-%20Terry%20Eagleton.pdf>
- Frühauf, A., Hardy, W. A., Pfoestl, D., Hoellen, F. G., & Kopp, M. (2017). A qualitative approach on motives and aspects of risks in freeriding. *Frontiers in psychology*, 8, 1-13.
- Gao, X. (2016). A cross-disciplinary corpus-based study on English and Chinese native speakers' use of linking adverbials in academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 24, 14-28.
- Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes*, 15(1), 17-27.
- Green, C. F., Christopher, E. R., & Mei, J. L. K. (2000). The incidence and effects on coherence of marked themes in interlanguage texts: A corpus-based enquiry. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19(2), 99-113.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1994). Spoken and written modes of meaning. *Media texts: Authors and readers*, 7, 51-73.
- Halliday, M. A. K., Matthiessen, C. M., Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2014). *An introduction to functional grammar*. Routledge.
- Hawes, T.P., & Thomas, S. (2012). Theme choice in EAP and media language. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, 175-183.
- Hetland, A., Vittersø, J., Oscar Bø Wie, S., Kjelstrup, E., Mittner, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2018). Skiing and thinking about it: Moment-to-moment and retrospective analysis of emotions in an extreme sport. *Frontiers in psychology*, 9, 971.
- Holmbom, M., Brymer, E., & Schweitzer, R. D. (2017). Transformations through proximity flying: a phenomenological investigation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 18-31.

- Hyland, K. (2004). A convincing argument: Corpus analysis and academic persuasion. In U. Connor & T. Upton (Eds.) *Discourse in the professions: Perspectives from corpus linguistics* (pp. 87-112). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Ishikawa, S. (2009). A corpus-based study on Asian learners' use of English linking adverbials. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*, 3 (1-2), 139-157.
- Johns, T. (1994). From printout to handout, In Odlin, T. (Ed.). *Perspectives on pedagogical grammar*, Cambridge University Press.
- Jing, W. (2015). Theme and thematic progression in English writing Teaching. *Journal of Education and Practice*, 6(21), 178-187.
- Manan, N. A., & Noor, N. M. (2014). Analysis of reporting verbs in Master's theses. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 134, 140-145.
- Martin, J. R. & Rose, D. (2007a). Designing literacy pedagogy: Scaffolding democracy in the classroom. In J. Webster, C Matthiessen & R. Hasan (Eds.), *Continuing discourse on language* (pp. 251-280). Continuum.
- Milton, J. C., & Hyland, K. (1996). Assertions in students' academic essays: A comparison of English NS and NNS student writers. In *Language analysis, description and pedagogy, proceedings of international conference organized by Language Centre, HKUST*.
- Myers, G. (1996). Strategic vagueness in academic writing. In E. Ventola and A. Mauranen (Eds.). *Pragmatics and Beyond New Series*, (pp. 3-18). John Benjamins Publishing.
- Pecorari, D. (2008). *Academic writing and plagiarism: A linguistic analysis*. Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Rose, D. (2004). *Learning to read: Reading to learn, teacher training manual*. University of Sydney.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2003). Grammar for writing: Academic language and the ELD Standards. *Language Learning*, 63(1), 153-170.
- Sinclair, J. & R.M. Coulthard. (1992). Towards an analysis of discourse. In M. Coulthard (ed.). *Advances in spoken discourse analysis* (pp.1-34). Routledge
- Wang, L. (2007). Theme and rheme in the thematic organization of text: Implications for teaching academic writing. *Asian EFL Journal*, 9(1), 164-176.
- Zhang, W., & Hu, G. (2008). A corpus-based study of subjunctive mood patterns: Implications for EFL instruction. *Linguistics Journal*, 3(1), 136-150.

Mark Brooke is currently Senior Lecturer and Faculty Development Lead at the National University of Singapore's Centre for English Language Communication. He is a sport sociologist and primarily teaches and researches the effectiveness of Content and Language Integrated learning (CLIL) for developing undergraduate academic literacy. He has published over 40 articles in international peer reviewed journals, including high ranking ones such as *Teaching in Higher Education* (THE). He is also on the editorial board of THE.