



RESEARCH ARTICLE

The Integration of Grammar and Discourse in Academic Writing

Prince Grover^{1*}, Dr. Bhaskar Kanaiyalal Pandya²

Abstract

The research-oriented writing has historically been treated by means of separate, isolated and discrete analytical angles of accuracy in grammar. Since it was more focused on grammar correctness, it failed to fully explain the way in which academic discourse is interactively produced via the interrelationship between language-based configuration, pragmatic function, and domain-specific practice. This study puts forward a holistic grammar-in-discourse model for investigating and pedagogically addressing scholarly writing and it also draws theoretical contributions derived from discourse-based analysis, genre-based theory, functional language theory as well as pragmatic theory.

By bringing together core research studies on authorial positioning or stance, discourse-syntax interface, communicative acts, rhetorical or genre category as well as textual connectedness, the current scholarly work puts forward a comprehensive and integrated theoretical as well as conceptual framework. The study establishes that syntactic selections in scholarly prose are governed by higher-level discourse purposes, for instance evaluation, authorial voice construction, and knowledge development. The analysis highlights the effective use of syntactic patterns such as modal expressions, noun-based constructions, attitudinal language, and syntactic embedding patterned in different and structured ways across scholarly genres and subject areas. The research additionally addresses pedagogical implications for English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and second-language learning settings contending that grammatical pedagogy integrated into discourse and genre consciousness empowers academic writers to cultivate a more proficient and authorial presence. By re-framing grammatical systems as discourse-embedded meaning, the study provides a coherent and an integrated theoretical schema that links language analysis and the teaching of academic writing.

Keywords: Genre-oriented, EAP, Discourse analysis, Functional linguistics, Pedagogical implications, Pragmatics and authorial positioning.

Introduction

The study of discourse analysis is utmost important in academic writing. It actually means how the text is influenced by interpretation of the language. Discourse analysis is a heterogeneous discipline as it emerged out of many disciplines in early 1970s. Zellig Harris was a

distinguished researcher who published a paper titled "Discourse Analysis" (Harris 1952). Harris examined extended texts and linked them with social situations. A considerable amount of eminent and distinguished researchers and authors published research outputs and theoretical texts to examine the implications of linguistic expression over socially situated behavior and articulation of such scholarly productions, paved the way for the evolution of pragmatic theory (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Grice, 1975). Pragmatics is the study of meaning in contexts (Levinson 1983; Leech 1983).

In the realm of academic writing, coherence, cohesion, precision and a tone presenting ideas are of great significance. At certain levels, the grammatical accuracy is still only considered to be important. In domains like academic writing, the language is looked into beyond the sentence level. A gap is commonly observed between grammar and discourse. Learners can produce work free from grammatical errors, but it may still have imperfections in coherence, cohesion, register and appropriate vocabulary in the specific context. Grammar lays a foundation by focusing on sentence-level rules, whereas discourse

¹Researcher Scholar at Charotar University of Science and Technology, (Charusat), Changa, Anand, Gujarat, India

²Research Guide and Professor of English, Principal at Charotar Institute of Languages, Arts and Social Studies (CLASS), Dean at Faculty of Humanities (FOH), Charusat, Gujarat, India

***Corresponding Author:** Prince Grover, Researcher Scholar at Charotar University of Science and Technology, (Charusat), Changa, Anand, Gujarat, India, E-Mail: 23drfoh003@charusat.edu.in

How to cite this article: Grover, P., Pandya, B.K. (2026). The Integration of Grammar and Discourse in Academic Writing. *The Scientific Temper*, 17(2):5730-5735.

Doi: 10.58414/SCIENTIFICTEMPER.2026.17.2.16

Source of support: Nil

Conflict of interest: None.

conveys how language is presented to convey the meaning appropriately, and effectively. Systematic Functional Linguistics reenvisioned both grammar and discourse differently. Systematic Functional Approach promotes the usage of grammar as a tool or a device for the construction of meaning in the particular discourse situations (Halliday 61). The grammar has immense potential to present how choices in language can contribute the required meaning. The integrated approach of grammar and discourse offers comprehensive framework in academic writing. Hence, the rich resources of grammar are essential to have the construction of spontaneous and discerning discourse.

Literature Review

The conceptual roots of discourse analysis emerged from the foundational linguistic-structural and context-oriented theoretical explorations as well as academic examinations transcending sentence-bound structure (Harris, 1952; Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Grice, 1975/1989). One of the most remarkable works produced in the field of discourse analysis was *Cohesion in English* which was published by Halliday and Hasan (1976). It was a significant monograph that produced all-encompassing model of textual cohesion which covered areas such as reference, ellipsis/substitution, and conjunctions (Schiffrin, 1994; Van Dijk, 2008). In *Discourse and Syntax*, an edited volume, editor Talmy Givon shared views on how syntactic structures are shaped by discourse-level functions, furthering to discourse-functional linguistics (Halliday, 2004; Palmer, 2001). In one of the monographs authored by Ronald Geluykens, entitled *From Discourse process to Grammatical Construction* (1992) explored how discourse can influence the grammar progression, predominantly by virtue of linguistic and structural conventionalization (Geluykens, 1992). It was pioneering investigation into the relationship between grammar and discourse and bridged the gaps of research between the both and the stated association additionally manifests more extensive and far-reaching cultural and community-based doctrinal components of discourse (Fairclough, 1992; Wodak & Meyer, 2001). It was entirely focused on discourse process led to grammaticalization (Biber et al., 1999; Biber & Grey, 2016). It was a great work to know how lexis and its constructions lead to develop grammatical structures.

Another work titled *Analyzing Genre* was published in 1993 by Vijay K. Bhatia and it was indeed an outstanding monograph that developed genre analysis and it markedly contributed to English for Specific Purposes (ESP) as well as academic discourse research (Swales, 1990; Gledhill, 1995). It was entirely centered on functional English. After *Cohesion in English*, M.A.L. Halliday produced another work to cover discourse analysis entitled *An Introduction to Functional English* (Halliday, 2004; Halliday & Matthiessen, 2014), substantiating and solidifying Systemic Functional

Linguistics (SFL) theoretical framework functioning to explicating and outlining the mechanisms through which grammatical system encodes meaning throughout discourse. SFL theorizes grammatical system serving as a distinct functional resource aimed at meaning construction rather than viewing a framework composed of rule-based conventions (Martin & White, 2005; Hyland, 2005; Hyland & Tse, 2004; Mauranen & Bondi, 2003; Xu & Nesi, 2017). Following the SFL, grammar structure ensures the fitment of cohesion and rhetoric devices.

"From Discourse Process to Grammatical Construction," produced by Geluykens (1992) drew points of motivation by grammar towards discourse management. This work showed how the grammar formation results in the discourse patterns, laying the presentation of academic writing. In 1993, Larsen-Freeman produced a work entitled *"Grammar as a Process"* that highlighted the significance and interconnectedness of grammar with discourse (Larsen-Freeman, 1993). Keeping it as adaptive, the integration of discourse into grammar solidifies the foundation of scientific writing skills among learners. Following the flow of MFU – Meaning + Form + Use matters most. Understanding the form with meaning systematically ensure better understanding of the usage. In *The Grammar Book*, published in 1999, Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman focused the importance of pedagogy of teaching grammar linking the flow of form, structure, and use affirms the achievement of academic goals (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999).

Academic writing is essentially to understand the structural approach of meaning, form and pronunciation (Flowerdew, 2002; Hyland, 2012; Ivanić, 2004). A large proportion of academic contributions and research outputs concentrated on English grammatical systems, by ignoring the intellectual disconnects that exists in analytical paradigms and classroom implementation to strengthen academic literacy skills and disciplinary writing abilities.

Research Methodology

The current investigation is non-quantitative nature. It adopts an idea-based research structure which is absolutely qualitative research. It emphasizes a process of the synthesization and the consolidation of evaluative examination of concepts in academic writing through the analysis of grammar and discourse in the language systems. It closely engages with recognized academic research. It has nothing to deal with the empirical and observation-driven dataset.

Central Concepts and Definitions

Grammatical Structures and Communicative Roles

Grammar is typically attributed to form and function. The former represents the components of language such as sentence and word formation. For instance, the sentence

“the boys are playing hockey” follows a present continuous tense form where it is marked by an auxiliary verb i.e. “are” and the participle is “playing.” Therefore, the form is all about the grammatical makeup. It consists of specific patterns, and arrangement of words. The study of form is closely engaged with specific rules and the standardized system that guide the language construction. It reinforces the fundamental principles of communication.

Oppositely, *function* symbolizes the underlying purpose of communication in grammar. The context has a significant role in determining the function of a structure in a sentence. This approach is chiefly oriented toward the development of contextually grounded and real-world linguistic expression, providing scope for responsive and dynamic situationally responsive and pragmatically informed implementation of grammatical patterns. It always underscores pragmatic dimensions and communicative purpose. It is common among the learners that they learn and apply the grammar rules, but sometimes find it challenging in conveying the intended meaning appropriately in the given context. Form and function together constitute indispensable role in facilitating purposeful communication.

Meanings: Semantic and pragmatic dimensions

The study of meaning in language is segmented into semantics and pragmatics. The former addresses lexis-based or dictionary-based meanings of vocabulary, linguistic strings, and sentences. For instance, in a sentence “The birds are chirping on the branches,” the semantic aspect is concerned with how to represent the particular or precise circumstance. The sense or meaning in a sentence is deeply engaged with reference, synonyms, antonyms, and lexical associations. The semantic analysis also deals with truth validation. It studies the way the sentences convey meanings objectively.

On the contrary, *pragmatics* is more subjective or contextual unlike semantics. While comparing pragmatics with semantics, it is ascertained that what is speaker’s communication goal and what the listener derives, rather what the language expresses. Therefore, it is clear that semantics offers dictionary meaning, whereas pragmatics concerns with dynamically extracted meaning with the influence of both linguistics and social context.

Discourse: Macro and micro-level views

Discourse analysis has a very deep meaning. It deals with the meaning presented in a sentence beyond the words. It has both micro and macro dimensions. At macro-level, discourse addresses both social and cultural aspects. Having a wider meaning at macro-level, discourse analysis includes genre analysis, and prevailing different conventions. It is referred to the communication how it is derived. The extended frameworks of macro-level discourse comprise ideologies of social and cultural domains. It is deeply concerned with

the reflections and the construction of language in social condition. A classic example of discourse at macro-level includes reading articles published in the newspaper and closely analysing the argumentative structures, hedging, rhetorical devices, and the use of figurative language to influence the audience.

Antithetically, the main emphasis is placed on the direct and close-range structures of communication during micro-level discourse. It reflects how the individuals manage the spontaneous communication by uncovering fine-grained linguistic components. Micro-level discourse mainly focuses not only on sentence structures and flow of information, but also interacting, negotiating meaning and building relationships. It does not analyse wider domains of socio-cultural aspects, unlike in macro-level discourse.

Academic Writing: Genre, register, and communicative purpose

Academic writing has pivotal role to play in both academic and non-academic domains in terms of promoting precision and clarity. It is primarily required in producing works such as dissertations, research papers, articles, essays and others. It is chiefly characterized in objective tone, formal lexis, complex sentence structures, high preciseness, and other elements that avoid personal bias and slangs. The purposes of academic writing include to inform, argue, analyse, persuade, and evaluate. Academic writing is considered organized in terms of two core constituents: genre (text-type) and register (mode of expression).

Moreover, academic writing has different requirements, having influence of each discipline where genre conditions may vary. The exploration of genre enfolds categories of the texts, specific patterns to be followed each type of genre, the way it directs or regulates the meaning and flow of information, and a framework of rules or conventions pre-configured. The stylistic formality in academic writing is a decisive element in achieving standards of academic work. Lastly, the communicative purpose to determine why the text has been produced, encompassing common goals such as inform, argue, persuade and others; and vitally influencing the form and style.

Integration of concepts (Meaning + form + discourse)

It is always challenging to examine the language extensively without scrutinizing meaning, form, and discourse. The language becomes so impressive and rich with the excellent combination of all of these three constituents. The grammar has a central role to lay structural foundation and supplies adequate meaning with specific dimension, which is fundamental in communication. The integration is also essential for fostering well-rounded expertise.

Form is described as noticeable grammatical and lexical structures entailing morphology, syntax, and phonology, whereas meaning is concerned with conversational design

of language. Meaning embodies semantics and semantics and pragmatics. Discourse is identified as extended language use in context-bound practice that surpasses the boundaries of sentence-bound interpretation. The integration of form, meaning and discourse results in holistic view of language that is both goal-determined and socially embedded.

Application to Academic Writing

Grammar as meaning-developing resource in academic writing:

There are different perspectives about the grammar. The long-established assumptions of grammar system refer it to the fixed, and rule-bound framework with its insufficiency developing academic writing (Halliday & Hasan, 1976; Halliday, 2004; Larsen-Freeman, 1993; Strauss et al., 2018). The discourse-oriented approaches and function-oriented frameworks illustrate the grammar systems are much valid to enhance the quality in the academic writing. The advanced approaches and methods of teaching English grammar under the heavy influence of discourse functions promote elaborating, persuading, assessing and framing knowledge.

Within academic discourse, the grammar repertoire in particular process to noun conversation (nominalization), clause subordination, and metaphorical expressions facilitate the academic writers to compact information, generate field-specific conceptual knowledge, and bring to the fore activities and procedures as functioning as objects and concepts (Fang et al., 2006; Biber & Gray, 2016). Consequently, the grammar system in combination with discourse strengthens the approach in conceptual clarity and highlight in the academic writing.

Discourse organization, textual connectedness (cohesion), and conceptual consistency (coherence)

Discourse-based analysis brings attention to the ways and approaches the scholarly and disciplinary written texts can establish conceptual unity and logical consistency transcending discrete sentences. The application of various cohesive devices can bring more clarity and enhance the overall quality. Some of such devices are mentioned below:

- Reference (cataphoric, anaphoric)
- Substitution
- Ellipsis
- Connective markers

Apart from the direct functions, the cohesive devices strengthen discourse-level mechanisms or devices to contribute more to the quality and clarity in sophisticated arguments (Halliday & Hassan, 1976).

While looking into discourse-grammar approach (Givón, 1979; Geluykens, 1992), linguistic selections, namely clause arrangement, effective content structuring along with theme-rheme give rise to:

- Coherent development of arguments

- Explicitness in argumentative structure
- Reader-oriented comprehensibility

In academic writing, the transparency, explicitness, easiness and effectiveness have high roles enhancing the overall quality on the content developed.

Genre-Oriented Linguistic Selections

The genre-theoretical model (Swales, 1990; Bhatia, 1993; Hyland, 2012) argues that academic discourse is structurally diverse and syntactic patterns in discourse-level features diverge in systematic ways. The genre manifests variation in extended research projects, research papers and summaries.

A holistic framework in the application of genres in scholarly writing supports academic writers to:

- Integrate grammatical structures to genre-based communicative purposes with more emphasis on hedging devices, ensuring comprehensibility in discussion sections.
- Identify widely used grammatical configurations and phraseological patterns associated with subject areas (Gledhill, 1995; Flowerdew, 2002).
- Customize communicative techniques in accordance with projected needs of the target readers.

The genre-sensitivity brings more clarity and enhances level of precision.

Pragmatics and Authorial Positioning:

The scientific writing is really uncommon. Typically followed genres and grammatical systems do not seem to be balance in different situations. Therefore, academic writing has to deal with all together. Scholarly writing is fundamentally interactional.

Pragmatics-based frameworks (Austin, 1962; Searle, 1969; Grice, 1975; Levinson, 1983; Leech, 1983) uncover the ways or the manners in which the academic writers carry out discourse actions, for example stating claims, hedging, assessing, and arguing and convincing. The academic inquiry concerning authorial stance and dialogic involvement with the readers (Hyland, 2005; Mauranen & Bondi, 2003; Xu & Nesi, 2017) indicates that the grammatical selections encompassing modal-based verb forms, judgmental adjectival forms, and evidentiality-related markers facilitate the academic writers to align themselves in relation to scholarly knowledge assertions, concede opposing interpretations, and also balance authoritativeness in scholarly discourse

Thus, a holistic grammar-discourse framework guarantees knowledge-related tentativeness, pragmatic politeness, and domain-specific trustworthiness substantially.

Application to Academic Writing

Accounting for Regularities in Scholarly/Academic Writing

The main emphasis is put on the recurring configurations in scientific writing where the links are generated between

the grammar systems and discourse. The scholarly works produce content enormously where the connected and consistence of ideas, sentences structures and across paragraphs are urgently required.

The texts in academic writing demonstrate a wide range of characteristics including noun-based reformulations, clause constructions, a frequent shift across sentences structures across simple, compound and complex, the application of active-passive sentence structures, as well as information-heavy noun forms.

While looking into discourse, the above-mentioned areas refer to purposeful choices for the enhancement of broadening the concepts, more preciseness as well exactness, and excellent connectedness. The appraisal-based adjectival forms, evidence-marking indicators, and modal-based verb forms foster the adjustment of certainty, recognize opposite viewpoints and align scholarly knowledge.

Instructional Significance and Pedagogical Implications

The holistic approaches of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) and English as a Second Language (ESL) possess high quality and outstanding instructional implications. The conventional approaches in English grammar earlier promoted sentence-based correctness. The major challenges noticed in what ways linguistic choices can operate inside multi-sentence disciplinary discourse. The grammar-discourse framework supports language learners to recognize grammatical resources for accomplishing discourse-related and communicative objectives. The integrated approach places a special emphasis on

- Context-based grammatical instruction employing authentic and diversified academic texts
- Clearly articulated emphasis on authorial stance, argumentation construction, reader engagement and assessment
- Genre-category consciousness and discipline specific writing production conventions
- Diagnostic-based formative feedback to enhance coherence and cohesion.

The integrated approach of grammar and discourse devices boost the level of accuracy, authenticity, transparency and quality overall. The evidence-based research EAP teaching pedagogy suggests that incorporating grammatical instruction together with discourse practices and genre conventions sensitivity contributes to strengthened increasingly well-aligned authorial positioning, discourse coherence, and heightened writer confidence in scientific writing.

Acknowledgement

We extend our deepest gratitude to the Dean, Research and University Research Cell at Charotar University of

Science and Technology, Changa for their extensive and unwavering support, which has enabled us to further excel in our research endeavors.

Conclusion

- The research confirms that scientific writing is optimally understood through the convergence of grammatical structure and discourse in a holistic and comprehensive model.
- An orientation of grammar and discourse foregrounds dynamic interrelation between language-based framework, argumentative function and community-based setting in research-oriented exchange.
- The investigation is derived from Systematic Functional Linguistics (SFL) frameworks, pragmatic perspectives and discourse analysis which substantiates the effective use of grammatical structures to develop arguments and present authorial positioning.
- The study has revealed that scientific writing involves strategic knowledge arrangement with logical progression to enhance coherence and cohesion.
- The fundamental attributes of academic writing mainly embrace modal expressions, evaluative textual devices, noun-based conceptualization and research-oriented grammatical compactness.
- Awareness of subject-oriented and genre-specific conventions and protocols governs academic exchange.
- The integration of grammar analysis with discourse-based perspectives results in a unified framework of academic writing.
- The study has contested rule-based understandings by reinterpreting grammatical structures embedded in discourse to produce precise articulation.
- It reconciles micro-level with macro-level processes to present the significance of their complementary functions in enhancing academic quality.
- The unified mechanism of grammar and discourse enriches academic writing both theoretically and pedagogically.
- The current investigation is constrained by evidence-based validation.
- It accommodates subject-oriented differentiation.
- The subsequent pedagogical interventions should be evaluated in ESL, ESP and EAP settings.
- The future research should pursue interdisciplinary, developmental and cross-linguistic scholarly inquiries to validate the integrated framework of pedagogical practice.

References

- Arslan, R. (2013). An integrated approach to enhancing prospective English language teachers' writing skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 9(2).
- Austin, J. L. (1962). *How to do things with words* (J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà, Eds.). Oxford University Press.

- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analyzing genre: Language use in professional settings*. Longman.
- Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2016). *Grammatical complexity in academic English: Linguistic change in writing*. Cambridge University Press.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Longman.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle.
- Fairclough, N. (1992). *Discourse and social change*. Polity Press.
- Fang, Z., Cox, B., & Schleppegrell, M. J. (2006). Understanding the language demands of schooling: Nouns in academic registers. *Journal of Literacy Research*, 38(3), 247–273.
- Fang, Z., Schleppegrell, M. J., & Cox, B. (2006). The language demands of academic literacy. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 50(8), 588–603.
- Flowerdew, J. (Ed.). (2002). *Academic discourse*. Longman.
- Flowerdew, J., & Peacock, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Research perspectives on English for academic purposes*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fraser, B. (2009). An account of discourse markers. *International Review of Pragmatics*, 1(2), 293–320.
- Gee, J. P. (2014). *An introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and method* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Geluykens, R. (1992). *From discourse process to grammatical construction*. John Benjamins.
- Givón, T. (Ed.). (1979). *Discourse and syntax*. Academic Press.
- Gledhill, C. (1995). Collocation and genre analysis. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 43(1), 11–35.
- Goodwin, C. (1981). *Conversational organization: Interaction between speakers and hearers*. Academic Press.
- Grice, H. P. (1989). Logic and conversation. In *Studies in the way of words* (pp. 22–40). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1975)
- Gumperz, J. J. (Ed.). (1972). *Directions in sociolinguistics: The ethnography of communication*. Blackwell.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2003). Written language, standard language, global language. *World Englishes*, 22(4), 405–418.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004a). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (2004b). *An introduction to functional grammar* (3rd ed.). Hodder Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2014). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge.
- Harris, Z. S. (1952). Discourse analysis. *Language*, 28(1), 1–30.
- How to do things with words. (1962). (J. O. Urmson & M. Sbisà, Eds.). Oxford University Press.
- 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. (2012). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing* (2nd ed.). University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing. *Applied Linguistics*, 25(2), 156–177.
- Ivanič, R. (2004). Discourses of writing and learning to write. *Language and Education*, 18(3), 220–245.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (1993). Grammar as a process: A conceptual framework. *TESOL Quarterly*, 27(4), 701–718.
- Larsen-Freeman, D. (2003). *Teaching grammar in context*. Heinle & Heinle.
- Leech, G. N. (1983). *Principles of pragmatics*. Longman.
- Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Logic and conversation. (1989). In *Studies in the way of words* (pp. 22–40). Harvard University Press. (Original work published 1975)
- Longman grammar of spoken and written English. (1999). Longman.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mauranen, A., & Bondi, M. (Eds.). (2003). Evaluation in academic discourse. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 2(4).
- Palmer, F. R. (2001). *Mood and modality* (2nd ed.). Cambridge University Press.
- Schiffrin, D. (1994). *Approaches to discourse*. Blackwell.
- Schleppegrell, M. J. (2004). *The language of schooling: A functional linguistics perspective*. Routledge.
- Searle, J. R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge University Press.
- Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language. (1969). Cambridge University Press.
- Strauss, S., Feiz, P., & Xiang, X. (2018). *Grammar, meaning, and concepts: A discourse-based approach to English grammar*. Routledge.
- Swales, J. M. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge University Press.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (1998). *Ideology: A multidisciplinary approach*. Sage Publications.
- Van Dijk, T. A. (2008). *Discourse and context: A sociocognitive approach*. Cambridge University Press.
- Wodak, R., & Meyer, M. (Eds.). (2001). *Methods of critical discourse analysis*. Sage.
- Xu, X., & Nesi, H. (2017). An analysis of the evaluation contexts in academic discourse. *Functional Linguistics*, 4.