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Abstract: Using reporting verbs effectively in academic writing is an essential academic skill and a prominent learning activity to present previous research outcomes. But it seems to have been a problem for non-native graduate students for many years. Non-native learners often use reporting verbs inappropriately. To raise graduate students’ awareness of using reporting verbs, this study compares the frequency, types, and tenses of reporting verbs in the literature review section of 25 MA theses written in English by Chinese graduate students, and 45 articles from 5 prestigious international journals in the field of linguistics. The findings demonstrate the similarities and differences in the use of reporting verbs by Chinese graduate students majoring in English and international experts in the field of linguistics. The two groups of writers use discourse, research, and cognition reporting verbs in a descending order of frequency. Chinese graduate students use a larger number but fewer types of reporting verbs. Experienced researchers demonstrate greater proficiency in using reporting verbs than graduate students who are considered novice researchers. The comparison also reveals that the two groups of writers show a similar tendency in using verb tenses to report information, namely, using simple present tense and past tense frequently, and using the present perfect tense infrequently. Via the analysis, suggestions for novices and pedagogical implications are provided.
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1. Introduction

Academic papers exert an essential influence on the communication of international academia. If a scholar wants to have an achievement in his research field, he needs not only the original insight but also ingenious writing techniques (Manan & Noor, 2014). The literature review section, a significant component of academic writing, is indispensable for classifying prior research and identifying future research gaps. One typical feature of the literature review section is to cite or report the previous studies, which intends to use it in the later research articles and lay a foundation for the new research. Even the most original research paper must integrate and represent ideas, concepts, findings, and theories from other sources. Without doing so, it is unlikely to meet the publication requirements of scientific journals (Hyland, 2002). Using reporting verbs is an explicit way to express ideas in the literature section. The selection of reporting verbs varies according to disciplines and particular sections of academic papers (Jaroonkhongdach, 2015; Chen et al., 2022; Kwon et al., 2018). The literature review section of an academic paper typically includes a collection of references and citations to previous research. As a result,
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this section often contains a greater number of reporting verbs. Thus, the research subject of the present study focuses on the use of the reporting verbs in the literature review section. Researchers have defined and categorized reporting verbs from a variety of angles (Swales, 1990; Thompson & Ye, 1991; Thomas & Hawes, 1994). To use English reporting verbs is challenging, and non-native English learners have a series of problems in reporting the research results of the previous studies (Liu & Si, 2022). It is therefore necessary to explore distinctions in using reporting verbs between non-native novice writers and international expert writers. Given the above literature, many scholars agreed on the importance of reporting verbs. This study compares the similarities and differences in the use of reporting verbs between literature review sections of Chinese English-majored MA theses and those in international journals.

2. Literature Review

2.1. Reporting Verbs

Reporting verbs are a vital component of citation practice and an effective way for scholars to demonstrate the credibility and validity of published research (Maryam, 2021). They are the explicit outward manifestation to cite the research of others. This study uses Hyland’s classification of reporting verbs. It is a comprehensive and influential classification that is widely recognized and used by the academic community. The concrete categories are shown in Table 1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reporting verbs</th>
<th>Research acts</th>
<th>Factive</th>
<th>Counter-factive</th>
<th>Non-factive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Findings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tentative</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse acts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doubt</td>
<td>Tentative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Critical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance</td>
<td>Factive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Non-factive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counters</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hyland divided the reporting verbs into three identifiable types according to the activity types they referred to. Research acts are implied in experimental activities in reality, which occur in the finding (notice, show, discover) or procedures (calculate, analyse, explore). Cognition acts (suspect, believe, view) focus on the mental processes.
of researchers. Discourse acts (hypothesis, discuss, state) concentrate on the verbal expressions of cognition and research activities. According to the evaluative function, each process category of reporting verbs is composed of its subdivisions. Hyland (2002) noted that the categories were not perfect, some verbs showed multiple categories overlap. According to Swales (1990), the language had process meaning. With respect to the situation, the reporting verbs with overlapping meaning were analyzed in terms of the categories to which they belong in the contexts. Furthermore, the tenses of reporting verbs also remain an element to affect the citation. Scholars have reached an agreement in classifying the tenses of reporting verbs (Swales, 1990; Weissberg & Buker, 1990). Three widely used tenses of the reporting verbs are the present, past and present perfect tenses. Consequently, this study focuses on the analysis of the three tenses. In sum, Hyland’s framework in types and the Swales’ classification of reporting verb tenses are adopted as a new analytical model in present study.

2.2. Previous Studies

The most important means of attributing content to another source or presenting rhetorical meaning is the use of reporting verbs, which are the verbs used when making a citation and the verbs that introduce prior research results (Swales, 1990; Thompson & Ye, 1991; Hyland, 2000). Reporting verbs can be used to explain previous research and improve engagement and communication between the author and the authors they are citing, which aims to establish the author’s own research space. While reporting verbs have been extensively studied across genres, academic writing by second language learners presents a particularly intriguing research domain (Lou, 2022; Jalilifar & Dabbi, 2012; Manan & Noor, 2014). The studies conducted so far have revealed that second language learners are capable of using different types of reporting verbs, but there are still instances of misuse. Thus, second language learners should enhance their competence in academic writing. In the meanwhile, scholars also attempted to conduct comparative studies, which generally focused on two aspects. On the one hand, it was reflected in interdisciplinary research (Park, 2021; Maryam, 2021; Eckstein et al., 2022). The interdisciplinary studies reached an agreement that there are differences in using reporting verbs between different disciplines and different authors. Denotative reporting verbs were used more frequently than the evaluative ones, and research act reporting verbs were used with a clear predominance. On the other hand, a diversity of works have been run on cross-language studies (Manoochehr & Amirali, 2015; Yeganeh & Boghayeri, 2015; Liardét & Black, 2019; Duong & Tran, 2021). The cross-language research covered several kinds of languages in the world.

Like interdisciplinary studies, cross-language comparative research has revealed variations in the use of reporting verbs among scholars. Specifically, native experts tend to employ a wider range of these verbs. Moreover, the comparative study of reporting verbs also embodied on the authors with different academic proficiency or in different learning stages (Jaroongkhongdach, 2015; Wen & Pramoolsook, 2021). They concluded that the experts and learners in higher grades were more varied and skillful in the use of reporting verbs than novices and the learners in lower grades. Recent years have seen renewed interest in cross-genre comparative studies of reporting verbs. To cite an example, Yongkook (2021) compared the academic papers with the personal blogs discourse, which found that reporting verbs used in blog writing are more infrequently than in the academic writing. The innovation point is that this study
compared the academic writing and personal discourse, in other words, the formal and informal writing.

Put it briefly, researchers have conducted studies and comparative studies of reporting verbs across disciplines, languages, and genres. These researches provide valuable sources for the present study. However, little scholarly attention has been paid to the application and distribution of reporting verbs based on Chinese MA theses in English major and prestigious international journals. Understanding this gap, this research compares and analyzes academic papers written by Chinese graduate students in English major with international experts. Given the research status quo, this paper aims to answer the following research questions via a comparative analysis of literature review sections in MA theses of Chinese English-majored graduate students and prestigious journals written by native scholars: (1) how is the overall frequency distribution of reporting verbs in Chinese English-majored MA theses and international journals? (2) how are the types and type-token ratios (TTR) of reporting verbs used in Chinese English-majored MA theses and international journals? (3) how are the tenses of reporting verbs used in Chinese English-majored MA theses and international journals?

3. Methodology

3.1. Corpus and Data Collection

All research data from this study were written during 2019-2021. Twenty-five literature review sections of MA theses with a corpus size of 110,911 words were taken from the Chinese graduate students majoring in foreign linguistics and applied linguistics in “double world-class project” universities in CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure). Forty-five literature review sections of international journals were collected with a corpus size of 110,986 words, which emanate from five prestigious journals (Impact Factors over 3.0), namely Applied Linguistics, Journal of Memory and Language, Journal of Second Language Writing, Bilingualism: Language and Cognition, Language Learning. The average number from each journal is 9. Two small corpora were created based on the data, including the Chinese MA thesis Corpus (CLC, Chinese Learner Corpus) and the International Journals Corpus (IJC, International Journal Corpus). The two corpora are comparable in terms of capacity. To improve accuracy, international authors are all native speakers, which are judged through the authors’ affiliation. The genre of all selected research articles is empirical to guarantee the validity of the corpus. To eliminate the personal preference in employing reporting verbs, this study avoids selecting the research articles written by the same author.

3.2. Analysis Procedure

The literature review sections of the Master’s theses were initially downloaded from CNKI in caj format, while international journals were obtained in pdf format. To adhere to the text formatting requirements of AntConc 4.1.4 software, both corpora were transformed into txt format. Two corpora, CLC and IJC, were built using these two kinds of data. What’s more, the study employed the frequently available reporting verbs and their tenses based on Hyland and Swales’ classification and examples. The identification of reporting verbs was divided into two stage, the common reporting verbs and their tenses in Hyland and Swales’ definition were retrieved by regular expression in AntConc and annotated with [da] for discourse act reporting verbs, [ra] for research act reporting verbs, and [ca] for cognition act reporting verbs. The present, past, and perfect tenses were annotated using [pr], [pa], and [pp], respectively. As some
reporting verbs can’t be retrieved by the software, manual check and annotation were employed in the second stage by reading the corpus sentence by sentence after the retrieval annotation. The CLC corpus was annotated first, followed by the IJC corpus. The annotation and analysis process was carried out independently by the two writers of this paper, with any disagreements being resolved through negotiation to improve the reliability of the annotation. After three rounds of corpus annotation and revision, AntConc 4.1.4 was employed for frequency retrieval, and Chi-square and Log-likelihood Calculator software were used to examine whether there were any significant differences in the types and tenses distribution of reporting verb.

4. Results

4.1. The Comparison in Overall Distribution of Reporting Verbs

According to Table 2, Chinese graduate students used 267 types of reporting verbs a total of 1960 times, while scholars in international academic papers used 218 types of reporting verbs a total of 1307 times. To make the research findings more precise, the normalized frequency of the type and tokens of reporting verbs with per 10,000 words was taken into account. Table 2 indicates that Chinese graduate students cite the type of reporting verbs at a density of 24.07 per 10,000 words and tokens at a density of 176.72 per 10,000 words. Correspondingly, the density of the types and the tokens of reporting verbs used by international scholars are 19.64 and 117.76 per 10,000 words respectively. It points out that Chinese graduate students generally used more types and numbers of reporting verbs than international scholars. After chi-square test, there exists a significant difference in number ($X^2=131.85$, df=1, **p < .01) and types ($X^2=4.99$, df=1, *p < .05) in the use of reporting verbs. Compared with the types, the number difference is more salient in statistical significance.

Table 2
The Comparison in Types Distribution of Reporting Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th>IJC</th>
<th>$X^2$</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Types/ Normed</td>
<td>267/24.07</td>
<td>218/19.64</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokens/Normed</td>
<td>1960/176.72</td>
<td>1307/117.76</td>
<td>131.85</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2. Comparison in Overall Distribution of Each Type of Reporting Verbs

Table 3 shows that both Chinese graduate students and international scholars used the discourse act reporting verbs most frequently, accounting for 50.36% and 57.23% respectively.

Examples:

(1) Schunk (1994) reported [da pa] that students with low self-efficacy are more prone to anxiety, because they subconsciously exaggerate the difficulty of the task and worry about failure. (From CLC)

(2) Prior work indicates [da pr] that the effects of semantic processing and articulation are potentially separable (Bodner, Taikh, & Fawcett, 2014; Fawcett, 2013; MacLeod et al., 2010). (From IJC)

Chinese graduate students and international scholars have a tendency towards using the research reporting verbs as their second priority, taking up 44.80% and 39.94% respectively.
Examples:
(3) Liddicoat, Scrimgeour, and Chen (2008) examined the citation practices of high school students, using textual analysis and semi-structured interviews. (From CLC)
(4) Perchemlides and Coutant (2004) found that the common language provided by the rubric enabled students to evaluate their own compositions and learn from their own strengths and weaknesses. (From IJC)

Two groups of scholars used the least cognition reporting act verbs, and the exact percentages account for 4.84% and 2.83%.

Examples:
(5) Some scholars believe that such processing difficulty of the relationship between words can be quantified according to the distance between words (Gibson, 1998, 2000). (From CLC)
(6) The incremental strengthening and weakening of associations is often the hypothesized mechanism for both implicit and procedural learning, and models of this process typically employ simple connectionist learning algorithms (e.g. Gupta & Cohen, 2002; Cleeremans & McClelland, 1991). (From IJC)

It suggests that both Chinese graduate students and international authors consistently used three different types of reporting verbs in the process of academic writing. To find out whether there exists significant difference in the use of reporting verbs by two groups, the chi-square test was used. The results demonstrate that \(*p < .01\) in three types of reporting verbs, which indicates that there exist statistically significant differences in the use of discourse, research, and cognition act reporting verbs.

### Table 3
The Comparison of Each Type of Reporting Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CLC Frequency/Normed</th>
<th>CLC Percent</th>
<th>IJC Frequency/Normed</th>
<th>IJC Percent</th>
<th>(X^2)</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>878/79.97</td>
<td>44.80%</td>
<td>522/47.03</td>
<td>39.94%</td>
<td>91.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>95/8.57</td>
<td>4.84%</td>
<td>37/3.33</td>
<td>2.83%</td>
<td>26.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourse</td>
<td>987/88.99</td>
<td>50.36%</td>
<td>748/67.4</td>
<td>57.23%</td>
<td>33.19</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.3. Comparison in Type/Token Ratios (TTR) of Reporting Verbs

Table 4 contains the information on the number, types and the percentage of the type-token ratios (TTR) of three kinds of reporting verbs. TTR is known as the ratio between word type and word frequency. It is the measure to assess the diversity of the use of reporting verbs in the CLC and IJC. The range and diversity of reporting verbs tends to be wider when the TTR is higher, while the use of reporting verbs is more homogeneous and concentrated when the TTR is lower. Table 4 shows that academic papers of international experts presented higher TTR than Chinese graduate students in three types of reporting verbs, which reports that international authors used more diverse reporting verbs than Chinese graduate students. According to the results of comparison in Table 4, the highest percentage TTR of reporting verbs for both
Chinese and International scholars refer to the cognition act reporting verbs, though they take up the lowest percentage.

4.4. The Comparison in Tenses Choice of Reporting verbs

According to the data in Table 5, both groups were much more likely to use the simple present and past tenses than the present perfect tense. The simple present tense is employed more frequently by international experts than by Chinese graduate students. In statistics, the value of *p<.05 indicates a significant difference, while the value of p>.05 suggests no significant difference. Strong significant relationship can be shown when the value **p < .01. The most frequently occurring tense is simple past tense in both two groups. Chinese graduate students majoring in English were found to use the simple past tense more frequently than international scholars, and this difference was statistically significant (X^2=369.21, df=1, *p < .01).

Examples:
(7) Previous intercultural studies have confirmed [da pp] that metadiscourse in RAs differ according to the authors’ cultural background (Moreno, 1997; Abdollahzadeh, 2011; Loi & Lim, 2013). (From CLC)
(8) Vidal (2011) demonstrated [ra pa] that the effects of incidental learning of cognates were larger when participants listened to texts with unknown words compared to when they read such texts. (From IJC)

The simple present tense ranks second in the frequency distribution of reporting verbs. In terms of statistics analysis, there is no noticeable difference in the use of the simple present tense (X^2=2.21, df=1, p>.05).

Examples:
(9) Ribalta (2018) studies [ra pr] the main characters in the novel and Jasim (2018) focuses on [da pr] the isolation and escape from reality of the protagonist. (From CLC)
(10) Dispersion is another dimension of collocational association; it considers [ca pr] the distribution of the node and collocates in the corpus (Gries, 2008). (From IJC)

The present perfect tense occurs least frequently in both groups. A statistically significant difference can be found in the use of the present perfect tense between the two groups (X^2=-122.22, df=1, **p < .01).

Examples:
(11) The Soruş and Griffiths study has provided [da pp] the perceptive ideas for questionnaire design and interview operations. (From CLC)
(12) Surprisingly, the hypothesis that learners’ awareness of cognates (at any level) is necessary to benefit
from their cognate status has not been experimentally verified. Several studies have pointed out [da pp] that learners usually do not notice word cognateness in texts (e.g., Dressler, Carlo, Snow, August & White, 2011; Nagy, Garcia, Durgunoglu & Hancin-Bhatt, 1993; Singleton, 2006). (From IJC)

Table 5
The Tenses Comparison of Reporting Verbs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>CLC</th>
<th></th>
<th>LJC</th>
<th></th>
<th>X²</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency/</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency/</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Normed</td>
<td></td>
<td>Normed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple present</td>
<td>553/49.86</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>505/45.50</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>0.137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple past</td>
<td>1326/119.56</td>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>516/46.49</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>369.21</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present perfect</td>
<td>81/7.3</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>286/25.77</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>-121.22</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Discussion

5.1. Similarities and Differences in the Overall Use of Reporting Verbs

Writing a dissertation is the first shot that a novice researcher embarks on writing for academic purposes. Learning how to cite the works of others is essential for novice researchers to establish a foundation for their research, persuade readers, and give credit to other researchers. Reporting verbs were explicitly utilized in the MA theses slightly more than international authors. Such evidence lends support to Duong and Tran’s (2021) research on the TESOL journal papers written by both native and non-native speakers. It can be presumed that graduate students rely more on reporting the previous research directly to demonstrate their familiarity with the research field and to create their own research space or improve the credit of their studies. Conversely, the results of this study differ from Liu and Si’s (2022) study in which Chinese and foreign papers were selected from the Science Direct database. That may be due to the Liu and Si’s research corpus focused on full text, the corpus was derived from the same database, and the research article genre was consistent. It suggests that scholars with relatively equivalent academic competence are prone to publish articles that adhered to uniform writing norms. As a result, Chinese graduate students should shed light on the reading of high-level experts’ academic outcomes, pay attention to the use of reporting verbs in experts’ academic papers, learn the language expression ways, and adhere to the norms of prestigious journals.

5.2. Similarities and Differences in TTR and Types of Reporting Verbs

Experienced writers are more adept at citing the research of others, selecting diverse reporting verbs, and using more personalized verbs to convey their assessment of the cited contents (Lombardi, 2021). By counting the number and calculating the TTR, Chinese graduate students used more reporting verbs in general, and international experts used more types of reporting verbs in academic papers. To demonstrate their familiarity with the subject, Chinese graduate students mainly used finite reporting structures and tried to use the attribution function of citing sources. The findings bear out the previous studies (Hu & Jiang, 2007; Lou, 2013). The results indicate that Chinese graduate students show greater interest in the use of reporting verbs, but they should strive to use them more
flexibly and diversely. They need to read international literature and accumulate different kinds of reporting verbs. Even though the graduate students who have learned English for many years, they still need to learn about the use of reporting verbs.

Chinese graduate students and international experts tended to use discourse, research, and cognition reporting act verbs in a similar distribution overall. It demonstrates that both Chinese and international authors are attentive to the general norms that exist in the academic discourse community and observe the general rules for the use of reporting verbs in academic papers. According to the aforementioned findings, the discourse act reporting verbs were employed with the highest frequency. This finding contradicts with Un-udom and Un-udom’s (2020) and Maryam’s (2021) studies, differences in corpus capacity and source may be a contributing factor. The result concludes that both groups of scholars used more discourse reporting verbs to convey their evaluation of the cited content and to lay a foundation for their own research. In addition, the present study reveals that there are significant differences in the use of subcategories of reporting verbs by non-native novice writers and experts. It can be confirmed in the study of Marti, Yilmaz and Bayyurt (2019). Marti and his companies investigated the differences between native and non-native writers in their reporting practices, which suggests that professional knowledge is an important factor in differences of academic writing. Therefore, Chinese graduate students should insistently improve their professional knowledge, enhance their overall academic literacy, and constantly approach the academic proficiency of expertise.

5.3. Similarities and Differences in Tenses Choices of Reporting verbs

The reporting verbs have multiple tenses, each of which has a distinct meaning. Tense stands for particular communicative consequences. Tang (2004) pointed out that the simple present tense focuses on an overview of the study and a summary of the current research situation. On the contrary, the simple past tense is merely an introduction to individual studies of the previous period. In addition to the simple present and past tense, the present perfect tense is often used to provide a positive conclusion to previous research. The comparison reveals that both groups frequently used the simple past and simple present tenses but rarely used the present perfect tense, which is in line with the findings of the study of Tang (2004). Using the simple present tense of reporting verbs is more convenient because it can weaken the limitation of time and reduce the challenge in tenses choice (Chen, 2010). The simple present tense has no significant difference in the two corpora, which implies that both groups use the simple present tense to provide an overview of previous research. There is a significant difference in the use of the simple past tense. Chinese graduate students are likely to use the simple past tense to present research results. In contrast, the role of the present perfect tense is more complex. Chinese learners rarely use the present perfect tense, but international journal authors show certain proficiency in the use of this tense. The differences in the use of simple past tense and the present perfect depict that international experts are ingenious in the use of reporting verbs, while Chinese graduate students try to avoid the risk of making mistakes in tenses selection. Some learners are confused about the use of reporting verbs and tend to use tenses in a simplistic manner (Liu & Si, 2022). In brief, reporting verbs remain one of the important ways to cite the research results. The general distribution of reporting verbs used by Chinese graduate students is consistent with international scholars. Turning to the details, there are significant differences in the use of
each concrete type. The comparison of second language learners’ and international experts’ discourse can provide learners with valuable references.

6. Conclusion

To use the reporting verbs effectively and accurately proves to be an important aspect in academic writing, especially for the non-native novice researchers. This study investigated the similarities and differences in the use of reporting verbs between MA theses written by Chinese graduate students majoring in English and prestigious international journals authored by native experts. The comparison of the two groups of scholars shows the following conclusions: (1) Chinese graduate students used more reporting verbs in terms of quantity. (2) International scholars seem to be more varied in the use of the types. (3) Two groups of researches use discourse, research and cognition reporting verbs in a decreasing order and there exist significant differences in each concrete type. (4) In tenses choice, scholars used the simple present and past tenses obviously more than the present perfect tense. The implication of this study is twofold. The one is that English-majored graduate students should study, refer and imitate the use of reporting verbs in prestigious international experts’ academic papers. The novices should approach the professional capability also need to be improved. The other is to provide the pedagogical implication. English teachers should illustrate the differences in the use of reporting verbs in the English academic writing classroom to raise learners’ awareness to use various reporting verbs flexibly so that they can enhance their ability to write academic papers and increase their opportunity to publish articles in international journals. However, it is worth emphasizing that the present study only selects the MA thesis of English-majored graduate students from some top-ranked universities in China, which limits the scope of the corpus. In addition, the research only focuses on the literature review section. Hence, more corpus are necessary to collect more corpora, and the other sections of research articles also should be concerned in future studies.
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MỘT NGHIÊN CỨU SO SÁNH VỀ ĐỌNG TỪ TƯỞNG THUẬT TRONG LUẬN VĂN THẠC SĨ CỦA HỌC VIÊN PHI BẢN NGỮ VÀ BÀI BÁO TRÊN TẬP CHÍ QUỐC TẾ

Yingqi Hu, Haixu Li

Trường Ngoại ngữ, Đại học Hà Bắc, Bảo Định, Trung Quốc

Tóm tắt: Sử dụng dòng từ tưởng thuật một cách hiểu quâ trong văn bản hệ thống thuật là một kỹ năng học tập thiết yếu và là hoạt động học tập nổi bật để trình bày các kết quả nghiên cứu trước đó. Tuy nhiên, nhiều năm qua, học viên cao học phi bản ngữ đường như luôn gặp vấn đề về việc sử dụng loại dòng từ này. Họ thường sử dụng các dòng từ tưởng thuật không phù hợp. Để nâng cao nhận thức của học viên cao học về việc sử dụng dòng từ tưởng thuật, nghiên cứu này so sánh năm suát, loại và thị của dòng từ tưởng thuật trong phân Tóm quan tính hình nghiên cứu của 25 luận văn học sử bằng tiếng Anh do học viên người Trung Quốc viết và 45 bài báo trên 5 tạp chí quốc tế có uy tín trong lĩnh vực ngôn ngữ học. Kết quả nghiên cứu chỉ ra những điểm tương đồng và khác biệt trong việc sử dụng dòng từ tưởng thuật giữa hai nhóm tác giả. Hai nhóm này sử dụng các loại dòng từ tưởng thuật diễn ngôn, nghiên cứu và nhận thức theo thứ tự năm suát giảm dần. Học viên Trung Quốc sử dụng số lượng lớn hơn nhưng ít loại dòng từ tưởng thuật hơn. so với những người mới bắt đầu nghiên cứu, tác giả bài báo trên tạp chí quốc tế khá ít hơn ở trong việc sử dụng các dòng từ tưởng thuật. So sánh cũng cho thấy rằng hai nhóm tác giả cũng có xu hướng sử dụng thảm từ đề báo cáo thông tin, cụ thể là sử dụng thị hiện tại đơn giản và thị quá khởi thưởng xuyên, và sử dụng thị hiện tại hoàn thành không khởi thưởng xuyên. Thông qua kết quả phân tích, bài báo đưa ra những gợi ý cho người mới bắt đầu và một số gợi ý mang tính sự phạm.

Từ khóa: luận văn thạc sĩ, tạp chí quốc tế, dòng từ tưởng thuật, nghiên cứu đối chiếu, ngôn ngữ học.