ISSN 2788-7979 (online)
8 Ayalon, L., Suberry, A., Okun, S., Awad, R. and Gazawi, R. (2025), "Learning from memes about ageism among Israeli Arab tweens", *Ageing and Society,* vol. 45, pp. 2602–2624.
9 Chonody, J., Perez, C., Filmore, Q. and McGuinness, M. (2025), "Ageism and sexism in films with older people as the lead", *International Journal of Ageing and Later Life,* vol.18, no.1, pp. 59-101.
10 Camacho-Markina, I. and Santos-Diez, M.-T. (2025), The Social Construction of Age: Media Stigmatization of Older Adults: A Systematic Review, *Journalism and Media,* vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 1-17.
11 Anthony, L. (2022), *What can corpus software do?*, in O'Keeffe A. and McCarthy M. J. (eds.), Routledge, Abingdon, UK.
12 Peters, P. (2004), *The Cambridge Guide to English Usage,* Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.
13 *Cambridge Essential English Dictionary* (2011), Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 29.03.2026

IRSTI 16.01 DOI: 10.59102/kufil/2026/iss3pp170-184

G. Sarseke
L. Gumilyov Eurasian National University, Astana, 010000, Kazakhstan

REPORTING VERBS IN KAZAKH ACADEMIC WRITING: CORPUS-BASED STRUCTURAL AND DISCOURSE PATTERNS

This study investigates reporting verbs in Kazakh academic writing, an area that has received little linguistic or pedagogical attention. Reporting verbs are central to citation practices, as they allow writers to attribute ideas, findings, and evaluations to other scholars while positioning their own contributions within disciplinary discourse.

A specialised corpus of 110 peer-reviewed research articles across eleven humanities and language and literature disciplines was compiled, yielding 356,498 tokens. From an initial inventory of 5,984 verb lemmas, semantic screening identified 17 candidate verbs with potential reporting functions. A stratified sample of 1,398 concordance instances was manually annotated for discourse function, resulting in 939 confirmed reporting cases.

Quantitative analysis revealed that reporting functions are concentrated in a small set of recurrent verbs (ait, jaz, anyqta, ūsyn, baianda), while lower-frequency items (e.g., habarla, paiymda, tūjyrymda) contribute to functional diversity. Disciplinary distribution analysis showed variation in reporting density, with literature, religious studies, and linguistics exhibiting the highest normalised frequencies. Qualitative analysis classified reporting verbs into three activity-based categories: discourse acts, research acts, and mental acts. These categories highlight how Kazakh academic writers attribute statements, present findings, and evaluate prior scholarship.

The findings reveal both lexical concentration and functional heterogeneity, suggesting that Kazakh academic discourse relies on a core repertoire of verbs while maintaining flexibility in expressing stance and attribution. This study contributes to corpus linguistics and discourse analysis by providing empirical evidence on reporting practices in Kazakh, offering insights for academic writing pedagogy, and extending reporting verb frameworks to typologically diverse languages.

Key words: reporting verbs, citation practices, Kazakh academic writing, corpus linguistics, discourse analysis.

MAIN PROVISIONS

The focus of the study is citations, which are an integral part of scientific research and a sign of its progress. Any scholar or young researcher writing a research paper will refer to the work of other authors. Citations are primarily used to fulfil the writer's main goals, such as expressing their own opinions, proving them, introducing new knowledge and summarising. In achieving these aims, the author relies on linguistic tools. One of these tools is verbs. Verbs vary in terms of semantics, structure, and function, and not all verbs in a language are used for citation purposes. Only a group of verbs with reporting semantics is used for this purpose. These are known as reporting verbs in linguistics. Kazakh is rich in such verbs. However, their functions have not yet been fully studied. This study aims to address this gap.

During the course of our study, we discovered that reporting verbs exhibit a high degree of diversity in terms of both number and function within Kazakh academic discourse. To identify the different types of reporting verb related to processes and evaluations, we employed the classifications made by G. Thompson and K. Hyland. These classifications enabled us to categorise reporting verbs in academic Kazakh texts in relation to research, mental processes and discourse activities and to analyse them using examples from a corpus of texts. In this study, we analysed evaluations provided by reporting verbs from the perspectives of authors and writers. We also employed the classifications of pioneering linguists in this area, such as J. Swales, to identify common types of evaluation. These scholars' published theories on this topic were employed to develop theoretical claims and research conclusions. Studies by J. Swales, G. Thompson, Y. Ye, P. Thompson, and K. Hyland were valuable theoretical resources for this study.

The results of this study are valuable and novel, as it is the first study of its kind. The findings can contribute to the fields of corpus linguistics and discourse studies.

INTRODUCTION

Citing previous research is an important feature of academic writing. In academic writing, writers refer to theories, ideas, concepts, and findings from previous research to situate their work within the existing body of knowledge. Knowledge is displayed and integrated through referencing, which is a system of formally acknowledging the sources of other writers' words and thoughts [1, 4]. Such references can serve a range of rhetorical purposes, including reinforcing a point, developing an argument, and persuading readers. The purpose of referencing prior research is not only to acknowledge the work of others but also to support the writer's own claims to knowledge [2]. Situating current research within the broader disciplinary narrative is therefore central to effective academic writing [3; 4; 5]. By establishing connections with significant work in the field, writers can justify their arguments, demonstrate their engagement with existing disciplinary knowledge, and establish the originality and significance of their own contributions [5]. Accordingly, making appropriate references to previous research and reporting the actions, ideas, and findings of other scholars constitute essential practices in academic writing. The use of such references should also conform to the conventions and expectations of the relevant research community [5]. Citations thus function not merely as acknowledgements of sources but also as important rhetorical resources through which writers negotiate the relationship between their own contributions and established disciplinary knowledge [6]. In particular, the use of reporting verbs and evaluative language enables writers to position new claims in relation to previous research and to communicate their stance towards earlier scholarship. Such practices are therefore essential to effectively situating new knowledge within the ongoing disciplinary discourse.

English for Academic Purposes (EAP) scholars and instructors have devoted considerable attention to the use of references and citations in academic discourse. In the early 1980s, J. Swales drew particular attention to the role of citations in research article introductions [7]. A decade later, G. Thompson and Y. Ye examined the use of reporting verbs in citations, with particular attention to

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

their role in academic article introductions [8]. Research in EAP has subsequently highlighted the challenges that academic writers, particularly those writing in English as an additional language, may encounter when incorporating and appropriately acknowledging sources. Although these challenges are often associated with non-native English writers, native English writers may also experience difficulties in integrating source materials effectively and using citations appropriately in academic writing [1; 4; 8].

One area of particular difficulty concerns the selection and use of reporting verbs. Non-native English writers have been found to rely heavily on direct quotations without sufficient interpretation and to employ a relatively limited range of verbs to introduce quoted material [9; 10]. EAP instructors have also noted the frequent overuse of the reporting verb “say” among non-native English writers. For example, V. Pickard reports that “say” is significantly overused by these writers [10]. Such overuse may reflect not simply a limited vocabulary but also broader difficulties in understanding the rhetorical and disciplinary conventions governing the use of sources in academic writing [10, 89]. Thus, a restricted repertoire of reporting verbs may be symptomatic of difficulties in using and integrating source material appropriately rather than merely a lack of lexical knowledge [4]. The choice of reporting verbs is particularly important because these verbs can communicate a writer’s stance towards the claims and positions of previous researchers. Similarly, T. McEnery and N.A. Kifle found that L2 writers tended to use fewer assertive devices than native English writers [11]. For non-native English speakers (NNES), selecting an appropriate reporting verb can therefore be challenging, as the choice must satisfy the grammatical requirements of the sentence while also conveying the writer’s intended interpretation or evaluation of the cited author’s claim [1].

Significant cross-cultural differences have been identified in the use of references in academic writing [12], and these differences extend to conceptions of authorship and textual ownership [9]. K. Hyland offers several developmental and cultural explanations for these differences, including the possibility that students receive limited instruction in how to articulate their own positions in relation to the claims and ideas of other scholars [3]. Given the central role of referencing in academic writing, providing students with explicit instruction in the effective use of sources is therefore essential. Successful academic writing requires students to understand how grammatical choices used to report the claims of other scholars can influence their credibility as researchers and shape the rhetorical force of those claims [12]. In this regard, an important component of academic writing pedagogy is to teach students how to select and use reporting verbs strategically to express their stance towards previous research and achieve their intended rhetorical purposes.

The use of reporting verbs in academic writing may vary according to writers’ levels of experience. In particular, novice and expert writers may differ in how they refer to theories, ideas, concepts, and findings from previous research in their own work. V. Pickard found that novice writers tend to overuse certain reporting verbs, particularly “say”, and highlighted the need to examine how expert writers employ reporting verbs in their citation practices [10]. For novice writers, integrating references to previous research into their own academic texts can be a significant challenge [1]. Such difficulties may arise from developmental and cognitive factors, as well as from differences in prior academic and cultural experience [9]. Inadequate acknowledgement of the sources of ideas may result in accusations of plagiarism, while inappropriate choices or formulations of reporting verbs may produce ambiguous or misleading representations of the relationship between the current writer and the cited author. Developing an appropriate repertoire of reporting verbs is therefore important not only for acknowledging sources accurately but also for enabling writers to communicate their stance towards the claims and positions of previous researchers.

Despite the substantial body of research on reporting verbs in English, comparatively little attention has been paid to their use in Kazakh academic discourse. In particular, research examining reporting verbs in Kazakh citations from either linguistic or pedagogical perspectives remains limited. Therefore, this research has been conducted to address this gap by investigating the use of reporting verbs in Kazakh academic writing, with particular attention to the lexical items employed to attribute content to other authors or sources. Reporting verbs constitute one of the most explicit linguistics means of attributing propositions to external sources and represent an important rhetorical choice in

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

academic writing [4]. Their analysis can therefore provide insights into how Kazakh academic writers engage with previous research and position cited knowledge within their own texts. Moreover, examining reporting verbs in Kazakh may reveal linguistic and culturally situated features of academic discourse that are not necessarily captured by frameworks developed primarily from English-language data. The study has three main objectives. First, it describes the construction of a corpus of academic writing and outlines the methodological procedures used to identify reporting verbs. Second, it examines the quantitative distribution of reporting verbs across lemmas and academic disciplines. Third, it investigates the functional classification of reporting verbs into discourse, research, and mental acts, supported by illustrative corpus examples. Finally, the study discusses the implications of these findings for understanding Kazakh academic discourse and for extending existing frameworks of reporting verbs to a typologically diverse language.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Research Corpus

The study adopts a corpus-based mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative corpus analysis with qualitative discourse-functional analysis to examine reporting verbs in Kazakh research articles. A specialised corpus was compiled to focus specifically on the genre of academic research articles and to investigate the use of reporting verbs in Kazakh academic writing. The corpus consists of 110 research articles drawn from domestic peer-reviewed journals, with 10 articles selected from each of 11 academic disciplines: archaeology and ethnology, history, Islamic studies, linguistics, literature, Oriental studies, philosophy, philology, religious studies, theology, and Turkology. The disciplines were selected to provide broad coverage of academic writing practices in the humanities and in languages and literature. After excluding abstracts, reference lists and text associated with tables and graphics, the articles yielded an electronic corpus of 356,498 tokens (see Table 1).

Table 1 - Composition and token distribution of the corpus

Discipline	***Number of articles***	***Number of tokens***	***Share of corpus (%)***
Humanities			
Archaeology and Ethnology	*10*	*24,460*	*6.86*
History	*10*	*45,594*	*12.79*
Islamic Studies	*10*	*29,426*	*8.25*
Oriental Studies	*10*	*37,059*	*10.40*
Philosophy	*10*	*38,349*	*10.76*
Philology	*10*	*35,909*	*10.07*
Religious Studies	*10*	*32,277*	*9.05*
Theology	*10*	*31,635*	*8.87*
Turkology	*10*	*29,245*	*8.20*
Languages and Literature			
Linguistics	*10*	*23,982*	*6.73*
Literature	*10*	*28,562*	*8.01*
Total	***110***	***356,498***	***100.00***

The texts were selected according to predetermined inclusion and corpus-composition criteria. First, only articles published in domestic research journals were included to focus the analysis on conventions and practices characteristic of Kazakh academic writing. Second, only peer-reviewed journal articles were included to ensure that the corpus consisted of academically validated publications. Journals were selected from the list of publications recommended by the relevant

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

quality-assurance authority of the Republic of Kazakhstan[7]. Third, the corpus was restricted to publications issued between 2000 and 2024. This period was selected to capture contemporary academic Kazakh and to enable comparison of reporting-verb use across disciplines within a defined publication period. Finally, to ensure a balanced distribution of texts across disciplines, 10 articles were selected for each of the 11 disciplines represented in the corpus, resulting in a total of 110 articles. This balanced sampling strategy was adopted to facilitate cross-disciplinary comparison while avoiding over-representation of any single discipline. The selected disciplines and the distribution of articles and tokens are presented in Table 1. These criteria were intended to produce a balanced and systematically constructed corpus of Kazakh academic articles rather than to claim statistical representativeness of all academic writing in Kazakh.

Research design: identification and analysis of reporting verbs

The investigation followed a systematic, sequential procedure progressing from corpus-level quantitative analysis to discourse-level qualitative analysis. The computer programme was used throughout the computational stages of corpus processing, including the extraction of verbal tokens, lemma-based grouping, frequency calculations, distributional analysis, and random sampling of concordance instances. Initially, all verbal tokens were extracted from the corpus, yielding 63,459 verbal occurrences. Using the lemma field, morphologically inflected and derived forms were grouped under their corresponding lemmas. This step was particularly important given the agglutinative nature of Kazakh, in which a single lexical root may occur in numerous inflectional and derivational forms. The procedure resulted in an inventory of 5,984 distinct verb lemmas. For each verb lemma, three corpus-level measures were calculated: (1) overall frequency in the corpus, (2) the number of distinct articles in which the lemma occurred, and (3) the number of disciplinary domains in which it occurred. These measures were used to identify verbs that occurred recurrently across the corpus rather than being restricted to individual texts or disciplines. The complete inventory of 5,984 verb lemmas was then subjected to semantic screening to identify verbs potentially functioning in the reporting of speech and quotation, textual presentation, research findings, description, evaluation, and conclusion formulation. We have primarily focused on verbs used to report, attribute, or evaluate the ideas, claims, findings, methods, or conclusions of other authors or sources, rather than those used to present the writer's own research findings or conclusions. This screening resulted in 17 candidate verbs: *ait, jaz, de, anyqta, ūsyn, aiqynda, sipatta, baianda, ata, körset, tüsındır, belgıle, dälelde, tūjyrymda, bağala, paiymda* and *habarla*. For the qualitative analysis, a maximum of 100 concordance instances was established for each target verb. The computer programme was used to perform random sampling for verbs occurring more than 100 times in the corpus. For verbs occurring fewer than 100 times, all available instances were retained. This procedure produced a final sample of 1,398 concordance instances for manual annotation (see Table 2).

Table 2 - Distribution of annotated concordance instances across the 17 target verbs

Verb lemma	***Instances annotated***	***Sampling type***
ait	*100*	*Capped at 100*
jaz	*100*	*Capped at 100*
anyqta	*100*	*Capped at 100*
ūsyn	*100*	*Capped at 100*
aiqynda	*100*	*Capped at 100*

7 Ğylymi eñbektıñ negızgı nätijelerın jarialau üşın Qazaqstan Respublikasy Ğylym jäne joğary bılım ministrlıgınıñ Ğylym jäne joğary bılım salasynda sapany qamtamasyz etu komitetı ūsynatyn ğylymi basylymdar tızbesı [List of scientific publications recommended by the Committee for Quality Assurance in Science and Higher Education of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan for publishing the main results of scientific work]. 2023. https://www.gov.kz/memleket/entities/quality/documents/details/436479?lang=ru&ysclid=mtfo1shslj323497014

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Verb lemma	***Instances annotated***	***Sampling type***
sipatta	*100*	*Capped at 100*
baianda	*100*	*Capped at 100*
ata	*100*	*Capped at 100*
körset	*100*	*Capped at 100*
de	*100*	*Capped at 100*
tüsındır	*88*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
belgıle	*82*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
dälelde	*63*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
tūjyrymda	*58*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
bağala	*51*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
paiymda	*36*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
habarla	*20*	*Complete lower-frequency set*
Total	***1,398***	***Final qualitative sample***

The final stage consisted of manual discourse-functional annotation. Each sampled concordance was examined within its complete sentence context and assigned a binary reporting-function label (YES/NO), together with a specific functional category. Confirmed reporting instances (YES) were assigned to one of four primary categories: attribution of statement/claim (R1); quotation/citation (R2); research finding/conclusion (R3); and reported evaluation/interpretation (R4). Non-reporting instances were (NO) classified as naming, designation, categorisation, or classification (N1); constructions involving terminology, concepts, linguistic units, expressions, or questions (N2); authorial argumentation, qualification, interpretation, or metadiscursive positioning (N3); grammatical uses without a discourse-reporting function (N4); other non-reporting uses outside N1–N4 (N5); and uncertain cases where the context did not permit a sufficiently confident classification (U). The annotation prioritised contextual discourse function over surface form to minimise the misclassification of forms that merely resembled reporting constructions. All concordance instances were manually examined and classified by a single annotator, using the predefined functional categories described above. The same annotation criteria were applied consistently across the dataset.

The final sample contained 939 confirmed reporting instances (67.22%) and 458 instances classified as non-reporting or uncertain (32.78%). This macro-to-micro framework provides a systematic pathway from corpus-level lexical evidence to fine-grained discourse-functional analysis of reporting verbs in Kazakh academic prose.

RESULTS

Normalised frequency analysis of reporting verbs

Across the 356,498-word corpus, a total of 939 instances of reporting verb uses were identified across 13 lemmas (yielding an overall normalised frequency of 26.34 per 10,000 words) (see Table 3). Five lemmas – *ait, jaz, anyqta, ūsyn*, and *baianda* – each accounted for 100 confirmed instances in the annotated dataset, and each had a normalised frequency of 2.81 per 10,000 words. They were followed by *sipatta* (2.55), *tüsındır* (2.22), *dälelde* (1.77), *tūjyrymda* (1.63), *bağala* and *de* (1.29 each), *paiymda* (1.01), and *habarla* (0.56). The distribution indicates a concentration of reporting functions in a relatively small set of recurrent lexical resources, alongside a wider range of lower-frequency items.

Table 3 - Normalised frequency (NF) of reporting verbs

Lemma	**Reporting cases (Raw)**	**Share of reporting pool (%)**	**NF per 10,000 words**
ait	100	10.65%	2.81
jaz	100	10.65%	2.81
anyqta	100	10.65%	2.81
ūsyn	100	10.65%	2.81

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

baianda	100	10.65%	2.81
sipatta	91	9.69%	2.55
tüsındır	79	8.41%	2.22
dälelde	63	6.71%	1.77
tūjyrymda	58	6.18%	1.63
bağala	46	4.90%	1.29
de	46	4.90%	1.29
paiymda	36	3.83%	1.01
habarla	20	2.13%	0.56
Total / Overall	**939**	**100.00%**	**26.34**

Disciplinary distribution analysis of reporting verbs

An analysis of the 939 reporting verb instances across the 11 academic disciplines reveals notable variations in how scholarly citation and attribution are distributed across fields (see Table 4).

Table 4 - Disciplinary distribution of reporting verbs

Code	Discipline name	Reporting cases	Share of total reporting pool (%)	Reporting cases per 10,000 words
HIST	History	118	12.57%	25.88
PHIL	Philosophy	102	10.86%	26.60
RELS	Religious Studies	96	10.22%	29.74
PHILG	Philology	94	10.01%	26.18
LITER	Literature	92	9.80%	32.21
ORTS	Oriental Studies	88	9.37%	23.75
THEOL	Theology	80	8.52%	25.29
ISS	Islamic Studies	76	8.09%	25.83
LING	Linguistics	69	7.35%	28.77
TURKS	Turkic Studies	67	7.14%	22.91
AE	Archaeology and Ethnology	57	6.07%	23.30
Total	**11**	**939**	**100.00%**	-

In terms of absolute frequency, history records the highest number of reporting cases (118; 12.57% of the total reporting pool), followed by philosophy (102; 10.86%) and religious studies (96; 10.22%). Philology (94; 10.01%) and Literature (92; 9.80%) also contribute substantial proportions. At the lower end of the distribution are archaeology and ethnology (57; 6.07%), Turkic studies (67; 7.14%), and linguistics (69; 7.35%). Thus, the absolute counts suggest that reporting verbs are most extensively represented in history and least represented in archaeology and ethnology. However, the normalised frequencies reveal a somewhat different pattern. Literature has the highest rate, with 32.21 reporting cases per 10,000 words, despite ranking only fifth in absolute frequency. Religious studies follows with 29.74, while linguistics records 28.77. philosophy (26.60), philology (26.18), history (25.88), Islamic studies (25.83), and theology (25.29) occupy the middle range. The lowest normalised frequencies are found in Turkic studies (22.91), archaeology and ethnology (23.30), and oriental studies (23.75). This contrast between raw frequency and normalised frequency is particularly important for interpreting disciplinary differences. History has the largest absolute number of reporting cases, but its normalised rate (25.88 per 10,000 words) is considerably lower than that of literature (32.21) and religious studies (29.74). This indicates that the relatively high number of reporting verbs in history is at least partly associated with the size of its textual sample, whereas reporting verbs occur more densely in the texts representing literature and religious studies.

Overall, the findings point to disciplinary variation in the use of reporting verbs. The relatively high normalised frequencies in literature, religious studies, and linguistics may suggest a stronger reliance on explicit reporting and attribution practices in these disciplines. Conversely, the lower rates in Turkic studies, archaeology and ethnology, and oriental studies indicate comparatively less frequent use of reporting verbs per 10,000 words. Importantly, the range between the highest normalised frequency (32.21 in literature) and the lowest (22.91 in Turkic studies) is approximately 9.30 cases per 10,000 words, indicating a meaningful degree of cross-disciplinary variation. Taken

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

together, Table 4 demonstrates that absolute reporting-verb frequency alone does not fully capture disciplinary patterns. Normalised frequency provides a more informative basis for comparison because it accounts for differences in corpus size. The results therefore suggest that reporting verbs are not distributed uniformly across the disciplines but rather exhibit discipline-sensitive patterns that may reflect differences in scholarly argumentation, source integration, attribution practices, and rhetorical conventions.

Distribution across the three functional act types

The qualitative analysis was interpreted using the three-way, activity-based distinction proposed by G. Thompson, Y. Ye and K. Hyland: discourse/textual acts, research acts and mental/cognitive acts [4; 8]. This classification is based on the type of activity to which a reporting verb refers. Verbs in the **research acts** category represent activities or actions carried out in an experimental or real-world setting. They typically appear in statements of findings (e.g., *observe, discover, notice* and *show*) or procedures (e.g., *analyse, calculate, assay, explore, plot* and *recover*) [4, 6]. The verbs of **cognition acts** (e.g., *believe, conceptualise, suspect, assume,* and *view*) relate to the cognitive processes of the researcher. **Discourse acts verbs** anchor the physical or linguistic act of conveying information, presenting statements, or documenting written and oral communication across scholarly sources (e.g., *say*, *write*, *state*, *report*, *mention*, and *discuss*). Discourse acts are represented by reporting verb lemmas such as *ait* (to say), *jaz* (to write), *habarla* (to report), *baianda* (to relate), and *de* (to say/call). These verbs form the backbone of source attribution and direct quotation frameworks (mapping to R1 and R2 annotations), accounting for a major portion of communicative interactions where external text or speech is introduced. For example:

(1) Baskakov qaraqalpaq tılında dybystardyñ artikuläsialyq bazasy tılı arty bolyp keletının eskere kelıp, būl tūrğydan qaraqalpaq tılı qazaq, noğai tılderıne jaqyn degen **pıkır aitady** [3 , 25-6.]. (Philology)
‘Baskakov, taking into account that the articulatory base of sounds in the Karakalpak language is the back of the tongue, argues that in this respect the Karakalpak language is close to the Kazakh and Nogai languages [3, p. 25].’

Research acts are anchored primarily by *anyqta* (to determine), *dälelde* (to prove), *aiqynda* (to identify), *belgıle* (to designate) and *ūsyn* (to propose). These verbs embody empirical validation, scholarly proofs, and methodological discoveries (R3 annotations), giving objective grounding to academic claims. Example from the corpus:

(2) Köptegen zertteuşıler IRF-tı liberalizmmen bailanystyru üşın liberalizm konturyn **anyqtady**. (Islamic Studies)
‘Many researchers outlined the contours of liberalism in order to associate IRF with liberalism.’

Mental (or cognitive) acts comprise *bağala* (to evaluate), *paiymda* (to surmise), *tūjyrymda* (to conclude/to formulate), *tüsındır* (to explain), and *sipatta* (to describe). These verbs capture epistemic stance, qualitative assessment, and conceptual interpretation (R4 annotations), allowing authors to evaluate prior scholarship or synthesise theoretical positions. This is illustrated by the following corpus example:

(3) Şyğarmany arnaiy zerttemese de türkı tılında jazylğan ortağasyrlyq şyğarmalarğa şolu eñbekter jazyp jürgen belıgılı türık ğalymy Varner Haidar men İdris Nebi Uisal «Asrār al-atibbā’ny» şağatai tılında jazylğan alğaşqy medisinalyq eñbek dep **bağalaidy** (Vaner, 1939; Uysal, 2020: 380). (Oriental Studies)
‘Although they did not specifically study the work, prominent Turkish scholars Varner Haydar and Idris Nebi Uysal, who wrote reviews of medieval works written in the Turkic

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

language, consider “Asrār al-atibbā” to be the first medical work written in the Chagatai language (Vaner, 1939; Uysal, 2020: 380).’

Complex reporting verbs and auxiliary verb constructions

The corpus also demonstrates that reporting is frequently realised through morphosyntactically complex verb constructions. In Kazakh, a head lexical verb may combine with converbal morphology and functional auxiliary verbs, producing configurations such as *aita kelip, aitylyp keledi, aitu kerek, aita ketken* and *aityp otedi* (see Table 5). These patterns indicate that the discourse function of reporting is distributed across a verbal complex rather than necessarily encoded in a single lexical item.

Table 5 – Morphosyntactic configurations of *ait*

Verb type	Example
ait- + kel-	O.S. Radionova sintagmalardy söilem müşelerımen aralastyruğa bolmaitynyn **aita kelıp**, sintagmany söileudegı semantika-sintaksistık bırlıkter dep tanidy [10]. (Linguistics) Türkı tılderındegı söz basyndağy /i-/ dybysy bırqatar lingvis, äsırese, altaitanuşy ğalymdardyñ zertteu nysanyna ainalyp, onyñ tarihyna bailanysty türlı boljamdar men tūjyrymdar **aitylyp keledı**. (Turkology) A. Mustafaeva arab terminologiasy damuynyñ tarihynda klasikalyq jäne zamanaui kezeñ bolğanyn **aita kelıp**, dını leksikanyñ tuuynyñ klasikalyq kezeñında arab terminologiasynyñ basqa türlerınıñ , sonyñ ışında filosofia, ekonomika, äleumettanu, medisina, qūqyq jäne t.b. damuyna negız bolğanyna toqtalady [2]. (Literature)
ait- + öt-	Osy şatqaldardağy būlaqtardyñ mañynda qyş qūbyrlardyñ synyqtary şaşylyp jatqandyğyn G. İ. Pasevich öz eñbegında **aityp ötedı.** (Archeology and Ethnology)
ait- + kerek	... Sonymen bırge Q. Jūbanovtyñ qazaq sözınıñ segmentı, iağni, sözdıñ buyn jıgın ajyratudy sözdıñ soñynda tūrğan buynnan bastaudy ūsynğanyn da atap **aitu kerek**. (Philology) Kültegın ejelgı türkı jazuynda «Ötüken qoinauynda otyrsañ, Mäñgı eldıgıñdı saqtaisyñ sen» [10, 81 b.] dep beker **aitylmasa kerek**. (Turkology)
ait- + ket- + jön	«Qazırgı islam aqyl-oiy» ışında negızdeletın «Qazırgı arab aqyl-oiy», «Qazırgı islam-arab aqyl-oiy» degen anyqtamalardyñ da bar ekenın **aita ketken jön** [Boullata 1990]. (Islamic Studies)

The examples in Table 5 illustrate that the reporting function of *ait-* is shaped by the auxiliary verb and the resulting verbal configuration. The construction *ait-a kel-* presents reporting as an action that develops or continues, while *aityp öt-* can foreground the act of explicitly mentioning or noting information. The combination *ait-u kerek* introduces a modal dimension, presenting the reporting act as necessary or appropriate, whereas *aita ket-* may construe the reporting event as completed or as an additional point introduced into the discourse. The passive form *aitylyp kel-* similarly indicates that information has been reported or stated over the course of discourse without necessarily foregrounding the reporting source. These patterns suggest that auxiliary verbs do not simply accompany *ait-* grammatically; they help frame how the reporting event is presented in the discourse. Thus, reporting in the corpus is realised as a flexible verbal complex in which the lexical reporting meaning of *ait-* interacts with aspectual, modal, voice, and discourse-organisational meanings contributed by the accompanying forms.

DISCUSSION

We have employed an academic corpus to explore reporting practices in Kazakh academic writing, as corpus-based analysis provides empirical evidence of both the distribution and rhetorical functions of reporting verbs. Examining academic text corpora can enhance our understanding of the many types and purposes of citations in academic writing [13, 92]. The findings provide evidence that reporting in Kazakh academic writing, particularly the genre of a research article, is both lexically concentrated and functionally heterogeneous. The 939 confirmed reporting instances in Kazakh research articles are distributed across 13 lemmas. Among them, the five most frequent verb lemmas

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

are *ait, jaz, anyqta, ūsyn*, and *baianda*. Each of them accounts for 10.65% of the reporting pool. This lexical concentration suggests that a relatively small set of recurrent verbs provides much of the lexical infrastructure for source attribution and research reporting. At the same time, the use of lower-frequency verbs such as *habarla* and *paiymda* indicates that the system is not limited to a small group of near-synonymous citation verbs. This pattern corresponds with the view that reporting choices encode distinctions in activity and stance rather than merely grammatical variation [4; 8].

A particularly important finding is the gap between candidate-verb frequency and confirmed reporting function. Of the 1,397 concordance and full context instances examined manually, 67.22% were confirmed as reporting uses, whereas 32.78% were classified as non-reporting or uncertain. This result strengthens the methodological argument for contextual annotation. In an agglutinative language such as Kazakh, lemma-based retrieval is necessary to capture morphological variations, but it is not sufficient to identify discourse function. A lexical item such as *anyqta, belgıle*, or *aiqynda* may describe an action performed by a writer of an article, designate an entity, or report another researcher's finding. The findings therefore support a functional definition of reporting verbs in which reporting status is established at the level of discourse rather than assigned solely on the basis of lexical identity.

The disciplinary distribution results require interpretation beyond raw frequency. History contributes the largest number of reporting instances (118), but the unequal token sizes of the disciplinary subcorpora mean that raw counts partly reflect corpus volume. The normalised frequency analysis results demonstrate that the highest reporting rate is observed in literature (32.21 per 10,000 words), followed by religious studies (29.74) and linguistics (28.77), while Turkic studies has the lowest rate (22.91). The variation suggests that reporting practices may be shaped by disciplinary rhetorical needs, a possibility consistent with research emphasising the socially situated nature of academic discourse and the role of disciplinary communities in shaping academic writing practices [4].

The functional analysis further indicates that citation in Kazakh academic writing involves more than the transmission of another researcher's words. Discourse acts foreground the communicative event of expressing, writing, reporting, or attributing. Research acts construe findings, identification, demonstration, or proposal. Mental acts foreground interpretation, evaluation, and conclusion. This distribution is theoretically significant because it shows that citation practices are not merely mechanical but reflect deeper rhetorical choices that shape how knowledge is constructed and negotiated within the discipline. Such distinctions are consistent with earlier activity-based approaches to reporting verbs, particularly the work of G. Thompson and Y. Ye [8]. The Kazakh data thus support the proposition that reporting verbs do not simply function to indicate the status of the information reported but help writers construct relationships between source, proposition, and current argument, thereby reinforcing the socially situated nature of academic discourse. The selection of an appropriate reporting verb allows writers to intervene in the discourse to strengthen their own argument, highlight the contested nature of the concept or issue, or signal an evaluative stance. The current study provides the evidence that the established reporting verb clarification can be applied to the Kazakh academic writing practice. The discourse act/research act/cognition act classification provides a useful analytical starting point because it captures broad similarities in the activities attributed to researchers. However, frameworks originally developed from English academic writing may require further investigation when applied to languages with richer verbal morphology. In Kazakh, the distinction between lexical reporting meaning and grammatical meaning may be less clear since reporting functions can be modified or extended through agglutinative morphology and auxiliary constructions. As a result, the findings of this study point out the importance of broadening standard reporting verb frameworks to include typologically diverse languages.

One of the most distinctive contributions of the present study lies in the morphosyntactic realisation of reporting in Kazakh. Much of the existing literature on reporting verbs has been developed primarily from English academic writing, where reporting is often analysed through individual lexical verbs and relatively stable clause patterns such as "X argues that..." or "Y found that...". Studies of reporting verbs have increasingly recognised that their use cannot be adequately

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

described in terms of lexical choice alone, as reporting is also shaped by recurring phraseological and grammatical patterns [14; 20]. M. Charles, for example, demonstrates that reporting verbs occur in systematic combinations with particular grammatical subjects, tenses, and complement structures [14]. In Kazakh, verbal meaning is frequently distributed across morphologically complex forms, including converbal morphology and auxiliary verb constructions, in which a lexical verb combines with an auxiliary to express additional aspectual, temporal, or modal meanings [15]. The analysed verb forms such as *aita kelip, aitylyp keledi, aitu kerek*, and *aityp otedi* demonstrate that temporal, aspectual, modal, and discourse-organisational meanings may be layered onto the basic reporting predicate. This suggests that analyses based on single-word reporting verb lists may underestimate the resources available for attribution in Kazakh. At the same time, the present study does not quantify the relative frequencies or independent discourse contributions of the auxiliary constructions; therefore, their role should be regarded as an important qualitative finding requiring further dedicated analysis.

CONCLUSION

The present study contributes to this line of research by providing evidence from Kazakh academic discourse, a context that remains comparatively under-represented in corpus-based research on reporting and citation. The findings suggest that Kazakh academic writers share several broad rhetorical practices with writers in English-medium academic discourse: they use reporting verbs to attribute information, represent research activity, convey interpretation, and position knowledge within disciplinary conversations. At the same time, the linguistic realisation of these functions reflects the structural resources of Kazakh. In particular, the interaction between a relatively concentrated lexical repertoire and a morphologically productive verbal system emerges as especially significant.

Overall, the results support the view that reporting verbs function as complex rhetorical tools. Their use in Kazakh academic writing is shaped by several interacting factors, including lexical preference, disciplinary convention, the type of scholarly activity being represented, and the morphosyntactic resources available in the language. The concentration of reporting activity in a small number of recurrent lemmas resembles patterns identified in previous studies of academic English, while the variation across disciplines confirms the context-sensitive nature of citation practices. Moreover, the presence of discourse, research, and mental acts illustrates that academic reporting extends well beyond the reproduction of prior statements; it encompasses the representation of research processes, intellectual interpretation, and evaluative positioning.

Most importantly, the morphosyntactic findings suggest that Kazakh requires particular attention as an agglutinative language. Reporting meanings may be encoded not only through individual lexical verbs but also through complex constructions involving converbs, auxiliaries, voice forms, and modal structures.

There are several ways in which future research could extend the present study. Firstly, larger and more balanced corpora could establish whether the disciplinary patterns identified here remain consistent across academic genres and time periods. Secondly, a quantitative analysis of the three functional categories would enable a more precise comparison to be made with previous studies that used the same classification. Thirdly, a detailed analysis of complex verbal constructions could examine how agglutinative morphology and auxiliary verbs contribute to aspectual, modal, evidential and evaluative meanings in academic reporting.

In conclusion, this study shows both similarities and differences between Kazakh academic writing and that of other academic discourse communities that have been studied previously. The results converge with international findings in showing that reporting verbs are central to citation, disciplinary knowledge construction and writer stance, and that their use varies across rhetorical and disciplinary contexts. However, the study also reveals a distinctive feature of Kazakh academic discourse: reporting functions are often realised through morphologically and syntactically complex verbal constructions.

INFORMATION ON FINANCING

This research is funded by the Science Committee of the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of the Republic of Kazakhstan (Grant No. AP23488585 “Digital Humanities: Creating a Corpus of Academic Kazakh”).

REFERENCES

1 Borg E. Citation practices in academic writing / In P. Thompson (Ed.) Patterns and perspectives: insights into EAP writing practice. – Reading, UK: Centre for Applied Language Studies, 2000. – P. 26-42.

2 Petric B. Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master’s theses // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. – 2007. – 6. – P. 238-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEAP.2007.09.002

3 Hyland K. Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing. – London: Longman. 2000. – 211 p.

4 Hyland K. Activity and evaluation: reporting practices in academic writing / In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) Academic discourse. – London: Longman, 2002. – P. 115-130.

5 Thompson P.A. Pedagogically-motivated corpus-based examination of PhD theses: macrostructure, citation practices and uses of modal verbs. – University of Birmingham, 2001.

6 Hyland K., Jiang F. K. Talking to the literature: stance taking in citing others’ work / In R. Wette (Ed.) Teaching and learning source-based writing: current perspectives and future directions. – Routledge. 2023. – P. 223-240.

7 Swales J. Aspects of article introductions // Research Report No. 1. – Birmingham: University of Aston, 1981.

8 Thompson, G., Ye Y. Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers // Applied Linguistics. – 1991. – Vol. 12. – No. 4. – P. 365-382.

9 Pennycook A. Borrowing others’ words: text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism // TESOL Quarterly. – 1996. – 30 (2). – P. 201-230. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588141

10 Pickard V. Citing previous writers: what can we say instead of “say”. Paper presented at RELC Conference. – Singapore 1993.

11 McEnery T., Kifle N.A. Epistemic modality in argumentative essay of second-language writers // In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) Academic discourse. – Harlow, England: Longman, 2002. – P. 182-195.

12 Bloch J. A concordance-based study of the use of reporting verbs as rhetorical devices in academic papers // Journal of Writing Research. – 2010. – 2 (2). – P. 219-244. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.7

13 Thompson P., Tribble C. Looking at citations: using corpora in English for academic purposes // Language Learning & Technology. – 2001. – 5(3). – P. 91–105. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.7

14 Charles M. Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines // English for Specific Purposes. – 2006. – 25(3). – P. 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.05.003

15 Mukhamedova R. Kazakh: A Comprehensive Grammar. – Routledge, 2015. – 323 p.

Received: 29.03.2026

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Қазақ академиялық жазуындағы баяндау етістіктері: корпусқа негізделген құрылымдық және дискурс үлгілері

Г.Ә. Сәрсеке
Л.Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті, Астана, 010000, Қазақстан

Бұл зерттеу лингвистикалық немесе педагогикалық тұрғыдан аз көңіл бөлінген қазақ академиялық жазуындағы хабарлау етістіктерін зерттейді. Хабарлау етістіктері дәйексөз келтіру тәжірибесінде маңызды рөл атқарады, себебі олар жазушыларға идеяларды, тұжырымдарды және бағалауларды басқа ғалымдарға сілтеуге, сонымен бірге өз үлестерін пәндік дискурсқа орналастыруға мүмкіндік береді.

Он бір гуманитарлық және тіл және әдебиет пәндері бойынша 110 ғылыми зерттеу мақалаларынан, 356 498 токеннен тұратын корпус құрастырылды. 5984 етістік леммасының бастапқы түгендеуінен семантикалық іріктеу баяндау функциялары бар 17 үміткер етістікті анықтады. 1398 конкорданс жиынтығының стратификацияланған үлгісі дискурс функциясы үшін қолмен аннотацияланды, нәтижесінде 939 расталған баяндау жағдайлары пайда болды.

Сандық талдау баяндау функциялары қайталанатын етістіктердің шағын жиынтығында (айт, жаз, анықта, ұрсын, байқа) шоғырланғанын, ал төмен жиілікті элементтер (мысалы, хабарла, пайымда, тұжырымда) функционалдық әртүрлілікке ықпал ететінін көрсетті. Пәндік таралу талдауы баяндау тығыздығындағы айырмашылықты көрсетті, әдебиет, діntану және лингвистика ең жоғары нормаланған жиіліктерді көрсетті. Сапалық талдау баяндау етістіктерін үш әрекетке негізделген санатқа жіктеді: дискурс актілері, зерттеу актілері және ой (когнитивтік) әрекеттері. Бұл санаттар қазақ академиялық жазушыларының мәлімдемелерді қалай анықтайтынын, тұжырымдарды қалай ұсынатынын және бұрынғы ғылыми зерттеулерді қалай бағалайтынын көрсетеді.

Зерттеу нәтижелері лексикалық концентрацияны да, функционалдық гетерогенділікті де көрсетеді, бұл қазақ академиялық дискурсы позиция мен атрибуцияны білдіруде икемділікті сақтай отырып, етістіктердің негізгі репертуарына сүйенетінін көрсетеді. Бұл зерттеу қазақ тіліндегі баяндау тәжірибелері туралы эмпирикалық дәлелдер келтіру, академиялық жазу педагогикасына түсінік беру және баяндау етістіктерінің құрылымын типологиялық тұрғыдан әртүрлі тілдерге кеңейту арқылы корпус лингвистикасына және дискурс талдауына үлес қосады.

Кілт сөздер: баяндау етістіктері, дәйексөз тәжірибелері, қазақ академиялық жазуы, корпус лингвистикасы, дискурс талдауы

ӘДЕБИЕТТЕР ТІЗІМІ

1 Borg E. Citation practices in academic writing / In P. Thompson (Ed.) Patterns and perspectives: insights into EAP writing practice. – Reading, UK: Centre for Applied Language Studies, 2000. – P. 26-42.

2 Petric B. Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. – 2007. – 6. – P. 238-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEAP.2007.09.002

3 Hyland K. Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing. – London: Longman. 2000. – 211 p.

4 Hyland K. Activity and evaluation: reporting practices in academic writing / In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) Academic discourse. – London: Longman, 2002. – P. 115-130.

5 Thompson P.A. Pedagogically-motivated corpus-based examination of PhD theses: macrostructure, citation practices and uses of modal verbs. – University of Birmingham, 2001.

6 Hyland K., Jiang F. K. Talking to the literature: stance taking in citing others' work / In R. Wette (Ed.) Teaching and learning source-based writing: current perspectives and future directions. – Routledge. 2023. – P. 223-240.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)
7 Swales J. Aspects of article introductions // Research Report No. 1. – Birmingham: University of Aston, 1981.
8 Thompson, G., Ye Y. Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers // Applied Linguistics. – 1991. – Vol. 12. – No. 4. – P. 365-382.
9 Pennycook A. Borrowing others' words: text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism // TESOL Quarterly. – 1996. – 30 (2). – P. 201-230. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588141
10 Pickard V. Citing previous writers: what can we say instead of "say". Paper presented at RELC Conference. – Singapore 1993.
11 McEnery T., Kifle N.A. Epistemic modality in argumentative essay of second-language writers // In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) Academic discourse. – Harlow, England: Longman, 2002. – P. 182-195.
12 Bloch J. A concordance-based study of the use of reporting verbs as rhetorical devices in academic papers // Journal of Writing Research. – 2010. – 2 (2). – P. 219-244. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.7
13 Thompson P., Tribble C. Looking at citations: using corpora in English for academic purposes // Language Learning & Technology. – 2001. – 5(3). – P. 91–105**.** https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.7
14 Charles M. Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines // English for Specific Purposes. – 2006. – 25(3). – P. 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.05.003
15 Mukhamedova R. Kazakh: A Comprehensive Grammar. – Routledge, 2015. – 323 p.

Материал 29.03.2026 баспаға түсті

Глаголы прямой и косвенной речи в казахском академическом письме: структурные и дискурсные модели на основе корпуса

Г.А. Сарсеке
Евразийский национальный университет им. Л.Н. Гумилёва, Астана, 010000, Казахстан

В данном исследовании изучаются глаголы, вводящие прямую речь, в казахской академической литературе - области, которой уделялось мало лингвистического и педагогического внимания. Глаголы, вводящие прямую речь, играют центральную роль в практике цитирования, поскольку позволяют авторам приписывать идеи, выводы и оценки другим ученым, одновременно позиционируя свой собственный вклад в рамках дисциплинарного дискурса.

Был составлен специализированный корпус из 110 рецензируемых научных статей по одиннадцати гуманитарным наукам, а также языкознанию и литературе, содержащий 356 498 токенов. На основе первоначального перечня из 5984 глагольных лемм семантический анализ выявил 17 глаголов-кандидатов с потенциальными функциями, вводящими прямую речь. Стратифицированная выборка из 1398 экземпляров конкорданса была вручную аннотирована на предмет дискурсивной функции, в результате чего было подтверждено 939 случаев ввода прямой речи.

Количественный анализ показал, что функции передачи информации сосредоточены в небольшом наборе повторяющихся глаголов (ait, jaz, anyqta, ūsyn, baianda), в то время как менее часто встречающиеся глаголы (например, habarla, paiymda, tūjyrymda) способствуют функциональному разнообразию. Анализ распределения по дисциплинам показал вариативность плотности передачи информации, при этом литература, религиоведение и лингвистика демонстрируют самые высокие нормализованные частоты. Качественный анализ классифицировал глаголы передачи информации на три категории, основанные на видах деятельности: дискурсивные акты, исследовательские акты и умственные акты. Эти категории показывают, как казахские академические авторы приписывают утверждения, представляют результаты и оценивают предыдущие исследования.

ISSN 2788-7979 (online)

Результаты выявляют как лексическую концентрацию, так и функциональную неоднородность, предполагая, что казахский академический дискурс опирается на основной репертуар глаголов, сохраняя при этом гибкость в выражении позиции и приписывании. Данное исследование вносит вклад в корпусную лингвистику и дискурсивный анализ, предоставляя эмпирические данные о практике цитирования в казахском языке, предлагая идеи для обучения академическому письму и расширяя рамки глаголов, используемых для цитирования, на типологически разнообразные языки.

Ключевые слова: глаголы, используемые для цитирования, казахское академическое письмо, корпусная лингвистика, дискурсивный анализ

СПИСОК ЛИТЕРАТУРЫ

1 Borg E. Citation practices in academic writing / In P. Thompson (Ed.) Patterns and perspectives: insights into EAP writing practice. – Reading, UK: Centre for Applied Language Studies, 2000. – P. 26-42.
2 Petric B. Rhetorical functions of citations in high- and low-rated master's theses // Journal of English for Academic Purposes. – 2007. – 6. – P. 238-253. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JEAP.2007.09.002
3 Hyland K. Disciplinary discourses: social interactions in academic writing. – London: Longman. 2000. – 211 p.
4 Hyland K. Activity and evaluation: reporting practices in academic writing / In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) Academic discourse. – London: Longman, 2002. – P. 115-130.
5 Thompson P.A. Pedagogically-motivated corpus-based examination of PhD theses: macrostructure, citation practices and uses of modal verbs. – University of Birmingham, 2001.
6 Hyland K., Jiang F. K. Talking to the literature: stance taking in citing others' work / In R. Wette (Ed.) Teaching and learning source-based writing: current perspectives and future directions. – Routledge. 2023. – P. 223-240.
7 Swales J. Aspects of article introductions // Research Report No. 1. – Birmingham: University of Aston, 1981.
8 Thompson, G., Ye Y. Evaluation in the reporting verbs used in academic papers // Applied Linguistics. – 1991. – Vol. 12. – No. 4. – P. 365-382.
9 Pennycook A. Borrowing others' words: text, ownership, memory, and plagiarism // TESOL Quarterly. – 1996. – 30 (2). – P. 201-230. https://doi.org/10.2307/3588141
10 Pickard V. Citing previous writers: what can we say instead of "say". Paper presented at RELC Conference. – Singapore 1993.
11 McEnery T., Kifle N.A. Epistemic modality in argumentative essay of second-language writers // In J. Flowerdew (Ed.) Academic discourse. – Harlow, England: Longman, 2002. – P. 182-195.
12 Bloch J. A concordance-based study of the use of reporting verbs as rhetorical devices in academic papers // Journal of Writing Research. – 2010. – 2 (2). – P. 219-244. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.7
13 Thompson P., Tribble C. Looking at citations: using corpora in English for academic purposes // Language Learning & Technology. – 2001. – 5(3). – P. 91–105. https://doi.org/10.17239/jowr-2010.02.02.7
14 Charles M. Phraseological patterns in reporting clauses used in citation: A corpus-based study of theses in two disciplines // English for Specific Purposes. – 2006. – 25(3). – P. 310–331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2005.05.003
15 Mukhamedova R. Kazakh: A Comprehensive Grammar. – Routledge, 2015. – 323 p.

Материал поступил в редакцию журнала 29.03.2026