

From Examples to Evaluation: Local Grammar Patterns in Biological Science Book Reviews

LENG HONG ANG

*School of Humanities,
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia*

MENGYU HE*

*School of Foreign Languages,
Hubei University of Economics, China
mengyuhe1989@gmail.com*

CHRISTINA SOOK BENG ONG

*School of Humanities,
Universiti Sains Malaysia, Malaysia*

ABSTRACT

This study investigates exemplification in biological science book reviews through a corpus-based local grammar approach. Although previous studies have examined exemplification in research articles, student writing, English as an academic lingua franca, and AI-generated texts, little attention has been paid to how examples function in academic book reviews, especially in the sciences. To address this gap, we compiled a corpus of 100 expert-written biological science book reviews comprising 99,664 words and manually analysed 452 functional instances of exemplification in terms of markers and local grammar patterns. The findings show that exemplification is strongly marker-led, with such as, including, include(s)/included, and for example accounting for 73.1% of all instances. The two most frequent local grammar patterns were PA1: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC and PA2: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC, which together accounted for 71.4% of the instances. PA1 typically specifies broader biological categories through concrete examples such as species, habitats, methods, or processes, whereas PA2 draws examples directly from the reviewed book, including its chapters, topics, case studies, illustrations, and other features. Importantly, the evaluative patterns also show that reviewers use such examples to substantiate praise and specify the grounds for criticism or limitation. Thus, exemplification enables reviewers to move from general judgements to identifiable disciplinary or textual evidence, making their evaluations more concrete, accountable, and persuasive. The findings extend existing local grammar descriptions by identifying Exemplification-BC as a genre-sensitive category and offer useful implications for research on academic book reviews and English for Academic Purposes pedagogy.

Keywords: Exemplification; local grammar; biological science; academic book reviews; corpus-based

INTRODUCTION

Academic book reviews are an established evaluative genre in scholarly communication. Rather than merely summarising the contents of a book, reviewers assess its contribution, position it within disciplinary conversations, and offer judgements about its relevance and value to readers (Hyland & Diani, 2009; Jiang & Hyland, 2024). In doing so, book reviews typically combine several rhetorical purposes, including description, evaluation, criticism, recommendation, and disciplinary positioning (Salager-Meyer et al., 2007; Zou & Hyland, 2020). They therefore provide a useful context for examining how scholars move from describing published knowledge to making disciplinary judgements about it. For novice scholars in particular, book reviews can also

provide insights into the norms and expectations that shape evaluative academic writing (Jiang & Hyland, 2024).

These evaluative functions are especially relevant to biological science book reviews. Academic communication is shaped by disciplinary ways of constructing knowledge, presenting evidence, and establishing relevance (Hyland, 2004). In biological science, this often involves reference to observable phenomena, organisms, processes, classifications, methods, and empirical cases. Recent research on exemplification further suggests that biology displays distinctive practices in its use of examples. Amini Faskhodi et al. (2026), for instance, found that exemplification in biology research articles tends to be more concrete and context-specific than in applied linguistics. This suggests that examples may play an important role in making biological content identifiable and disciplinary meanings more precise. In book reviews, such examples may include particular species, biological processes, ecological issues, research methods, chapters, illustrations, case studies, or other features of the reviewed work.

Exemplification is widely recognised as a discourse strategy through which writers connect general propositions with more specific instances (Hyland, 2007; Triki, 2021). In academic discourse, examples can clarify meanings, elaborate general statements, and support arguments by making abstract or broad claims more accessible to readers (Hyland, 2007). Earlier studies often approached exemplification through visible linguistic markers such as *for example*, *for instance*, *e.g.*, and *such as*. From this perspective, exemplification was commonly treated as a form of elaboration, inclusive apposition, or code glossing (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013; Hyland, 2007; Quirk et al., 1985). While this approach has been useful for identifying how examples are signalled, it does not fully explain how different components of an exemplifying act work together.

More recent local grammar research has addressed this limitation by treating exemplification as a discourse act composed of recurring functional elements and lexicogrammatical patterns. Su and Zhang (2020), for example, showed that exemplification in linguistics research articles can be analysed in terms of elements such as the item being exemplified, the indicator introducing the example, and the exemplification itself. Subsequent studies have further demonstrated that these patterns may vary over time, across writer groups, and across disciplinary or communicative contexts (Jiang & Su, 2025, 2026; Su et al., 2021, 2022). Thus, a local grammar approach allows us to move beyond counting individual markers and to examine how examples are structurally organised and rhetorically deployed in particular genres.

Despite this growing body of research, the contexts in which exemplification has been investigated remain relatively restricted. Local grammar studies have examined exemplification in linguistics research articles (Su & Zhang, 2020; Su et al., 2021), student and expert academic writing (Su et al., 2022), English as an academic lingua franca research writing (Jiang & Su, 2025), and, more recently, biology and applied linguistics research articles (Amini Faskhodi et al., 2026). Collectively, these studies show that exemplification is sensitive to disciplinary, writer-related, and contextual factors. For example, Amini Faskhodi et al. (2026) identified significant differences in the frequency and functional realisation of exemplification between biology and applied linguistics research articles. Such findings indicate that exemplification cannot necessarily be described through a single set of preferred patterns across academic contexts.

Academic book reviews, however, have not received comparable attention in research on exemplification. Studies of book reviews have instead concentrated on areas such as evaluation, criticism, rhetorical organisation, disciplinary engagement, scholars' experiences of writing reviews, and differences between human- and AI-generated reviews (Jiang & Hyland, 2024; Salager-Meyer et al., 2007; Yao & Liu, 2025; Zou & Hyland, 2020). This research establishes book

reviews as an evaluative genre in which reviewers describe a publication, assess its contribution, identify its strengths and weaknesses, and position it for a disciplinary readership. What remains unclear, however, is how exemplification is linguistically organised within these evaluative activities. We do not yet know whether the local grammar patterns identified in research writing are also characteristic of book reviews, whether book reviews give rise to additional patterns, or what kinds of entities reviewers typically select as examples.

As corpus-based research has demonstrated disciplinary variation in recurrent linguistic patterning (Ang & Tan, 2018; Ong & Yuen, 2014), the transferability of such patterns across disciplinary and genre contexts cannot be assumed. Amini Faskhodi et al. (2026) provide empirical evidence that disciplinary context influences exemplification in biology research articles, but their findings are specific to the research-article genre. They do not establish how exemplification is realised in biological science book reviews or whether the same local grammar patterns are applicable to this genre. Rather than assuming that exemplification is frequent, or necessarily functions differently in book reviews, we take this absence of empirical evidence as the starting point for the present study.

There is also a clear genre-based reason for examining this question because research articles and book reviews serve different primary communicative purposes. Research articles principally report, interpret, and argue for new knowledge, whereas book reviews evaluate an existing scholarly publication for a disciplinary readership (Hyland & Diani, 2009; Jiang & Hyland, 2024). Consequently, the object around which exemplification is organised may also differ. In a research article, an example may illustrate a concept, a methodological procedure, a finding, or previous research. In a book review, by contrast, a reviewer may draw on a chapter, case study, species, illustration, bibliography, topic, or even an omission from the reviewed book when describing or evaluating it. Whether such genre-specific examples can be adequately captured by existing local grammar categories remains an empirical question.

Accordingly, we investigate exemplification in biological science book reviews without presupposing either its prevalence or its particular functional patterning. Using a corpus-based local grammar approach, we examine the markers through which exemplification is realised and identify the recurrent functional patterns that emerge from the corpus. In doing so, we aim to provide an empirical description of exemplification in an academic genre that has not previously been examined from this perspective and to determine whether existing local grammar categories require adaptation for book-review discourse. Specifically, the study addresses the following research questions:

1. What exemplification markers are used in biological science book reviews?
2. What are the common local grammar patterns of exemplification in biological science book reviews?

LITERATURE REVIEW

LOCAL GRAMMAR AS A FUNCTION-ORIENTED APPROACH

Academic writing is organised not only through general grammatical structures but also through patterned and recognisable ways of communicating. Writers define concepts, classify phenomena, report previous studies, evaluate claims, and provide examples. To understand these functions, it is useful to adopt an approach that begins with discourse meaning and communicative purpose rather than with general grammatical categories. Local grammar offers such an approach. Instead of asking how grammar works in general, local grammar examines how a specific discourse function is typically realised in actual texts. The idea can be traced back to Gross's (1997) work on local grammars and finite-state descriptions of language and has since been developed in corpus-informed studies of evaluation, speech acts, and academic discourse acts (Gross, 1997; Hunston & Sinclair, 2000; Hunston & Su, 2019; Su, 2017).

The strength of local grammar lies in its descriptive precision. For example, evaluative meanings may be realised through adjectives, nouns, clauses, and other patterns when viewed through general grammar. However, when evaluation is treated as the target function, its recurring forms become more visible (Hunston & Sinclair, 2000). Similarly, Hunston and Su (2019) show that patterns are linked to meanings in local grammar, bringing the approach closer to constructional accounts of language. More recently, Su et al. (2025) argue that local grammar patterns of discourse acts can be understood as form-meaning pairings, or constructions, in academic writing.

Nevertheless, local grammar research also presents a methodological challenge. Because the approach depends on identifying functional elements, the analyst must determine what constitutes part of the discourse act and how each element should be labelled. Local grammar therefore involves greater interpretive analysis than simply counting linguistic markers. At the same time, this is precisely why it is useful for the present study. An adequate account of examples in book reviews cannot be achieved by examining only markers such as *for example* or *e.g.* A local grammar approach allows us to examine how examples are constructed and what rhetorical work they perform.

LOCAL GRAMMAR AND EAP PEDAGOGY

One important aspect of local grammar research is its relevance to English for Academic Purposes (EAP). In academic writing, authors regularly perform discourse acts such as defining, classifying, exemplifying, and evaluating. These are not merely decorative features of academic prose; they are central to how writers structure knowledge, guide readers, and make arguments persuasive. Su and Zhang (2020) show how exemplification in linguistics research articles can be analysed through local grammar to identify recurring lexico-grammatical patterns and discourse-semantic regularities. Zhang and Su (2021) further demonstrate how local grammar descriptions of exemplification can be applied in the classroom, highlighting their potential value for EAP teaching.

Other studies have applied the same pedagogical logic to different academic discourse acts. Zhang and Su (2022) identify local grammar patterns of definition in linguistics research articles and show how writers use recurrent forms to introduce and delineate important concepts. Zhang (2025) also develops a local grammar of classification in academic discourse, explaining how writers organise entities or phenomena into meaningful categories. Together, these studies show

that local grammar is not limited to exemplification but can describe a wider range of discourse acts relevant to academic writing. Su et al. (2024) extend this pedagogical direction by combining pattern grammar, local grammar, and construction grammar in resources for EAP writing. This integration is useful because it connects linguistic patterns to their discourse purposes and communicative functions. In practice, such work can help learners understand what expressions are available and when and why particular expressions are appropriate in academic contexts.

EXEMPLIFICATION IN ACADEMIC DISCOURSE

Exemplification is fundamental to academic communication because it links abstract claims with concrete instances. Hyland (2007) treats exemplification as a form of glossing that helps writers clarify meanings and support arguments. Triki (2021) further shows that examples are not merely illustrative but also have structural, semantic, and metadiscursive properties that vary across disciplines. In other words, examples can contribute to both explanation and persuasion.

Earlier studies of exemplification have often focused on visible markers such as *e.g.*, *for example*, and *such as*. In grammar-based accounts, exemplification is commonly discussed in relation to inclusive apposition, elaboration, or clause-combining relations (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2013; Quirk et al., 1985). This marker-based approach has been useful because it shows that exemplification is a common feature of academic prose across different forms and genres. However, it also has a clear limitation, i.e. it treats exemplification mainly as a textual signal rather than as a complete discourse act. A marker may tell readers that an example is coming, but it does not explain what is being exemplified, what kind of example has been selected, or how the example contributes to the writer's argument.

Local grammar studies offer a way to move beyond this limitation. Instead of treating exemplification only as a marker-driven feature, they analyse it as a discourse act made up of functional elements. For instance, Su and Zhang (2020) show that exemplification in linguistics research articles can be described in terms of the item being exemplified, the indicator that introduces the example, and the exemplification itself. Building on this work, Su et al. (2021) show that exemplification patterns also change over time, with more recent linguistics research articles displaying simpler and more explicit patterns. Further research on L2 academic writing shows that expert writers use exemplification more flexibly and strategically than student writers (Su et al., 2022). These studies suggest that exemplification is not merely a superficial feature of academic prose; it can also provide insights into writers' pragmatic control and rhetorical maturity.

At the same time, existing research has shown that exemplification is highly context-dependent. Su et al. (2022) found that Chinese MA student writers used less expert-like exemplification practices, particularly when referring to relevant studies. Jiang and Su (2025) also found that exemplification in English as an academic lingua franca varies according to writers' L1 backgrounds, academic status, and discipline. More recently, Jiang and Su (2026) extended this line of research by comparing ChatGPT-generated and student argumentative writing. They found that AI-generated texts may appear fluent and credible but are often more routinised in their use of exemplification. These studies are valuable because they demonstrate that exemplification is shaped by writer background, proficiency, discipline, and mode of production. However, they also point to an important gap: exemplification has been studied mainly in research articles and learner writing, while academic book reviews remain largely unexplored.

DISCIPLINARY VARIATION AND BIOLOGICAL SCIENCE

Disciplinary variation is important because examples may carry different rhetorical value across fields. A discipline's ways of building knowledge, arguing, and evaluating evidence shape what counts as a convincing example. The distinction between hard and soft disciplines is often traced to Biglan's (1973) classification and was later developed in accounts of disciplinary cultures (Becher & Trowler, 2001). In softer fields, examples may help writers interpret ideas, position themselves within the literature, and persuade readers through illustrative cases. In harder fields, examples are more likely to involve empirical phenomena, methods, data, taxonomies, organisms, or observable cases because these constitute forms of evidence that carry disciplinary weight (Hyland, 2004). This distinction is particularly relevant to the present study because recent research shows that exemplification in biology is more concrete, selective, and context-specific than in applied linguistics (Amini Faskhodi et al., 2026), confirming that biology has distinctive exemplification practices.

However, these findings also raise an important genre-related question. Biology research articles and biological science book reviews do not perform the same rhetorical work. Research articles report new findings and construct empirical claims, whereas book reviews assess already published knowledge for a disciplinary audience. The patterns of exemplification identified in biology research articles therefore cannot simply be generalised to biological science book reviews. In reviews, examples may not primarily provide evidence for new research claims; instead, they may help justify reviewers' evaluative judgements. For example, a reviewer might praise or criticise a book's treatment of evolution, identify insufficient coverage of molecular research, or recommend the book to readers in conservation biology. In this sense, examples in biological science book reviews may be shaped both by the empirical orientation of the discipline and by the evaluative purpose of the genre.

ACADEMIC BOOK REVIEWS AS EVALUATIVE GENRES

Academic book reviews are particularly relevant to the study of evaluation because evaluation is central to their communicative purpose. Hyland and Diani (2009) identify review genres as important sites of academic evaluation, while Jiang and Hyland (2024) show that novice scholars engage with book reviews to understand disciplinary norms, reader expectations, and publishing practices. Book reviews are therefore not merely short academic texts; they are sites where scholars demonstrate disciplinary judgement and learn the conventions of scholarly evaluation.

Research on academic book reviews has focused on move structure, criticism, praise, stance, mitigation, and disciplinary identity. For example, Zou and Hyland (2020) compare criticism in academic book reviews and academic blog comments and find that book reviews tend to manage negative evaluation in a more conventionalised academic manner. Salager-Meyer et al. (2007), in their diachronic study of medical book reviews, also show that scientific criticism has changed over time and has increasingly been mediated by considerations of collegiality. More recently, Yao and Liu (2025) compared GPT-generated and scholar-written academic book reviews and found that human reviewers demonstrated stronger disciplinary contextualisation and rhetorical judgement, whereas GPT-generated reviews were more formulaic. These studies suggest that book reviews are not simply summaries of published books but rich evaluative texts in which reviewers negotiate expertise, criticism, and disciplinary expectations.

Although these studies are valuable, one important aspect remains underexplored. They tell us a great deal about how reviewers assess, criticise, and organise reviews, but relatively little about how reviewers use examples to construct and support those evaluations. This matters because book-review assessment often requires evidence. A reviewer cannot simply claim that a book is comprehensive, outdated, useful, selective, accessible, or weak; such judgements are strengthened by examples from the book's contents, topics, chapters, cases, or omissions. Exemplification may therefore be one mechanism through which evaluation becomes persuasive in book reviews.

In general, the literature reveals an important but underexplored intersection. Local grammar studies have provided increasingly detailed accounts of exemplification, but mainly in research articles and learner writing. Meanwhile, studies of book reviews have shown that reviews are highly evaluative and disciplinary, but they have rarely addressed exemplification as a discourse act. Although exemplification has been investigated in biology research articles, biological science book reviews have not been examined systematically from this perspective. This gap has both theoretical and pedagogical significance. Theoretically, biological science book reviews provide a context in which to examine how exemplification operates when the primary purpose is evaluation rather than knowledge reporting. Pedagogically, they can show novice writers how examples support praise, criticism, recommendation, and disciplinary positioning. Hence, this study uses a local grammar approach to identify exemplification markers and patterns in biological science book reviews and to examine how these patterns contribute to evaluative meanings.

METHODOLOGY

LOCAL GRAMMAR APPROACH

This study adopts a local grammar approach to analyse exemplification in biological science book reviews. Local grammar refers to a function-oriented description of language developed for a restricted semantic or discourse domain rather than for the language system as a whole (Gross, 1997; Hunston & Sinclair, 2000). Unlike general grammar, which describes broad grammatical categories and relationships such as nouns, verbs, clauses, modification and complementation, a local grammar begins with a specific communicative function and identifies the recurrent linguistic elements through which that function is realised. Thus, instead of asking whether an exemplifying expression is a noun phrase, clause, or prepositional phrase, local grammar asks what role each part of the expression performs in the discourse act of exemplification.

This functional orientation distinguishes local grammar from more general grammatical descriptions. For example, in the expression *small cetaceans, such as the baiji and vaquita*, a traditional grammatical analysis might describe *small cetaceans* and *the baiji and vaquita* as noun phrases and *such as* as a linking expression. A local grammar analysis, by contrast, describes *small cetaceans* as the Exemplified, *such as* as the Indicator, and *the baiji and vaquita* as the Exemplification-SC. Local grammar therefore captures the relationship between linguistic form and the discourse function being performed.

Local grammar is also different from a purely marker-based approach to exemplification. Searching only for expressions like *for example*, *for instance*, *such as*, or *including* can identify potential instances, but it does not explain what is being exemplified, what type of example is provided, or how the components of the exemplifying act are organised. Local grammar addresses this limitation by analysing the functional configuration surrounding the marker (Su & Zhang, 2020; Su et al., 2021). In this sense, it provides a more detailed account of exemplification as a discourse act rather than treating it simply as the occurrence of an exemplification marker.

This approach is particularly suitable for the present study because our aim is not only to identify how often exemplification markers occur but also to determine how exemplification is structurally realised in biological science book reviews. Previous studies have shown that local grammar can reveal recurrent form-function relationships in academic discourse and can be adapted to different discourse acts and communicative contexts (Hunston & Su, 2019; Su & Zhang, 2020; Su et al., 2021). We therefore use the established local grammar of exemplification as our analytical starting point while allowing additional functional categories to emerge where the book-review genre requires them. In particular, the category Exemplification-BC was introduced to capture examples drawn directly from the content of the reviewed book.

CORPUS DESIGN

This study adopted a corpus-based design to examine how exemplification is realised in biological science academic book reviews. This design was chosen because the study is concerned with recurrent language patterns in naturally occurring academic texts rather than with writers' reported perceptions or experimentally elicited language use. A corpus-based approach is consistent with previous local grammar studies that begin with authentic academic corpora and proceed to functional annotation and interpretation (Su & Zhang, 2020; Su et al., 2021; Zhang & Su, 2021).

The corpus consists of 100 peer-reviewed biological science academic book reviews published between 2000 and 2024, with a total size of 99,664 words. The period 2000–2024 was chosen to capture contemporary book-review practices while allowing a sufficiently broad temporal range. In this study, biological science is understood broadly to include areas such as ecology, evolution, genetics, molecular biology, biodiversity, conservation, zoology, botany, and related life-science fields. All reviews were collected from established journals indexed in the JSTOR database. JSTOR was selected because it provides access to long-established scholarly journals and enables book reviews to be retrieved from clearly identifiable disciplinary contexts. Most importantly, this helped to ensure that the texts analysed in the study were academic book reviews rather than publisher blurbs, online reader reviews, short promotional notices, or scientific commentary.

We included only full-length academic book reviews. We excluded short notices, editorial announcements, book lists, review essays covering multiple books without sustained evaluation of individual works, and non-evaluative descriptions. This was necessary because the study focuses on exemplification as a discourse act that contributes to evaluation. Full-length reviews provide sufficient textual space to summarise a book, assess its contribution, identify strengths and weaknesses, and support evaluations with examples. In this sense, they are better suited to local grammar analysis than short notices containing few or no examples.

IDENTIFICATION OF EXEMPLIFICATION

In this study, exemplification is defined as a discourse act in which a writer clarifies, specifies, or supports a more general point by providing one or more concrete instances. This definition follows previous work that treats exemplification as a means of linking general claims with specific examples (Hyland, 2007; Su & Zhang, 2020; Triki, 2021). However, the study does not treat exemplification merely as the occurrence of markers *for example* or *such as*. Instead, following local grammar research, exemplification is analysed as a functional act realised through patterned elements (Su & Zhang, 2020; Su et al., 2021).

AntConc version 4.1.4 (Anthony, 2022) was used for corpus analysis and data generation. The identification process involved two stages. First, potential instances of exemplification were retrieved through a marker-based search. The search list *included* common exemplification markers reported in previous studies, i.e. *for example*, *for instance*, *e.g.*, *such as*, *including*, *include*, *includes*, *included*, *like*, *especially*, *particularly*, *as an example*, *an example of*, *illustrate*, *illustrates*, *illustrated by*, and *case in point*. These markers were used as entry points into the corpus rather than as automatic evidence of exemplification.

Second, all retrieved instances were manually checked in context. This step was essential because some markers are multifunctional. For instance, *like* may function as a verb or comparison marker rather than as an exemplification marker, while *including* may sometimes introduce additions rather than examples. Conversely, some examples may be embedded in clauses without obvious markers. We therefore examined each marker and its co-text to determine whether it genuinely performed the discourse act of exemplification.

An instance was included if it met two criteria. First, there had to be a recoverable relationship between a more general element and a more specific instance. Second, the specific instance had to explain, specify, illustrate, or support the general element. For example, if a reviewer stated that a book covered “a wide range of ecological issues” and then mentioned “invasive species, habitat fragmentation, and climate-driven range shifts”, this would be treated as an instance of exemplification because the specific items clarify the broader claim about coverage.

LOCAL GRAMMAR ELEMENTS

The local grammar framework used in this study was adapted from Su et al.’s (2021) analysis of exemplification in linguistics research articles, which proposed several functional elements, including Exemplified, Exemplification-RS, Exemplification-SC, Indicator, Initiator, Researcher, Hinge and Supporting statement. These elements provided a useful starting point because they distinguish the discourse functions involved in exemplification from surface grammatical forms.

It should be noted that we made some adaptations because the present study examines book reviews rather than research articles. In research articles, examples may be drawn from relevant studies, methodological cases, or subcategories of concepts. However, examples in book reviews are often drawn from the book itself, including its chapters, topics, illustrations, species, case studies, methods, or omissions. Because book reviews are strongly evaluative, examples often occur alongside praise, criticism, recommendation, or interpretations of scope. Hence, the original elements were retained where applicable and modified where the genre required a more appropriate label. The adapted local grammar elements are shown in Table 1.

TABLE 1. Local grammar elements and descriptions

Element	Description in this study	Adaptation for book reviews
Exemplified	The general claim, topic, category, feature, or evaluation being clarified or supported.	This may be a claim about the book's content or coverage, or an evaluative claim about its usefulness, originality, limitations, or accessibility.
Indicator	The marker signalling exemplification, such as <i>for example, such as, including, or for instance</i> .	Retained from Su et al. (2021), but marker function was always checked manually.
Exemplification-SC	A specific subcategory, item, case, topic, organism, method, chapter, or biological phenomenon used to illustrate a broader category.	Adapted from Su et al.'s "subcategory" element. In book reviews, this often refers to book content or disciplinary examples rather than conceptual subcategories only.
Exemplification-RS	An example realised through reference to relevant studies, scholars, theories, or research traditions.	Retained but expected to occur less frequently than in research articles. In book reviews, this may include comparisons with other works or reference to established scholarship.
Exemplification-BC	An example drawn directly from the reviewed book's content, such as a chapter, section, illustration, case study, species, experiment, or topic.	Added for the book-review genre because reviewers frequently substantiate evaluation by pointing to concrete parts of the book. BC stands for "book content".
Initiator	A phrase or clause that introduces or frames the act of exemplifying.	Retained from Su et al. (2021). In book reviews, initiators may include expressions such as <i>the book discusses, the chapters cover, the author considers, or readers will find</i> .
Reviewer	The person or reviewing voice performing the act of exemplification.	Adapted from Su et al.'s "Researcher". Since the present genre is the book review, the relevant discourse role is the reviewer rather than the researcher. This element is marked only when the reviewing voice is explicit, as in <i>I was particularly struck by...</i> or <i>we see this in...</i>
Hinge	A linking element that connects parts of the exemplification structure.	Retained from Su et al. (2021). Typical hinges include relational or linking expressions such as <i>in, through, by, when</i> , or clauses that connect the general claim and example.
Supporting statement	Additional information that clarifies or strengthens either the exemplified element or the example.	Retained, but interpreted in relation to evaluation. Supporting statements may explain why an example matters, why it supports praise or criticism, or how it affects the book's value.
Evaluation	The reviewer's positive, negative, or mixed assessment associated with the exemplification.	Added because evaluation is central to book reviews. This element captures how the example contributes to praise, criticism, recommendation, limitation, or disciplinary positioning.

Exemplification-BC and Evaluation are the two most important adaptations made in this study. Exemplification-BC was added because the reviewed book itself is a frequent source of examples in book reviews. For instance, a reviewer may support a claim that a book is comprehensive by listing the topics or chapters it covers. Similarly, a reviewer may support criticism by naming a missing topic or an underdeveloped case. Evaluation was added because examples in book reviews often do more than clarify meaning; they also help make evaluative judgements accountable.

At the same time, the distinction between Exemplification-RS and Exemplification-SC remains useful. In biological science book reviews, reviewers may refer to relevant studies, theories, or other publications when positioning the book in a broader context. They may also provide subcategories, such as particular species, biological processes, habitats, or methods, to illustrate broader claims. The adapted model therefore retains the analytical strengths of Su et al.'s (2021) framework while remaining sensitive to the book-review genre.

ANNOTATION PROCEDURE

After the instances of exemplification were identified, each instance was annotated according to the adapted local grammar elements. The annotation focused on functional roles rather than grammatical categories. In other words, the question was not whether a segment was a noun phrase, clause, or prepositional phrase, but what role it played in the act of exemplification. For example, in this sentence “The volume is impressively broad, including chapters on island biogeography, conservation genetics, and invasive species”, the phrase “The volume is impressively broad” would be coded as Exemplified + Evaluation, “including” as Indicator, and “chapters on island biogeography, conservation genetics, and invasive species” as Exemplification-BC. If the reviewer then added that these chapters make the book useful for advanced undergraduates, the additional clause would be coded as a Supporting statement because it explains the evaluative significance of the examples.

The annotation was carried out in two steps. First, the boundary of each exemplification instance was determined by identifying the general element being exemplified and the specific example or examples provided. Second, the internal functional elements were annotated.

PATTERN IDENTIFICATION

Once all instances had been annotated, recurrent local grammar patterns were identified. These patterns were developed inductively from the corpus but were informed by those reported in Su et al. (2021). For example, patterns such as Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC and Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-RS were expected because they had been identified in previous local grammar studies of exemplification. However, the book-review corpus was also allowed to yield genre-specific patterns. In particular, examples drawn from the reviewed book could produce patterns such as:

Evaluation + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC
Initiator + Indicator + Exemplification-BC + Supporting statement
Exemplification-BC + Hinge + Evaluation
Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC + Evaluation

These possible patterns reflect the evaluative nature of book reviews. Unlike research articles, where exemplification often supports conceptual explanation or literature-based argumentation, examples in book reviews frequently support judgements about a book’s scope, accuracy, usefulness, novelty, or limitations. Pattern identification was therefore not limited to reproducing previous patterns; it also allowed new configurations to emerge from the corpus.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Question 1: What exemplification markers are used in biological science book reviews? Table 2 presents the distribution of exemplification markers in the corpus. In total, we identified 452 functional instances of exemplification in the 100 biological science book reviews, equivalent to 45.23 instances per 10,000 words.

TABLE 2. Exemplification markers and the distribution

Marker	Frequency	Percentage
such as	102	22.6
including	86	19.0
include(s)/included	73	16.2
for example	69	15.3
e.g.	33	7.3
illustrate(s)/illustrated	28	6.2
example(s)	23	5.1
case(s)	21	4.6
for instance	13	2.9
like / particularly / especially	4	0.8
Total	452	100

The clearest finding is that exemplification in the corpus is strongly marker-led. The four most frequent forms are *such as*, *including*, *include(s)/included*, and *for example*, which account for 73.1% of all instances. More importantly, the three listing-oriented forms, namely *such as*, *including*, and *include(s)/included*, make up 57.7% of the dataset. This distribution suggests that biological science reviewers often exemplify by specifying members of a set, topics within a book, organisms within a biological category, or cases within a wider phenomenon. In other words, exemplification frequently provides a compact way of making coverage visible. This finding is consistent with Hyland's (2007) view that examples help writers clarify and support meanings, but it also reveals something more specific about the genre. In research articles, examples may support claims, illustrate concepts, or position findings in relation to earlier scholarship. On the contrary, in book reviews, reviewers often need to show what a book contains and why that content matters. Listing markers are well suited to this task because they allow reviewers to compress substantial content into a relatively short evaluative space.

The dominance of *such as* is particularly revealing. *Such as* typically links a superordinate term to one or more concrete members. In the biological sciences, these members are often species, habitats, biological processes, methodological topics, or ecological issues. A typical instance is shown below:

- 1) *Many of these chapters contain information that applies to all cetaceans, such as dolphin evolution, structure and function, and life history.*

Here, the marker *such as* enables the reviewer to move from a broad assessment of the chapters to a set of concrete book-content topics. This is not simply a neutral list. By naming *dolphin evolution, structure and function, and life history*, the reviewer makes the book's disciplinary scope visible to readers who may be deciding whether the volume is relevant to their interests. The example therefore performs a dual role: it clarifies content and supports the review's assessment of the book's breadth.

Including and *include(s)/included* function in a similar but slightly different way. These markers often occur in clauses where the book, chapter, section, or author is the grammatical subject. For example, reviewers may state that a book includes a bibliography, case studies, or chapters on particular topics. This gives the exemplification a distinctly genre-specific character because the marker becomes part of the reviewer's act of accounting for the book's content. Reviewers are not merely providing examples from biology; they are itemising what the reviewed book offers. This is why we treat book-content exemplification as a genre-specific category in this study.

The marker *for example*, which accounts for 15.3% of the instances, has a different rhetorical profile. It tends to introduce a fuller illustrative statement rather than a short list. In the corpus, *for example* is often used when the reviewer wants to develop a point, support criticism, or provide a more extended illustration as shown in example 2.

- 2) *Moreover, a basic descriptive overview or a few statistics, for example about land use patterns and their changes, would have been useful for readers unfamiliar with this remote and little-known but fascinating region.*

In this case, *for example* does not simply add another item to a list. It specifies the kind of background information that the reviewer believes the book should have provided. The marker therefore helps turn a general criticism into a concrete and defensible one. This is important in book reviews because criticism needs to be both clear and collegial. By identifying land use patterns as an example of the missing information, the reviewer avoids a vague complaint and instead specifies an area in which the book could have served readers better.

The relatively smaller share of *e.g.* (7.3%) is also worth noting. The abbreviation is compact and familiar in academic prose, but it is visually denser and somewhat less reader-friendly than *such as* or *for example*. Its use in the corpus appears to be associated with more economical, specialist-oriented examples, often where the reviewer assumes that readers can readily process condensed references. This supports Triki's (2021, 2024) argument that exemplification choices are shaped by both the structure of the exemplifying unit and the writer's rhetorical preferences. In our corpus, reviewers do not avoid *e.g.*, but they appear to prefer more integrated and readable markers when describing book content or addressing a broader disciplinary readership.

The less frequent markers, such as *illustrate(s)/illustrated*, *example(s)*, *case(s)*, and *for instance*, are still analytically important. They often occur when the example itself becomes part of the reviewer's evaluation. Words such as *examples* and *cases* do not merely signal the presence of an instance; they can also name the book's pedagogical or evidential resources. When a reviewer writes that a book is "peppered with fascinating *examples*", the *examples* are not peripheral decorations. They form part of what makes the book approachable, persuasive, and useful. Thus, while the frequency pattern favours listing markers, the less frequent forms remind us that exemplification in book reviews is not only about describing content; it can also contribute to evaluating how well that content works for readers.

Research Question 2: What are the common local grammar patterns of exemplification in biological science book reviews?

We analysed the 452 instances according to their local grammar patterns. Table 3 presents the local grammar patterns of exemplification identified in this study.

TABLE 3. Local grammar patterns of exemplification

Code	Local grammar pattern	Frequency	Percentage
PA1	Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC	162	35.8%
PA2	Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC	161	35.6%
PA3	Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-RS	50	11.1%
PA4	Initiator/Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC	35	7.7%
PA5	Evaluation + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC	27	6.0%
PA6	Evaluation + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC	12	2.7%
PA7	Initiator + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC	3	0.7%
PA8	Evaluation + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-RS	1	0.2%
PA9	Initiator + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-RS	1	0.2%
Total		452	100%

PA1 and PA2 together account for 71.4% of all instances. Both patterns involve a straightforward movement from a general element to an explicit indicator and then to a concrete example. This suggests that exemplification in biological science book reviews tends to be explicit, accessible, and reader-oriented. However, the two dominant patterns do not perform exactly the same work. PA1 reflects a disciplinary preference for specifying biological categories through concrete subcategories, whereas PA2 reflects the genre-specific need to evaluate a book through its own contents.

PA1: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC

PA1 is the most frequent pattern, with 162 instances (35.8%). In this pattern, a broad biological category, topic, or phenomenon is followed by an indicator and then by one or more subcategory examples. A typical example is:

3) *small cetaceans, such as the baiji and vaquita*

The pattern is straightforward: *small cetaceans* is the Exemplified, *such as* is the Indicator, and *the baiji and vaquita* are the Exemplification-SC. On the surface, this appears to be a simple taxonomic clarification. Yet in biological science writing, such specificity carries disciplinary value. Naming actual species, organisms, habitats, or processes helps the reviewer show that the book's discussion is grounded in recognisable biological entities rather than abstract generalisations. This helps readers determine whether the reviewed book addresses examples that are relevant to the field.

This result resonates with Amini Faskhodi et al. (2026), who found that biology research articles tend to use context-specific exemplification. Our findings suggest that this disciplinary tendency is also visible in biological science book reviews. Still, there is an important difference. While subcategory examples often help build or support new knowledge claims in research articles, the same type of biological specificity is frequently redirected towards evaluation in book reviews. When reviewers identify species, ecological issues, experimental systems, or conservation cases, they may also be signalling whether the book's selection is appropriate, current, representative, or useful.

PA2: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC

PA2 occurs almost as frequently as PA1, with 161 instances (35.6%). It is structurally similar to PA1, but the examples are drawn from the reviewed book itself. This is the clearest genre-specific pattern in the corpus.

- 4) *Many of these chapters contain information that applies to all cetaceans, such as dolphin evolution, structure and function, and life history.*

Here, *information that applies to all cetaceans* is the Exemplified, *such as* is the Indicator, and the named topics are coded as Exemplification-BC because they refer to the book's own chapter content. This distinction is important. If we coded these examples simply as subcategories, we would miss what is distinctive about book-review exemplification. The reviewer is not only naming biological topics but also using selected parts of the book as evidence for an assessment of its coverage. PA2 can therefore be understood as a pattern of evidential selection: the reviewer selects particular parts of the book and presents them to readers as evidence. Sometimes these examples support praise, as when a reviewer highlights a substantial bibliography, effective illustrations, rich case studies, or well-chosen chapters. At other times, they support criticism, *such as* when a reviewer identifies missing maps, inadequate background information, insufficient references, or limited coverage of particular topics. In both cases, PA2 helps reviewers avoid unsupported evaluations by grounding their judgements in identifiable features of the book, thus, providing readers with a clear basis for those judgements.

PA3: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-RS

PA3 occurs 50 times (11.1%) and involves exemplification through relevant studies, scholars, theories, or research traditions. One example is:

- 5) *For example, Thomas (1983) found that the Adonis Blue Butterfly depends upon grazing pressure.*

This pattern is similar to research-study exemplification identified in earlier local grammar studies (Su & Zhang, 2020; Su et al., 2021). However, its relatively low frequency is meaningful. Biological science book reviews do not typically build arguments through citation in the same way that research articles do. Their main evidential base is the book under review. Consequently, book reviews rely more frequently on examples from book content or biological subcategories than on external studies. Nevertheless, PA3 is not marginal in rhetorical terms. When reviewers invoke

previous studies or current scholarship, they often use these examples to place the book in a broader disciplinary conversation. External studies can be used to show whether a book is up to date, reflects current knowledge, neglects important research, or aligns with accepted understanding in the field. In this sense, PA3 functions as a form of disciplinary calibration: the reviewer uses external scholarship as a benchmark against which the book is assessed.

PA4: Initiator/Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC

PA4 occurs 35 times (7.7%). This pattern often begins with an initiator such as the book, the volume, the chapter, the author, or the editors, followed by an indicator and an example from the book.

- 6) *Further, the book includes a substantial and up-to-date bibliography of relevant literature.*

This is a highly typical book-review construction. The initiator names the reviewed object, while the indicator introduces a concrete feature of that object. The pattern therefore helps reviewers move smoothly from identifying the book to describing what it offers. Importantly, the example in this sentence is not a biological subcategory but a feature of the book. A substantial and up-to-date bibliography forms part of the book's scholarly apparatus, and its inclusion supports a positive evaluation of the book's usefulness for readers with a deeper interest in the topic.

PA5 and PA6: evaluative patterns

PA5 and PA6 are less frequent than PA1 and PA2, but they are important because evaluation is built into the local grammar configuration. PA5, Evaluation + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC, occurs 27 times. It typically supports praise or recommendation by linking an evaluative expression to concrete book content.

- 7) *The book is peppered with fascinating examples, including many historical ones.*

The evaluative word *fascinating* is not left unsupported. It is tied to the book's examples, including historical ones, allowing readers to see why the reviewer finds the book interesting. This is a small but important rhetorical move. Praise in book reviews can easily become vague if it is not anchored in textual evidence. PA5 addresses this problem by bringing evaluation and exemplification into the same unit.

PA6, Evaluation + Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC, occurs 12 times. It is especially useful for criticism because it allows the reviewer to specify what is missing or underdeveloped.

- 8) *A basic descriptive overview or a few statistics, for example about land use patterns and their changes, would have been useful.*

Here, the evaluation *would have been useful* points to a perceived limitation, while *for example about land use patterns and their changes* specifies the kind of material that would have improved the book. The criticism is therefore not simply a negative judgement; it is a logical recommendation supported by a concrete example. This connects with research on criticism in

book reviews, which shows that reviewers must balance judgement with collegiality (Salager-Meyer et al., 2007; Zou & Hyland, 2020). PA6 is one way of achieving that balance.

The remaining patterns, PA7 to PA9 are rare, together accounting for only five instances. We do not interpret them as central patterns in the corpus. However, they are still informative because they show that the local grammar of exemplification has a core-periphery structure. The core consists of the simpler and more frequent patterns PA1 and PA2, while the periphery contains more specialised configurations involving explicit initiators, evaluation, or relevant studies. This is consistent with Su et al.'s (2025) argument that discourse-act patterns can be understood as constructional networks rather than as isolated templates. Some constructions are highly productive, whereas others are more restricted but still rhetorically meaningful.

CONCLUSION

This study examined exemplification in biological science book reviews through a corpus-based local grammar approach. We began from the view that book reviews are not merely descriptive texts, instead they are evaluative texts, and evaluation requires evidence. Based on 452 functional instances of exemplification in 100 biological science book reviews, our findings show that examples are one important way in which reviewers provide such evidence. Through examples, reviewers show what a book contains, what it does well, what it omits, and why it may be useful or limited for particular readers.

First, the study shows that exemplification in the corpus is mainly realised through explicit markers, especially *such as*, *including*, *include(s)/included*, and *for example*. The dominance of listing-oriented markers suggests that reviewers often use exemplification to map the content and scope of a book. In biological science book reviews, examples frequently refer to organisms, biological processes, ecological issues, methods, case studies, chapters, illustrations, and other book features. Thus, exemplification helps readers understand not only the reviewer's judgement but also the disciplinary and textual basis for that judgement.

Second, the local grammar analysis shows that the two dominant patterns are PA1: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-SC and PA2: Exemplified + Indicator + Exemplification-BC. PA1 reflects the disciplinary need for biological specificity, as reviewers clarify broader categories through concrete subcategories such as species, habitats, methods, or ecological issues. PA2, however, is more genre-specific. It captures examples drawn from the reviewed book itself, including chapters, topics, case studies, bibliographies, illustrations, or missing content. We therefore argue that Exemplification-BC is a useful addition to existing local grammar descriptions of exemplification when the object of analysis is the academic book review.

Generally, these findings contribute to local grammar research by showing that exemplification is both discipline-sensitive and genre-sensitive. While its basic functional elements may be recognisable across academic contexts, its preferred patterns vary according to the communicative purpose of the text. In our corpus, biological science encourages concrete and object-oriented examples, while the book-review genre encourages examples drawn from the reviewed book. The study also contributes to research on academic book reviews by showing how reviewers build credible judgements through selected examples rather than through overt evaluation alone.

The findings also have implications for EAP pedagogy. Novice scholars who write book reviews need to learn not only the broad moves of summary, evaluation, criticism, and recommendation but also how to support these moves with examples. Local grammar patterns such as PA1, PA2, PA5, and PA6 can be used as teaching resources to show students how expert reviewers move from general judgements to concrete evidence. This may help students make praise more grounded and criticism more precise (Jiang & Hyland, 2026).

Nevertheless, the study has several limitations. The corpus is limited to 100 biological science book reviews from one source. Future research should consider a wider range of journals, publishers, databases, and time periods. As local grammar annotation involves interpretive judgement, future research could also include multiple coders and report inter-coder agreement. Further studies could compare biological science book reviews with those from other fields and could also examine expert-written, novice-written, and AI-generated book reviews. Recent research has shown that AI-generated academic texts can be fluent but formulaic in their rhetorical patterning (Jiang & Su, 2026; Yao & Liu, 2025). A comparison of exemplification could show whether human reviewers use examples in more contextually sensitive and evaluatively grounded ways. Overall, exemplification is an important rhetorical resource in biological science book reviews because it allows reviewers to turn broad judgements into concrete, inspectable, and persuasive evaluations by showing readers the basis for those judgements instead of merely asserting them.

REFERENCES

- Amini Faskhodi, A., Shirazizadeh, M., & Fathali, S. (2026). Cross-disciplinary variation in exemplification: A local grammar analysis of biology and applied linguistics research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 83, 7–20. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2026.01.001>
- Ang, L. H., & Tan, K. H. (2018). Specificity in English for Academic Purposes (EAP): A corpus analysis of lexical bundles in academic writing. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 24(2), 82–94. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2018-2402-07>
- Anthony, L. (2022). AntConc (Version 4.1.4) [Computer software]. Waseda University, Tokyo. Available at: <https://www.laurenceanthony.net/software>
- Becher, T., & Trowler, P. R. (2001). *Academic tribes and territories: Intellectual enquiry and the culture of disciplines* (2nd ed.). Open University Press.
- Biglan, A. (1973). The characteristics of subject matter in different academic areas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 57(3), 195–203. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0034701>
- Gross, M. (1997). The construction of local grammars. In E. Roche & Y. Schabès (Eds.), *Finite-state language processing* (pp. 329–354). MIT Press.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2013). *Halliday's introduction to functional grammar* (4th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203431269>
- Hunston, S., & Sinclair, J. (2000). A local grammar of evaluation. In S. Hunston & G. Thompson (Eds.), *Evaluation in text: Authorial stance and the construction of discourse* (pp. 74–101). Oxford University Press.
- Hunston, S., & Su, H. (2019). Patterns, constructions, and local grammar: A case study of evaluation. *Applied Linguistics*, 40(4), 567–593. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm046>
- Hyland, K. (2004). *Disciplinary discourses: Social interactions in academic writing*. University of Michigan Press.
- Hyland, K. (2007). Applying a gloss: Exemplifying and reformulating in academic discourse. *Applied Linguistics*, 28(2), 266–285. <https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/amm011>
- Hyland, K., & Diani, G. (Eds.). (2009). *Academic evaluation: Review genres in university settings*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jiang, F. K., & Hyland, K. (2024). Writing book reviews: Perceptions and experiences of Chinese novice scholars. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 71, Article 101409. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101409>
- Jiang, F. K., & Hyland, K. (2026). EAP in a changing world: Towards a new research agenda. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 80, Article 101647. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2026.101647>

- Jiang, F. K., & Su, H. (2025). Exemplification and its local grammar patterns in English as an academic lingua franca in research writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 75, Article 101504. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101504>
- Jiang, F. K., & Su, H. (2026). Exemplification in ChatGPT and student argumentative writing: A local grammar analysis. *Linguistics and Education*, 93, Article 101533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2026.101533>
- Ong, C. S. B., & Yuen, C. K. (2014). A corpus study of structural types of lexical bundles in MUET reading texts. *3L: The Southeast Asian Journal of English Language Studies*, 20(2), 127–140. <https://doi.org/10.17576/3L-2014-2002-11>
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. Longman.
- Salager-Meyer, F., Alcaraz Ariza, M. A., & Pabón Berbesí, M. (2007). Collegiality, critique and the construction of scientific argumentation in medical book reviews: A diachronic approach. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39(10), 1758–1774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2006.06.003>
- Su, H. (2017). Local grammars of speech acts: An exploratory study. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 111, 72–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2017.02.008>
- Su, H., Chen, J., & Lu, X. (2025). Discourse acts, local grammars, and constructions in academic writing: The case of the “exemplifying” construction network. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 78, Article 101596. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101596>
- Su, H., Ye, J., & Wei, N. (2024). Integrating pattern grammar and local grammar into the identification of constructions and the development of a pedagogical construction in EAP context: An exploratory study. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 70, Article 101401. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101401>
- Su, H., & Zhang, L. (2020). Local grammars and discourse acts in academic writing: A case study of exemplification in linguistics research articles. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 43, Article 100805. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2019.100805>
- Su, H., Zhang, Y., & Chau, M. H. (2022). Exemplification in Chinese English-major MA students’ and expert writers’ academic writing: A local grammar-based investigation. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 58, Article 101120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101120>
- Su, H., Zhang, Y., & Lu, X. (2021). Applying local grammars to the diachronic investigation of discourse acts in academic writing: The case of exemplification in linguistics research articles. *English for Specific Purposes*, 63, 120–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2021.05.002>
- Triki, N. (2021). Exemplification in research articles: Structural, semantic and metadiscursive properties across disciplines. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 54, Article 101039. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.101039>
- Triki, N. (2024). Exemplification and reformulation in expert linguists’ writings: Elaborative metadiscourse between disciplinarity and individuality. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 71, Article 101407. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101407>
- Yao, G., & Liu, Z. (2025). GPT as book reviewer: A move and syntactic complexity analysis of GPT-generated versus scholar-written academic book reviews. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 76, Article 101533. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2025.101533>
- Zhang, L., & Su, H. (2021). Applying local grammars in EAP teaching. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 51, Article 100983. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2021.100983>
- Zhang, Y. (2025). “X can be classified into ...”: A local grammar of classification in academic discourse and its implications for EAP pedagogy. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 73, Article 101466. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2024.101466>
- Zhang, Y., & Su, H. (2022). “We define X as ...”: A local grammar of definition in linguistics research articles and its pedagogical value. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 59, Article 101143. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2022.101143>
- Zou, H., & Hyland, K. (2020). Managing evaluation: Criticism in two academic review genres. *English for Specific Purposes*, 60, 98–112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esp.2020.03.004>