CEM CAN
Çukurova University

KATARZYNA PAPAJA
University of Silesia

THE CHALLENGES OF ACADEMIC LANGUAGE – AN ANALYSIS OF ACADEMIC KEY WORDS STUDIED IN THE WRITTEN TEXTS OF UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

The academic language has certain features that do not occur in typical informal interaction about everyday things. The texts studied and produced in academic disciplines have different functions, and are structured in different ways. The linguistic features play an important role in the realization of different types of meanings. Some are important for their role in the expression of content (e.g. types of lexis, prepositional phrases or markers of logical relations between clauses). Others are involved in the role of the writer (e.g. informing, questioning or evaluating) or the organization of the content in the text.

The following paper provides an outline of the research on Academic Key Words studied in the texts of university students taken from the written corpora: the International Corpus of Learner English (the Polish and Turkish component of ICLE). Starting with a brief insight into the features of academic language, the article focuses on the analysis of chosen academic nouns, nouns, adjectives and adverbs as well as some basic clauses used by the Turkish and Polish university students of English as a Foreign language.

1. Introduction

The texts studied and produced in academic disciplines have different functions, and are structured in different ways to fulfill those goals. They also require different choices from the grammatical and lexical resources of the language. What is more, "in understanding and producing academic language, the focus is on the fact that students are expected to read, write using language that presents knowledge that is formal, technical, and distanced from everyday

life" (Schleppegrell 2004: 49). The choices students make create the register of the text type or genre which is defined as "staged and goal oriented process" (Martin and Rose 2005). The linguistic features play an important role in the realization of different types of meanings. Some are important for their role in the expression of content (e.g. types of lexis, prepositional phrases or markers of logical relations between clauses). Others are involved in the role of the writer (e.g. informing, questioning or evaluating) or the organization of the content in the text.

The purpose of our article is to analyse Academic Key Words studied in the texts of university students taken from the written corpora: the International Corpus of Learner English (the Polish and Turkish component of ICLE). The analysis is based on our own framework in which special attention is paid to carefully chosen academic nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs as well as some embedded clauses. This type of analysis will allow us to understand the role of language used in academic subjects and see how, through particular usage of verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and embedded clauses students begin to understand and learn the knowledge of a particular discipline. What is more, the analysis will help us to distinguish the difference in the use of Academic Key Words between the Turkish and Polish university learners of Foreign Languages.

2. The features of academic language

The academic language has certain features that do not occur in typical informal interaction about everyday things, and it is important to recognise those features and think about how they can be used as a focus for developing content knowledge in different subjects (Schleppegrell 2004). By using academic language students are expected to present their knowledge either in a written or spoken form. This knowledge is usually formal, content-specific and distanced from everyday life. Schleppegrell (2004) provides the following features of academic language:

- **dense information,** which is connected with the amount of knowledge to be displayed in particular academic texts;
- **the level of abstraction** – the abstract concepts that students need to understand by interpreting particular academic texts;
- **technicality** – the use of content-specific vocabulary;
- **multiple semiotic systems** – the language that is presented by particular symbols which need to be deciphered (e.g. in maths or chemistry);
- **expectations for conventional structure** – the organization of information in writing;
- **appropriate "voice"** – presenting information in an assertive and authoritative way so that it is highly recognised and respected;

When analysing the features of academic language, it is very important to mention the sociocultural contexts which involve the interaction between the student and the language environment encompassing genre/text type, register, topic, task/situation, participants' identities and social roles.

The features of academic language can be divided into the following categories:

Table 1: The features of academic language (World Class Instructional Design and Assessment – WIDA 2012)

Language categories	Performance criteria	Features
Discourse level	**Complexity** *(Quantity and variety of oral and written text)*	Amount of speech/written text Structure of speech/written text Density of speech/written text Organization and cohesion of ideas Variety of sentence types
Sentence level	**Language Forms and Conventions** *(Types, array, and use of language structures)*	Types and variety of grammatical structures Conventions, mechanics, and fluency Match of language forms to purpose/ perspective
Word/phrase level	**Vocabulary Usage** *(Specificity of word or phrase choice)*	General, specific, and technical language Multiple meanings of words and phrases Formulaic and idiomatic expressions Nuances and shades of meaning Collocations

As can be seen from the table provided above, language categories have been divided into three levels: *discourse level, sentence level and word/phrase level.* At the *discourse level,* it is important to pay attention to the quantity and variety of oral and written text, namely the amount of the text whether written or oral, structure and density of the text, organisation and cohesion of ideas as well as variety of sentence types. At the *sentence level,* types, array and use of language structures should be paid attention to. In other words, types and variety of grammatical structures, conventions, mechanics and fluency as well as match of language forms to the purpose of the text. At the *word/phrase level,* specificity of word and phrase choice should be taken into account such as general, specific and technical language, multiple meanings of words and phrases, formulaic and idiomatic expressions, nuances and shades of meanings and finally, collocations. In our study we are mainly going to concentrate on the *word/phase level* and to a little extent on the *sentence level.*

A lot of research was conducted on the role of context and grammatical structures (Christie 1985, 1986, 1991, 1998; Coffin 1997; Halliday 1978, 1993; Halliday & Hasan 1989; Halliday & Martin 1993; Jones, Gollin, Drury, & Economou 1989; Martin 1983, 1989; Veel 1998; Wignell 1994). The general outcome is that register differences manifest themselves both in choice of words or phrases and also in the way that clauses are constructed and linked. In the case of genres, there are also recognised text types that can be recognised through particular grammar structures and vocabulary usage (Christie 1985; Martin 1989; Michaels & Collins 1984; Schleppegrell 1998; Snow 1990; Swales 1990).

Llinares, Morton and Whittaker (2012: 155-156) provided the following framework of linguistic features which is based on frameworks established by Bloor & Bloor (1995); Eggins (1994) and Schleppegrell (2004):

Table 2: The framework of linguistic features studied in texts (Llinares, Morton and Whittaker 2012: 155-156)

Situational variable	Metafunction	Part of the linguistic system that realises meaning
FIELD Activity, topic	**IDEATIONAL MEANINGS** 'Language is used to organise, understand and express our perceptions of the world and of our own consciousness'	Processes (types of verbs: actions, relations; thinking, perceiving, linking etc.) Participants (nouns in subject and object position) Circumstances Markers of logical relations between clauses (addition, contrast, cause, sequence)
TENOR Relations of power, equality	**INTERPERSONAL MEANINGS** 'Language is used to enable us to participate in communicative acts with other people, to take on roles and to express and understand feelings, attitude and judgements'	Clause structure (declarative, imperative, interrogative) Modality (certainty and obligation) Attitude (positive / negative lexis)
MODE Distance between communicators (written / spoken)	**TEXTUAL MEANINGS** 'Language is used to relate what is said (or written) to the real world and to other linguistic events. This involves the use of language to organise the context itself'	Devices to move elements or compress or distribute information First position versus last position (passive voice) Clauses versus noun phrases etc.

The texts studied and produced in various academic disciplines have many functions and are structured in different ways. *Ideational meanings* are often showed by the types of verbs, actions, relations, thinking, perceiving, linking etc..., participants (nouns in subject and object position), circumstances as well as markers of logical relations between the clauses. *Interpersonal meanings* are realised by clause structures (declarative, imperative, interrogative), modality (certainty and obligations) and attitude (the usage of positive or negative lexis). *Textual meanings* are demonstrated by various textual devices to move elements in order to compress or distribute information, the usage of active / passive voice, the usage of clauses / noun phrases.

3. The current study

The current study is based on the analysis of the use of the items in AKL (Paquot, 2010) and some common clause structures in Polish and Turkish university students' written English essays and their comparison with the use in comparable types of native university students' written English. The abbreviation AKL stands for Academic Key Word List and it contains 930 potential academic words, e.i. words which are reasonably frequent in a wide range of academic texts.

The main hypothesis stated before conducting the analysis was the following:

There are significant differences in the use of the AKL and some common clause structures between Turkish and Polish university learners.

Additionally, the investigation aimed at seeking answer to the following basic question:

What are the main differences (if any) in the use of the AKL items and some clause structures between Turkish and Polish university learners of English as a Foreign Language?

For the purpose of the study, the data were extracted from two comparable corpora: ICLE (The International Corpus of Learner English) *Version 2* and LOCNESS (The Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays). The learner data come from the Turkish (TICLE) and Polish (PICLE) subcorpora of ICLE.

The Turkish learner data come from the Turkish subcorpus of ICLE, which contains 199,532 words academic writing from 280 essays produced by upper-intermediate to advanced EFL learners. The essays have an average length of 712 words. This subcorpus will be referred as TICLE, the Turkish International Corpus of Learner English. From this subcorpus, a sample of 208 essays totaling about 149,784 word tokens was selected (Table 2).

As for the Polish learner data, it consists of 365 texts and 233,920 words in total written by Polish university students. The average length of the essays is 641 words. The Polish International Corpus of Learner English will be referred as PICLE. From this subcorpus, a sample of 229 essays totaling about 149,364 word tokens was selected for the purpose of the study.

While analysing the data, we have decided to concentrate on the *word/phrase level* standards mentioned in the theoretical part (WIDA 2012). When discussing the embedded clauses we are also going to refer to the *sentence level*. In our study we are going to pay particular attention to:

- nouns
- verbs
- adjectives
- adverbs
- clause structure (distribution of embedded clauses)

The following verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and clause structures have been chosen:

- **NOUNS**: problem/ fact/ argument/ point/ example/ idea
- **VERBS**: to state/ to show/ to claim/ to prove/ to consider
- **ADJECTIVES**: important/ different/ effective/ particular
- **ADVERBS**: more/ however/ in general/ significantly
- **CLAUSE STRUCTURES**: that clause/ wh-determiner (either which/what or possessive).

The reason why the above mentioned verbs, nouns, adjectives, adverbs and clause structures were chosen was that while reading all the essays written by Turkish and Polish university learners we noticed (without deep analysis) that these words / clauses were the most common ones in academic English.

4. Data analysis

The results presented in Table 3 below demonstrate that nouns are common in both Polish and Turkish learners' argumentative essays as well as in native speaker university students' argumentative essays. As we could infer from the frequencies of nouns, verbs, adjectives and adverbs displayed, although there are some differences across TICLE, PICLE, and LOCNESS corpora TICLE has the lowest frequency of adverbs occurring in argumentative essays to PICLE and LOCNESS.

Table 3: Distribution of AKL across corpora

AKL Categories	LOCNESS		PICLE		TICLE	
	f	*type token ratio*	*f*	*type token ratio*	*f*	*type token ratio*
ADJECTIVES	1809	1.8	2219	2.2	1878	1.9
ADVERBS	286	0.3	272	0.3	93	0.1
NOUNS	8222	8.2	7308	7.2	6221	6.2
VERBS	4708	4.7	3955	3.9	2701	2.7

As Crystal (1995: 211) states, "adverbs are usually accepted as a sort of "dustbin" word class including all manner of various forms and functions that cannot be categorized under the classes such as noun and verb". In Turkey,

although lexical adverbs are introduced comparatively early in English as a Foreign Language syllabus in which they are clearly stated to be as adjective derivatives, little attention is drawn to the textual use of adverbs or to how the use of adverbs in English could differ from the expression of the same meaning in Turkish. This might be leading to the use of avoidance strategy by the learners and to the problems with adverb collocations.

In Tables 4 and 5, the frequency of **nouns** in PICLE and TICLE in comparison to LOCNESS is presented:

Table 4: Nouns: PICLE vs. LOCNESS

Noun	PICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
argument	92	.09	255	.25	-79.67
example	130	.13	95	.09	+5.47
fact	247	.25	117	.12	+47.47
idea	135	.14	140	.14	-.09
point	67	.07	73	.07	-.26
problem	458	.46	267	.27	+50.92

+ indicates overuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS

When analysing the occurrence of the chosen nouns (problem, fact, argument, point, example, idea) in PICLE (Table 4), it can be noticed that Polish learners tend to overuse the nouns *fact* (+47.47) and *problem* (+50.92) while they tend to underuse the noun *argument* (-79.67). The nouns *fact* and *problem* also occur in Polish and tend to be often used the by the Polish learners. One of the reasons why they are overused in English could be the influence of L1 or language transfer in the foreign language learning (Arabski 2006). What is more, the nouns have similar pronunciation both in Polish and in English and therefore, it is easier for the Polish learners to use them in English. The word *argument* is often associated with a dispute, fight, rumour and probably this is why the Polish

Table 5: Nouns: TICLE vs. LOCNESS

Noun	TICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
argument	39	.04	255	.25	-177.43
example	101	.10	95	.09	+.18
fact	55	.05	117	.12	-22.86
idea	115	.12	140	.14	-2.45
point	86	.09	73	.07	+1.06
problem	430	.43	267	.27	+38.47

+ indicates overuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS

learners tend to avoid it using expressions such as *in my opinion, I think, I would suggest* etc... instead. In the case of the nouns *example, idea* and *point,* the Polish learners tend to use them correctly.

When analysing the Turkish data in TICLE (Table 5), it can be seen that Turkish learners overuse the noun *problem* (+38.47), probably stemming from a possible L1 influence as the word is borrowed from English with its original spelling, example (+18) and *point* (+1.06). In the case of other nouns it is worth noticing that the Turkish learners like the Polish learners underuse the noun *argument* (-177.43) and the difference in the observed frequency (TICLE 39) is very significant when comparing it to the observed frequency in LOCNESS (255). Additionally, the Turkish learners tend to underuse the nouns *fact* (-22.86) and *idea* (-2.45).

Below some examples of the usage of the academic noun *fact* are presented:

Table 6: The usage of the noun *fact* by native, Polish and Turkish learners.

LOCNESS	PICLE	TICLE
Individual articles expressed the **fact** that no one has the right to take someone else life.	The main factor behind such a situation is the **fact** that teenagers are not as mature as they would like to be in the eyes of the world.	The **fact** that a person has brain and heart so he may feel himself in trouble.

In Tables 7 and 8, the frequency of **verbs** in PICLE and TICLE with reference to LOCNESS is presented:

Table 7: Verbs: PICLE vs. LOCNESS

Verb	PICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
claim	99	.10	38	.004	+28.14
consider	146	.15	97	.10	+9.95
show	165	.17	125	.12	+5.53
state	47	.05	115	.12	-29.45
prove	32	.03	55	.05	-6.15

+ indicates overuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS

When looking at the chosen academic verbs (claim, consider, show, state and prove) in PICLE (Table 8), it can be noticed that Polish learners tend to overuse the verbs *claim* (+28.14), *consider* (+9.95) and *show* (+5.53) while underuse the verbs *state* (-29.45) and *prove* (-6.15). The Polish learners might

overuse the above mentioned verbs because there is a tendency to use the Polish equivalents of these verbs in the native language (Polish). The Polish learners are used to using these verbs in Polish. When considering the underuse of the verb *state,* most of the Polish learners when asked about the usage of this word would rather use it as a noun in a different meaning e.g. the United *States* of America.

Table 8: Verbs: TICLE vs. LOCNESS

Verb	TICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
claim	24	.02	38	.004	-3.19
consider	75	.08	97	.10	-2.82
show	81	.08	125	.12	-9.47
state	14	.01	115	.12	-90.23
prove	22	.02	55	.05	-14.61

- indicates underuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS

The Turkish data concerning the frequency of verbs (Table 8) is very interesting. Although these are not very low frequency lexical items for their level of proficiency, Turkish learners tend to underuse all verbs: *claim* (-3.19)*, consider* (-2.82), *show* (-9.47)*, state* (-90.23) and *prove* (-14.61). Various studies based on one or more ICLE sub-corpora, like TICLE, revealed that 'these EFL writers are not equipped with the type of lexical knowledge necessary for the type of writing task they are undertaking' (Petch-Tyson 1999: 60). This analysis of Turkish learners' use of the verbs from the Academic Keyword List supports Petch-Tyson's view in this regard.

Below some examples of the usage of the academic verb *claim* are presented:

Table 9: The usage of the verb *claim* by native, Polish and Turkish learners

LOCNESS	PICLE	TICLE
Others **claim** it is against the law to teach the creation model**.**	Some people **claim** that you do not need to think about healthy eating until you are older.	There are many ways to kill the convicted as Hunter **claims** in his article.

Tables 10 and 11 display the frequency of **adjectives** in PICLE and TICLE in comparison to LOCNESS.

Table 10: Adjectives: PICLE vs. LOCNESS

Adjectives	PICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
different	240	.24	108	.11	+51.04
effective	37	.04	49	.05	-1.68
important	241	.24	115	.12	+45.58
particular	52	.05	21	.02	+13.59

+ indicates overuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS

As can be inferred from Table 10, Polish learners tend to overuse most of the adjectives analysed in the study, namely: *different* (+51.04), *important* (+45.58) and *particular* (+13.59). Polish learners underuse the adjective *effective* (-1.68).

Table 11: Adjectives: TICLE vs. LOCNESS

Adjectives	TICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
different	175	.17	108	.11	+16.01
effective	21	.02	49	.05	-11.52
important	324	.32	115	.12	+103.65
particular	7	.01	21	.02	-7.33

+ indicates overuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS

What is more, Turkish learners as can be inferred from Table 11 also tend to overuse the adjectives *important* (+103.65) and *different* (+16.01) and underuse the adjectives *effective* (-11.52) and *particular* (-7.33). Both learners – the Polish and the Turkish ones overuse the adjectives *different* and *important* which is definitely linked to the topics of the compositions. All learners were asked to write argumentative essays in which they had to concentrate on important aspects of some issues and present clear arguments. No wonder the adjectives *different* and *important* occur so frequently due to the possible teaching-induced factors – they are usually associated with argumentative essays and very often emphasised by the English teachers.

Below some examples of the usage of the academic adjective *important* are presented.

Table 12: The usage of the adjective *important* by native, Polish and Turkish learners

LOCNESS	PICLE	TICLE
The most **important** parts of an argument are facts to support the author's claim.	Advertisements fulfill a very **important** informative role.	One of the most **important** inventions in the field of communication is television

Tables 13 and 14 display the frequency of **adverbs** in PICLE and TICLE with reference to LOCNESS.

Table 13: Adverbs: PICLE vs. LOCNESS

Adverbs	PICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
however	392	.39	174	.17	+86.17
in general	27	.03	3	.00	+22.08
more	451	.45	286	.29	+37.26
significantly	1	.00	16	.02	-15.96

+ indicates overuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS

As can be seen from Table 13, Polish learners overuse most of the adverbs analysed in this study except for one adverb – *significantly* (-15.96), which tend to be underused by Polish learners. The overuse of the other adverbs tends to be pretty high in comparison with native speakers – *however* (+86.17), *more* (+37.26) and *in general* (+22.08). During English classes, first adverb that is introduced to Polish learners is the adverb *however* and this is probably why Polish learners overuse it so often. Most English teachers warn Polish learners against using the adverb *but* in their academic English, especially in compositions. They advise Polish learners to use the adverb *however* instead. As for the adverb *in general*, lots of Polish learners use it because it sounds 'so sophisticated' and definitely belongs to the academic register used in compositions. Moreover, Polish learners tend to have a lot of problems with comparative adjectives and overuse the adverb *more*. They tend to say *more big* instead of *bigger* or *more small* instead of smaller. The adverb *significantly* sounds very formal for Polish learners and therefore they prefer to use the adverb *importantly* instead. The adjective *important* is the one that is overused by Polish learners, which has already been discussed above. Probably a deep analysis of the adverb *importantly* would reveal that Polish learners also overuse it.

Table 14: Adverbs: TICLE vs. LOCNESS

Adverbs	TICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
however	143	.14	174	.17	-3.04
in general	2	.00	3	.00	-.20
more	258	.26	286	.29	-1.44
significantly	-	.00	16	.02	-22.18

+ indicates overuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS

When analysing the Turkish data displayed in Table 14, it can be clearly seen that Turkish learners underuse all adverbs analysed in the study, namely: *however* (-3.04), *in general* (-2.0), *more* (-1.44) and *significantly* (-22.18).

Below some examples of the usage of the academic adverb *however* are presented:

Table 15: The usage of the adverb *however* by native, Polish and Turkish learners

LOCNESS	PICLE	TICLE
Affirmative action in and of itself, **however**, is not unconstitutional if carried out correctly	**However**, there are also authorities on gynecology who do not find evidence that children born to postmenopausal women are subject to any higher risks.	**However**, being a cell phone user has disadvantages, as well.

The frequency of **clause structures** in PICLE and TICLE with reference to LOCNESS is displayed in Tables 16 and 17.

Table 16: Clause Structures: PICLE vs. LOCNESS

Clause	PICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
that-clause	2535	2.54	1921	1.92	+84.87
which	999	1.00	275	.28	+437.07
what	536	.54	400	.40	+19.83
whose	65	.06	6	.01	+57.30

+ indicates overuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in PICLE relative to LOCNESS

Table 17: Clause Structures: TICLE vs. LOCNESS

Clause	TICLE Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LOCNESS Observed frequency	Relative frequency	LL
that-clause	1447	1.45	1921	1.92	-66.93
which	350	.35	275	.28	+9.02
what	450	.45	400	.40	+2.94
whose	31	.03	6	.01	+18.49

+ indicates overuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS
- indicates underuse in TICLE relative to LOCNESS

As can be inferred from Table 16, Polish learners significantly tend to overuse all clauses, especially *which-clauses* and *that-clauses* (+437.07 and +84.87, respectively). In the case of *whose-clauses* it is +57.30 and *what-clauses* +19.83. In comparison to the Turkish data displayed in Table 18, the numbers are very high. Turkish learners also overuse *which-clauses* (+9.02)*, what-clauses* (+2.94) and *whose-clauses* (+18.49) but the difference between TICLE and LOCNESS is not that striking. Polish learners tend to overuse all the clauses due to the influence of L1. Polish learners directly translate *która, który, które* into *which, that, whose* and *what* but often use these clauses incorrectly making no distinction between objects and people.

Below some examples of the usage of the *which-clauses* are presented:

Table 18: The usage of the *which-clauses* by native, Polish and Turkish learners

LOCNESS	PICLE	TICLE
Mercy killing is a complex issue **which** has ignited a fiery debate in the medical profession as well as others concerned with ethic and human rights.	Ads ' task is to show only the positive sides of products, **which** is obvious to adults but not to children.	I think one of the most crucial inventions **which** marked its name on this century is "computer"

5. Conclusions and teaching implications

The aim of the study was to investigate the use of chosen academic items in Polish International Corpus of Learner English and Turkish International Corpus of Learner English consisting of argumentative essays written by Polish and Turkish university students. The hypothesis stated before the analysis, namely that **there are significant differences in the use of the AKL and some common clause structures between Turkish and Polish university learners of Foreign languages** has been partially proved. There are significant differences in the

use of academic verbs between the Turkish and Polish university learners. The Turkish university learners tend to underuse most of the academic verbs analysed while the Polish university learners tend to overuse most of the academic verbs analysed. A similar situation can be noticed in the case of adverbs. There is a significant difference between the Turkish and the Polish university learners. While the first one tend to underuse academic adverbs, the second one tend to overuse them. In the case of nouns, adjectives and clause structures no significant difference in the use between the Turkish and the Polish university learners was noticed.

    To sum up, the analysis helped us to arrive at the following conclusions and provide answers to the above stated research question:

- **Polish** and **Turkish** learners of English as a Foreign Language tend to overuse or underuse some AKL items and clause structures.
  – Both **Polish** and **Turkish** learners overuse similar nouns (Tables 4 & 5).
  – **Polish** learners tend to overuse most of the analysed verbs, especially *claim* and *consider* while **Turkish** learners tend to underuse all the analysed verbs (Tables 7 & 8).
  – Both **Polish** and **Turkish** learners tend to overuse the adjectives *important* and *different* (Tables 10 & 11).
  – **Polish** learners overuse most of the adverbs, especially the adverb *however* while **Turkish** learners underuse all adverbs (Tables 13 & 14).
  – **Polish** learners significantly overuse the clause structures in comparison to the **Turkish** learners (Tables 17 & 18).
- Both **Polish** and **Turkish** learners use the AKL items and structures correctly, however, having analysed all the examples, **Polish** learners tend to use the verbs with *that-clauses*.
- There is a huge influence of L1 when choosing academic items especially among Polish learners.
- As Paquot (2010) also states the results from the EFL learners suggest their limited repertoire of lexical items used in EAP.
- Lack of register awareness.
- As also stated by Petch-Tyson, (1999: 60) 'these EFL writers are not equipped with the type of lexical knowledge necessary for the type of writing task they are undertaking'.
- Genre specific writing using corpora of academic writing like BAWE and BNC-ACD-HUM should be adapted.

    Bearing in mind all the findings, it is very important to think about teaching implications which could be taken into consideration by Polish and Turkish language teachers. Firstly, teachers should pay more attention to academic writing and academic vocabulary in particular. Secondly, the teachers should read their students' essays very carefully and concentrate on the usage of academic vocabulary and give the students valuable feedback. What is more, by careful analysis of students' essays more data can be driven which could be very

beneficial for further investigation of the usage of AKL items. Finally, teachers should make their students aware of various genres and registers. Moreover, "using genre knowledge of EFL learners can develop understanding of how to participate in the real world events along with the knowledge of text such as conventions of grammar, lexicon, content and organization" (Hyland 2004: 55).

References

Arabski, J. 2006. Language Transfer in Language Learning and Language Contact. In J. Arabski (ed.), *Cross-linguistic Influences in the Second Language Lexicon*, 12-21. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

Bloor, T. and M. Bloor 1995. *The Functional Analysis of English. A Halliday Approach.* London: Hodder Arnold.

Christie, F. 1985. Language and schooling. In: S. Tchudi (ed.), *Language, schooling and Society*, 21-40. Upper Montclair, NJ: Boynton/Cook.

Christie, F. 1986. Writing in schools: Generic structure as ways of meaning. In B. Couture (ed.), *Functional approaches to writing: Research perspective*, 221-239. London: Pinter.

Christie, F. 1991. First- and second-order registers in education. In E. Ventola (ed.), *Functional and systemic linguistics*, 235-256. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Christie, F. 1998. Science and apprenticeship: The pedagogic discourse. In J.R. Martin and R. Veel (eds.), *Reading science: Critical and functional perspectives on discourses of science*, 152-177. London: Routledge.

Coffin, C. 1997. Constructing and giving value to the past: An investigation into secondary school history. In F. Christie and J.R. Martin (eds.), *Genre and institutions: Social processes in the workplace and school*, 196-230. London: Cassell.

Crystal, D. 1995. The Cambridge Encyclopedia of the English Language. Cambridge: CUP.

Eggins, S. 1994. *An Introduction to Systematic Functional Grammar.* London and New York: Continuum.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1978. *Language as social semiotic*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M.A.K. 1993. Some grammatical problems in scientific English. In M.A.K. Halliday and J.R. Martin (eds.), *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power*, 69-85. Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan 1989. *Language, context, and text: Aspects of language in a social– semiotic perspective* (2nd ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Halliday, M.A.K. and J.R. Martin (eds.) 1993. *Writing science: Literacy and discursive power.* Pittsburgh, PA: University of Pittsburgh Press.

Hyland, K. 2004. *Genre and second language writing.* The University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.

Jones, J., S. Gollin, H. Drury and D. Economou 1989. Systemic–functional linguistics and its application to the TESOL curriculum. In R. Hasan and J.R. Martin (eds.), *Language development: Learning language, learning culture*, 257-328. Norwood, NJ: Ablex,

Llinares, A., T. Morton and R. Whittaker 2012. *The Roles of Language in CLIL.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, J.R. 1983. The development of register. In J. Fine and R.O. Freedle (eds.), *Developmental issues in discourse*, 1-40. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Martin, J.R. 1989. *Factual writing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Martin, J.R. and D. Rose 2005. Designing Literacy Pedagogy: Scaffolding asymmetries. In J. Webster, C. Matthiessen and R. Hasan (eds.), *Continuing Discourse on* Language, 251-80. London: Continuum.

Michaels, S. and J. Collins 1984. Oral discourse styles: Classroom interaction and the acquisition of literacy. In D. Tannen (ed.), *Coherence in spoken and written discourse*, 219-244. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

Paquot, M. 2010. *Academic Vocabulary in Learner Writing*. London: Continiuum.

Petch-Tyson, S. 1998. Reader/writer visibility in EFL persuasive writing. In S. Granger (ed.), *Learner English on Computer*, 107-118. London and New York: Addison Wesley Longman.

Schleppegrell, M.J. 1998. Grammar as resource: Writing a description. *Research in the Teaching of English* 32(2): 182–211.

Schleppegrell, M. 2004. *The Language of Schooling. A Functional Linguistics Perspective.* Mahwah. NJ: Erlbaum.

Schleppegrell, M. J. 2006. The challenges of academic language in school subjects. In I. Lindberg and K. Sandwall (eds.), *Språket och kunskapen: att lära på sitt andraspråk i skola och högskola*, 47-69. Göteborg, Sweden: Göteborgs universitet institutet för svenska som andraspråk.

Snow, C.E. 1990. The development of definitional skill. *Journal of Child Language 17*: 697–710.

Swales, J.M. 1990. *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Veel, R. 1998. The greening of school science: Ecogenesis in secondary classrooms. In J.R. Martin and R. Veel (eds.), *Reading science: Critical and functional perspectives on discourses of science*, 114–151. London: Routledge.

Wignell, P. 1994. Genre across the curriculum. *Linguistics & Education* 6(4): 355–372.