European Journal of Applied Linguistics Studies
ISSN: 2602 - 0254
ISSN-L: 2602 - 0254
Available on-line at: http://www.oapub.org/lit

DOI: 10.46827/ejals.v9i1.679 Volume 9 | Issue 1 | 2026

A CORPUS-BASED INVESTIGATION OF COLLOCATION, SEMANTIC PROSODY, AND SEMANTIC PREFERENCES OF A HIGH-FREQUENCY NOUN *VALUE* IN BRITISH ACADEMIC WRITTEN ENGLISH (BAWE)

K. M. Jubair Uddin[i]
Assistant Professor (English),
Faculty of Biological Sciences,
University of Chittagong,
Bangladesh

Abstract:
This paper examines the collocations, semantic prosody, and semantic preferences of the high-frequency abstract noun *value* in British Academic Written English (BAWE) using Sketch Engine. The analysis is based on a neo-Firthian corpus-linguistic approach in which the recurring grammatical patterns across disciplines, such as adjectival modifiers, verb-noun constructions, noun compounds, and prepositional structures, are discussed. The results demonstrate that *value* is largely associated with quantitative and methodological meanings in STEM-based writing, where it expresses mostly neutral semantic prosody. In contrast, in the social sciences, humanities, and business discourse, *value* is typically evaluative, normative, and strategic and exhibits less systematic prosodic tendencies. The semantic preference analysis uncovers stable associations with domains of measurement, evaluation, ideology, and market orientation, which are reflective of disciplinary epistemologies. By combining collocation, semantic prosody, and semantic preference to analyse a single high-frequency noun, this paper contributes to corpus-based studies of academic discourse and offers a pedagogical implication for teaching discipline-specific academic writing and developing collocational competence.

Keywords: collocation, semantic prosody, semantic preferences, high-frequency noun *value*, British Academic Written English (BAWE)

1. Introduction

The main constructs in corpus linguistics are collocation, semantic prosody, and semantic preference, which can shape the lexical choice and construction of meaning in academic writing. Collocations are words that are statistically repeated together, and the

[i] Correspondence: email jubair@cu.ac.bd

combination constitutes a part of conventionalized meaning (Sinclair, 1991, 1996). Semantic prosody is the attitudinal or evaluative meaning that emerges around a word throughout its habitual collocational context (Louw, 1993), and semantic preference is the tendency of a lexical item to be used with semantic categories (Stubbs, 2001). Collectively, these ideas provide insight into how meaning in academic discourse is achieved through co-occurrence in patterns, rather than single lexical units. In the UK academic tradition, scholarly writing conforms to discipline-related, conventional, and examination-based criteria, which are increasingly investigated using corpus-based methods. Collocational and evaluative patterns in academic discourse have been studied in earlier research and are grounded in large-scale corpora and theoretical frameworks like lexical priming as well as evaluative prosody (Hoey, 2012; Morley & Partington, 2009). Nevertheless, in comparison to the generally accepted patterns of evaluation and phraseology, much less has been studied regarding the combined operation of collocation, semantic prosody, and semantic preference as applied to single high-frequency abstract nouns. To fill this gap, this paper will discuss the lexical behaviour of high-frequency nouns, specifically *value,* in British academic writing with the help of the British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus and Sketch Engine. The analysis of collocation, semantic prosody, and semantic preference would help clarify the effect of disciplinary context in forming meaning in academic discourse.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Collocation and Academic Cohesion

Collocations are particularly important in creating cohesion and precision in scholarly writing. From a corpus-linguistic perspective, the distribution of meaning resides in recurrent combinations of words and not individual words (Sinclair, 1996; Ackermann & Chen, 2013). Discipline-specific collocations can be salient in academic discourse, and they not only lead to conventionalized phraseology but also facilitate discourse comprehension by the reader (Hyland & Tse, 2009; Durrant & Schmitt, 2009). A body of research has demonstrated that effective writing in the field of academia is typified by the sustained application of such lexical patterning due to shared disciplinary norms. Students of academic English are susceptible to collocation problems even with proficiency in high-frequency academic vocabulary.

The Academic Word List by Coxhead (2000) provides coverage of major academic lexis but does not account for collocational behaviour. The literature on corpus-based research shows that collocational competence is developed unevenly and varies across disciplines and levels of proficiency (Ackermann & Chen, 2013; Durrant & Schmitt, 2009; Gablasova, Brezina, & McEnery, 2017). Subsequent literature gives greater emphasis to the need to study individual abstract nouns, which serve to construe evaluative and epistemic meaning as opposed to concrete reference (Flowerdew, 2012; Biber & Gray, 2016; Jones & Waller, 2015). Other corpus-based works also highlight the importance of

verb–noun collocations in the structuring of an academic argument (Sidupa & Wastono, 2019). It is also underscored in research that discipline-specific evaluative lexis can be particularly effective in expressing stance (Begagić, 2013; Lin & Chung, 2016). Moreover, the significance of phraseological patterning in promoting coherent academic writing regardless of the field has been empirically established (Gablasova *et al.*, 2017).

2.2 Semantic Prosody

Semantic prosody refers to how words develop evaluative meaning through their recurring co-occurrence with specific word combinations in written texts (Louw, 1993). According to Morley & Partington (2009), the prosodies in academic writing consist of positive, negative, and neutral elements, which shape how writers articulate their stance and evaluation. Academic research using corpora shows that semantic prosody appears in a systematic way, which reinforces the persuasive power of academic discussions. The lexical priming approach shows that readers develop their interpretive skills through multiple readings of recurrent word combinations (Hoey, 2012). Research shows that abstract nouns produce distinct sound patterns because they connect to words that convey evaluative meaning (Partington, 2004; Bednarek, 2008b). Academic writing requires prosodies to establish valid statements and delineate boundaries and critical perspectives, which serve as core components for building disciplinary knowledge.

Evaluative prosody is usually evident in the noun *value,* and it varies depending on the discipline. The prosody of STEM is largely neutral (as a sign of quantitative and methodological usage), but the prosody of the humanities and social sciences is generally positive or negative (as a sign of normative or strategic interests).

2.3 Semantic Preference and High-frequency Nouns

Semantic preference denotes a word's tendency to co-occur with objects that fall within specific semantic categories, thereby characterize its common-sense meaning potential in discourse (Stubbs, 2001; Bednarek, 2008b). In contrast to collocation that works on single word pairings, semantic preference is operationalized on the conceptual category level. Studies show that semantic preferences differ across genres and disciplines because of divergent epistemological orientations (Begagić, 2018; Begagić, 2013). Although initial investigations into semantic preference were based on generic corpora (Sinclair, 1996), subsequent research indicates that analyses should be targeted toward disciplines. Large-scale financial academic corpora have made the examination of evaluative language and phraseology easier, but the bulk of work explores lexical patterns and trends and not the semantic behaviour of individual high-frequency abstract nouns. Consequently, the semantic choices of nouns like *value* in British academic writing are relatively under-researched (Flowerdew, 2012).

The results of corpus-based analyses substantiate the statement that semantic preferences tend to be closely associated with evaluative ones, underscoring the importance of verb–noun collocations in academic discourse (Sidupa & Wastono, 2019).

Other studies underscore the significance of phraseological patterns in learner comprehension (Gablasova *et al.*, 2017). Additionally, evaluative and attitudinal meanings of language are demonstrated to contribute to meaning making in discourse (Bednarek, 2008a; Begagić, 2013).

2.4 Theoretical Framework

This work takes a neo-Firthian corpus-linguistic approach where meaning is derived from recurring patterns of co-occurrence (Sinclair, 1991). The analysis is guided by three dimensions. Collocation captures statistically significant co-occurrence patterns that contribute to disciplinary meaning (Durrant & Schmitt, 2009; Ackermann & Chen, 2013). Semantic preference delineates conceptual areas that a word is associated with most of the time (Stubbs, 2001; Bednarek, 2008b; Begagić, 2018). The evaluative orientation that emerges from these patterned associations is reflected in semantic prosody (Louw, 1993; Bednarek, 2008a). These dimensions are analytically different but complementary to each other: collocations reveal semantic preferences, which in turn shape semantic prosody.

This study brings together collocation, semantic prosody, and semantic preference in the analysis of *value* across the three disciplines represented in BAWE, offering insights into corpus linguistics and EAP pedagogy. The strategy is aligned with previous research on the topic of semantic prosody in scholarly writing (Bednarek, 2008b; Smith & Nordquist, 2012). It also accords with theoretical views on lexical priming (Hoey, 2012; Jones & Waller, 2015). Moreover, it is anchored in investigations into assessing phraseology in different fields (Begagić, 2013).

2.5 Justification for Researching *Value* in BAWE

The noun *value* is particularly well adapted to corpus-based investigation because of its semantic flexibility and interdisciplinary applicability. It is a technical term in scientific language and a criterion in the humanities and in the social sciences. This dual role means that *value*s participate in various collocational, prosodic, and semantic patterns across disciplines. In addition, abstract nouns like *value* often encode an evaluative attitude and epistemic judgment, making them pedagogically challenging to EAP learners. Knowing how they are used systematically can then guide teaching methods that would enhance academic writing competence.

Considering *value* in the BAWE corpus, the current research responds to the call to conduct more fine-grained studies of individual words in academic writing (Hunston, 2007; Partington, 2004). Further evidence suggests that cross-disciplinary variation in evaluative terms requires detailed semantic study (Biber & Gray, 2016). Researchers also show that it is essential to study verb–noun collocations in disciplinary contexts (Sidupa & Wastono, 2019). In addition, the study focuses on phraseological mapping as one of the primary resources for understanding the features of academic writing (Gablasova *et al.*, 2017).

2.6 The BAWE Corpus

The British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus is a massive amount of academic writing that students at the United Kingdom universities generate. It has, according to Sketch Engine, 2,761 graded books of students, with a length of about 500 to 5,000 words and an overall length of 6.9 million words. The texts address four generalized fields—arts and humanities, social sciences, life sciences, and physical sciences—and undergraduate and taught master-level learning. Dr. Paul Thompson and Dr. Alois Heuboeck of the University of Reading prepared the corpus to be used in Sketch Engine (Sketch Engine, n.d.).

The BAWE corpus offers a rich empirical input to the study of academic writing, as it includes a vast range of different genres, such as traditional essays and lab reports, as well as more exploratory types of writing, such as narratives and reflective pieces. It facilitates cross-disciplinary/cross-level comparison and emphasizes not only the generic characteristics of student writing but also a more specific analysis of lexical items. Every genre is associated with a social role, which explains why BAWE classifies the family and is therefore used in research on how the writing of students differs based on their discipline and level of study (Nesi & Gardner, 2018).

Past studies based on BAWE have investigated the disciplinary difference in academic writing, which includes disciplinary lexical patterns (Gablasova *et al.*, 2017), disciplinary evaluative language (Lin & Chung, 2016), and repetitive collocational and phraseological patterns in student academic texts (Begagic, 2013). Nevertheless, despite these studies, collocation, semantic preference, and semantic prosody are usually studied separately or in a generalized manner. Specifically, little has been done on the noun *value* in terms of how its collocational tendencies, semantic inclinations, and the tendencies of its prosodic characteristics interact with various disciplines. The current research fills this gap with a systematic corpus-based study of *value* based on the BAWE data retrieved through Sketch Engine.

3. Research Questions

1) Which collocations appear most often with the high-frequency nouns *value* in British academic written English?
2) What semantic prosodies accompany collocations of high-frequency noun *value* in British academic writing texts?
3) How do the semantic preferences of a high-frequency noun of *value* impact their usage as well as their meanings in academic discourse?

4. Methodology

This paper uses a corpus research design to examine collocations, semantic prosody, and semantic preference relating to the high-frequency noun *value* of British academic written English (BAWE). The data for the corpus was sourced from the BAWE, a corpus

encompassing a wide range of British academic texts, through Sketch Engine, a software tool for the analysis of linguistic detail. This approach enables systematic examination of semantic patterning, evaluative meaning, and collocational frequency across discipline-specific academic language.

4.1 Data Collection

The BAWE corpus was used to gather data through Sketch Engine. The Word Sketch and Collocations tools were used to identify the collocational patterns related to the noun *value*. The grammatical groups that were studied were as follows: adjective + noun (Adj + N), verb + noun (V + N), noun + noun (N + N), and prepositional phrase structures (PP) with *value.* The frequency and t-score were used to select collocates because the t-score is good at revealing high-frequency collocations that are statistically stable in large corpora. The five most common collocates of each grammatical category were chosen. To study the contextual meaning and evaluative dispositions, ten concordance lines for each collocate were studied; for the purpose of presentation in this study, only one representative example per collocate is provided in the tables. This will combine both quantitative frequency-based analysis and qualitative interpretive analysis of the concordance data.

4.2 Data Analysis

Recurring patterns of *value* collocated across the disciplinary texts of the BAWE corpus were identified through the Word Sketch function in Sketch Engine. Manual concordance analysis was conducted to study semantic prosody in terms of the repetitive evaluative meaning (positive, negative, or neutral) of the target noun. Semantic preference was examined based on the identification of recurring semantic domains and conceptual relations linked to *value*, especially disciplinary variation and its impact on meaning construction in academic discourse.

5. Findings

The next part presents the key findings of a corpus study on the high-frequency noun *value* in British Academic Written English (BAWE). Analysis has been conducted on collocational patterns, semantic prosody, and semantic preferences in four grammatical categories: adjective modifiers, verb-object constructions, noun compounds, and prepositional phrases.

5.1 Collocational Patterns of *Value*

The noun *value* exhibits different collocational patterns, which vary in terms of grammatical context and disciplinary use. The most common adjective modifiers are quantitative descriptive (e.g., high, low, mean) and methodological (e.g., theoretical, literature) modifiers, which reflect the evaluative functions of numeric and academic

domains. *Value* can be co-occurring with the following verbs in verb-object constructions: obtain, calculate, give, add, and compare, which denote measurement, calculation, and analysis actions. *Value* appears as a head noun in noun compounds, commonly with such endings as neutrality, judgment, proposal, theorem, and relevance, and it signifies abstraction or evaluation. *Value* is used in prepositional clauses alongside nouns in theory, range, set, ratio, and average and in quantitative contexts where STEM vocabulary is predominant, but such phrases as "theory of value" are used in conceptual discussion in economics and social theory. These collocational patterns have been summarized in Table 1, which presents the frequency and t-scores of the collocates in each grammatical context.

Table 1: Collocational Patterns of *Value* in BAWE

Modifier (Adj + Noun)	**Freq**	**t-score**	**Object of (Verb+ Noun)**	**Freq**	**t-score**	**Modifier (Noun+ Noun)**	**Freq**	**t-score**	**PP object of Noun**	**Freq**	**t-score**
Theoretical	67	8.85	Obtain	116	10.1	Neutrality	8	9.9	Theory	46	10.1
High	134	8.74	Calculate	89	9.9	Judgment	7	9.5	Range	29	9.3
Literature	56	8.74	Add	68	9.4	Proposition	7	9.5	Set	17	8.7
Mean	58	8.7	Give	115	8.9	Theorem	9	9.4	Ratio	6	8.2
Low	93	8.68	Compare	47	8.8	Relevance	6	9.3	Average	5	8.2

5.2 Semantic Prosody of *Value*

Semantic prosody of *Value* varies across grammatical and disciplinary settings. "High value" is used as an adjective modifier, which is rather neutral to positive prosodically, and "low value" signifies diminished significance or suboptimal results. Theoretical value, literature value, and mean value are mainly neutral and pertain to comparisons, benchmarking, or averages in science and academia. Observe, calculate, and give value exhibit neutral prosody in verb-object structures, whereas add value and compare value are either negative or contextually evaluative. Compounds such as "value neutrality" and "value judgment" are nouns that represent a methodological or evaluative position and maintain neutral prosody, but "value proposition," "value theorem," and "value relevance" are linked to positive or technical meaning. Lastly, the prepositional phrases (PP objects), such as "theory of value," "set of values," "range of values," "ratio of values," and "average of values," have prosody that is neutral, positive, or negative depending on the conceptual or quantitative meaning. These trends generally indicate that the evaluative meaning of *value* is highly mediated by collocational context and disciplinary norms. The following Table 2 presents these patterns by showing the occurrence rate, semantic meaning, and prosody of *value* in various grammatical contexts.

Table 2: Semantic Prosody of *Value* Across Grammatical Constructions

Modifiers (Adj+ Noun)	**Meaning**	**Semantic Prosody**
High value	High value of gearing, stock turnover, displacement, statistical data	Neutral / Positive
Theoretical value	Theoretical vs. experimental values, agreement or discrepancy	Neutral
Literature value	Literature values used for comparison, minor deviations noted	Neutral
Mean value	Mean values from measurements or data sets	Neutral
Low value	Low value of stopping voltage, dissociation constant, profits, production values	Negative
Object (Verb +Value)	**Meaning**	**Semantic Prosody**
Obtain + value	Refers to receiving or deriving values, usually from calculations or measurements.	Neutral
Calculate + value	Involves computing values through mathematics or scientific processes.	Neutral to Positive
Give + value	Indicates assigning, outputting, or providing a value, often via a process or instrument.	Neutral
Add + value	Refers to enhancing, increasing, or contributing to the worth or usefulness of something.	Positive
Compare + value	Involves evaluating differences or similarities between values.	Neutral to Positive
Modifies (Noun+ Noun)	**Meaning**	**Semantic Prosody**
Value neutrality	Weber emphasizes value neutrality in social science	Neutral
Value judgment	Sociological analysis should avoid including value judgments	Neutral
Value proposition	Customers perceived the value proposition as distinct and superior.	Positive
Value theorem	The final value theorem is applied to calculate system outcomes	Neutral
Value relevance	Value relevance of financial analysis is not diminishing despite evolving accounting standards.	Positive
Prepositional Phrase	**Meaning**	**Semantic Prosody**
Theory of value	Refers to Marx's economic theory linking value to labor; used in critique	Neutral to Negative
Set of values	Refers to moral, cultural, or ideological standards or beliefs	Positive
Range of values	Indicates variety or spread in data (mathematical/statistical)	Neutral
Ratio of values	A mathematical or scientific comparison used in analysis	Neutral
Average of values	Reflects central tendency of quantitative measurements	Neutral

5.3 Semantic Preferences of *Value*

Semantic preference analysis indicates that *value* co-occurs with lexical items drawn from distinctive conceptual domains across academic discourse. Across construction types, including adjectival modification, verb–object combinations, noun compounds, and prepositional phrase constructions, *value* exhibits stable associations with measurement, evaluation, market, and ideology-related domains. In quantitatively oriented disciplines, *value* frequently occurs in contexts involving numerical measurement, calculation, and comparison. In contrast, in the social sciences and humanities, it is more commonly linked to evaluative and normative expressions, while business and economics discourse prioritizes market- and strategy-related constructions. These distributional patterns are consistently observed across grammatical environments, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Semantic Preferences of *Value* Across Academic Disciplines

Modifier Adj+ Noun	**Semantic Preference/Function**	**Concordance Example**
High value	Indicates quantity, significance, or magnitude (often numerical or abstract, e.g., gearing, measurements)	*"A high value of Gearing means that a large proportion of the funding comes from long-term loans."*
Theoretical value	Refers to expected or calculated values in scientific or mathematical models	*"The experimental value for the standard deviation is in agreement with the theoretical value."*
Literature value	Refers to established or previously published data used as benchmarks	*"The molar enthalpy of vaporization of propanone was found to be 30.72kJmol-1, which is slightly higher than the literature value of 29.10kJmol-1."*
Mean value	Denotes average in statistical or experimental contexts	*"Table 2 shows the unweighted mean values of these two indicators for each region in the discussion."*
Low value	Indicates reduced magnitude or performance; often contrasts with higher values in analytical comparisons	*"This would have the effect of lowering the voltage across the capacitor, giving a lower value for the stopping voltage."*
Object (Verb +Noun)	**Semantic Preferences/Function**	**Concordance Example**
Obtain + value	Scientific/Experimental Measurements	*"The experimentally obtained values of the coefficient of friction are compared with established results..."*
Calculate + value	Numerical/Data-Driven Results	*"Therefore, the 't' value was calculated as 1.91..."*
Give + value	Mathematical Output/Measurement	*"Graph 5... gives a value of k of 0.013..."*
Add + value	Economic/Educational Gain; Accumulated Effect	*"This course has greatly added value to my own learning process."*
Compare + Value	Evaluation/Validation Against Standards or Theory	*"Values are compared to those predicted by theory, and values obtained"*

Modifies Noun + Noun	**Semantic Preference/Function**	**Concordance Example**
Value+ neutrality	Objectivity, scientific method, positivism	*"Weber emphasizes value neutrality in social science."*
Value + judgment(s)	Subjectivity, evaluation, ethics, decision-making	*"Sociology must avoid personal value judgments."*
Value + proposition	Business offering, customer perception, strategic advantage	*"Customers perceive distinct value proposition."*
Value + theorem	Mathematical rules, prediction, system analysis	*"Use final value theorem to find system's output."*
Value relevance	Financial reporting & analysis	*"Another article... discusses 'Measuring value relevance in a (possibly) inefficient market"*
Prepositional Phrase	**Semantic Preferences/Function**	**Concordance Example**
Theory of value	Marxist economics, political critique	*"The labour theory of value as described by Marx… is complex and has been the subject of much criticism…"*
Set of values	Ideological, cultural, or moral beliefs	*"A set of cultural values that are embodied within liberal and democratic regimes…"*
Range of values	Statistical or scientific data representation	*"This gives an idea of the range of values in the set of variables."*
Ratio of values	Quantitative comparison in experiments	*"The ratio of their integral flux values was used to calculate the thickness of the crystal…"*
Average of values	Central tendency in numerical data	*"This value was the average of the three line-to-line values"*

6. Discussion

The discussion below is an examination of the distributional and evaluative properties of the high-frequency noun *value* in British Academic Written English (BAWE). This section is based on the findings of the collocational, prosodic, and preferential patterns identified in the results and investigates the concept of *value* in the context of STEM, social sciences, humanities, and business. These three dimensions of analysis, the collocational patterns, semantic prosody, and semantic preferences, are systematically organized to structure the discussion.

6.1 Collocation Patterns of *Value*

The collocational phenomenon of *value* indicates clear disciplinary distinctions in academic writing. In STEM subjects, *value* is a term of operation and methodology, which measures, calculates, and empirically validates. Its collocational properties place it as a measure of centrality in experimental rigor and analytical accuracy. Contrastingly, in the social sciences and humanities, *value* is more often an operational and evaluative

category, which involves an ethical orientation, interpretive judgment, and epistemological assertion. This range of functions is further extended to business and economics discourse, where the *value* is equated with strategic and market-based senses. Overall, these tendencies point to the fact that *value* has both technical and conceptual functions, and it is understood through disciplinary epistemologies and communicative practices. The trend corresponds to the previous corpus-based studies of abstract nouns, which also reveal that high-frequency evaluative words are also subjected to disciplinary and communicative intentions.

6.2 Semantic Prosody of *Value*

The *value*'s semantic prosody is highly conditioned by the collocational context and its discursive role. Positive prosody is observed when there is a gain in *value* indexes, improvement, or tactical benefit, especially in evaluative or result-based discourse. Negative prosody, which is less frequent, signifies restriction, diminishment, or suboptimal performance, commonly comparative or analytical. Scientific and statistical applications utilize neutral prosody because *value* in such instances is a descriptive factor rather than an evaluative one. Semantic prosody is more complex in social, philosophical, and theoretical writing, ideologically situated, and oriented towards a methodology. These results suggest that semantic prosody is a nuanced evaluative process where academic authors articulate a stance without necessarily violating the conventions of objectivity or critical discourse within a particular discipline. These results demonstrate that automated feedback systems in writing can potentially identify semantic prosody patterns in student texts, which can provide targeted guidance on evaluative language based on disciplinary standards.

6.3 Semantic Preferences of *Value*

The analysis of semantic preferences shows that the *value* is systematically aligned with certain conceptual domains in different academic fields. It is also linked positively in the field of quantitative orientation towards domains of measurement, computation, and data representations, which further strengthens its use in generating empirical knowledge. In social sciences and humanities, *values* are more likely to be grouped around normative, ethical, and ideological spheres where the meaning is defined by interpretation and not calculation. The discourse of business and economics predicts functional and strategic arenas in terms of institutional and market demands. Such preferences provide limits to the interpretive scope of *value* because they indicate disciplinary specificity, as well as provide the expectations of the readers. Simultaneously, the regularities in grammatical structures depict how a high-frequency noun may be semantically open and at the same time systematically organized according to genre and discipline. Such findings can guide corpus-driven teaching in which learners are instructed on how to recognize and use semantic preferences and patterns of evaluation based on discipline-specific requirements.

In summary, the study demonstrates that *value* collocations appear differently throughout various grammatical structures and academic fields because they show both numerical values and assessment outcomes. The semantic prosody of this term depends on the context because it remains neutral in scientific writing, yet becomes positive or evaluative when used in social science and business fields. The analysis of semantic preferences shows how different academic fields create their own conceptual areas, which determine how researchers use the term value in their work.

7. Recommendations

This research paper provides several theoretical and practical recommendations. Corpus-based analyses of high-frequency nouns can also be used to further the study of evaluative and conceptual senses and make cross-disciplinary/cross-linguistic comparisons. In practice, the results can inform academic writing teaching, as they can assist students in applying evaluative, technical, and conceptual senses of value in the right way to increase coherence and context-specific communication. They are also able to guide the creation of automated feedback writing systems for discipline-specific lexical guidance.

The techniques employed in this study, involving the use of a corpus to examine the meanings of high-frequency abstract nouns, could be used in future studies on other high-frequency abstract nouns and address cross-corpus or cross-language regularities of meaning. Academic writing skills of students can also be enhanced with the help of pedagogical interventions, e.g., specific exercises or digital tools for feedback. Possible social and cultural effects of these practices are also present, including creating an inclusive, context-specific, and globally informed academic communication.

8. Conclusion

This paper demonstrates that high-frequency noun *value* is varied in the application in British Academic Written English (BAWE). It is applied most commonly in a quantitative and methodological sense in the field of STEM, as an expression of measurement, calculation, and analysis; in the humanities and social sciences, it can be transformed into an articulation of an ethical, normative or interpretive judgment; in the business world, it is connected with a strategic, functional and market-focused connotation. Semantic prosody and semantic preferences are also discussed to highlight the influence of evaluative predilection and conceptual associations by disciplinary conventions, which throws some light on the flexibility and systematicity of academic vocabulary. The findings contribute to corpus linguistics and enable a focused analysis of a high-frequency abstract noun and can be practically implemented towards the teaching of academic writing. Specifically, the perception of such lexical patterns can help the researchers, the teachers and the learners to recognize the influence of the disciplinary

situation on meaning-making, develop the collocational and evaluative competence and produce more correct and concise academic texts.

Conflict of Interest Statement
The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

About the Author
K. M. Jubair Uddin is an Assistant Professor in the Faculty of Biological Sciences at the University of Chittagong, Bangladesh. His research centres on corpus-based approaches to second language acquisition, bilingualism, and language assessment with an emphasis on integrating theory and practice to support multilingual learners. His publications have addressed pronunciation, vocabulary development, second-language acquisition theories, language in literature, corrective feedback, language policy, and language identity. His work provides insights into the teaching and assessment of language across different disciplinary settings.

References

Ackermann, K., & Chen, Y.-H. (2013). Developing the academic collocation list (ACL) – A corpus-driven and expert-judged approach. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 12*(4), 235–247. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeap.2013.08.002

Bednarek, M. (2008a). Evaluation in media discourse. Retrieved from https://www.torrossa.com/it/resources/an/5204191

Bednarek, M. (2008b). Semantic preference and semantic prosody re-examined. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory, 4*(2), 119–139. https://doi.org/10.1515/CLLT.2008.006

Begagić, M. (2013). Semantic preference and semantic prosody of the collocation make sense. *Jezikoslovlje, 14*(2–3), 403–416. https://hrcak.srce.hr/112198

Begagić, M. (2018). Semantic preference and semantic prosody: A theoretical overview. *Journal of Education and Humanities (JEH), 1*(2), 65–88. Retrieved from https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=773549

Biber, D., & Gray, B. (2016). *Grammatical complexity in academic English: Linguistic change in writing*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from https://www.cambridge.org/core/books/grammatical-complexity-in-academic-english/0986B2B0F882B68A7427909C6A8C428D

Coxhead, A. (2000). A new academic word list. *TESOL Quarterly, 34*(2), 213–238. https://doi.org/10.2307/3587951

Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations? *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching, 47*(2), 157–177. Retrieved from https://repository.bilkent.edu.tr/items/835a37e6-b15d-493b-8ccd-67448063c12a

Flowerdew, L. (2012). *Corpora and language education*. Springer. Retrieved from https://link.springer.com/book/10.1057/9780230355569

Gablasova, D., Brezina, V., & McEnery, T. (2017). Collocations in corpus-based language learning research: Identifying, comparing, and interpreting the evidence. *Language Learning, 67*(S1), 155–179. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12225

Hoey, M. (2012). *Lexical priming: A new theory of words and language*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.taylorfrancis.com/books/mono/10.4324/9780203327630/lexical-priming-michael-hoey

Hunston, S. (2007). Semantic prosody revisited. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 12*(2), 249–268. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.12.2.09hun

Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2009). Academic lexis and disciplinary practice: Corpus evidence for specificity. *International Journal of English Studies, 9*(2), 111–129. Retrieved from https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ878445.pdf

Jones, C., & Waller, D. (2015). *Corpus linguistics for grammar: A guide for research*. Routledge. Retrieved from https://www.routledge.com/Corpus-Linguistics-for-Grammar-A-guide-for-research/Jones-Waller/p/book/9780415746410

Lin, Y.-Y., & Chung, S.-F. (2016). A corpus-based study on the semantic prosody of challenge. *Taiwan Journal of TESOL, 13*(2), 99–146. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1143821

Louw, B. (1993). Irony in the text or insincerity in the writer? — The diagnostic potential of semantic prosodies. In M. Baker, G. Francis, & E. Tognini-Bonelli (Eds.), *Text and technology* (pp. 157–176). John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://doi.org/10.1075/z.64.11lou

Morley, J., & Partington, A. (2009). A few frequently asked questions about semantic—or evaluative—prosody. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 14*(2), 139–158. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.14.2.01mor

Nesi, H., & Gardner, S. (2018). The BAWE corpus and genre families classification of assessed student writing. *Assessing Writing, 38*, 51–55. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S107529351830045X

Partington, A. (2004). "Utterly content in each other's company": Semantic prosody and semantic preference. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 9*(1), 131–156. https://doi.org/10.1075/ijcl.9.1.07par

Sidupa, C., & Wastono, A. T. (2019). Semantic preference of verb–noun collocation: A corpus-based analysis (pp. 7–11). https://doi.org/10.2991/conaplin-18.2019.216

Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford University Press.

Sinclair, J. (1996). The search for units of meaning. *Textus, 9*(1), 75–106. Retrieved from https://corpus.bfsu.edu.cn/Sinclair_1996_The_Search_For_Units_Of_Meaning_Textus.pdf

Sketch Engine. (n.d.). *Sketch Engine*. Lexical Computing. Retrieved from https://www.sketchengine.eu

Smith, K. A., & Nordquist, D. (2012). A critical and historical investigation into semantic prosody. *Journal of Historical Pragmatics, 13*(2), 291–312. https://doi.org/10.1075/jhp.13.2.05smi

Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and phrases: Corpus studies of lexical semantics*. John Wiley & Sons. Retrieved from https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=opa8EAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=Stubbs,+M.+(2001).+Words+and+phrases:+Corpus+studies+of+lexical+semantics.+Blackwell.&ots=kSN61xguSg&sig=I6uh_sCqcXMgNj3usZLvvImSJe0