

A Corpus-Based Analysis of BE + Being + Adjective in English from the Appraisal Framework Perspective

Baramee Kheovichai

Department of English, Faculty of Arts, Silpakorn University, Thailand

Corresponding author: baramEEK436@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper investigates the phraseological pattern BE + being + adjective. Specifically, it looks at the types of adjective meanings that can occur in this pattern, using Martin & White's (2005) appraisal framework as the classification scheme, the grammatical subjects, tenses and engagement resources co-occurring with this phraseological pattern. The interplay of these linguistic features is investigated to shed light on the meaning and functions of the phraseological pattern. Data was drawn from the British National Corpus. The results indicate that there are 1,218 instances of this phraseological pattern in the corpus. The type of adjectives that occur in this pattern with the highest frequency is Judgment. Third person subjects, the present tense and Monogloss have the highest frequency in comparison with other categories of grammatical subject, tense and engagement resource, respectively. A closer look at the interrelation between different linguistic features leads to further findings and complex picture of how clusters of linguistic features can influence the meaning and function of this phraseological pattern.

Keywords: Corpus linguistics; Grammar; Stative verb; evaluative language; Phraseology

Introduction

Corpus linguistics has shed new light on various aspects of English grammar via the analysis of phraseology and authentic examples in context. The advent of corpus linguistics facilitates studies on how grammatical features are used in different contexts and how they change over time. For example, Biber et al. (1999) compares linguistic features such as the progressive aspect and modal verbs in British English and American English. Biber (2006) compare the functions of various grammatical features in different registers. Bachman (2013) diachronically studies the pattern go-v and go-and-v in American English. Smith (2013) investigates the preposition + noun + preposition sequences and looks at the grammaticalization process whereby such sequences become fixed expressions. Yao & Collins (2013) conduct a comparative study of how the non-present perfect constructions have changed in British and American English.

Furthermore, corpus linguistics has led to further study on collocation and phraseology, which have tremendous influences on meanings of words and structure. Through investigation of co-occurring words and grammatical features, meanings and uses of words or structures can be identified. This has led to new findings and, among various claims, it has been argued that grammar and lexis are in fact not entirely separated (Sinclair, 2004; Sinclair, 1991). Hunston & Francis (1999) even propose the pattern grammar approach which investigates grammatical patterns using corpus linguistic methodology. They observe that lexis generally occurs in the pattern that has a meaning related to it, thereby displaying a co-selection between lexis and grammar. This notion is corroborated by Stefanowitsch & Gries (2003) who use corpus linguistics and statistical methods to investigate the association between a construction and words. From a cognitive linguistics perspective, they view that certain constructions attract a group of words whose meanings are congruent with the meaning (s) of the constructions. There are several studies that look at association between various linguistic features and the phraseology. For instance,

Mindt (2011) studies the adjective + that-clause and how the surrounding linguistic features influence its meaning. Vincent (2013) analyzed the association between modality, verbs and wh-words, using the pattern grammar approach.

While a number of phraseologies have been investigated, little attention has been paid to the phraseological pattern BE + being + adjective. This pattern is of particular interest because EFL textbooks often write that the progressive aspect is rarely used with stative verbs (cf. Soars & Soars, 2012). Yet, it has been pointed out that what is taught in textbooks is not always similar to authentic language use (Phoocharoensil, 2014). In fact, examples such as ‘You are being stupid again’ clearly contradict what is taught in textbooks about the progressive used with stative verbs (Kennedy, 2003, p.232). It has been argued that such examples of ‘be’ used in the progressive aspect is possible with dynamic adjectives where the grammatical subject is in control of the state (Kennedy, 2003; Kranich, 2010). Still, this explanation disregards how other linguistic features may influence the meaning of the grammatical pattern as has been pointed out by a number of other studies (Levin, 2013; Mindt, 2011).

While Levin’s (2013) study investigates BE + being + adjective and also looks at tense and grammatical objects co-occurring with the phraseological pattern, the interrelation between the evaluative meaning of the adjective, the grammatical subject and the tense has not been investigated. To shed light on the discursive function of this phraseological pattern, it is crucial to investigate the interrelation between these linguistic features. As Conrad (2010) notes, grammatical features need to be analysed in relation to discourse contexts. Therefore, frameworks in discourse analysis can be applied to shed further light on the discursive functions of this phraseological pattern. Since this pattern has been claimed to be associated with attitudinal meanings (Levin, 2013), a discourse analytical framework of Appraisal Framework (Martin & White, 2005), which has been widely applied in discourse analysis of attitudinal meaning (cf. Fuoli, 2012), was selected for the analysis of the evaluative meanings

associated with this phraseological pattern. In addition, engagement resource (Martin & White, 2005) which is the interactive discourse feature has not been investigated in relation to this phraseological pattern, and thus it is used to analyse this pattern in this study.

This paper aims to investigate the pattern BE + being + adjective in the British National Corpus (Burnard, 2000). The research questions are as follows:

- 1) What are meaning groups of adjectives that occur in this phraseological pattern;
 - 2) What tense is more frequently used in this pattern;
 - 3) What are the grammatical subjects of this pattern;
 - 4) What categories of engagement resources occur in this pattern;
- and
- 5) What is the interplay between adjective meanings, grammatical subjects, tenses and engagement resources when they co-occur in this pattern?

It is hoped that the meanings and functions of this phraseological pattern resulting from the co-selection of grammar and lexical features associated with this pattern can be identified based on an analysis of a corpus of authentic language. With the analysis of adjectives, the qualities or characteristics associated with this pattern can be detected. The analytical framework employed here is Martin & White's (2005) appraisal framework, which allows a systematic analysis of adjective meanings. The analysis of grammatical subjects occurring in this pattern can show whether this pattern is often used to refer to the addresser, addressee or a third party. Whether this pattern is used for current or past events can be answered via the analysis of tenses. Furthermore, the interactive aspect of this pattern which can influence the meaning and function of this phraseological pattern can be investigated via the framework of engagement. The interplay between these variables can further elucidate the meanings and functions associated with the pattern.

Literature Review

Progressive aspect and the stative verb ‘be’

There are a number of studies that investigated the progressive aspect (cf. Bybee & Dahl, 1989; Drackova, 2011; Granath & Wherrity, 2014; Kranich, 2010; Levin, 2013; Mindt, 2000; Romer, 2005; Smiecinska, 2003; Smitterberg, 2005). Based on these studies, there seem to be corroborated claims that the progressive aspect has two types of meaning associated with it. These are aspectual meaning and attitudinal meaning. Aspectual meaning is related to temporal reference, whereas attitudinal meaning is related to emotion and stance construed by this grammatical feature. A survey of the findings from the aforementioned previous studies reveals that these two types of meaning can be further subdivided into sub-categories as follows. The aspectual meaning consists of eight subcategories: 1) on-going actions, 2) actions that have no clear ending, 3) incomplete actions, 4) habitual actions, 5) actions that involve gradual changes, 6) temporary and specific action, 7) contrasting old and new habits and 8) framing on-going action being interrupted by another action. There are seven sub-categories of attitudinal meaning: 1) expressing annoyance, 2) conveying shock or disbelief, 3) showing emphasis to give a vivid image of the event, 4) indicating the volition of the agent, 5) implying that the doer is pretending, 6) showing politeness and 7) implying that the actions violate the norms.

While it has been noted that stative verbs are not frequently used in the progressive aspect, such uses do occur and they generally have added layers of meaning. The instances of stative verbs used with the progressive aspect often have attitudinal meanings (Kranich, 2010; Smiecinska, 2003), indicate a process of change (Swan, 2005) or imply that the agent is in control of the state (Kennedy, 2003). Studies have been conducted on various stative verbs such as ‘love’ and ‘know’ (Granath & Wherrity, 2014), ‘like’, ‘fear’, ‘want’ ‘wish’, understand’, ‘believe’, ‘realize’ and ‘suppose’ (Drackova, 2011). As for the verb ‘be’, two studies are of particular relevance. Kranich (2010) studied the changes of stative

verbs that are used in the progressive aspects and Levin (2013) analyzed the verb 'be' and private verbs in various corpora.

Kranich (2010) investigated the diachronic changes of the verb 'be' and found that it is rarely used in the progressive aspect. However, when it is used, it has an evaluative meaning associated with the dynamic behavior being described as a state. It is used to refer to the speaker's or addressee's behavior and it implies that the grammatical subject is in control of the state. Levin (2013) conducted a diachronic study of the verb 'be' and private verbs when used in the progressive aspects. The data was from two sources: the Time Magazine Corpus for a diachronic analysis and COCA and Longman Spoken American English Corpus for a cross-genre comparison. The diachronic investigation indicates that the use of verb 'be' in the progressive aspect has increased over time. It is mainly used in conversation and informal contexts. Furthermore, a vast majority of adjectives occurring as a complement of the verb 'be' has evaluative meanings. In addition, the first person and second person pronoun frequently occur as a grammatical subject of this construction. In terms of temporal reference, this construction often occurs in the present tense. He also notes that this construction functions as a face-saving tactic as it construes the action as temporary and unusual for the person who performs the action in question. While the adjectives occurring in this construction are largely associated with negative evaluation, such as displaying annoyance, there are cases where adjectives with positive meanings appear in this construction as well.

While Levin's study made claims about the evaluative adjectives, it has not further investigated the classification of evaluative adjectives. Moreover, while it mentions the co-occurrences of this construction with certain types of grammatical subjects and the tenses associated with this construction, he has not investigated how different meaning groups of the evaluative adjectives may interact with these linguistic features.

Methodology

1. Procedure

The analysis was based on the British National Corpus (BNC: Burnard, 2000) which contains a large size of data and allows part-of-speech search, thereby facilitating the retrieval of this pattern in the corpus. The British National Corpus consists of 100 million words data: 10 million words of spoken texts and 90 million words of written texts from a variety of genres and situational contexts. Since this study does not aim to do cross-genre comparison and analyse a particular genre specifically but analyse language use in general, the British National Corpus seems to be a strong candidate for representing spoken and written English. The research procedures are as follows. First, a search string `_VB* (n't)? (not)? being (_AV*)? (_AV*)? (_AV*)? _AJ*` was entered into the BNC webpage. The resulting outputs were exported into Microsoft Excel. This study only focuses on instances where BE + being + adjectives is used in progressive aspect and thus when this pattern is used in a pseudo-cleft sentence, the instances were excluded from the analysis. The remaining instances were then manually coded. The adjectives were sorted into categories according to the Appraisal Framework (Martin & White, 2005). After that, the classification of the subject, tenses and engagement (Martin & White, 2005) was used to code the data. Once all the data had been coded, they were counted and cross-tabulated in order to determine the salient features and cross-category association. The next section provides more detail of the classification schemes.

2. Classification schemes

This section explains the classification schemes for data coding. The classification scheme are based on theoretical framework in linguistics, especially the Appraisal Framework (Martin & White, 2005) and the classification schemes have been tested on data analysis and modified

accordingly. It is an iterative process of applying and modifying the schemes to make them best suitable for the data analysis. To answer the research questions posed in Section 1, this paper used the following classification for the coding of adjective meanings, tenses, grammatical subjects and engagement features.

2.1 Adjective meaning classification

The classification of evaluative meanings of adjectives is based on Martin and White's (2005) Appraisal Framework. The evaluative meanings of adjectives are divided into three broad categories. These are: 1) Affect, 2) Judgment and 3) Appreciation. As noted earlier, Affect refers to emotion; Judgment is about social ethics and ability while Appreciation construes aesthetic qualities. These three categories are further subdivided as follows.

Affect is subdivided into: 1) Inclination, 2) Disinclination, 3) Happiness, 4) Unhappiness, 5) Security, 6) Insecurity, 7) Satisfaction and 8) Dissatisfaction. A brief explanation and an example of each category is shown below. The adjective is underlined and the file from the corpus where the example was drawn is provided in brackets.

Inclination: feeling of desire

1) Charles and Ann had been out several times together, there had been no aggression, and they were being more affectionate. (B30 551).

Disinclination: fear or undesirability

2) They're being frightened because they enjoy being frightened and there's a kind of perverse wish fulfillment in that. (HUL 566 P52 R3).

Happiness: happy emotion

3) They are being happy. (J17 3144).

Unhappiness: sad or unhappy feeling

4) Do you think they're being too gloomy and do you think certain other people are being too euphoric? (HYE 194 PS2 YR)

Security: peace, confidence and trust

5) find that when I am not being as assertive or I'm not very good in a one to one situation thinking your answers back straight away. (JND 364 PS40B)

Insecurity: anxiety and distrust

6) But they were being pessimistic (JIG 531)

Satisfaction: pleasure and interest

7) Make notes and read back key points so that the caller knows you are being attentive (B2F 1933)

Dissatisfaction: displeasure and boredom

8) You're being hysterical (GV2 1109)

Inclination construes the feeling of desire and, in example 1 above, the word 'affectionate' construes this feeling. Disinclination relates to fear and not wanting certain things which is shown in 'frightened' in example 2. Happiness and Unhappiness are self-explanatory and the word 'happy' in example 3 indicates Happiness, whereas the word 'gloomy' in example 4 indicates Unhappiness. In example 5, the word 'assertive' belongs to Security which construes trust and confidence. In example 6, the word 'pessimistic' construes Insecurity which is associated with anxiety and lack of trust. Example 7 shows Satisfaction as can be seen from the word 'attentive'. Example 8 shows Dissatisfaction as shown in the word 'hysterical'.

Regarding Judgement, it is sub-divided into ten categories. These are 1) +Normality, 2) -Normality, 3) +Capacity, 4) -Capacity, 5) +Tenacity, 6) -Tenacity, 7) +Veracity, 8) -Veracity, 9) +Propriety and 10) -Propriety. A brief explanation and an example of each category is shown below:

+Normality: normal or common

9) Why do I have to conform, to feel real only when I am being normal? (H86 1794)

-Normality: abnormal and strange

10) I think my mum thought she was being unusual at the time, (HHO 2300)

+Capacity: ability and sensibility

11) You're being too clever (APM 2614)

- Capacity: lack of ability and reason

12) You are being silly about this, Penny. (AB9 985).

+Tenacity: dependability and carefulness

13) And then the practicalities come in, and that's why your executive is being very cautious in this report. (HDU 485)

-Tenacity: carelessness and unreliability

14) I had no money and she was being highly irresponsible. (CH1 1867)

+Veracity: honesty

15) I'm being honest. (CKO 480)

-Veracity: dishonesty

16) He wants so desperately to be vital, but he is being terribly dishonest with himself. (CK5 3375)

+Propriety: good and respectable

17) Everyone is being extra nice to me and, best of all, Pa is taking me to the yard tomorrow. (G02 2208)

-Propriety: bad and villainous

18) The hon. Gentleman is being unfair to the North sea supplies industry. (HYV 375)

In example 9, the word 'normal' indicates +Normality. In example 10, the word 'unusual' is indicative of -Normality which construes anomaly. In example 11, the word 'clever' shows +Capacity which is about ability. Example 12 contains the word 'silly', indicating -Capacity which is about inability. Example 13 has the word 'cautious' which construes +Tenacity which is about dependability Example 14 contains the word 'irresponsible' which construes -Tenacity which is associated with unreliability. In example 15, the word 'honest' construes +Veracity which is related to truthfulness. In example 16, the word 'dishonest' construes -Veracity which relates to dishonesty. The word 'nice' in example 17 and 'unfair' in example 18 construes +Propriety and -Propriety, respectively. +/-Propriety is concerning ethics or the lack of it.

The final main category, Appreciation, is sub-divided into six subcategories. These consist of: 1) +Reaction, 2) –Reaction, 3) +Composition, 4) –Composition, 5) +Valuation and 6) –Valuation. An example of each category is provided below.

+ Reaction: evoking positive emotional reaction

19) I was sitting next to Mrs. Gorman, and as usual Mrs. Gorman was being very bright and amusing. (H9U 98)

- Reaction: evoking negative emotional reaction

20) You cannot blame the puppy if you are being boring (AR5 1425)

+ Composition: the quality of being balanced, subtle and well-structured

21) ‘You ought to make Bueno take you to the concert,’ she said, thinking instantly that she was being cruelly tactful. (G10 722)

- Composition: being imbalanced, simplistic and poorly-structured

22) You’re being evasive again, and I won’t have it. (HA6 3011)

+ Valuation: worthwhileness

23) Mild advice to stop shouting and come back to bed because he wasn’t being effective and little to deter from a sense of deep injustice. (ACE 60)

- Valuation: worthlessness

24) ‘Now you’re being utterly futile,’ Madaleine told him. (F58 1174)

+/-Reaction refers to positive or negative emotional impact. The word ‘amusing’ in example 19 construes positive emotional impact while the word ‘boring’ in example 20 construes negative emotional impact +/-Composition is related the complexity, clarity and organization. The word ‘tactful’ in example 21 indicates the evaluative meaning of +Composition. On the other hand, the word ‘evasive’ in example 22 conveys the evaluative meaning of – Composition. The categories +/- Valuation are associated positive or negative value and usefulness.

The word ‘effective’ in example 23 expresses a positive value but the word ‘futile’ expresses a negative value.

The final category is Others. This group consists of adjectives that cannot be sorted into any group according to Martin & White’s (2005) Appraisal Framework. An example is the word ‘windy’ as shown in example 25 below:

25) Well it’s being so windy isn’t it? (KBP558)

2.2 Tense classification

The concept of tenses in English has been classified in many ways. While EFL textbook normally divides them into 12 tenses (Fuchs & Bonner, 2006), from a linguistic perspective, tenses can be divided into two primary tenses: present and past (Huddleston & Pullum, 2007); or the classification may involve 3 tenses: present, past and future (Saeed, 2003) while the progressive and perfective, normally considered tenses in EFL textbooks, are considered as aspects. In the present study, since only instances of present and past tense can be identified and the phrases under investigation are all progressive aspect, the coding of tenses are based on two primary tenses: present and past. Examples are as follows:

26) I’m being polite. (A7A 18)

27) I wasn’t being noble. (G07 4177)

2.3 Grammatical subject classification

The classification of grammatical subjects is as follows: 1) first person, 2) second person, and 3) third person. An example of each category is given below.

First person:

28) I’m being perfectly rational. (JXW 1452)

Second person:

29) You’re being quite wonderful (BOB 156)

Third person:

30) Maloney is being wise and Lewis should listen to him.

2.4 Engagement classification

The classification of engagement is based on Martin & White's (2005) framework of engagement. It consists of six categories: 1) Monogloss 2) Deny, 3) Counter, 4) Proclaim, 5) Entertain and 6) Attribute. A brief definition and an example of each category is provided below.

Monogloss: direct, unmitigated statement

31) You're being too clever. (APM 2614)

Deny: negation

32) Jenny, I don't want to sound like an old auntie, but you are not being very sensible about Matthew. (J54 1429)

Counter: statements countering the existing proposition

33) But I was the one who was being ruthless. (ASV 1303)

Proclaim: linguistic features heightening the certainty of the speakers

34) I know I'm being stupid ! (C9W 1046)

Entertain: linguistic features mitigating the certainty of the statement

35) Perhaps she was being silly in thinking that her job was the stumbling-block between them. (JY4 3125)

Attribute: linguistic features construing proposition as deriving from other sources

36) Others thought I was being stupid. (BME 1609)

Example 31 is an instance of Monogloss because it is apparent that the message is stated outright without any linguistic features that indicate subjective stance. In example 32, the words 'not' indicate negation of a particular position, which is called Deny based on the engagement meanings. In example 33, the word 'but' shows contrast and thus is an example of Counter. In example 34, the word 'I know' shows Proclaim, indicating the author's high degree of confidence in the statement. In example 35, the word 'perhaps' construes the engagement meaning of Entertain, which tones down the force of the message and acknowledges alternative possibility. Example 36 contains the clause 'others thought', which indicates external source where the statement came from. In some instances of the phraseological

pattern BE + being + adjective, there are more than one categories of co-occurring engagement and they were coded accordingly.

Results and Discussion

This section presents findings from data analysis. Overall, there are 1,218 instances of this pattern in the British National Corpus. Findings from data analysis can be presented in two phases. In Section 1, analysis of individual categories is presented. In Section 2, occurrences of linguistic features are cross-tabulated with each other to investigate whether there is a tendency for certain linguistic features to cluster with each other.

1. Analysis of individual categories

This section presents findings of adjective meanings, tense, grammatical subjects and engagement individually. Frequency of the broad categories of adjective meanings is shown in Table 1. From the table, it is evident that Judgement has the highest frequency (990 instances), followed by Affect (112 instances), Appreciation (104 instances) and Others (12 instances). It can be seen then that the majority of this phraseological pattern uses are associated with social behaviour. Affect and Appreciation are much less frequent and thus constitute a marginal pattern. In what follows, we look more closely into the subcategories of each adjective meaning group.

Table 1 Frequency of broad categories of adjective meaning

Adjective meaning	Frequency	Percent
Judgement	990	81.21
Affect	112	9.19
Appreciation	104	8.53
Others	12	0.98
Total	1,218	

A closer look at Judgement yields a number of observations. Based on the frequency of the subcategories shown in Table 2, this phraseological pattern tends to be used to describe behaviour and competence more than

morality. This observation came from the fact that the frequency of Social Esteem, which consists of +Normality, - Normality, +Capacity, -Capacity, +Tenacity and –Tenacity, is 575 instances whereas the frequency of Social Sanction, comprising +Veracity, -Veracity, +Propriety and –Propriety is 465 instances. Furthermore, this phraseological pattern is more frequently used in negative contexts; that is, it is used to describe bad behaviour or character. There are 378 instances of adjectives with positive meaning in this pattern but 612 instances of adjectives with negative meanings. Among these in the Social Esteem category, 173 instances are positive adjectives while 352 instances are negative adjectives. In the Social Sanction category, 205 instances are positive adjectives while 260 instances are negative adjectives. With higher frequency of negative adjectives in the social esteem, it seems that this phraseological pattern is used more frequently to describe incompetence or annoying behaviours than immoral or unethical action or character. However, it should be noted that in the +/-Veracity, the trend is reverse, with + Veracity having a higher frequency than - Veracity. Even though the tendency for negative meaning can be observed in the majority of the categories, this exception also indicates that the pattern is more complicated as some type of evaluative meaning favours positive more than negative meaning.

Table 2 Frequency of judgment

	Judgment types	Example adjectives	Frequency
Social Esteem	+Normality	Normal	1
	-Normality	Unusual	2
	+Capacity	Clever, sensible, successful	66
	-Capacity	Silly, unreasonable, ridiculous	178
	+Tenacity	Cautious, careful, brave	106
	-Tenacity	Irresponsible, hasty, aggressive	172
Social Sanction	+Veracity	Honest, frank, truthful	52
	-Veracity	Tactless, coy, disingenuous	44
	+Propriety	Nice, kind, generous	153
	-Propriety	Unfair, rude, horrible	216

In terms of Affect, the frequency information is shown in Table 3, and the following observations can be made. The types of emotion most frequently expressed using this pattern is In/Security (43 instances), followed by Dis/Satisfaction (32 instances), Dis/Inclination (31 instances), and the least frequent one, Un/Happiness (6 instances). Furthermore, negative emotions occur more frequently than positive emotions (68 instances of adjectives associated with negative emotions vs 44 instances of adjectives associated with positive emotions). Considering each type of emotion in terms of positive/negative polarity, it can be seen that Security and Happiness occur more than their negative counterparts, which are Insecurity and Unhappiness, respectively. In contrast, Dissatisfaction and Disinclination occur more frequently than their positive Counterparts, which are Satisfaction and Inclination. This is consistent with Levin's (2013) findings that there are instances of this phraseology used with a positive meaning as well as negative meaning and certain groups of meanings are more prone to co-occurring with positive or negative meanings than others. Thus, while the majority of the meaning groups are negative, a fine-grained analysis indicates that this phraseological pattern is more complicated than what has been discussed in previous studies.

Table 3 Frequency of Affect

Affect types	Example adjectives	Frequency
Security	Reassuring, positive, assertive	20
Insecurity	Paranoid, cagey, pessimistic	23
Satisfaction	Appeasing, cool, attentive	3
Dissatisfaction	Dismissive, hysterical, grumpy	29
Happiness	Happy, cheerful, euphoric	5
Unhappiness	Gloomy	1
Inclination	Affectionate, intrigued, admiring	16
Disinclination	Choosy, frightened, indifferent	15

Regarding Appreciation, the frequency information is shown in Table 4. Here it can be seen that the majority of the adjectives that belong to this category are associated with +/-Composition (53 instances). +/-Reaction has the second highest frequency (35 instances) while +/-Valuation has the lowest frequency (16 instances). In terms of positive/negative polarity, there are slightly more instances of positive adjectives associated with Appreciation than negative ones (55 instances vs 49 instances). A more detailed comparison of the sub-categories within the Appreciation reveals that +Composition and – Composition have almost equal frequency (27 and 26 instances), -Reaction (21 instances) occurs more than + Reaction (14 instances) and +Valuation (14 instances) occurs more than - Valuation (2 instances).

Table 4 Frequency of Appreciation

Affect types	Example adjectives	Frequency
+Composition	Direct, exact, consistent	27
-Composition	Evasive, cryptic, inconsistent	26
+Reaction	Amusing, funny, pleasant	14
-Reaction	Disgusting, noisy, unpleasant	21
+Valuation	Effective, wonderful, remarkable	14
-Valuation	Futile, under-utilised	2

Moving on to the tenses used in this phraseological pattern, 718 instances, which constitute the majority of this pattern, occur in the present tense. 500 instances occur in the past tense. In consequence, this phraseological pattern tend to be used to describe current events more than past events, which is consistent with Levin’s (2013) study.

As for the grammatical subjects, it can be argued that this phraseological pattern is used largely to describe personality or behaviours of other people. There are 719 instances of third person subject, 318 instances of first person subjects and 181 instances of second person subject. This finding is different from Levin (2013) who found that the subjects are mostly first person pronoun, but in this study third person

subject occurs more frequently. This may possibly be attributable to the different composition of the corpus. As the data in Levin's study consists of only spoken language, it may mainly concern immediate environment and contain a lot of first person pronouns, which is a characteristic of spoken language (Cameron & Panovic, 2014; Graddol, Cheshire, & Swann, 1994). On the other hand, this study is based on the BNC, which is comprised of spoken and written language and therefore results in different findings.

With respect to engagement, this pattern is more strongly associated with definitive statement. There are 521 instances of Monogloss, 230 instances of Deny, 215 instances of Counter, 106 instances of Proclaim 179 instances of Entertain, and 210 instances of Attribute. Given that Deny has the second highest frequency, it can be argued that apart from definitive statement, this phraseological pattern has a tendency to be associated with contrast and negation.

2. Interrelations among the linguistic features

This section discusses the co-occurrences of adjectives, tenses, grammatical subjects and engagements. It details the adjective meanings that frequently occur with the linguistic features. It also discusses co-occurrence pattern in terms of its function and the positive/negative meaning polarity that is associated with the tenses, grammatical subjects and engagements.

2.1 Adjective meanings and tenses

This section discusses the co-occurrences of adjective meanings and tenses. Table 5 shows the frequency and percentages of co-occurrences between adjective meanings and each tense. First, due to space limitations, only the adjective meanings which are ranked in the top five based on frequency in each tense are discussed. After that, meanings and communicative functions of adjectives meanings in relation to tenses are discussed.

Table 5 Frequency of co-occurrences between adjective meanings and tenses

Adjective meanings	Present		Past	
	Raw	%	Raw	%
+Normality	1	0.14	0.00	0
-Normality	1	0.14	0.20	1
+Capacity	42	5.85	4.80	24
-Capacity	104	14.48	14.80	74
+Tenacity	59	8.22	9.40	47
-Tenacity	103	14.35	13.80	69
+Veracity	30	4.18	4.40	22
-Veracity	32	4.46	2.40	12
+Propriety	70	9.75	16.60	83
-Propriety	147	20.47	13.80	69
Security	10	1.39	2.00	10
Insecurity	9	1.25	2.80	14
Satisfaction	3	0.42	0.00	0
Dissatisfaction	21	2.92	1.60	8
Happiness	3	0.42	0.40	2
Unhappiness	1	0.14	0.00	0
Inclination	6	0.84	2.00	10
Disinclination	7	0.97	1.60	8
+Composition	17	2.37	2.00	10
-Composition	17	2.37	1.80	9
+Reaction	5	0.70	1.80	9
-Reaction	10	1.39	2.20	11
+Valuation	8	1.11	1.20	6
-Valuation	2	0.28	0.00	0
Others	10	1.39	0.40	2

The first top five adjective meanings that occur in the present tense are as follows: 1) –Propriety, 2) –Capacity, 3) –Tenacity, 4) +Propriety and 5) +Tenacity. As such, it is apparent that adjective meanings associated with BE + being + adjective are largely negative and they are related to social sanction and social esteem, to use Martin & White’s (2005) term. The top five adjective meanings that occur in the past tense are: 1) +Propriety, 2) –Capacity, 3) –Propriety, 4) –Tenacity and 5) +Tenacity. What can be observed here is that the categories are the same but their frequency ranks are different. The relative frequency (percentages) across

the tenses do not differ greatly, except +Propriety and –Propriety. While + Propriety occurs much more frequently in the past tense than the present tense (16.6% vs 9.75%), -Propriety occurs far more frequently in the present tense than the past tense (20.47% vs 13.8%).

Analysis of the concordances indicates that even though the communicative functions associated with this phraseological pattern are of similar types across the tenses, the emphasis is different. That is, the +Propriety is associated with pretence, contrasting perception and reality, intentionality and finally compliment as in example 37, 38 and 39, respectively. These are used more frequently in the past tense.

37) She knew that Maggie was being polite, trawling for subjects to pass the time till she could safely move away. (CDY 1344)

38) The weight-conscious so often choose the most fattening dishes on the menu, in the mistaken idea that they were being virtuous. (C94 877)

39) He was being really helpful. (KD9 1610)

The –Propriety is used as disclaimer, self-defence, apology and criticism as shown in example 40, 41, 42 and 43, respectively. These are more often used in reference to present events.

40) I'm not being greedy but if someone paid me £50,000 for a fight, I'd be the happiest man in the world. (K37 210)

41) No I'm not being rude to Brian! (KBL 5403)

42) I'm being unfair, gabbling on about me and Maria Luisa when things didn't go right for you and Fernando. (JY4 3613)

43) You're being horrible. (KDV 2420)

2.2 Grammatical subjects and adjective meanings

This section is concerned with the co-occurrences of certain types of grammatical subjects with adjectives. Table 6 shows the frequency and percentages of co-occurrences each adjective category with each type of grammatical subject.

Table 6 Frequency of co-occurrences between adjective meanings and grammatical subjects

Adjective meanings	1 st Person		2 nd Person		3 rd Person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
+Normality	1	0.31	0	0.00	0	0.00
-Normality	0	0.00	0	0.00	2	0.28
+Capacity	19	5.97	8	4.42	39	5.42
-Capacity	46	14.47	45	24.86	87	12.10
+Tenacity	26	8.18	13	7.18	67	9.32
-Tenacity	52	16.35	15	8.29	105	14.60
+Veracity	17	5.35	9	4.97	26	3.62
-Veracity	13	4.09	8	4.42	23	3.20
+Propriety	29	9.12	19	10.50	105	14.60
-Propriety	68	21.38	31	17.13	117	16.27
Security	7	2.20	5	2.76	8	1.11
Insecurity	6	1.89	3	1.66	14	1.95
Satisfaction	2	0.63	1	0.55	0	0.00
Dissatisfaction	9	2.83	7	3.87	13	1.81
Happiness	0	0.00	0	0.00	5	0.70
Unhappiness	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.14
Inclination	1	0.31	1	0.55	14	1.95
Disinclination	3	0.94	1	0.55	11	1.53
+Composition	5	1.57	0	0.00	22	3.06
-Composition	5	1.57	4	2.21	17	2.36
+Reaction	1	0.31	1	0.55	12	1.67
-Reaction	3	0.94	5	2.76	13	1.81
+Valuation	3	0.94	2	1.10	9	1.25
-Valuation	0	0.00	1	0.55	1	0.14
Others	2	0.63	2	1.10	8	1.11

The top five adjective categories that occur with the first person subject are: 1) –Propriety, 2) –Capacity, 3) –Tenacity, 4) +Propriety and 5) +Tenacity. The five adjective categories that co-occur with the second person subject are: 1) –Capacity, 2) –Propriety, 3) +Propriety, 4) –Tenacity and 5) +Tenacity. The top five adjective categories that occur with the third person subject are: 1) –Propriety, 2) +Propriety, 3) –Tenacity, 4) –Capacity and 5) +Tenacity. It can be seen that –Propriety, -Capacity,

+Propriety, +Tenacity and –Tenacity occur in the top five of every category, indicating that the phraseological pattern BE + being + adjective is mainly used to criticize behaviour.

Apart from frequencies of co-occurrence, observations can be made regarding the communicative functions of this phraseological pattern when used with different types of grammatical subjects. We will look at the top five categories of adjective meanings since they are very frequent and occur across the grammatical subject categories, though with some differences in frequency ranking.

As for -Capacity, it is used for apology when the grammatical subject is the first person as in example 44. Yet, when the subject is the second or third person, it is used to express annoyance with certain behaviour as in example 45 and 46. Furthermore, with third person grammatical subjects, this phraseological pattern is used to convey the meaning that the person in question cannot help doing something silly as in example 47, that the thought is different from reality as in example 48, and that the person is denying one's thought or feelings as in example 49.

44) Sorry, I'm being silly (CA0 370)

45) Miss Kenton, you are being quite ridiculous.
(HGT 371)

46) Your husband is being unreasonable. (A70 1197)

47) This upset Stella, though she knew she was being foolish. (FNU 640)

48) Frederica thought he was being philistine and was later to learn that he was being simply truthful. (FET 1591)

49) She felt rather guilty at the thought, then told herself she was being ridiculous (J19 1311)

Regarding +Tenacity, when the grammatical subject is the first person, it is frequently used to emphasize seriousness as shown in example 50. On the other hand, when the grammatical subject is the second person, it is often used to express doubt as to how reliable the second person

is as in example 51. For the third person subject, it tends to be used to convey lack of confidence as in example 52.

50) I'm being serious Paul! (KCW 2923)

51) And you're being serious? (FYY 1580)

52) Large government grants are being offered to attract industries to the Enterprise Zones within Liverpool and Manchester but, with an uncertain future, most managers are being cautious over investing money for new industries in the region. (B1H 2491)

In terms of –Tenacity, with the first person subject, the phraseological pattern is often used to emphasize the speaker's seriousness as shown in example 53 or to make a preface before negative comments as in example 54. In the first case, it often co-occurs with negation or the engagement category of Deny. In the latter case, it frequently co-occurs with Counter. In contrast, with the second and third person, it tends to be used to express negative comments as in example 55 and 56.

53) Well I like singing it, what I mean, I think what it is I'm looking for the old, I'm not being funny, I'm looking for the old voice. (KCF 3715)

54) Perhaps I am being unnecessary cynical but it seems that too much of a designer maker's time is spent on public relations and maintaining the image and there is less willingness to share the things learned from technical and creative nightmares. (EFH 680)

55) You are being too hasty, Bodenland! (HTH 955)

56) She was being melodramatic. (HH8 2958)

Concerning +Propriety, when used with the first and third person subject, the phraseological pattern is frequently used to convey the sense of pretence as shown in example 57 and 58. Moreover, with the third person subject, it is in some cases used to contrast what is supposed to be and the reality as in example 59. On the contrary, when used with the second person subject, it is used as a compliment as in example 60.

57) I am being polite about the way in which the Government have behaved when I say that they have dealt with our recommendation in a cavalier fashion. (HHX 8276)

58) Days ago she had decided to be good – she was being quite good – but she was only pretending to be good so far and all this appreciation was as yet undeserved. (G0X 2349)

59) Worse, Dr. Neil was being so kind, when reason told her that no one would blame him if he turned her away for what she had done. (HE 993)

60) You are being very kind. (HOD 1684)

With respect to –Propriety, with the first person subject, this phraseological pattern tends to be used for apology as in example 61, as a disclaimer before negative comments as in example 62. With the second person subject, it is frequently used to express annoyance as in example 63. As for the third person subject, it expresses annoyance as in example 64 or conveys the sense that the person is putting on an act as in example 65 or the person knows that it is wrong but cannot help it as in example 66.

61) I wasn't thinking – I was being awful --. (HJH 2840)

62) I'm not being nasty but I mean look at our hairdo's!
(KCE 997)

63) I can't understand why you're being so callous. (CCM 2659)

64) He was being unfair, so cruel! (HGT 4764)

65) He was being deliberately perverse, but she would not give in to him (H97 1423)

66) Shiva smiled sadly and asked why not but he know he was being unfair to Adam as well as to himself. (CDB 31)

Based on the cross-subject comparison, even though the adjective meaning group is the same, when co-occurring with different grammatical subjects, the communicative function is different. Grammatical subjects

therefore have a major influence on the determination of the communicative function of this phraseology.

2.3 Engagement and adjective meanings

This section deals with the interplay between engagement resources, linguistic features construing interaction between addressers and addressees, and adjective meanings. Table 7 shows the co-occurrences of engagement resources and adjective meanings. The following adjective meanings are among the top five adjective meanings that co-occur with Monogloss, Counter, Proclaim and Entertain albeit with different ranking: 1) –Capacity, 2) –Propriety, 3) +Propriety, 4) +Tenacity and 5) –Tenacity. It is worth mentioning that the engagement resource of Deny has the following top five co-occurring adjective meanings: 1) –Propriety, 2) –Tenacity, 3) +Propriety, 4) +Veracity and 5) +Capacity. The +Capacity and +Veracity are not among the top five adjective meanings of other engagement resources. Yet, when +Capacity occurs with Deny, the statement refers to incompetence, thereby construing –Capacity like in other engagement resources as in example 67.

67) We aren't being wise after the event. (CH2 5087)

When +Veracity co-occurs with Deny, it refers to dishonesty and thus it has a negative meaning as in example 68.

68) Noted also that Unionists were not being very honest in their more general allegations. (EW1 317)

Table 7 Frequency of co-occurrences between adjective meanings and engagement resources

Adjective meaning	Monogloss		Deny		Counter		Proclaim		Entertain		Attribute	
	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%	Raw	%
+Normality	1	0.19	0.19	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00
-Normality	1	0.19	0.19	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.56	1	0.48
+Capacity	24	4.61	4.61	7.39	17	7.91	6	5.66	9	5.03	12	5.71
-Capacity	86	16.51	16.51	5.22	33	15.35	12	11.32	26	14.53	39	18.57
+Tenacity	58	11.13	11.13	5.22	19	8.84	8	7.55	12	6.70	10	4.76
-Tenacity	51	9.79	9.79	15.65	40	18.60	21	19.81	37	20.67	30	14.29
+Veracity	21	4.03	4.03	8.26	9	4.19	5	4.72	7	3.91	8	3.81
-Veracity	23	4.41	4.41	3.91	3	1.40	5	4.72	5	2.79	5	2.38
+Propriety	66	12.67	12.67	14.35	20	9.30	14	13.21	19	10.61	28	13.33
-Propriety	84	16.12	16.12	23.48	34	15.81	20	18.87	27	15.08	39	18.57
Security	10	1.92	1.92	2.61	3	1.40	0	0.00	4	2.23	4	1.90
Insecurity	5	0.96	0.96	0.43	7	3.26	4	3.77	7	3.91	8	3.81
Satisfaction	1	0.19	0.19	0.43	1	0.47	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.48
Dissatisfaction	13	2.50	2.50	2.17	7	3.26	3	2.83	3	1.68	2	0.95
Happiness	3	0.58	0.58	0.43	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.48
Unhappiness	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.56	0	0.00
Inclination	5	0.96	0.96	1.30	6	2.79	0	0.00	5	2.79	2	0.95
Disinclination	7	1.34	1.34	0.87	1	0.47	1	0.94	1	0.56	4	1.90
+Composition	11	2.11	2.11	1.74	5	2.33	1	0.94	6	3.35	5	2.38
-Composition	12	2.30	2.30	1.74	3	1.40	2	1.89	3	1.68	5	2.38
+Reaction	7	1.34	1.34	1.74	3	1.40	1	0.94	0	0.00	3	1.43
-Reaction	16	3.07	3.07	0.43	3	1.40	0	0.00	2	1.12	0	0.00
+Valuation	7	1.34	1.34	1.30	0	0.00	2	1.89	2	1.12	2	0.95
-Valuation	1	0.19	0.19	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	1	0.48
others	8	1.54	3	1.30	1	0.47	1	0.94	2	1.12	0	0.00

2.4 Grammatical subjects and tenses

This section explains the interrelation between types of grammatical subjects and tenses. It elaborates on which tense tends to be used with each type of grammatical subjects. Table 8 shows the co-occurrences between each type of grammatical subjects and tenses.

Table 8 Frequency of co-occurrences between grammatical subjects and tenses

	1 st person		2 nd person		3 rd person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
present	239	75.16	158	87.29	321	44.65
past	79	24.84	23	12.71	398	55.35

From the table, it can be seen that there is a strong tendency for the first and the second person subjects to co-occur with the present tense (75.16% for the first person and 87.29 for the second person subject). The third person subject is used slightly more in the past tense (44.65%) than the present tense (53.35%). This can be explained as follows. When the grammatical subject is the first person, the phraseological pattern BE + being + adjective has many functions, such as preface before negative comments, self-defence and emphasizing seriousness. The present tense seems to be more congruent with these functions because they are about present occurrences. As such, the sense of heightened temporal relevance associated with this grammatical constructions discussed in previous studies (Cf. Levin, 2013; Smiecinska, 2003; Smitterberg, 2005) might be exploited to enhance the communicative forces of preface, self-defence and emphasis on seriousness.

On the other hand, when the grammatical subject is the second person, this phraseological pattern is used to convey criticisms levelled at the hearer. The criticism is direct and related to the present behaviour or situation. As a result, it tends to be used in the present tense. When the grammatical subject is the third person, the communicative functions tend to be either about negative behaviour or contrasting thought and reality, which can occur in both the present and the past tense. This might explain

there is not much disparity between the frequency of the present or the past tense.

2.5 Engagement and tenses

This section discusses the interaction between engagement and tenses. The frequency of co-occurrences between engagement and tenses is shown in Table 9. From the frequency, it can be seen that most of the engagement categories are more strongly associated with the present tense except Attribute. This is consistent with the findings discussed in Section 4.1 that the phraseological pattern BE + being + adjective is more frequently used to talk about present events. As for Attribute, the majority of the co-occurrences is in the past tense. This can be explained based on the functions of this phraseological pattern when co-occurring with Attribute. That is, it is used to convey a report on negative behaviour. Such behaviour normally happened already, which is why when this phraseological pattern co-occurs with Attribute, it tends to be in the past tense.

Table 9 Frequency and percentages of co-occurrences between tenses and engagement resources

	Monogloss		Deny		Counter		Proclaim		Entertain		Attribute	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Present	328	62.96	154	66.96	123	57.21	63	59.43	120	67.04	63	30
Past	193	37.04	76	33.04	92	42.79	43	40.57	59	32.96	147	70

2.6 Engagement and grammatical subjects

Table 10 shows the frequency of co-occurrences between the engagement resources and the grammatical subjects. Apparently, Monogloss has the highest percentages among other engagement resources when co-occurring with the second and the third person subject. This is probably attributable to the prevalent communicative function of this phraseological pattern, that is, heightened temporal relevance, as discussed in previous studies (Smiecińska, 2003). Furthermore, this phraseological

pattern is frequently used to express annoyance with other's behaviour. To realize these communicative functions, the message is often direct and unmitigated to intensify the force of the statement.

Table 10 Frequency of co-occurrences between engagement resources and grammatical subjects

Adjective Meaning	1 st person		2 nd person		3 rd person	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Monogloss	106	26.57	104	50.49	311	36.33
Deny	107	26.82	22	10.68	101	11.80
Counter	70	17.54	18	8.74	127	14.84
Proclaim	39	9.77	12	5.83	55	6.43
Entertain	48	12.03	36	17.48	95	11.10
Attribute	29	7.27	14	6.80	167	19.51

On the other hand, the tendency is different with the first person subject. As can be seen in Table 10, with the first person subject the percentage of Deny is higher than other categories of engagement. In fact, the percentage of Deny co-occurring with the first person subject is higher than the second and the third person subject. This can be explained by the differing communicative functions when this phraseological pattern is used with the first person subject in comparison with the second and the third person subject. When used with the first person subject, it is used to affirm the truth of the statement or for self-defence as discussed in Section 4.2.2. Since these two communicative functions are used only with the first person subject, the percentage of Deny is higher in this category than others.

With regard to Counter, the percentage is higher in the first person subject. In fact, the frequency of the first and the third person subject is almost twice higher than the percentage of the second person subject (17.56% vs. 14.84% vs. 8.74%). This is possibly due to the communicative function of contrasting perception and reality often found when the third person subject is used and Counter is often used to realize this communicative function.

In terms of Proclaim, the percentage is higher in the first person subject than the other two. A closer look at the data reveals that when Proclaim co-occurs with the first person subject, this phraseological pattern is frequently used to acknowledge the speaker's negative behaviour, that is, to make an apology as shown in example 69 below. When making an apology, the speaker often intensify their commitment to the truth of the proposition to convey their sincerity. As such, this communicative function renders the percentage of Proclaim higher in the first person subject than the second and the third person subject.

69) I know that I'm being unfair to you and to Virginia, but what I feel for you — what I have always felt for you — has made a weakling of me. (EVC 1717)

Regarding Entertain, the percentage is the highest in the second person subject. When Entertain is used with the second person subject, it is used as a hedged criticism. Although, the percentage is higher than the other two categories of grammatical subject, it does not mean that people are more indirect when criticizing the addressee. This is because the percentage of Monogloss is also the highest in the second person subject. Instead, it could be that criticisms of addressee is such a prevalent use and there are both hedged and unhedged criticisms. That might explain why the frequency of Monogloss and Entertain is higher in the second person subject.

Finally, for the engagement category of Attribute, the percentage is the highest in the third person subject. Since this engagement resource attributes information as coming from others, such a high percentage of co-occurrence with the third person subject is probably because this phraseological pattern is used to report on what others thought was a negative behaviour either of themselves or others as shown in example 70 and 71.

70) I can see that people must have thought we were being very mysterious then, that we were a bit of a mystery, that The Bar was a very strange place; but it never seemed that way to us. (AR2 148)

71) He thinks they're being unfair. (K21 1285)

Conclusion

This study investigated the phraseological pattern BE + being + adjective and found that it is mainly used to describe behaviours rather than state. Even though 'be' is one of the stative verbs, in this phraseological pattern where the behaviour could have been described using action verbs, the verb 'be' is employed instead to assign an evaluative meaning to the action. This is possibly motivated by the attitudinal meaning associated with the progressive aspect such as heightened temporal relevance or temporary event (Smieciniska, 2003). The use of phraseological pattern may then intensifies the rhetorical force, gives a vivid image of the statement and assigns an evaluation of the behaviour, or mitigate the statement by suggesting the temporariness of the behaviour.

In terms of the surrounding linguistic features other than the adjective, the findings are as follows. The most frequent grammatical subject of this phraseological pattern is the third person, which is different from Levin's (2013) study where the first person subject was found to be the most frequent subject in this phraseological pattern. This might be because the corpora used in Levin's study consist mainly of spoken language whereas in the BNC the majority of the data consists of journalistic texts. Regarding the tense, the present tense is most frequent probably because this phraseological pattern is used for direct criticism, which is about the present situation. As for the engagement resources, Monogloss is more prevalent than other categories. One of the plausible explanations is that this phraseological pattern is frequently used to intensify the rhetorical force of the criticism or express annoyance and thus it is often not mitigated.

Furthermore, there is interplay between different linguistic features and a closer look at the concordances reveals the communicative functions of this phraseological pattern. The analysis reveals that there are patterns of co-occurrence and differing frequency distribution which vary according to the communicative functions of this phraseological pattern. The same type of evaluative meaning can be used for different communicative functions when the grammatical subject is different;

when the adjective is in the –Propriety group and the subject is the first person, this phraseology is used for apology and disclaiming whereas when the subject is the second or third person, this phraseology is used to express annoyance. Such findings were derived from a fine-grained analysis of the interaction between different linguistic features based on a corpus of naturally occurring language and thus offer a further insight into this pattern which, to the best of my knowledge, has not been identified before in other studies.

What this study shows is that the uses of the phraseological pattern BE + being + Adjective is more complex than was previously thought. The analysis of this phraseological pattern in context in relation to other linguistic features reveals the communicative function in a more insightful way. Above all, this study stresses the important roles of collocation, co-occurrence of grammatical features, or colligation, and phraseology in the meaning and functions of grammatical feature. These concepts help throw further light on the complexity of this phraseological pattern and the functions of progressive aspects when used with the stative verb ‘be’. Findings from this study can be used to inform the teaching of English grammar and teachers should raise students’ awareness of the meaning and function of this phraseological pattern.

It should be noted that since this study is based on the British National Corpus, it focuses only on the British English. It has not compared the pattern BE + being + adjective across register or varieties. Future studies can further investigate whether this phraseological pattern and its surrounding linguistic features will be the same or different across registers and varieties.

References

- Bachman, I. (2013). Has Go-V Ousted Go-and-V? A Study of the Diachronic Development of Both Constructions in American English. In *Perspectives on Patterns of Lexis*, Edited by Hasselgard, H., Ebeling, J., & Ebeling, S. O. pp. 91–112. Amsterdam and New York: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Biber, D. (2006). *University Language: A Corpus-based Study of Spoken and Written Registers*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E., & Quirk, R. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Burnard, L. (2000). *User Reference Guide for the British National Corpus: Technical Report*. Oxford: Oxford University Computing Services.
- Bybee, J., & Dahl, O. (1989). The Creation of Tense and Aspect Systems in the Language of the World. *Studies in Language*, 13: 51–103.
- Cameron, D., & Panovic, I. (2014). *Working with Written Discourse*. Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore and Washington DC: Sage Publications Limited.
- Conrad, S. (2010). What can a corpus tell us about grammar? In *Routledge Handbook of Corpus Linguistics*, pp. 227–240. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Drackova, J. (2011). *Stative Verbs with the Progressive*. Unpublished master's diploma thesis, Masaryk University, Czech Republic.
- Fuchs, M., & Bonner, M. (2006). *Focus on Grammar: An Integrated Skills Approach* (3rd ed.). New York: Pearson Education Limited.
- Granath, S., & Wherrity, M. (2014). I'm Loving You – and Knowing It Too: Aspect and So-called Stative Verbs. *Rhesis: Linguistics and Philology*, 4(1): 2–22.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2007). *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Hunston, S., & Francis, G. (1999). *Pattern Grammar: A Corpus-driven Approach to the Lexical Grammar of English*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Fuoli, M. (2012). Assessing social responsibility: A quantitative analysis of Appraisal in BP's and IKEA's social reports. *Discourse & Communication*, 6(1): 55–81.
- Graddol, D., Cheshire, J., & Swann, J. (1994). *Describing language* (2nd ed.). Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Kennedy, G. (2003). *Structure and Meaning in English: A Guide for Teachers*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Kranich, S. (2010). *The Progressive in Modern English: A Corpus-based Study of Grammaticalization and Related Changes*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Levin, M. (2013). The Progressive Verb in Modern American English. In *The Verb Phrase in English: Investigating Recent Language Change with Corpora*, Edited by Aarts, B., Close, J., Leech, G., & Wallis, S. pp. 187–216. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, J. R., & White, P. R. R. (2005). *The Language of Evaluation*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Mindt, D. (2000). *An Empirical Grammar of the English Verb System*. Berlin: Cornelsen.
- Mindt, I. (2011). *Adjective Complementation: An Empirical Analysis of Adjectives Followed by That-clauses*. Amsterdam and New York: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2014). If-conditionals in Authentic Corpus-based English. *Review of European Studies*, 6(3): 62–73.
- Romer, U. (2005). *Progressives, Patterns, Pedagogy: A Corpus-driven Approach to English Progressive Forms, Functions, Contexts and Didactics*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Saeed, J. I. (2003). *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Press Oxford.
- Sinclair, J. (1991). *Corpus, concordance, collocation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Sinclair, J. (2004). *Trust the Text: Language, Corpus and Discourse*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Smiecinska, J. (2003). Stative Verbs and the Progressive Aspect in English. *Poznan Studies in Contemporary Linguistics*, 38: 187-195.
- Smith, A. (2013). Complex Prepositions and Variation within the PNP Construction. In *Perspectives on Patterns of Lexis*, Edited by Hasselgard, H., Ebeling, J., & Ebeling, S. O. pp. 153–174. Amsterdam and New York: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Smitterberg, E. (2005). *The Progressive in 19th-century English: A Process of Integration*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Soars, L., & Soars, J. (2012). *New Headway: Intermediate Students' Book* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stefanowitsch, A., & Gries, S. T. (2003). Collostructions: Investigating the Interaction of Words and Constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 8(2): 209–243.
- Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Vincent, B. (2013). Modality and the V wh Pattern. In *Perspectives on Patterns of Lexis*, Edited by Hasselgard, H., Ebeling, J., & Ebeling, S. O. pp. 247–270. Amsterdam and New York: John Benjamins Publishing.
- Yao, X., & Collins, P. (2013). Recent change in non-present perfect constructions in British and American English. *Corpora*, 8(1): 115–135.

