

Linking Adverbials in Academic Writing on English Linguistics by Korean MA Students

Youngdong Cho

1. Introduction

This study examines the use of linking adverbials by MA students¹⁾ and professional writers in their academic writing. Linking adverbials play an important role for textual cohesion in that they help to present clear and logical relationships among sentences. They explicitly “signal” the connections between passages (Biber et al., 1999). Thus, they have been investigated as important writing tools for EFL learners in academic and argumentative writing. A number of studies have examined the use of linking adverbials by EFL learners from different countries (Lei, 2012; Shaw, 2009; Granger & Tyson, 1996; Milton & Tsang, 1993). Also, many studies have been conducted on the use by Korean EFL learners; however, most of them focused on short essays by undergraduate students (Kim, 2019; Eun, 2016; Park, 2013; Yoon, 2006; Lee, 2004). One study, done by Suh and Choe (2015), analyzed the use of linking adverbials by Korean EFL scholars. The present study will explore the

1) Following Chen (2006), the MA students referring to master's students will be adopted in this study.

use of linking adverbials in the academic writing on English linguistics by Korean MA students. The findings in this study will show the characteristics of MA students in English linguistic field, who might be considered as more advanced EFL learners and positioned between undergraduate students and professional scholars. This study is expected to show some developmental aspects in using linking adverbials by Korean EFL learners.

2. Background

This paper focuses on the use of linking adverbials by Korean MA students. According to Park (2013) and Liu (2008), various terms such as “conjunctive adverbials”, “sentence connectors”, “linking adjuncts”, “connectives”, and “logical connectors” were used in previous studies investigating the use of linking adverbials. The various terms and studies about EFL learners’ usages demonstrate the importance of linking adverbials in EFL writing teaching. In this study, I adopted the term “linking adverbials” following Lei (2012), Liu (2008), and Biber et al. (1999).

Crewe (1999) examined the writing of Chinese EFL students at Hong Kong University and the misuse of connector such as *on the contrary* was commonly found in their writings. Learners also overused connectors to achieve surface logicity. Due to lack of deep logicity, they tended to disguise their poor writing by using the connectors. In this case, non-use is always more desirable than misuse because misuse might bring wrong communication. Granger and Tyson (1996) examined the use of linking adverbials in French EFL learners’ writing. They did not find the overall overuse; instead, some linking adverbials were found being overused or underused individually. More importantly, they reported that *moreover* was semantically misused in learner’s writing. *Moreover*

was used to just add a point rather than to add a final argument. In addition to the studies about undergraduate students, research about students who are more skilled at writing, that is, more professional than undergraduates was also conducted. Chen (2006) compared Taiwanese MA students' use of linking adverbials in academic writing with that of professional writers. The study was done in two approaches: word-based and sentence-based analyses. With the analysis on word level, MA students slightly overused linking adverbials. In addition, the study found that *besides* was overused and misused, which seemed arise from their confusion about registers. More recently, Lei (2012) compared Chinese doctoral students' dissertations with articles written by professional writers. Based on Liu's (2008) 110 types of linking adverbials, he conducted quantitative analyses which showed that students overused linking adverbials in general while certain items like *however* were underused.

Considerable studies have also been done about the use of linking adverbials in Korea. First, Lee (2004) compared the use of linking adverbials by Korean college students with that by British native speakers. The result indicated that Korean students used linking adverbials more frequently with fewer types. The syntactic distribution was also examined in her study. Korean learner clearly preferred sentence-initial position for linking adverbials whereas native speakers preferred non-initial position. Park (2013) conducted research comparing the use of linking adverbials by Korean undergraduate learners with difference English proficiency to the use by native speakers. Non-native learners heavily depended on the use of sequential linking adverbials. The qualitative analysis on misuse of *moreover* and *furthermore* was also employed in her study, conforming to previous studies (Milton & Tsang, 1993). Kim (2019) focused on linking adverbials in Korean college students' English essays by comparing them with not only native speakers but also with

other EFL learners. Analogous to previous studies, Korean student overused sequential types of linking adverbials and highly preferred sentence-initial position. Suh and Choe (2015) analyzed the use of linking adverbials by professional scholars. They compared the use among ENL, ESL, and EFL scholars. The overall frequency of linking adverbials by Korean scholars was larger than that of native scholars. However, the result of top ten most used linking adverbials was different from previous studies in that Korean scholars showed the similar distribution with native and ESL scholars. The last relevant study is Eun (2016), which investigated the use of linking adverbials in doctoral dissertations on sociology by Korean and English students. Like previous studies, Korean writers placed linking adverbials mostly in the sentence-initial position, which might be influenced by L1 interference. Interestingly, Korean doctoral students attempted to achieve logical style of writing by overusing causal items such as *therefore*.

In sum, many studies compared native speaker's written discourse with EFL learners' writing to demonstrate the difference in the use of linking adverbials. Most of the studies were conducted by examining the overuse, underuse and misuse while some studies added the analysis of syntactic position of linking adverbials in the sentence. This study focuses on the usage of linking adverbials by more professional Korean EFL student writers in English linguistic field. In order to clarify the characteristics of Korean MA students' writing, the following research questions will be examined:

1. How are linking adverbials used in the academic writing of Korean MA students in terms of frequency and taxonomy? What are the most frequently used linking adverbials?
2. Which linking adverbials are overused and underused in the academic writing of Korean MA students? Which position in the sentence do Korean MA students prefer for linking adverbials?

3. What are the linking adverbials that are misused in the academic writing of Korean MA students? How are they misused?

3. Methods

3.1. Corpora

For the current study, two corpora were compiled. First, a total of 10 master's theses in the discipline of English linguistics were collected to organize the corpus of MA students' academic writing. The purpose of choosing English linguistics field is that it is expected to show the usages by advanced EFL writers. Data were collected from Seoul National University, Korea University, and Yonsei University. The various parts of linguistics were included from theoretical linguistics like syntax, semantics, etc. to applied linguistics like discourse analysis, second language acquisition, etc.

Second, for the control corpus, a total of 50 published journal articles were randomly collected instead of using already-existing native corpora. As the norm of the students' academic writing should be the published articles in international English-language journals (Bolton et al., 2002). Six recognized journals²⁾ were selected; three from theoretical linguistics field and three from applied linguistics field. All the data of both corpora were written from 2016 to 2019.

Following Chen (2006), the term "MA students" has been adopted for the master's students. The term "professional writers" for the authors of journal articles will also be adopted following Lei (2012), because professional writing represents the criterion that advanced foreign learner

2) Journals of theoretical linguistics: *Linguistics*, *Language*, and *Journal of Semantics*.

Journals of applied linguistics: *Applied Linguistics*, *Journal of Memory and Language*, and *Journal of Second Language Writing*.

Table 1. Data Corpora

	MA	Control
# of essays	10	50
# of word types	7614	15626
# of word tokens	162,710	483,161

*#: the number

writer try to reach. Only the main bodies of the texts were considered in this study; the name of the authors, tables, figures, notes, endnotes, footnotes, appendices, references, and direct quotations were excluded to reduce the irrelevant contents. As for the size of the corpora, the corpus of MA students' writing is composed of 162,710 words and the corpus of professional writers' is composed of 483,161 words. The size of the control corpus (the corpus of professional writers) were organized almost three times bigger in order to make a generalized standard of professional writing. Table 1 presents the statistics of both corpora including the number of essays, word types, and word tokens.

3.2. *Taxonomy of the linking adverbials*

The list of linking adverbials by Liu (2008) was employed. Liu compiled 110 items of linking adverbials based on Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman (1999) and Quirk et al. (1985). He slightly modified the taxonomy of linking adverbials classified by Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman (1999) in order to make it clearer and more comprehensive. However, in this study, some adverbials like *because of this*, *despite NP* etc. were excluded because of their prepositional properties. It might be controversial whether they should be considered as adverbials or just prepositional phrases. In addition, four items—*so*, *then*, *although*, and *anyway*—were excluded due to their spoken discourse characteristics (Biber et al., 1999). A total 98 items of linking adverbials were examined. The

examples of taxonomy are presented below:

- 1. **Additive**: emphatic, appositional, similarity comparative (e.g., above all, besides, for example, likewise)
- 2. **Adversative**: proper adversative/concessive, contrastive, correction, dismissal (e.g., nevertheless, by comparison, admittedly)
- 3. **Causal/Resultative**: general causal, conditional causal (e.g., accordingly, otherwise)
- 4. **Sequential**: enumerative, simultaneous, summative (e.g., first/ firstly, meanwhile, in short)

After using AntConc concordance, 76 items were identified: 26 items for additive, 18 for adversative, 11 for causal/resultative, and 21 for sequential type. Then the frequency of occurrence of the linking adverbials was calculated, and further analysis was conducted to find overuse, underuse, misuse, and the syntactic position of lining adverbials used by MA students (see Appendix for all items examined).

4. Results and analysis

4.1. The distribution of linking adverbials

I will first examine the number of the types of linking adverbials. Ta-

Table 2. A number of types of linking adverbials

Corpus		MA	Control
# of total examined LA*		98	98
# of used types	Additive	19	24
	Adversative	14	17
	Causal/Resultative	10	10
	Sequential	20	20
	Total	63	71

*LA: Linking Adverbials

Table 3. Frequency and percentage use of the linking adverbials

Linking adverbials	MA			Control		
	Raw frequency	Frequency per 100,000 words	%	Raw frequency	Frequency per 100,000 words	%
Additive	1236	760	53	2712	561	53
Adversative	422	259	18	1041	215	20
Causal	344	211	14.5	818	169	16
Sequential	346	213	14.5	550	114	11
Total	2348	1443	100	5121	1060	100

ble 2 below presents the number of identified types of linking adverbials in each corpus. In total, 63 types of linking adverbials were found from MA corpus while 71 types were found from control corpus.

From Table 2, it is noted that MA students used less types of linking adverbials than professional writers (63 versus 71). Especially, various additive and adversative linking adverbials were used by professional writers. Next, Table 3 shows the frequency and the percentage of the linking adverbials used in the corpora by category. In addition to the raw frequency, the normalized frequency (frequency per 100,000 words) was used for comparison.

Table 2 and Table 3 show that generally MA students used more linking adverbials than professional writers whereas they used less types of linking adverbials, which confirms previous studies (Eun, 2016; Suh & Choe, 2015; Lei, 2012; Lee, 2004). This result indicates frequent occurrence of the same type of items by the EFL learners. EFL learners tend to use expressions that they believed they knew and they could manage (Lee, 2004; Milton, 1998). They use linking adverbials more frequently in an attempt to create surface logicity in their writing (Crewe, 1990). Korean MA student writers and the professional writers used the same proportions of additive linking adverbials (both 53%) and both of groups used the additive types more often. For the adversative and causal link-

Table 4. The top 10 most frequently used linking adverbials

MA				Control		
	Linking adverbials	Raw frequency	Frequency per 100,000 words	Linking adverbials	Raw frequency	Frequency per 100,000 words
1	also	503	309	also	1082	224
2	however	219	135	however	674	139
3	thus	170	104	i.e.	388	80
4	in addition	112	69	for example	295	61
5	i.e.	111	68	thus	392	81
6	first/firstly	93	57	therefore	261	54
7	moreover	90	55	that is	160	33
8	therefore	89	55	first/firstly	159	33
9	for example	85	52	for instance	151	31
10	on the other hand	81	50	in fact	114	24

ing adverbials, the professional writers used more proportions. However, MA students used more sequential linking adverbials. The high proportion of additive and sequential types of MA students explains the main characteristics of MA student writers and will be discussed in the later section in terms of overuse.

Next, the ten most frequent linking adverbials used in two corpora will be examined as shown in Table 4. The top ten most frequently used linking adverbials indicated that both groups share common features in their academic writing. First, top ten frequently used items account for 66% and 72% of all the linking adverbials used in each corpus. This result is analogous to the previous studies (Suh & Choe, 2015; Lei, 2012; Chen, 2006). It can be noted that both groups heavily rely on a small set of linking adverbials in their academic writing. Second, both groups used most frequently *also* and *however*.

In Park’s (2013) study, the top ten most frequent list showed that nonnative writers heavily depend on the use of a sequential linking adverbial. However, the data used in her study consisted of argumentative

writings in undergraduate English courses. The different style of writing itself might cause the discrepancy.

Meanwhile, it is noteworthy that unlike previous studies analyzing Korean EFL learners' writings, the distribution of ten most frequently used items by category in both corpora was the same. Both groups used five additive items, two adversative, two causative, and one sequential item. This shows that two groups share a similar pattern of use in semantic categories. Interestingly, the linking adverbials used by MA students in Table 4 conform to the those reported in Suh & Choe's (2015) study. They compared the usages of linking adverbials among ENL, ESL, and EFL scholars. EFL group was only composed of Korean scholars. The ten most frequent items used by Korean scholars were exactly the same except *i.e.* and *that is*. The item *i.e.* was even not examined in their study; *that is* was not shown in Table 4, but it ranked eleventh position following the tenth. This likeness demonstrates that Korean MA students use the linking adverbials in a similar way to Korean scholars, unlike undergraduate students. Korean MA students can manage usage of linking adverbials as much well as professional writers do and exercise much greater control in their use of sequential linking adverbials.

So far, I have discussed the difference in using linking adverbials between MA students and professional writers in terms of the overall frequency. It is shown that Korean MA students have better management of linking adverbials compared to the Korean EFL learners in the previous studies, and this pattern is similar with that of professional writers. However, it is necessary to examine the overuse and underuse of individual linking adverbials to clarify the characteristics of MA student writers.

4.2. *Overuse and underuse*

As there is no definite criterion for overuse and underuse, previous

studies established their own criteria for examination. In this study the quantitative perspective is adopted; that is, the difference of 5 between the frequency of occurrence per 100,000 words of MA corpus and that of the control corpus was set as a criterion. It should be first mentioned that 23 linking adverbials were overused while only 7 items were under-used. Table 5 presents the linking adverbials overused by MA students.

The most overused item by the MA students is *also*, with a difference of 85 times per 100,000 words from the control corpus. This result is consistent with the result of Suh & Choe (2015), which seems to indicate that Korean EFL scholars and MA students use linking adverbials as grammatical markers, and they tend to use certain items they are familiar with. In terms of the category of the overused items, 9 were additive items, 7 were sequential, 5 were adversative, and 2 were causal items. Additive and sequential linking adverbials are primarily over-used. This result has been identified in many previous studies of Korean EFL learners, which suggests that they are engaged in clarifying and enumerating what was already mentioned (Kim, 2019; Park, 2013; Lee, 2004).

It should be noted that the causal linking adverbial *thus* was over-used by MA students. This is consistent with the findings of Suh & Choe (2015), which have not been found before in the studies on EFL undergraduate students. This overuse seems natural in that the data of MA students are their MA theses which must be reasonable and logical. *Thus* is the most formal expression among causal linking adverbials even than *therefore* (Eun, 2016). MA students might have used this item to assure their arguments more formally and with authority. In contrast, professional writers did not use this as much as MA students did since they were able to manage the causal relation between sentences without this extra item. The overuse of adversative linking adverbial *on the other hand* also needs to be examined. It seems that the misuses

Table 5. Overuse of linking adverbials (per 100,000 words)

Linking adverbials	MA	Control	Difference	Category
additionally	12	6	6	Additive (9)
also	309	224	85	
as well	13	3	10	
in addition	69	10	59	
furthermore	22	14	8	
moreover	55	20	35	
that is	43	33	10	
in other words	37	18	19	
for instance	39	31	8	
nevertheless	20	9	11	Adversative (5)
nonetheless	12	3	9	
yet	12	4	8	
in/by contrast	20	12	8	
on the other hand	50	16	34	
hence	30	11	19	Causal (2)
thus	104	81	23	
first of all	6	1	5	Sequential (7)
second/secondly	28	22	6	
finally	27	22	5	
last/lastly	37	2	35	
first/firstly	57	33	24	
meanwhile	7	1	6	
in short	9	2	7	

which will be discussed later are related to the overuse of these items. Now the underused linking adverbials will be examined.

As shown in Table 6, a total of 7 linking adverbials were identified underused by MA students and the most underused item is *in fact* followed by *of course*, which is never used in MA students' writings. In terms of the category of the underused items, 4 were additive items, 2 were adversative, and 1 was causal. According to some previous stud-

Table 6. Underuse of linking adverbials (per 100,000 words)

Linking adverbials	MA	Control	Difference	Category
of course	0	11	-11	Additive (4)
i.e.	68	80	-12	
for example	52	61	-9	
namely	7	13	-6	
however	135	139	-4	Adversative (2)
in fact	7	24	-17	
otherwise	3	8	-5	Causal (1)

ies, the most underused linking adverbials by EFL learners belonged to adversative category (Park, 2013; Lei, 2012; Granger & Tyson, 1996). However, as additive category was the most underused in this study, it is better to focus on individual items instead of the difference in categorical distribution.

As already mentioned, *In fact* and *of course* are the primarily underused items. The underuse of *in fact* might be ascribed to its semantic complexity, which makes it hard for MA students to use it with ease. In addition to adversative meaning, *in fact* can be also used to give extra details about something that has just been mentioned. MA students might have avoided using this polysemous item and relied on other familiar items. However, professional writers used *in fact* more freely. Next, the second most underused item *of course* as an emphatic additive function needs to be considered. The frequent use in spoken discourse of this item may affect the usages by MA students in their academic writing. Liu (2008) examined linking adverbials in every register of British National Corpus, and he showed that *of course* was predominantly used in the spoken register. Of course, *of course* can be used in academic register, too. While professional writers are accustomed to using this item across various registers, MA student writers tend to avoid uncertainty

of the usage and rely on rather formal items.

In case of interchangeability between *for instance* and *for example*, MA students show less control over registers. *For example* was underused while *for instance* was overused by MA students. According to findings of Liu (2008), both linking adverbials are used in spoken and academic registers. 11 percentage of uses of *for example* belong to spoken register and 63 percentage belong to academic register. This shows that *for example* is mostly used in academic writings than other registers. Professional writers also show this tendency in their writings. However, 15 percentage of uses of *for instance* belong to spoken register and 45 percentage belong to academic register. It can be inferred that *for instance* has more spoken characteristics compared to *for example*. This accounts for the overuse of *for instance* by MA students; that is, they are still confused about using LA over registers.

Until now, the pattern of overuse and underuse has shown some characteristics of MA students in academic writing. For more thorough and qualitative examination, syntactic position and misuse will be examined in next section.

4.3. Syntactic position and misuse

Table 7 presents the frequency of sentence occurring positions of three linking adverbials in two corpora. Heavy use of linking adverbials in sentence-initial position is also observed in the current study confirming many previous studies (Kim, 2019; Park, 2013; Yoon, 2006; Lee, 2004).

Table 7. The frequency of three linking adverbials in sentence-initial position

	MA	Control
for example	69/85 (81.2%)	156/296 (52.7%)
however	161/219 (73.5%)	422/674 (62.6%)
therefore	71/89 (79.8%)	63/261 (24.1%)

For the comparison, three items—*for example*, *however* and *therefore*—were selected and checked for sentence position. They were included in top frequently used items in both corpora, and previous studies also used them for investigation. So, for the comparison not only between two corpora but also with previous studies, they were chosen. As expected, MA students have a strong preference for the sentence-initial position compared to professional writers. In case of *therefore*, more than 75 percentage of instances used by professional writers occurred in non-initial position. This phenomenon is easily found in previous studies on EFL learners from other countries (Eun, 2016). Learners may have difficulties in mastering the complete knowledge of the individual linking adverbials' various possible positions and the overuse in sentence-initial position may be developmental as it is observed in the research on EFL learners with many different L1s (Granger & Tyson, 1996). MA students' weak management over syntactic position of linking adverbials indicates “less skill” (Shaw, 2009).

For analyzing the misuse of linking adverbials, more qualitative analysis needs to be employed. Here, analysis is mostly based on the findings in previous studies (Park, 2013; Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Granger & Tyson, 1996). The first examples of misuse are related to *however*. It has been shown that *however* is one of the most frequently used items, from which it can be inferred that various misuses would be found using this item. When it occurs in the sentence-middle position, *however* cannot be comma spliced between two independent clauses (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). As shown in (1) and (2), two sentences are masquerading as a single sentence resulting in run-on sentences.

- (1) When it comes to assessing interactional competence, *however*, it is challenging for assessors to evaluate individual interlocutors' interactional competence since ratings assigned to each individual

interlocutors based on the co-constructed single performance is jointly produced by more than two interlocutors in paired or group oral tests. (MA 4)

- (2) There were significant differences among three prosody conditions, *however*, no facilitation or interference effect was found in the data. (MA 10)

Interestingly, this type of misuse is not limited to the MA students. Some examples of run-on sentences in the professional writers are also found (3).

- (3) Since the model-theoretic interpretation of DRSs is only defined with respect to the current discourse structure, *however*, accommodating the projected content to the global discourse context will result in the appropriate truth-conditions. (Control 49)

From the control corpus, *however* also occurs in a run-on sentence even without commas. According to Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman (1999), when *however* falls in the middle of a clause, it needs to be bracketed in commas. In example (4), no commas are found around *however*.

- (4) There was *however* a difference in semantic diversity as the exception words were more diverse than the regular words. (Control 18)

Next, a form mismatch was found in MA student's writing.

- (5) *Last but not the least*, FAITH(\check{v}) is the constraint for some exceptional words for stress patterns. (MA 3)

A correct form of this sequential linking adverbial is *last but not least*. It seems that the author was confused because the last word *least* is a superlative form which generally accompanies the determiner *the*. This type of misuse was not found in professional writer's writing.

Now more usage-based misuse examples are presented. First, redundant use was found. MA students use linking adverbials when there already exist a similar expression connecting two sentences.

- (6) Hayes proposed *three kinds* of extrametricality rules in English:

Consonants, Noun, and Adjective Extrametricality as seen in (34). **First**, ‘Consonant Extrametricality Rule’ states that [...] **Second**, ‘Noun Extrametricality Rule’ is applied to nouns. As SPE already noted, stress patterns [...] **Third and last**, ‘Adjective Extrametricality Rule’ is suggested. From the examples in (40), the adjectives ending in suffixes ‘-al,’ ‘-ous,’ ‘-ant,’ ‘-ent,’ ‘-ive,’ etc. are applied. (MA 3)

In the beginning of the paragraph it is mentioned that ‘three’ kinds of extrametricality rules are going to be discussed. And there is no further explanation about the rules after the last sentence in (6). Consequently, it would have been better to use only *Third* or *Last* instead of using both.

Second, the misuse of three contrastive linking adverbials—*in contrast*, *on the other hand*, and *on the contrary*—were easily found in MA students’ writings. *On the other hand* was one of the highly misused linking adverbials in previous research (Suh & Choe, 2015), consistent with the result of this study.

- (7) Previous studies, such as SPE and metrical analyses, predicted that stress patterns differ according to the syllable weight and the syntactic categories. In the case of trisyllabic words, as they predicted, the stress will be ‘ $\sigma \sigma \sigma$ ’ because of alternating stress rule and stress adjustment rule. ***In contrast***, they could not predict the correct stress pattern of *rèprodûce* in trisyllabic ‘prefix + stem’ structure, as well as explain the difference of stressing between *còunterattáck* and *accúmulate* within the four-syllabic structure. (MA 3)

In contrast specifies that two different topics or subjects are different in at least one respect (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). In the paragraph (7), the relation between two sentences surrounding *in contrast* is not contrastive but a proper adversative. In this case, just *however* would have been enough to show the relation.

- (8) Additionally, it has often been noted that a PP remnant can omit the preposition, as shown in (25). That is, when there is a PP correlate, the remnant could be either a PP or a DP. ***On the contrary***, a CP remnant, provided as in (26), does not drop its head complementizer (Morgan 1973, Merchant 2004, Nakao 2008). (MA 7)

On the contrary is most usually used to deny a proposition that has come just before. Here, the author is comparing the different patterns of remnant omission between PP and CP. The different subjects about the same phenomenon are under discussion. In this case, *in contrast* should have been used.

- (9) As the target passage was about the Yanomamo tribe, which all participants were unfamiliar with, only the participants in [+P] received relevant information and gained prior knowledge before reading the target passage. ***On the other hand***, the participants in [-P] received an irrelevant text and thus, were expected to have difficulties in understanding the target passage. (MA 1)

- (10) Freire (1981) believes that as language and reality are indispensably intertwined, reading allows a reader to expand his or her knowledge of the world. Language educators, ***on the other hand***, emphasize the importance of reading from a different point of view; reading is beneficial as it results in superior general knowledge, enhanced reading comprehension and increased vocabulary knowledge (Krashen, 2004), with the latter garnering the most interest. (MA 1)

In case of *on the other hand*, it is only necessary to have a single subject or topic. In the paragraph (9), the author presents the different situations in which the participants having [+P] or [-P] are compared. So, in the same line with the analysis of (8), *in contrast* would have been a better choice. In the paragraph (10), the language educator is emphasizing the different point from Freire's. Also here, *in contrast* would sound more

natural.

Finally, it was earlier reported that additive linking adverbials like *furthermore* and *moreover* were overused by EFL learners (Park, 2013; Milton & Tsang, 1993). Similarly, the overuse of two items were observed and the misuse emerging from those overused were found in the current study.

- (11) That is, when there is a PP correlate, the remnant could be either a PP or a DP. On the contrary, a CP remnant, provided as in (26), does not drop its head complementizer (Morgan 1973, Merchant 2004, Nakao 2008). That is, a sentence cannot be the remnant of negative stripping. **Furthermore**, other categories such as an AdjP, an AdvP, and a VP can also be the remnant of negative stripping. Some of the examples from corpus data are presented as follows. (MA 7)
- (12) The second type of hedge, attribution shields are expressions that attribute the responsibility of the statement to a third party other than the speaker, such as *according to her estimates*, *presumably*, and *as far as anyone knew*. **Moreover**, Brown and Levinson (1987) expanded the concept of hedge in terms of illocutionary act to focus more on politeness. (MA 2)

Moreover and *furthermore* are used when some sort of conclusion is expected from the connection of several premises. Especially, *furthermore* tends to preface third or fourth premises where more than two premises exist (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999), which is shown in (13).

- (13) In the case of *which*, because of its \pm Definite feature, it is used both in RRCs and NRRCs, in many cases resulting in numerous borderline cases compared with other *wh*-relativizers. As for *that*, because of +weak personal and +strong impersonal features, relative *that* tends to colligate mostly with impersonal antecedents. **Moreover**, because of its pronominal feature loss (-Pron), it can

be used as a relative adverb. **Furthermore**, due to this feature, in the Chomskyan syntax or derivative syntax, it is often treated as a complementizer. (MA 8)

In (11), however, the author is just adding other possible candidates of a remnant phenomenon mentioned before in which case *also* would have been enough. In example (12), only one premise exists before *moreover*, in which case *in addition* would have been a better choice. The author should have given more premises or claims in advance.

5. Conclusion

The present study investigated Korean MA student writers' overuse, underuse, misuse, and syntactic distribution of linking adverbials in academic writing. The results indicated that the MA students generally overuse the linking adverbials compared to professional writers. In contrast, the types used are rather fewer, which conforms to previous studies on EFL undergraduate students. In spite of being more skilled student writers, MA students still rely on a small set of linking adverbials to express their arguments. However, it should be noted that the top ten frequently used linking adverbials of MA students and professional writers consist of the same proportion of semantic categories. That is, both of the lists include five additive, two adversative, two causal, and one sequential type of linking adverbials. This likeness of distribution has not been found in previous studies on EFL undergraduate students. Interestingly, this was found in Suh & Choe (2015)'s study comparing Korean EFL scholars' and native scholars' academic writings. The top ten frequently used linking adverbials by Korean scholars are very similar to those by MA students and to those by professional writers in this study, which indicates that MA students manage the usage of linking adverbials better than undergraduate students and attempt to attain

the textual cohesion in a similar way that professional writers do. It can be inferred that MA students show the developmental stages in using linking adverbials in their academic writing. In terms of overuse, as many previous studies have already mentioned, additive and sequential linking adverbials are overused. Korea students tend to explain with enumeration pattern and clarify what they have just said before (Park, 2013). For the adversative type, *on the other hand* is mostly overused; for the causal type, *thus* is mostly overused. The over use of *thus*, which is a causal and formal linking adverbial, shows the characteristics of MA students' academic writing that MA theses should be logical and formal (Eun, 2016).

There are few cases of underuse, such as *of course* and *in fact*. This may be because MA students are still afraid of managing use of linking adverbials across registers and the expressions may have a semantic complexity which hinders students from using them with ease. In addition, syntactic position was examined in this study. Many instances confirm previous findings that students prefer the sentence-initial position for linking adverbials (Kim, 2019; Park, 2013; Yoon, 2006). The characteristics of MA students' writing can also be explained with misuse of linking adverbials. The overuse of *on the other hand* mentioned above may be because MA students misuse and confuse this item with other contrastive linking adverbials such as *in contrast* or *on the contrary*. Analogous to the previous studies, the misuses of *moreover* and *furthermore* are found in the current study. Finally, some grammatical misuses such as form mismatch and run-on sentences are easily identified. The characteristics of MA students examined in the current study indicate that Korean MA students in English linguistics are in the process of becoming professional writers; that is, even though they still have some similarities with Korean EFL undergraduates, they certainly attained a better control over linking adverbials compared to undergraduate stu-

dents.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Bolton, K., Nelson, G., & Huang, J. (2002). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing: research from the International Corpus of English in Hong Kong ICE-HK. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7(2), 165-182.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chen, C. (2006). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(1), 113-130.
- Crewe, W. J. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 316-325.
- Eun, H. (2016). A comparative analysis of conjunctive adverbials between Korean EFL and native English writers in English abstracts of doctoral dissertations. *Studies in English Language & Literature*, 42(2), 239-262.
- Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native speakers of English. *World Englishes*, 15(1), 17-27.
- Kim, J. (2019). The use of adverbial connectors in Korean college students' English essays: A corpus-based comparative study. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 35(2), 83-104.
- Lee, E. (2004). A corpus-based analysis of the Korean EFL learners' use of conjunctive adverbials. *English Teaching*, 59(4), 283-301.
- Lei, L. (2012). Linking adverbials in academic writing on applied linguistics by Chinese doctoral students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11, 267-275.
- Liu, D. (2008). Linking adverbials: an across-register corpus study and its im-

- plications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 491-518.
- Milton, J. (1998). Exploiting L1 and interlanguage corpora in the design of an electronic language learning and production environment. In S. Grander (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 186-198). London: Longman.
- Milton, J., & Tsang, E. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing: directions for future research. In R. Pemberton, & E. S. C. Tsang (Eds.), *Studies in Lexis* (pp. 215-246). Hong Kong: The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology.
- Park, Y. (2013). How Korean EFL students use conjunctive adverbials in argumentative writing. *English Teaching*, 68(4), 263-284.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, G., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Shaw, P. (2009). Linking adverbials in student and professional writing in literary studies: What makes writing mature. In M. Charles, D. Pecorari, & S. Hunston (Eds.), *Academic writing: At the interface of corpus and discourse* (pp. 215-235). London: Continuum.
- Suh, J. W., & Choe, H. (2015). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the research articles of American, Hong Kong/Singaporean, and Korean scholars. *The 21st Century Association of English Language and Literature*, 29(1), 357-384.
- Yoon, H. (2006). A corpus-based analysis of connectors in Korean students' essay writing. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 159-178.

Appendix

A total of 78 types of linking adverbials identified in the study

Additive (26)		Causal / Resultative (11)	
Emphatic	above all	General causal	accordingly
	additionally		as a consequence
	again		as a result
	also		consequently
	as well		hence
	besides		naturally
	in addition		therefore
	as a matter of fact		thus
	further	Conditional causal	in such a case / in such cases
	furthermore		in that case
	moreover		otherwise
	of course		
	too		
	what is/ s more	Adversative (18)	
Appositional	i.e.	Proper adversative/ Concessive	at the same time
	that is		however
	that is to say		nevertheless
	in other words		nonetheless
	for example		yet
	for instance	Contrastive	actually
	for one thing		as a matter of fact
	namely		conversely
	to put it another way		in/by comparison
Similarity Comparative	alternatively		in/by contrast
	likewise		in fact
	similarly		in reality
			on the other hand

Dismissal	admittedly	Simultaneous	meanwhile
	after all		at the same time
	at any rate	Summative	all in all
	in any case		in a word
	still		in conclusion
Sequential (21)			in short
Enumerative/ Listing	afterwards		in sum
	eventually		to conclude
	first of all		to sum up
	to begin with		to summarize
	second/secondly		
	third/thirdly		
	fourth/fourthly		
	Finally		
	last/lastly		
	first/firstly		
	next		

ABSTRACT

Linking Adverbials in Academic Writing on English Linguistics by Korean MA Students

Youngdong Cho

This paper investigates the use of linking adverbials in the academic writing on English linguistics by Korean master's students. Linking adverbials have been investigated as important writing tools for EFL learners in academic and argumentative writing since they help to present clear and logical relationships among sentences. For the present study, a student corpus which consists of 10 master's theses in the discipline of English linguistics is compiled. I also compile a control corpus composed of 50 published articles from international journals to use as a standard. Master's students generally overuse the fewer types of linking adverbials compared to professional writers. Among 98 linking adverbials, 23 are overused while only 7 are underused by master's students. Also, they have a strong preference for the sentence-initial position of linking adverbials. Regarding the misuse, students are found to confuse *on the other hand* with *in contrast* or *on the contrary*. Some grammatical misuses such as form mismatch and run-on sentences are also easily identified. The results of this study indicate that Korean students in English linguistics are in the process of becoming professional writers; that is, even though they still have some similarities with Korean EFL undergraduates, they certainly attained a better control over linking ad-

verbials compared to undergraduate students.

Key Words linking adverbials; EFL learner corpus; academic writing; Korean master's students

