



Linking Adverbials in the Writings of Kurdish Private School Students in Comparison to Native Speakers

ID No. 677

(PP 220 - 230)

<https://doi.org/10.21271/zjhs.27.4.15>

Nabaz Mustafa Omer

Department of English, College
Department of English, Salahaddin
University-Erbil
nabaz.omer@su.edu.krd

Fatimah Rashid Hasan Albajalani

Department of English, College
Department of English, Salahaddin
University-Erbil
fatimah.hassan@su.edu.krd

Received: 12/10/2022

Accepted: 13/11/2022

Published: 27/09/2022

Abstract

This study is extracted from an MA thesis entitled “Linking Adverbials in the Writing of Private School Students in Erbil City”. It investigates how private school students in Erbil city use linking adverbials in their essays compared to native speakers. The study consists of two corpora, a native corpus and a learner corpus. The learner corpus comprises 80 essays written by 11th-year students from four private schools in Erbil city and the native corpus is comprised of 20 essays written by American native speakers extracted from the Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers (MICUSP) (2009). The study specifically attempts to discover which linking adverbial categories and which individual linking adverbials are overused or underused, and in which positions in the sentence. The results showed that private school students explicitly overused enumeration/addition, and summation categories while underused contrast/concession categories. For individual linking adverbials, the results indicated that learners overused some linking adverbials, such as *in conclusion*, *also*, *first(ly)*, *second(ly)*, etc. In contrast, they underused *rather*, *still*, *though*, *that is*, etc. the results also demonstrated that learners preferred to place linking adverbials in the initial position.

Keywords: Linking adverbials, native speakers, and private school students.

1. Introduction

Halliday and Hassan (1976) consider cohesion a significant textual factor in writing well-constructed texts. One way to achieve cohesion and coherence in a piece of writing is through the proper use of linking adverbials. Linking Adverbials (LAs hereafter) along with coordinating conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions play a significant role in establishing cohesion in the text (Celce-Murcia and Larson-Freeman, 1999). Thus, understanding the use of these adverbials is very important for second-language learners. Learners of English face difficulties in using LAs properly such as overuse, underuse, or misuse of these adverbials. Many researchers have reported those problems mentioned above which face EFL (English as a foreign language) learners in using LAs with different mother tongue backgrounds (e.g. Granger and Tyson, 1996; Chen, 2006; Xu and Liu, 2012; Park, 2013; AL Sharif, 2017, etc.). This study investigates LA use by private school students in Erbil city in compared to native speakers in terms of frequency of use and sentence positions. According to the researcher’s knowledge, it is the first study that is conducted in this area on private school students in Erbil city. It tries to answer these questions:

1. What are the differences between private school students and native speakers in using LA categories?
2. Which linking adverbials are overused or underused by private school students in Erbil city?



3. What are the differences between private school students and native speakers in preferring LA positions?

2. Linking Adverbials

Oshima and Hogue (1997) defined linking adverbials as words or phrases which link ideas among sentences or clauses. Biber et al. (1999) argue that 'their primary function is to state the speaker/writer's perception of the relationship between two units of discourse' (p.875). Linking adverbials are peripheral in the clause structure, Quirk et al (1985). This means that they are outside the clause construction.

Linking adverbials (LAs) have been termed differently by scholars. However, all scholars agree on their connective role and contribution to textual coherence. Quirk et al. (1985) name them *conjuncts*; Halliday (2004) calls them *conjunctive adjuncts*; Huddleston and Pullum (2002) label them as *connective adjuncts*; Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999) call them *conjunctive adverbials*. In this study, Biber et al.'s label, linking adverbials, is used as the model of the study. The suitability of the term resides in the combination of the two words linking and adverbial, which shows the primary function of this category: its connective role in the text and its behaviour as an adverbial in a sentence.

2.1. Semantic Categories of Linking Adverbials

Linking adverbials can express various relationships among units of discourse. They are classified into different semantic categories and each LA can be put under one of these categories and some of them can be put under more than one category.

Grammarians have provided different semantic classifications of LAs. Quirk et al (1985) classify LAs into seven major categories: *Listing*, *summative*, *appositional*, *resultive*, *inferential*, *contrastive*, and *transitional*. Halliday and Hassan (1976) have only four main categories: *additive*, *adversative*, *causal*, and *temporal*. Celce-Murcia and Larson Freeman (1999), and Liu (2008) have also classified them into *additive*, *adversative*, *causal*, and *sequential* categories. Carter and McCarthy (2006) have classified them into *additive*, *meta-textual*, *contrastive*, *concessive*, *resultative*, *time*, *listing*, *summative*, and *inference*. This study follows Biber et al's (1999) classification that classifies linking adverbials into six categories: *enumeration/addition*, *result/inference*, *contrast/concession*, *apposition*, *summation*, and *transition*.

Table 1 Biber et al's classification of linking adverbials

LA category	Examples
Enumeration/addition	First, second, moreover, more, what's more, in addition, etc.
Result/inference	So, therefore, thus, as a result, hence, consequently, etc.
Contrast/concession	Yet, however, instead, rather, still, on the contrary, in contrast, etc.
Summation	To sum up, in conclusion, to conclude, in summary, etc.
Apposition	For example, that is, in other words, that is to say, e.g., etc
Transition	Now, by the way, meanwhile, incidentally, meantime, etc.

2.2. Positions of Linking Adverbials

LAs can occur in different positions in a sentence. That is to say, they are comparatively free to occupy initial, medial, or final positions. Biber et al. (1999) argue that the most frequently occurring place for linking adverbials is initial in both conversation and academic prose. Similarly, Larsen-Freeman and Celce-Murcia (1999) state that 'placement in the sentence-initial position makes them most salient' P. 536. Thus, Biber et al (1999) consider initial position as the unmarked position, and Quirk et al. (1985) consider initial position as the



normal position for linking adverbials. They also argue that many conjuncts are almost restricted to this position such as *so, (what is) more, hence, yet, still, besides, else*.

The second common position for linking adverbials in academic prose is medial, while final position is the least common (Biber et al. 1999; Larsen-Freeman and Celce-Murcia, 1999). Several LAs can normally occur medially such as *however, nevertheless, also, in other words, on the contrary, thus, therefore*, etc. (Quirk et al., 1985). In the final position, we can find LAs such as *in other words, anyhow, anyway, though, then*.

3. Literature Review

Studies on the use of linking adverbials in EFL learners have occupied a large space in corpus linguistics. Since 1990s researchers (e.g. Crewe, 1990; Field and Yip, 1992; Milton and Tsang, 1993; Granger and Tyson, 1996; Altenberg and Tapper, 1996, etc.) have compared the use of LAs by EFL learners with different L1 backgrounds to native speakers of English under more general terms such as connectors, conjunctions, and logical connectors. These researchers have primarily investigated issues of overuse, underuse, and misuse of LAs by EFL learners. For example, Field and Yip (1992) compare Cantonese writers with native speakers in using conjunctions as cohesive devices in their writings. The results showed that Cantonese writers used a significantly higher frequency of cohesive devices, among them conjunctive adverbials, in their English writing than their native-speaker counterparts. The study reveals that the sentence-initial position is the most common position for all L2 writers.

Recently, in the last ten years, many studies (e.g. Xu and Liu, 2012; Park, 2013; Mudhhi and Hussein, 2014; Ahmad and Wey, 2020, etc.) have investigated LAs in EFL learners' writings from different levels of education. These researchers have used more specific terms such as conjuncts, conjunctive adverbials, and linking adverbials. For example, Xu and Liu (2012) have investigated the differences in using conjuncts (i.e. LAs) between Chinese EFL learners and native speakers. The results of their study demonstrated that Chinese students overuse and inappropriately use conjuncts. They used a small set of conjuncts compared to native speakers. They preferred the initial position while native speakers preferred the medial position. Park (2013) also reports similar results. He examined Korean university students' use of conjunctive adverbials in argumentative essays with different proficiency levels. The researcher found out that Korean students overused conjunctive adverbials, especially sequential and additive categories. Ahmad and Wey (2020) investigated the use of linking adverbials by pre-university Malaysian students in argumentative essays and compared them to argumentative essays written by British students. The results of their study demonstrated that Malaysian learners used a small set of LAs, overused additive and sequential adverbials, and underused adversative adverbials.

Although many researchers have studied LAs use by learners of English with various L1 backgrounds, only a few studies that have investigated Kurdish learners' uses of LAs. One of these studies is Habbas and Mirza's (2011) study. They tested students' ability to identify and use conjuncts. They found that most students are weak at identifying conjuncts and use a small set of familiar conjuncts. Regarding the categories, enumeration/ addition category was the most used type by students. Another study is Aziz and Nuri's (2021) study. They investigated the use of conjunctive adverbials by Kurdish university students. They discovered that Kurdish learners overused CAs and they tended to use more sequential and additive CAs than causals and adversatives. Additionally, they highly relied on initial positions rather than medial and final ones.

The current study, therefore, intends to present more information about Kurdish EFL learners' uses of LAs. It investigates LAs in the writings of 11-year students in private schools in Erbil city in comparison to professional native speakers.



4. Data and Analysis Procedures

4.1. Learner Corpus

For this study, 100 essays were randomly collected from 11th-year students in four private schools in Erbil city whose language of instruction is English. The number of essays was then reduced to 80 because some were identical. The schools are *The Private Nilufer Girls' Secondary school*; *Ishik Secondary School, a boys' school*; *Cambridge International School-Capital*, a co-educational school with grades from 1-12; and *Classical School of the Medes*, a co-educational school having grades from 1-12. Most of the essays are argumentative with some exploratory and descriptive ones. Some essays have been written at home and some others in class. The essays were relatively short ranging between 118 to 576 words. The total number of words in the essays is 23035 words.

4.2. Native Corpus

As Leech (1998) argues, 'the goal of foreign language learning is to approximate closer and closer to the performance of native speakers. Therefore, learners' writings should be compared with native speakers to evaluate the level of their writing appropriateness. But which native speakers are appropriate to be used as models for learners? Leech (1998) argues that not all native speakers are appropriate models for learners to imitate. Ishikawa (2013) proposes native speaker teachers, instructors, and professional business persons as a model of native speakers' essay writing. Thus, in this study highly educated students' essays, i.e. undergraduate and graduate students, rather than native high school students have been chosen to compare with 11th-year students in private schools in Erbil city.

The Michigan Corpus of Upper-Level Student Papers (MICUSP) (2009), a sub-corpus of the Michigan Corpora, has been used in this study. This Corpus is a collection of 829 A-grade papers from various disciplines across four academic divisions (Humanities and Arts, Social Sciences, Biological and Health Sciences, Physical Sciences) of the University of Michigan (U-S) in the United States. MICUSP was created by a group of researchers and students at the English Language Institute, University of Michigan. The texts were collected between 2002-2009.

For the purpose of comparison with private school students, the researcher of this study extracted only 20 essays from MICUSP because they are longer than the essays written by private school students (PSS). The essays are from different disciplines such as English, Linguistics, psychology, education, sociology, philosophy, history and classical studies, and economics. They are written by graduate and final-year undergraduate students, all are Native American speakers. The total number of words in the native speakers' corpus of this study is 23785 words. Table 2 below shows the overall information about the data of this study.

Table 2 Summary of the data of this study

	Native speakers (NS)	Private School Students (PSS)
Number of essays	20	80
number of words	23785	23035
Mean words per essay	1167	287

4.3. Data Analysis Procedures

All LAs have been identified manually in the corpora. All the occurrences of the items which function as linking adverbials have been checked clearly in order to assure whether they are functioning as LAs or not because they can also have other functions such as an adjective or an adverb, etc. Only when the item has a connective role and is peripheral to the clause



structure, that is, the omission of it does not affect the grammatical structure of the clause has been kept as data for this study.

Other occurrences, for instance, the occurrences of *so*, and *still* in the following examples have been excluded.

So, let's go home. (Interjection)

This man is so funny. (adverb)

Still waters run deep. (adjective)

Is it still raining? (adverb)

After extracting all tokens of LAs in the corpora, they were put under the six semantic categories proposed by Biber, et al. (1999) which are: Enumeration/ addition, summation, result/inference, contrast/concession, apposition, and transition. And it was taken into consideration that some LAs could have more than one semantic function such as *then* that can be used for enumeration/ addition and result/inference as follows:

First, turn the lights on; *then*, go inside the building. (Enumeration and addition)

If it is locked, *then* we'll need the key. (Result/inference)

Then each LA position was identified to find out the preferred position by private school students and native speakers and identify the similarities and distinctions between the two groups.

After identifying all LAs in the two corpora and counting the frequency of the occurrence of each LA, a log-likelihood (henceforth, LL) test was utilised to determine whether the frequency differences between the learner corpus and the native corpus have reached statistical significance or not. The log-likelihood calculator utilised in the current study, is available at <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>. The results of LL enable us to make inferences about the differences in the frequency between the two corpora. That is, it tells us whether the differences are by chance or significant. According to Rayson (2003) cited by Dutra et al. (2019), when the result of the LL is greater than 3.8 and smaller than 6.6, there is less than a 5% probability for the result to be by chance, expressed by $p > 0.05$. When the LL result is 6.63, it means that the probability of the result by chance is less than 1% and we can be 99% sure that the difference between the two corpora is not random. The higher the LL result, the more significant is the difference between the two frequency scores. As follows:

- 95th percentile; 5% level; $p < 0.05$; critical value = 3.84
- 99th percentile; 1% level; $p < 0.01$; critical value = 6.63
- 99.9th percentile; 0.1% level; $p < 0.001$; critical value = 10.83
- 99.99th percentile; 0.01% level; $p < 0.0001$; critical value = 15.1

5. Results and discussion

5.1. Comparison of LA Categories in the two corpora

Regarding answering the first question of the study, the results of the data analysis showed that private school students overused enumeration/addition, and summation categories while underused contrast/concession categories relative to native speakers. Table 3 shows that private school students overuse the summation category most frequently, with the log-likelihood value of 24.34+, then the enumeration/addition category, with the log-likelihood value of 6.43+. The results of the log-likelihood test also show that the contrast/concession category is underused by learners relative to native speakers at a level that is statistically significant, with the log-likelihood value of 6.17-. The frequency usage of the other categories, namely, apposition, result/inference, and transition, between the two groups has not reached statistical significance. The frequency of apposition LAs is nearly the same between the two



groups, 17 to 18, with the log-likelihood value of 0.01-. Transition category was slightly underused by learners, with the log-likelihood value of 3.80-. Result/inference category was slightly overused, with the log-likelihood value of 1.37+.

Table 3 Comparison of LA categories in the two corpora

LA Categories	Learner corpus	Native Corpus	LL Value
Enumeration and addition	112	80	6.43 +
Result/inference	67	56	1.37 +
Contrast/concession	49	79	6.17 -
Summation	22	1	24.34 +
Apposition	17	18	0.01 -
Transition	1	6	3.80 -
Total	268	240	2.57 +

Many previous studies confirm that there is a tendency among learners of English with different levels of education to overuse linking adverbials of enumeration/addition and underuse LAs of contrast/concession, although they have used different categorizations. One of these studies is Chen’s (2006) study who found that advanced Taiwanese learners overused additive (in the current study, addition and apposition) and temporal (in the current study, enumeration, and summation) linking adverbials and underused adversative (in the current study, contrast/concession) linking adverbials compared to native speakers. Granger & Tyson (1996) also found that French and German learners overuse connectors which perform functions such as giving examples and adding points to the argument and underused connectors of contrast. Mudhhi and Hussein (2014) reported the overuse of additive and causal (result/inference) categories and the underuse of adversative and temporal categories by Kuwaiti students. Sebzavari et al. (2016) found the same results as Mudhhi and Hussein (2014) among Iranian EFL writers. Ahmad and Wey (2020) found that Malaysian students overused additive, sequential (in the current study, enumeration and summation) and causal LAs while underused adversative category.

Thus, the results of the current study are in line with previous studies which report that learners of English usually overuse linking adverbials of summation, enumeration/addition, and result/inference categories while underuse linking adverbials of contrast/concession category. These results show a drastic difference between native and non-native groups in terms of their preference for using LAs, and organizational and structural differences in their writings. Non-native students frequently depend on those LAs used to list, add, and enumerate ideas to organize their writings, while native writers depend more on those LAs which logically develop their argumentation (Park, 2013). Granger and Tyson (1996) observed a similar tendency as they stated ‘learners use most frequently those connectors which add to, exemplify, or emphasizes a point, rather than those which change the direction of the argument or take the argument logically forward’ (p.20).

5.2. Overused and Underused LAs

For answering the second question of this study about overused and underused LAs by private school students, table 4 presents a detailed clarification.

Table 4 overused and underused LAs

LAs (Category)	LC	%	NC	%	LL
In conclusion (summation)	10	0.04	0	0.00+	14.19
Also (enumeration/addition)	73	0.32	45	0.19+	7.64
Second(ly)(enumeration/addition)	4	0.02	0	0.00+	5.67



As a result (result/inference)	4	0.02	0	0.00+	5.67
First(ly) (enumeration/addition)	7	0.03	1	0.00+	5.23
First of all (enumeration/addition)	3	0.01	0	0.00+	4.26
Afterall (contrast/concession)	3	0.01	0	0.00+	4.26
So (result/inference)	32	0.14	19	0.08+	3.78
Rather (contrast/concession)	2	0.01	11	0.05 -	6.57
Next (enumeration/addition)	0	0.00	4	0.02 -	5.42
That is (appositional)	0	0.00	3	0.01-	4.06
Though (contrast/concession)	0	0.00	3	0.01-	4.26
Now (transitional)	1	0.00	6	0.03-	3.80
As well (enumeration/addition)	1	0.00	6	0.03-	3.80

As can be seen from the table above, private school students overused 8 LAs significantly. The most overused LA is *in conclusion* (LL 14.19, $p>0.001$) which is from the summation category. Four significantly overused LAs are from the enumeration/addition category: *also* (LL 7.64, $p>0.01$), *second(ly)* (LL 5.67, $p>0.05$), *first(ly)* (LL 5.23, $P>0.05$), and *first of all* (LL 4.26, $p>0.05$). Two others are from the result/inference category: *as a result* (LL 5.67, $P>0.05$), and *so* (LL 3.78, $P>0.05$); and one is from the contrast/concession category which is *after all* (LL 4.26, $P>0.05$). This coincides with the previous findings that private school students overuse LAs of summation, enumeration/addition, and result/inference.

Other studies have reported the overuse of those LAs. For instance, two of the most overused LAs by Malaysian students in Ahmad and Wey's (2020) study were *in conclusion* and *so*; Liu (2013) reported overuse of *so* by Chinese college students. Nakayama (2021) observed overuse of *second(ly)*, *first(ly)*, *so*, and *first of all* among Japanese EFL learners. Zhang (2014) observed overuse of *in conclusion* among Chinese learners. Ishikawa (2011) discovered overuse of *also* among Asian learners.

The table also indicates that private school students underused 6 LAs to a statistically significant level. The most highly underused LA is *rather* (LL 6.57, $P>0.01$) which belongs to the contrast/concession category. LA *though* (LL 4.26, $P>0.05$) was another significantly underused linking adverbial which also belongs to the contrast/concession category. Two other underused linking adverbials which are *next* (LL 5.42, $P>0.05$) and *as well* (LL 3.80, $P>0.05$), belong to the enumeration/addition category. One LA is from the appositional category which is *that is* (LL 4.06, $P>0.05$). Another one is *now* (LL 3.80, $P>0.05$) from the transitional category.

The underuse of those linking adverbials in this study is in agreement with some other studies. Ishikawa (2011), for instance, reported underuse of *rather* among Asian learners. Gunes (2017) discovered the underuse of *though* among advanced Turkish learners. Ahmad and Wey (2020) found underuse of *rather*, *as well*, and *that is* by Kuwaiti students relative to native speakers. Park (2003) reported underuse of *rather* among Korean EFL learners. Nakayama (2021) observed the underuse of *though* and *rather* among Indonesian students.

5.3. Positions of Linking Adverbials

To answer the study's third question, table 5 shows the comparison of the three sentence positions of linking adverbials by category between learner corpus and native corpus. As the table indicates, there is no significant difference between the two corpora in the distribution of LAs among the three positions. The initial position occupies %65.2 and %62.5 of LAs in the learner and native corpora, respectively. The medial position occupies %32.4 and %33.3 of LAs and the final position occupies only %2.2 and %4.1 of LAs in learner and native corpora, respectively.

Table 5 shows that both groups used LAs most frequently in the initial position, followed by medial and final positions. This finding is in line with Celce- Murcia & Larson-Freeman's (1999) argument in which they claim that sentence-initial position is the most salient position



for LAs followed by medial and final positions; and Biber et al.'s (1999) findings that the initial position could be seen as the unmarked position for LAs with the medial position the second most common position in academic writing, leaving final position the least frequent one.

Table 5 Comparison of LAs positions in the two corpora

LA category	Learner Corpus			Native Corpus		
	Initial	Medial	final	initial	medial	final
Enumeration/addition	35	72	5	28	46	6
Result/inference	64	2	1	44	12	0
Contrast/concession	43	5	1	58	17	4
Summation	22	0	0	1	0	0
Apposition	12	5	0	18	0	0
Transition	1	0	0	1	5	0
Total	177	84	7	150	80	10
Percentage	%65.2	%32.4	%2.2	%62.5	%33.3	%4.1

As the table indicates, there is no significant difference between the two corpora in the distribution of LAs among the three positions. Initial position occupies %65.2 and %62.5 of LAs in the learner and native corpora, respectively. Medial position occupies %32.4 and %33.3 of LAs and the final position occupies only %2.2 and %4.1 of LAs in learner and native corpora, respectively.

The table also shows that the position of LAs depends on their category. Although the initial position is the most common place for LAs in general, both groups used the enumeration/addition category more frequently in the medial position. LAs of this category occurred 72 to 46 times in the medial position in learner and native corpora, respectively while they occurred 35 to 28 times in the initial position. This finding results from the great frequency of LA 'also' which is the most frequent LA in the two corpora as shown in table 5 and is more commonly used in the medial position (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). Therefore, if the enumeration/addition category is excluded from the table, it can be seen that native speakers have used 34 LAs in the medial position while private school students have used only 12 LAs in this position. This indicates that private school students rarely use LAs in medial position, except for 'also'. It could be, therefore, argued that private school students prefer sentence-initial positions for LAs. This means they are not well aware of the flexibility of LA-positioning in sentence structure.

This preference for the sentence-initial position in using LAs by learners of English has been observed by previous studies from various L1 backgrounds (e.g. Lee, 2004; Park, 2013; Zhang, 2000; Granger and Tyson, 1996; Aziz and Nuri 2021, etc.).

Zhang (2000) attributes Chinese learners' preference for placing LAs in sentence-initial positions to L1 transfer, but since learners from different L1 backgrounds share the same problem, it seems that it is a developmental problem. Until learners develop their proficiency, they tend to place LAs mainly in the initial position.

6. Conclusions

This study explored frequency differences in LAs use between Kurdish private school students and native speakers. The results indicated that private school students frequently overuse LAs of enumeration/addition, and summation while underuse LAs of contrast/concession. For individual linking adverbials, the results indicated that the most overused linking adverbial was *in conclusion*, followed by *also*, *second(ly)*, *as a result*, *first(ly)*, *first of all*, *after all*, and *so*. In contrast, the most underused linking adverbial was



rather, followed by next, that is, though, now, and as well. The study also discovered that both groups have a tendency to place LAs in sentence-initial position, but this tendency is higher among private school students. However, both groups prefer to place some LAs in the medial position such as also.

In light of these findings, some pedagogical instructions are needed. Students need to be taught to distinguish individual LAs semantically. They should be exposed to authentic texts to be instructed properly about the authentic uses of LAs. And teachers can use corpus-based research as a teaching tool that helps them better to identify students' errors and sources of errors.

7. Suggestions for further research

Further research is suggested on the way Kurdish EFL learners use LAs. This study could be replicated with learners from different levels. A study could be conducted on specific LAs or the reasons behind choosing certain LAs by Kurdish EFL learners. A study could be conducted on La use by Kurdish EFL learners in spoken language.

8. References

- Ahmad, U. K. & Wey, L. P. (2020). The Use of Linking Adverbials in Malaysian Students' Argumentative Essays. *International Journal of Social Science and Human Research*, 3 (12), 416-425.
- Alsharif, M. (2017). The Frequently Used Discourse Markers by Saudi EFL Learners. *Arab World English Journal*, 8(2), 384-397.
- Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M. (1998). The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on Computer* (1st ed., pp. 80-93). New York: Longman.
- Aziz, A.R., & Nuri, R. B. M. (2021). Iraqi Kurd EFL Learners' Uses of Conjunctive Adverbials in Essays. *Arab World English Journal*, 12 (2) 222-237.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited
- Carter, R., & McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge Grammar of English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, L. (1999). *The Grammar Book* (2"d ed.). Boston: Heinle & Heinle.
- Chen, C. W. (2006). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(1), 113-130.
- Crew, W. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 316-325.
- Dutra, D.P., Orfanó, B.M. and ALMEIDA, V.C., 2019. Result linking adverbials in learner corpora. *Domínios de Linguagem*, 13(1), pp.400-431.
- Field, Y., & Yip, L. M. O. (1992). A comparison of internal cohesive conjunction in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 15-28.
- Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes*, 15(1), 17-27.
- Güneş, H. (2017). A corpus-based study of linking adverbials through contrastive analysis of L1/L2 PhD dissertations. *International Journal of Curriculum and Instruction*, 9(2), 21-38.
- Halliday, M. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A.K., revised by Matthiessen Christian, M.I.M (2004) *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Hodder Arnold, a member of the Hodder headline Group. London



- Huddleston, R. D., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Hussein, R. F., & Mudhi, S. (2014). A Corpus-based Study of Conjunctive Adjuncts in the Writings of Native and Non-native Speakers of English. *English Linguistics Research*, 3(2), 17–32.
- Ishikawa, S. (2013). The ICNALE and sophisticated contrastive interlanguage analysis of Asian learners of English. In S. Ishikawa (Ed.), *Learner corpus studies in Asia and the world*, 1 (pp. 91-118). Kobe University.
- Ishikawa, S. (2011). A corpus-based study on Asian learners' use of English linking adverbials. *Themes in Science and Technology Education*, 3(1-2), 139-157
- Lee, E. (2004). A corpus-based analysis of the Korean EFL learners' use of conjunctive adverbials. *English Teaching*, 59(4), 283-301.
- Leech, G. (1998). Preface. In S. Granger (Ed) *Learner English on Computer*. London, UK. Longman
- Liu, D. (2008). Linking adverbials: An across-register corpus study and its implications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 491–518.
- Log-likelihood and effect size calculator (n.d.) <http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html>
- Michigan Corpus of Upper-level Student Papers (MICUSP), (2009-2010). Regents of the University of Michigan. <https://elicorpora.info/main>
- Nakayama, S. (2021). A Corpus-based analysis of Japanese EFL learners' linking adverbial use. *The Education Review, USA*. 5(6), 164-171
- Oshima, A., & Hogue, A. (1997). *Coherence: Introduction to Academic Writing*. White Plains, NY: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Park, Y.-Y. (2013). How Korean EFL Students Use Conjunctive Adverbials in Argumentative Writing. *English Teaching*, 68(4), 263–284.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, J., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Sabzevari, A., Haghverdi, H., & Biria, R. (2016) Sentence-initial conjunctive adverbials in academic articles written by native English speakers and Iranian EFL writers. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods (MJLTM)*, 6 (5), 282-287.
- Xu, Y., & Liu, Y. (2012). The use of adverbial conjuncts of Chinese EFL learners and native speakers-corpus-based study. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 2(11), 2316–2321.
- Zhang, M. (2000). Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese universities. *RELC Journal*, 31, 61-95.

به كارهيتانى ليكده ركان له نوسينى قوتايانى قوتابخانه تاييه تەكان به راورد به قسه كهره ره سه نه كان

نه به ز مسته فا عومهر

به شى زمانى ئينگليزى، كوئىزى زمان، زانكو سلاحه دين-ههولير

فاتيمه رشيد حسن باجلانى

به شى زمانى ئينگليزى، كوئىزى زمان، زانكو سلاحه دين-ههولير

پوخته

نهم توئىنه وه به له شيوارى به كارهيتانى ليكده ركانى زمانى ئينگليزى ده كوئىته وه له وتاره كانى خوئىندكارانى قوتابخانه تاييه تەكان له شارى ههولير به راورد به قسه كهره ره سه نه كان. داناى توئىنه وه كه پيكدت له (80) وتار كه له لايه ن قوتايانى پولى يانزهى ناماده يى نوسراوه له چوار قوتابخانه ي تاييه تە له شارى ههولير وه (20) وتار كه له لايه ن قسه كهره ره سه نه ئهمريكه كان نوسراوه كه له كوئىزى ميسيجان وه رگراوه. توئىنه وه كه به شيوه يه كى دياريكرا وه ههولدهات كه پيشانى بدات كام جوئى ليكده ركان وه كام ليكده ر به تاييه تە زياد يان كه م به كارديت له لايه ن قوتايانى قوتابخانه تاييه تەكان. نه نجامه كانى توئىنه وه كه دهريان خست كه قوتايانى قوتابخانه تاييه تەكان ئه و ليكده رانه زياد به كارديت كه بۆ مبه ستي ريزبه نديكردن و زيادكردن بىرۆكه به كارديت وه ههروه ها ئه وانه ي بۆ كوئاييه تان به وتار به كارديت به لام ئه و ليكده رانه كه م به كارديت كه بۆ مبه ستي ده رپى جياوازي و دژيه كى به كارديت . نه نجامه كان ههروه ها ده رپشانخست كه قوتايانى قوتابخانه تاييه تەكان زياتر ليكده ركان له سه ره تاي پسته دا به كارديت.

وشه گرنگه كان : ليكده ركان، قسه كهره ره سه نه كان، قوتايانى قوتابخانه تاييه تەكان.

ادوات الربط في مقالات طلاب المدارس الخاصة مقارنة بالمتحدثين الاصليين

نهبه ز مصطفى عمر

قسم الانجليزية - كلية اللغات، جامعة صلاح الدين-اربيل

فاطمة رشيد حسن الباجلاني

ملخص

تبحث هذه الدراسة عن الطريقة التي يستخدم بها طلاب المدارس الخاصة في مدينة أربيل ادوات الربط في مقالاتهم مقارنة بالمتحدثين الأصليين. تتكون الدراسة من 80 مقالة كتبها طلاب الصف 11 من أربع مدارس خاصة في مدينة أربيل و 20 مقالة من مجموعة ميسيجان كتبها متحدثون أمريكيون أصليون. تحاول الدراسة على وجه التحديد اكتشاف أي فئة من ادوات الربط واي ادوات الربط بشكل خاص تم الإفراط في استخدامها أو لا يستخدم بشكل كاف، وفي أي مواضع في الجملة. وأظهرت النتائج أن طلاب المدارس الخاصة بالغوا في استخدام ادوات الربط التي تستخدم للاضافة واختتام المقالة بينما لم يستخدموا الادوات التي تستخدم للتعبير عن فكرتين متضادتين او متقابلتين بشكل كاف. كما أظهرت النتائج أيضاً أن طلاب المدارس الخاصة يفضلون وضع ادوات الربط في بداية الجملة.

كلمات المفتاحية: ادوات الربط، متحدثون الاصليون، طلاب المدارس الخاصة.