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Discourse connectors (DCs) are one of the elements of cohesive devices that bring about cohesion to a piece of writing or speech. They are potentially useful means for writers, particularly in ESL and EFL writing pedagogic settings. DCs usefulness is two-pronged. First, they help and guide readers through the text, and then they are tools for writers to engage with their readers. It has been well-documented that appropriate and efficient use of DCs will create a coherent flow of the text. However, second/foreign language learners have some difficulties to use them efficiently and systematically in their writing. Literature review shows that the Malaysian ESL students are also suffering from improper and efficient use of DCs which leads them in failing to produce a cohesive text. Surprisingly, no single study was found in the context of Malaysia to investigate Malaysian ESL students’ understanding and use of DCs.

Hence, this study attempted to investigate and understand the nature and the use of the DCs in the Malaysian student writing compared with Native speakers writing. The study also was set to examine the correlation between the frequency use of the DCs and the quality of writing. The final goal of this research study was to find out to what extent Malaysian ESL students are committing errors while using DCs.

A corpus-based approach was adopted to meet the objectives of the study. To this end, an argumentative topic was assigned to the Form 4, Form 5 (upper-secondary) and the first year college students (post-secondary) and they were asked to write about the given topic in the classroom and submit their works to the instructors. They were required to write 250 words within 45 minutes. Upon compilation of the essays, the Malaysian Corpus of Students' Argumentative Writing (MCSAW) was built with ≃ 600,000 tokens. To compare and find out a vivid picture of Malaysian ESL students use of DCs with Native English Speakers, the Louvain Corpus of Native Essay Writing [LOCNESS] corpus was used.

Oxford Wordsmith Tools (5) was employed to extract data from corpus for analysis, by using frequency count and concordance functions. Aiming to identify what type of DCs is used by Malaysian ESL students, Discourse Connector List developed by Rezvani
Kalajahi and Neufeld (2014) was used. To be able to examine the relationship between the quality of writing and the frequency of the use of the DCs, ESL composition profile offered by Jacobs et al. (1981) was utilized. Finally, a framework of identification of DCs error type was developed by the researcher to explore the errors that students commit while using DCs.

Findings of this study entail three phases. First, it was observed that Malaysian students tend to use DCs more frequently than native students. The overall frequency of the use of the DCs between Malaysian and native students was statistically significant at p < .05. However, the native students used more variety of DCs types than Malaysian students (398 vs. 328). It was also found that Malaysian students use DCs in some categories frequently and infrequently. Based on the findings in the native students writing (LOCNESS Corpus), the most frequent DCs in written English were offered. Second, there was a very weak negative but insignificant correlation between writing quality and the frequency of the use of the DCs in the writing of Malaysian ESL students. Finally, the qualitative analysis revealed that the erroneous use of DCs made by Malaysian ESL student writers mainly manifested in eight different categories. They had problems with the use of these devices which involved semantic, syntactic, stylistic, positional and mechanical errors. They also appeared to have tendency for unnecessary addition, omission, and redundant repetition of the DCs.

In conclusion, this study demonstrated that Malaysian ESL students’ use of DCs was still at an evolving level. It is vitally important that the accurate use of DCs in writing among Malaysian students be further highlighted in the classrooms through using concordance lines and adopting explicit instruction technique. Besides, material developers may take the outcome of the research into consideration and could find out possible ways to distribute and introduce DCs systematically across the educational levels.
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Penghubung wacana - Discourse Connectors (selepas ini DC) merupakan salah satu daripada unsur-unsur peranti kohesif membawa kepada penulisan atau ucapan yang padu. Perkara ini sangat berguna bagi penulis, terutamanya dalam pedagogi penulisan ESL dan EFL. DC dianggap sebagai serampang dua mata. Pertama, mereka membantu dan membimbing pembaca dalam pembacaan teks, kemudiannya menjadi alat untuk penulis melibatkan diri dengan pembaca mereka. Hal ini telah didokumenkan dengan baik bahawa kesesuaian dan kecekapan penggunaan DC akan mewujudkan aliran koheren teks. Walau bagaimanapun, pelajar bahasa kedua/pelajar bahasa asing menghadapi kesukaran menggunakannya dengan cekap dan sistematik dalam penulisan mereka. Satu sorotan literatur menunjukkan bahawa pelajar ESL Malaysia juga mengalami kesukaran menggunakannya yang kemudiannya mengakibatkan ketercenderungan untuk menghasilkan teks yang padu. Yang menghairankan, tiada pun satu kajian dijalankan dalam konteks Malaysia untuk mengkaji ketercenderungan penggunaan DC oleh pelajar ESL Malaysia.

Oleh itu, kajian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji dan memahami sifat dan penggunaan DC bagi pelajar Malaysia berbanding dengan penutur asli. Kajian ini juga telah direka untuk mengkaji ketercenderungan antara kekerapan penggunaan DC dan kualiti penulisan. Matlamat akhir kajian ini adalah untuk mengetahui sejauh mana pelajar ESL Malaysia melakukan kesilapan semasa menggunakan DC.

Pendekatan berasaskan korpus telah digunakan bagi mencapai objektif kajian. Untuk tujuan ini, satu topik penulisan perbincangan ditugaskan kepada pelajar tingkatan 4, Tingkatan 5, dan pelajar kolej tahun pertama. Pelajar-pelajar diminta untuk menulis tentang topik yang diberikan di dalam kelas dan menghantar karya mereka kepada pengajar. Mereka dikehendaki menulis sebanyak 250 patah perkataan dalam masa 45
minit. Setelah selesai penulisan itu disusuni, korpus penulisan perbincangan bagi pelajar-pelajar Malaysia (MCSAW) telah dibina dengan ≈ 600,000 token. Untuk perbandingan dan memperoleh gambaran yang jelas antara pelajar-pelajar ESL Malaysia dengan penutur asli bahasa Inggeris dalam menggunakan DC, pendekatan Louvain Corpus of Native Essay Writing [LOCNESS] telah digunakan.


Hasil kajian ini melibatkan tiga fasa. Pertama, ia telah memperlihatkan bahawa pelajar Malaysia menggunakan DC lebih banyak berbanding dengan pelajar-pelajar penutur asli. Kekerapan keseluruhan penggunaan DC antara pelajar Malaysia dan pelajar penutur asli didapati mempunyai statistik yang ketara pada p <.05. Walau bagaimanapun, pelajar penutur asli menggunakan pelbagai jenis DC berbanding dengan pelajar Malaysia (398 vs. 328). Kajian ini juga mendapati bahawa terdapat pelajar-pelajar Malaysia yang menggunakan beberapa kategori DC secara berlebihan dan berkurangan. Berdasarkan penemuan kajian ini penulisan pelajar penutur asli (LOCNESS Corpus), yang paling kerap menggunakan DC telah ditawarkan. Kedua, terdapat korelasi yang menunjukkan hubungan yang negatif dan lemah tetapi tidak ketara antara kualiti penulisan dan kekerapan penggunaan DC dalam penulisan pelajar ESL Malaysia. Akhir sekali, analisis data kualitatif pula menunjukkan bahawa penggunaan DC yang salah telah dilakukan oleh penulis pelajar ESL Malaysia terutamanya dimanifestasikan dalam lapan kategori yang berbeza. Mereka mempunyai masalah tentang penggunaan alat-alat ini yang melibatkan semantik, sintaksis, gaya, kedudukan dan kesilapan mekanikal. Mereka juga mempunyai kecenderungan untuk penambahan yang tidak perlu, tidak menggunakan, dan pengulangan penggunaan DC.

Kesimpulannya, kajian ini menunjukkan bahawa penggunaan DC oleh pelajar ESL Malaysia masih pada tahap perkembangan. Ia amat penting untuk dititikberkaitan penggunaan DC yang tepat dalam bilik darjah melalui penggunaan tali tambahan ini dan menerima pakai teknik arahan-arahan terperinci. Selain itu, pemaju bahan pengajaran boleh mempertimbangkan hasil kajian ini dan mengenalpasti pelbagai pelaksanaan untuk mengedari dan memperkenalkan DC secara sistematik di seluruh peringkat pendidikan.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

“Use of DCs appears to be the last part of grammar. To make an analogy, the relationship between grammar and DCs is like the relationship between train and rail. Coal is morphology, skeleton of train is syntax, chains that join the compartments together are semantics, waiters are vocabulary items, passengers are readers, the person who is leading the train is writer, and the rail is DMs. If all parts of train work well, then the train is able to move on the rail, and if the person who is leading the train knows the interpretation of signs along the rails, then he is able to keep the train on the right track (Jalilifar, 2008).”

This chapter begins with a review of the background of the study. Next, a brief account of corpus and its link to language teaching is presented. Later, the nature of the present study is explained and then it is continued with the review of the rationale of the present study. The chapter continues with the statement of the research problem, objective, and research questions. Next comes the significance of the study followed by some limitations. The chapter concludes with the definitions of some of key words used throughout the study.

1.1 Background of the Study

English is seen as an important language that is taught in schools for 11 years in Malaysia. English Language has also become an important and a compulsory subject matter for primary and secondary educational levels (Malaysia Education Blueprint 2013 – 2025). In fact, majority of the Malaysian children find an opportunity to be exposed to English language even at the age of four or five at the kindergarten. Then they continue learning the language until they complete SPM or Malaysian Education certificate at the age of 17.

Although the majority of the Asian students appear to be capable of using English communicatively, their performance may not be satisfactory in relation to a number of language skills. Some studies have indicated that Malaysian ESL students have problems mainly in writing tasks, at both school level and tertiary level many learners tend to be incapable of choosing appropriate conjunctions, or what is called as Discourse Connectors (henceforth DCs) in this study. Therefore, inexplicable absence or inappropriate use of the DCs tends to result in lack of cohesion in the text (Ghabool, Mariadass, & Kashef, 2012; Maros, Hua, & Khazriyati, 2007; Musa, Lie, & Azman, 2012; Ahour & Mukundan, 2012; Ellis & Barkhuizen, 2005).
Norrish (1983) claims that writing has been proven to be the most difficult language skill even for native speakers. By the same token, it comes as no surprise that ESL or EFL students may suffer from inappropriate writing. Ostensibly, writing is more difficult than speaking since, in written communication, there are no additional nonverbal cues (e.g. facial expression, gesture) to ensure that the message comes across. Hence, it is very important for the student writers to put their ideas into words in a way that are clear, succinct, and easily comprehensible for the readers.

A written text requires the writer not only to be able to construct sentences accurately but also to be able to use DCs appropriately to build a coherent text. It has been well documented that DCs are one of the important devices for signaling the connections between clauses or beyond in textual communication. Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan (1999) observe that the primary function of DCs is to state the speaker/writer perception of the relationship between two and more units of discourse and thus help to create textual cohesion. Appropriately used DCs are considered to be contributable to the clarity and comprehensibility of discourse.

With the status of English as an international language and the increasing expansion of the use of the English language throughout the world, second and foreign language learners find themselves in different contexts that require them to write in English. It is, therefore, the concern of this study to investigate the Malay students’ writing to see how they deal with the DCs in compositions and how their use of DCs compares with native students.

L2 writers must learn that the readers are able to follow the ideas expressed in the text more easily if they properly signal the relations of their utterances to those which precede and follow. Therefore, DCs constitute an important component of communicative competence, which L2 learners must acquire if they want to communicate effectively. This implies that the nonnative speakers competent in using the DCs of the L2 will be more successful in interaction than those who are not (Rahimi, 2011).

DCs function as cohesive devices in discourse that help guide the reader or listener through the message by signaling how successive units are related (Leech, 1998). Some examples of DCs are: but (indicating contrast), because (reason) and therefore (result). Halliday & Hasan (1976) describe these expressions as connectors of logical or semantic relations between units of discourse. Results of the studies have attempted to show that DCs actually contribute to a better understanding of discourse (Flowerdew, 1998; Hartnett, 1986; Mauranen, 1993; Mosenthal & Tierney, 1984). In addition, some research results report that DCs may be very significant in terms of how a text is perceived. For instance, Mauranen (1993) found that a sample of
academic writing with DCs to be more logical, convincing and authoritative than the same sample with all the DCs removed.

It, therefore, seems reasonable to assume that inappropriate use of DCs could, to a certain degree, hinder successful communication and lead to a misunderstanding. Therefore, as part of communicative competence, L2 learners should acquire the appropriate use of DCs of their target language (TL). Warsi (2000) remarks that it is plausible to suppose that L2 learners who are competent in the use of DCs of the target language will be more successful in both verbal and non-verbal interaction than those who are not. For these reasons, the use of DCs needs to be studied and should receive sufficient attention in language research and instruction.

As highlighted earlier, writing skill turns out to be a major concern for non-natives as they more often than not find it difficult to produce a piece of coherent text. Numerous researchers in the realm of writing and discourse claim that DCs may lead to cohesion (Halliday and Hassan 1976; Tannen, 1982; Quirk et al., 1985; Cook, 1989; McCarthy, 1991; Biber et al., 1999; Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Brown, 2001; Ozono and Ito’s, 2003). However, students often experience difficulty applying them in their writing. Considering this, it can be assumed that Malaysian students are not an exception. Although extensive researches have been carried out on the use of DCs both in EFL and ESL contexts, no single study was found to address the use of DCs by Malaysian ESL students.

1.2 Discourse Connectors

There is a plethora of research studies done on linguistic devices writers use to connect their ideas; yet, researchers have to agree on common terms for such devices, let alone a defining framework of reference for language users. Rezvani Kalajahi, Nadzimah Abdullah, Mukundan, and Tannacito (2012) state that current debate over the terms ‘linkers, DCs or discourse markers’ illustrates the ambiguity linguists face due to the lack of universal definitions and terms to label these linguistic units. A trend to use the term ‘discourse connector’ (henceforth DC) has emerged in the literature, being applied and fully justified by Prommas and Sinwongsuwat (2011), Cowan (2008), and Biber (2006). Cowan additionally features the ability of DCs to connect a sentence to a greater piece of discourse with less restriction in terms of where they may occur in a sentence. It is worthwhile to clarify that there are three major types of DCs, namely discourse markers, adverbial connectors or linking adverbials, and coordinating conjunctions. In fact, DCs is an umbrella term and in this study it entails the instances of all three types.

Generally, without considering the three aforementioned types DCs have been studied under different terms including, but not limited to connectives (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002), discourse markers (Fraser,1999), connectors (Biber et al., 1999), conjunctive adverbials (Celce-Murcia, Larsen-Freeman, & Williams, 1983), pragmatic particles (Östman, 1981), pragmatic operators (Ariel, 1994), cue phrases (Knott & Dale, 1994), pragmatic expressions (Erman, 1987), discourse operators
(Redeker, 1990 & 1991), phatic connectives (Bazanella, 1990), pragmatic markers (Fraser, 1988) and (Schiffrin, 1987), discourse marker (Schiffrin, 1987), pragmatic formatives (Fraser, 1987), discourse connectives (Blakemore, 1987; Blakemore, 1992), discourse particles (Schourup, 1985), semantic conjuncts (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985), discourse signaling devices (Polanyi & Scha, 1983), pragmatic connectives (Stubbs, 1983), and sentence connectives (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

This study chose to use the term ‘discourse connector’ and apply it to cover DCs of both spoken and written English according to the definition put forward by Rezvani Kalajahi and Neufeld (2014), that “[discourse connectors] are words and expressions that can be accommodated within the text [or speech] in order to join one sentence to another sentence or one paragraph to another paragraph.” Obviously, the appropriate use of DCs will help the reader to easily follow the direction of the text or the speech and understand his points of view, arguments, examples, etc., and yield cohesion both in spoken and written language.

As Biber (2006) puts forward:

DCs are devices used to bridge between turns and sentences, indicating the logical relations among the parts of a discourse, and providing an interpretive framework for the listener/reader. There are two major classes of DCs: discourse markers and linking adverbials. DMs — forms like ok, Well, and now — are restricted primarily to spoken discourse. These forms have distinct discourse functions, but it is difficult to identify the specific meaning of the word itself. In contrast, linking adverbials — forms like however, thus, therefore, for example (e.g.), and that is (i.e.) — are found in both spoken and written registers, and they have greater inherent meaning than discourse markers (p.133).

By using appropriate DCs, a reader is able to follow easily the direction of the text and understand a writer’s points of view, arguments, examples, etc. Cohesion is a text feature upon which good writing heavily relies, but it is not limited to DCs because they are one of the means of cohesive devises proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) that help the text or piece of writing to be coherent.

A number of taxonomies have been offered which take into account the various functions and meanings that these devices may assume (Fraser 1999; Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999; Biber et al., 1999; Quirk et al, (1985). As these accounts appeared to fail to provide a comprehensive description of these cohesive elements, Rezvani Kalajahi and Neufeld (2014) proposed a new taxonomy of DCs validated against the two corpora of British National Corpus (BNC) and Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA). The researcher has decided that this new taxonomy serves as the major tool in this study for the analysis of the treatment of the DCs as used in Malaysian ESL students’ writing. They have built on this pioneering effort with the intention that it is comprehensive enough for material
developers, teachers, learners and non-native writers and speakers of English to depend on. As a result, the taxonomy offered by Rezvani Kalajahi and Neufeld (2014) has been adopted and expanded to encompass eight broad classes, subdividing six of the broad classes into a total of seventeen categories.

It is worth mentioning here that there exist plenty of research studies carried out on DCs. For example, DCs have been investigated in classroom oral discourse (Hays, 1992), informal settings (Lee, 1999; Müller, 2004; Trillo, 2002), reading (Abdollah Zadeh, 2006; Jalilifar, 2009; Jalilifar & Alipour, 2007), lectures (Dailey-O'Cain, 2002; Pérez & Macià, 2002), academic genres (Abdi, 2002; Blagojevic, 2004; Bunton, 1999; Longo, 1994; Mauranen, 1993; Ventola & Mauranen, 1991), and student writings (Connor, 1984; Field & Oi, 1992; Intaraprawat & Steffensen, 1995; Johns, 1984; Johnson, 1992; Karasi, 1994; Norment, 1994; Steffensen & Cheng, 1996). These studies have targeted the frequency counts and patterns of use of these devices.

It is perhaps of pedagogical interest to point out that the great bulk of recent research on DCs have focused on the use of these linking devices in learner written discourse (Granger and Tyson, 1996; Altenberg and Tapper, 1998; Tankó, 2004; Narita, Sato, and Sugiuira; 2004; Tang and Ng, 1995; Yaochen, 2006; Milton, 2001; Yoon, 2006; Chen, 2006; Lenko-Szymańska, 2007; etc.). Findings of these studies are, nevertheless, inconsistent. While Chen (2006), Tankó (2004), Yoon (2006) and Milton (2001) reported on a general overuse of connectors by non-native speakers of English, Altenberg and Tapper (1998) found a general tendency for underuse of the connectors among the Swedish. Granger and Tyson (1996), on the other hand, noticed neither general overuse nor underuse of connectors in the essays composed by the French students. Despite the observed differences in the general use, over/underuse and misuse of individual connectors were observed by all the authors.

1.3 Corpus and its Connection to Language Teaching

Corpus or ‘corpora’ are large and principled collections of natural texts (Reppen, 2010). For most linguists, a corpus cannot only be equated with just a large collection of texts but needs to be justified in linguistic terms. Therefore, a corpus can be defined as a collection of texts assumed to be representative of a given language or subset of a language to be used for linguistic analysis (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001).

The aim of corpus linguistics is to analyze and describe the language use as realized in the selected texts (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001). Schmitt (2000) pointed out “insights from corpus research have revolutionized the way language is viewed, especially words and their relationship with each other in context”.
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Corpus linguistics does not begin by accepting certain rules as given; it rather defines its own sets of rules before being applied. It provides new rules and parameters for linguistic description (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001). Corpus research permits researchers and learners to gain insights into different aspects of the language. It, for example, enables the researchers to notice how DCs are used and to observe how ESL/EFL learner patterns as well as frequency of use of the DCs compare with the native writer norm. Through the use of powerful concordance software, corpus analysis has enabled the linguists to gain new insights into the language and its use (Ghadessy, Henry & Roseberry, 2001).

Corpus use has also contributed to language teaching, especially in the compilation of pedagogical grammars and dictionaries (Hunston & Francis, 2000; Kennedy, 1990; Gabrielatos, 2005). Flowerdew (2003) adds that corpus linguistics contributes to language teaching by selecting the features of language which seem worth teaching in a given pedagogical content. Research on corpus, particularly learner corpus, consists of almost all the instances of language that a learner has been exposed to in a classroom, from language in teacher instructions to language in textbooks (Hunston, 2002). Such enquiries have also contributed a lot to the understanding of language learning processes (Granger, Hung, & Petch-Tyson, 2002) and to the construction and evaluation of language tests (Alderson, 1996). Most importantly, research on corpus from language learners has enabled the comparison of the language to which learners are used with reference corpora or real-language corpora, resulting in the development of more effective pedagogical materials (Gabrielatos, 2005).

In fact, an instructional advantage of a corpus is that when an item is met in a text, examples of the item from similar text can be used as evidence for the learner to draw conclusions about the syntagmatic and paradigmatic use of that item in that particular genre. In other words, it helps learners to recognize patterns or phraseology particular to that discourse (Hunston, 2002; Sinclair, 1991). Other than benefiting learners and teachers, a learner corpus would be useful in re-designing teaching materials in the future. For instance, identification of the phraseological patterns used by the learners and their comparison with real world language use could aware material writers, teachers, and even language learners of how similar to or different from the native speakers the learners are using the language.

1.4 Nature of the Present Study

The present research focused primarily on the so far understudied DCs in written discourse of Malaysian ESL students through a corpus-based approach. To this end, it adopted both qualitative and quantitative methods. First and foremost, the main goal of this current research was building a written corpus of Malaysian ESL students. Next in importance for the study was to carry out a thorough corpus-based study of DCs use in the writing of Malaysian ESL students. The study sees it as its third objective to determine if employing an adequate number of DCs will result in
higher quality of the written text. It finally aimed to seek whether or not Malaysian students’ could appropriately utilize DCs in, syntactic, semantic and stylistic terms.

1.5 Rationale of the Present Study

Several reasons motivated the present study. First of all, as Granger (2004) states that research into the use of corpus for language teaching is almost entirely done by linguists; the contribution of SLA researchers to – and the participation of ESL teachers in – what happens in corpus linguistics is still relatively low. It is, however, crucial to involve SLA researchers and the ELT community, including teachers and learners, to a much larger extent in the actual work on corpus and in the systematic evaluation and improvement of corpus-based activities in the classroom.

When it comes to the Malaysian context, internet search revealed that there was no empirical research on DCs by using corpus-based approach. Besides corpus-based study of DCs, the researchers was interested to find out to what extent writing quality in the writing of Malaysian students depend on DCs use and to what extent students misuse DCs in their writing since there was no single research conducted in the context. Aforementioned shortcomings made the researcher think about modification of method and carrying out a comprehensive study that may make new contribution to the current context of English language teaching in Malaysia.

Previous researchers studying DCs attempted only to extract the frequency of DCs manually without comparing with any reference corpus, to explore errors of DCs use randomly without adopting or following a scientific framework, and also to correlate writing quality with the quantity of DCs in the texts by using Halliday and Hassan’s taxonomy (1976), Fraser’s classification (1999), Quirk et al’s (1985) framework, Biber et al. (1999) taxonomy, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999) framework. However, there are two major criticisms of these taxonomies. First, the classification and taxonomies are not thorough enough to take into account all the possible DCs in the real language use. For instance the above mentioned taxonomies failed to include comprehensive list of DCs and they were only introduced some instance that were mainly common among those taxonomies. The previous studies, therefore, managed to develop and use a list of DCs incorporating elements from different taxonomies. Second, learners’ erroneous use of DCs which deteriorated the quality of text were not taken into account. It is, however, often argued that it is not only the quantity of DCs but also the proper use of them that makes a text hang together or improves its readability. Despite this, review of the existing literature revealed that majority of the studies including ESL and EFL context (Johns 1984; Crewe, 1990; Field, 1994; Field & Yip, 1992; Tickoo, 1998; Green, Christopher, Lam, 2000; Lake, 2004) investigated DCs mainly quantitatively and failed to address exploration of the use of DCs qualitatively.
To date various methods have been developed and introduced to investigate DCs, but there were two major reasons why corpus–based approach was adopted in the current research to investigate DCs with a different list. First, computer text-processing capabilities have provided an opportunity to investigate large samples of learner writing through corpus-based research. Text processors have also enabled the researchers to compare learner-created texts with those written by native speakers in an attempt to corroborate their intuitions about different aspects of language use (Chen, 2006; Granger & Tyson, 1996). Moreover, the main strengths of using corpus in language research have been identified by researchers interested in corpus studies (Biber, Conrad & Reppen, 1996). They highlight that computerized corpora “provide large databases of naturally occurring discourse, enabling empirical analyses of the actual patterns of use in a language; and, when coupled with (semi-) automatic computational tools, the corpus-based approach enables analyses of a scope not otherwise feasible”.

1.6 Statement of the Problem

The English language had played a dominant role as a compulsory subject and medium of instruction in English medium schools which formed the backbone of the education system of pre-independence Malaysia (Pandian, 2006, cited in Voon Foo, 2007, p. 1). “Writing is such an important learning tool because it helps students to understand ideas and concepts better” (Voon Foo, 2007, p. 4).

From theoretical perspective, social constructivist theory and social cognitive theory provide deep insight into how writing is happening. It can be noticed that writing is not simply a cognitive activity but a social act as well. ESL/EFL writers have to take into account the social-cognitive aspects in composing, organizing and analyzing the written discourse. A challenge that has received relatively little attention in studies dealing with written discourse is that ESL/EFL students generally face difficulties in using higher cognitive skills which include the use of DCs in their writing (Tan, 2010).

As students manage to put their ideas into words, they are expected to make their message clear to the reader. The writer has to narrow the topic and explain it in as much detail as possible. Nothing should remain vague. In doing so, the ultimate goal is to form a well-organized, unified, and coherent composition in which DCs can play a pivotal role in yielding cohesion to the text (Demirci & Kleiner, 1997). Despite this, empirical studies have confirmed that Malaysian ESL students have major problems in building cohesion in their writings. There is, therefore, a considerable need for the future generations of Malaysian students to master in writing skill, knowing how to write coherently (Ghabool, Mariadass & Kashef, 2012).

The need for studying DCs was due to their importance in writing. ESL and EFL students need to use DCs appropriately. Proper use of DCs allows students to differentiate their multiple functions and various grammatical constructions. Failing
to utilize them appropriately, students will face problems composing a coherent text. If this issue is not addressed at the right time during school years, it may eventually affect learner writing at the tertiary level.

Wu (2006), in an empirical study, found a main problem with nonnative speakers' use of DCs in writing tasks. Asian students, in particular, tended to overuse or under use some types of DCs. It was also found that students placed DCs in sentence-initial position more often than native speakers do. Furthermore, the use of DCs has been reported to be problematic both for native and non-native speakers (Heino, 2010; Crew 1990, Altenberg & Tapper, 1998). Heino (2010) argues that DCs usage may cause difficulties for ESL/EFL students due to several reasons. First of all, appropriate use of DCs calls for right recognition of discourse type and register, which is, to a great extent, complicated for the EFL/ESL learner to gain. In order to know which DCs to use in a certain situation, the student writer needs to know about different registers and text types. For instance, certain connectors like therefore, thus, hence, etc. belong to the formal registers whereas the resultive connector so and the contrastive connector anyhow are generally used in informal registers (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998; Quirk et al., 1985). Another problem is that mere use of DCs does not contribute to the quality and richness of the text and languages differ from one another in their preference for the use of these devices. Yet there is no piece of evidence to show whether or not the quality of writing depends on the quantity of DCs in the context of Malaysia. Finally, correct use of DCs tends to be influenced by factors like the development of the learners’ communicative competence and how language is taught (Altenberg and Tapper, 1998).

In a cross-cultural study, Johnson (1992) examined cohesion in expository Malay and English essays composed by the native speakers. The research findings showed that "Good" Malay compositions had more intersentence semantic ties (e.g., reiteration and collocation) than "weak" compositions. On the other hand, "good" English compositions turned out to have more intersentence syntactic ties (e.g., reference and conjunction [connectors]) than "weak" compositions. In other words, languages seem to differ from one another in their use of techniques to create coherent texts. Implied here is that Malay learners’ use of DCs to create coherent texts in English might, under the influence of their cultural-linguistic background, be radically different that of the English native speakers.

Another issue of pedagogical concern in ESL/EFL use of DCs has to do with misuse of DCs. Errors in language learning have always been the center of research attention and dealing with errors have become one of the most actively discussed issues in language pedagogy (Stapa & Izahar, 2010). Johnson (1992) indicates that forming coherent texts presents a problem to Malaysian ESL learners. This is supported by Ahour and Mukundan (2012) when they found that majority of the students in Malaysia experienced problems with the appropriate use of DCs in their writing. Therefore, analyzing learners’ errors provides useful insights into the features of the language that Malaysian ESL students are using.
According to Leki (1992), ESL students are also disappointed with difficulties in understanding the implications and various meanings of DCs. It is obvious that there is a divergence between writing in the first and the second language. Musa, Lie, and Azman, (2012) believes that ESL students may encounter with a variety of complicated problems, which may be either culturally or linguistically motivate. These problems may create difficulty for both teachers and ESL student writers, therefore paying attention to different aspects of variation of use can aid ESL students adapt themselves to the writing standards.

As DCs make a text coherent, it is logical to suppose that the lack of use or inappropriate use DCs in an L2 could, to a certain degree, hinder understanding or even lead to misunderstanding (Lahuerta Martínez, 2004). Malaysian students often cannot construct an organized and coherent text in English. The researcher’s observations also confirmed that it is difficult for students to make use of various DCs in their writings. Certainly, the fault cannot be put on the shoulders of the students mainly because there are research evidence that developers of materials and dictionaries in particular as well as teachers are not fully aware of them. As a result, they are often introduced as a list requiring the learners to use them interchangeably (Bikelienė, 2008; Rezvani Kalajahi, Abdullah, Baki, 2012).

An important observation that inspired the present study is the lack of literature on how Malaysian ESL students use DCs. Despite some studies in written discourse by L2 learners with different L1 backgrounds in other contexts, the DCs use by Malaysian ESL students of English has not been the focus of research. Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive study and no single published evidence of corpus-based study of DCs by Malaysian students, although a bulk of studies have discussed the roles and importance of DCs in relation to the comprehension of a text or written discourse or listening comprehension around the world. Romero Trillo (2002) and Muller (2005) opined that in spite of the highly important role of DCs in achieving coherence, it is vitally important to note that they have been rather neglected in the ESL curriculum.

More importantly, the current blueprint and English language curriculum of Malaysia under language content category clearly state that DCs have to be taught and assessed systematically as they bring cohesion to a piece of writing. However, school English textbooks, which are main source of teaching and learning in the context of Malaysia, offer only a limited number of DCs. Word processing enquiries revealed that less than 90 DCs have been introduced to the Malaysian pupils in both Primary and Secondary levels (Rezvani Kalajahi & Abdullah, 2012). Enquiries also showed that they are not systematically distributed across different stages even though their role is emphasized in both levels in the Curriculum Specification of each respective level. The textbooks also seem not to have stressed on the pedagogical aspects of DCs either explicitly or implicitly. As a result, the learners may not realize at what level of education they should learn and use them efficiently and appropriately.
In order to cultivate this unstudied field, this is perhaps the first study to use a corpus-based approach to investigate the use of DCs by Malaysian ESL students. This study contributes to practical implications of raising students underrating of what DCs are, teachers’ understanding of how they can be taught in classroom and material developers’ understanding of how suitable and appropriate teaching material should be developed in order to help students to learn and use DCs effectively.

1.7 Objectives

Generally, writing sentence, paragraphs or larger units of discourse and connecting them together requires aspects more than the patterns within the sentence level (Dülger, 2007). Therefore, this study mainly concerns writing beyond the sentence level, because efficient use of the DCs proves to have a great contribution to stick the sentences together, creating a cohesive, coherent and unified text. Appropriate use of DCs enables the writer to make strong connections among ideas and deliver them clearly to the readers (Cavender & Weiss, 1987). That being said, the current study seeks:

1. To build Malaysian students’ written English corpus
2. To investigate the frequency of the use of DCs in the students’ writing and to compare it with that in the Native students corpora (Louvain; the Louvain Corpus of Native Essay Writing [LOCNESS]).
3. To find out sematic distribution of DCs in Malaysian school students’ writing and native students
4. To examine the relationship between the use of DCs frequency and the quality of writing
5. To explore the erroneous use of DCs in the writing of Malaysian ESL students

1.8 Research Questions

The ultimate goal of this study is to explore this unknown area and attempts to provide a continuum of the importance of a corpus-based analysis to make a principled decision on using DCs by students or input for instructional purposes that have not been previously studied. To achieve the purpose of this study, the following research questions are addressed.

1. What is the overall frequency of DCs use in argumentative essays of Malaysian school students’ writer and native students’ writer?
   1.1 What is the frequency of DCs use in three different educational levels, namely Form 4, Form 5, and College?
   1.2 Is there any significant difference in the frequency of use of DCs between Malaysian school students and the native speakers of English?
   1.3 What are the most frequent DCs used in Malaysian ESL students’ writing and native writing?
2. What is the semantic distribution of DCs in Malaysian school students’ writing and native students?
3. Is there any relationship between the use of DCs frequency and the quality of the essays in different educational levels?
4. What kind of errors do Malaysian ESL student commit in using DCs?

1.9 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study can be viewed in a number of ways. This study would provide insightful evidence on the knowledge base of DCs among Malaysian ESL students in their writing, particularly in argumentative compositions. Writing instructors may gain insights from the results and get to know how to help the students to improve their writing skills in different ways in terms of DCs use. Studying learner use of DCs is useful for writing instructors mainly because it empowers them to assist students to enhance their knowledge on how to “engage with their topic and their readers” and the proper means of conveying their “attitude, marking structures and engaging with their readers” in their writing (Hyland, 2004; p.146). In addition, comparison between native speakers and ESL learner would provide helpful insight into the extent to which L2 learner use of DCs is similar to or different from that of the native speaker. Recognition of the use of DCs displayed in the concordance lines would make such comparison plausible.

It is hoped that through the assistance of informative insights provided by the results of the present study, the problems encountered by Malaysian students of different levels of education in the use of DCs could be effectively addressed. Being aware of the different problems with the learner use of DCs, writing instructors both at school and tertiary level may find it useful to design specific writing materials which would satisfy learners’ individual needs as to the acquisition of DCs in order to improve their writing proficiency remarkably. The correct use of DCs in writing is vitally important as they act as a signpost in writing that help readers to the intended message of the writer. A failure in the appropriate use of DCs will definitely cause confusion and the text might appear incomprehensible to the readers.

Finally, it is anticipated that assigning a right DC to a right educational level would help both English teachers and leaners to realize the appropriate time for learning a certain number of DCs. Furthermore, material developers may take the list even more serious to be able to incorporate them efficiently into the right level so that both teachers and learners may know which DCs are required to be taught and learnt by the end of the course.

1.10 Limitations

In spite of the research and pedagogical significance of the current study, it is threatened by several limitations. First, the findings would be more reliable if there
were a possibility of creating a writing corpus of native students with the same age, education level, in the same genre type with the same task setting, etc.

Second, This research could not use BNC, COCA or Brown corpus as a reference corpus since the coverage of the topics in these general corpora are totally different and they cover broad themes and topics from newspapers, plays, TV shows and so forth. Hence, they could not be assumed as suitable reference corpora against which the results of Malaysian school students’ findings might be compared.

Third, the researcher was unable to develop a spoken corpus of Malaysian students mainly because it turned out to be costly, time consuming and labour intensive. The fourth limitation was the issue of sampling in building the corpus. Just because the researcher could not access all the Malaysian school students with the same equal number from three ethnic groups (Malay, Chinese, and Indian) and request them to write about a topic for the corpus purposes, opportunistic sampling was used to build the learner corpus and the level of proficiency was confined to Form 4, Form 5, and College students who are known as Upper Secondary level.

Fourth, the data were collected only from the students attending the schools in Selangor, Sembilan and Malacca. Unfortunately, other states could not be included in the corpus compilation because creating a larger corpus required a team with certain amount of budget to be allocated by pertinent organizations, a great deal of time and energy.

Fifth, as is the case for all research methods, there are potential limitations of this corpus-based approach. One of the main disadvantages of such approach lies in the ways in which linguistic information can be retrieved (Leech, 1998). When investigating large corpora, the researcher is for all practical purposes confined to investigating linguistic features which are feasible to search for by computer software. There are in principle two factors that control the searchability of a corpus. The first deals with the restrictions set by the available search and retrieving software. The second has to do with the corpora that have not been annotated in some way, e.g. tagged or parsed. Such corpora primarily leave the researcher to search for those linguistic features that are visible in the electronic record of the text.

Furthermore, the entire instances of discourse markers, adverbial connectors and coordinating conjunctions which are three major types of DCs were not considered in detail and all instances were studied under the term of DCs.
Finally, the qualitative analysis of this research was primarily carried out by the researcher and one non-native instructor. The researcher, though with the help of various reliable references such as grammar reference books and authentic language corpus, is not an English native speaker and may not be able to identify every problem learners encounter. The learners’ problems are re-confirmed by the instructors who is already an experienced instructor in ELT, but this may reflect one-sided opinions.

1.11 Definition of Terms

Prior to reviewing the related literature in the next chapter, the key words related to the study are defined both conceptually and operationally.

1. Discourse connectors

Discourse markers, adverbial connectors, and coordinating conjunctions form DCs. They are words and expressions that can be accommodated within the text in order to join one sentence to another sentence or one paragraph to another paragraph. By using appropriate DCs, a reader/listener is able to follow easily the direction of the text/speech and understand a writer’s/speaker’s points of view, arguments, examples. Cohesion is a text/speech feature upon which a good writing heavily relies on, but it is not limited to DCs because they are only one of the cohesive devices proposed by Halliday and Hasan (1976) that help the text or writing to be coherent. In this study, DCs includes all instances of ‘discourse markers, adverbial connectors, and coordinating conjunction’ and it is referred to words and expression such as “but, yet, moreover, also, nevertheless, in addition to, and for example” that Malaysian ESL students used in their writing to connect one sentence to another through giving examples, refuting an earlier idea or adding some more information.

2. Corpus

Corpus is “a large, principled collection of naturally occurring texts (written or spoken) stored electronically” (Reppen, 2010). Corpus is perhaps best described in simple terms as “the study of language based on examples of real-life language use” (McEnery & Wilson, 2001: 1). Linguists have always utilized the word corpus to elucidate and describe a collection of naturally occurring examples of language, containing of anything from a few sentences to a set of written texts or recordings which have been composed for linguistic study. Corpus in this study involves written composition of Malaysian ESL students who were in Form 4, Form 5, and College level.

3. Corpus-based approach

Corpus-based studies use a corpus as a source of examples to check researcher intuition or to examine the frequency and/or plausibility of the language contained within a smaller data set. The researcher following a corpus-based approach does not question pre-existing traditional descriptive units and categories (Tognini-Bonelli, 2001).
4. Learner corpus

The really authentic texts for foreign language learning are not those produced by native speakers for native speakers, but those produced by learners learning the target language. James (1998) holds that a learner corpus consists of language output produced by learners of a language. Most learner corpora consist of written essays using pre-set topics produced in language-teaching classrooms. Learner corpus, in this study, refers to the words, phrases and language that Malaysian ESL students produced from three educational levels (Form 4, Form 5, and the first year students in College) via asking them to write about an argumentative during a class time.

5. Reference Corpus

A reference corpus is one that is designed to provide comprehensive information about a language (Leech, 2002; Sinclair, 1996). It aims to be large enough to represent all the relevant varieties of the language, and the characteristic vocabulary, so that it can be used as a basis for reliable grammars, dictionaries, thesauri and other language reference materials. In this study, reference corpus refers to the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS), composed of samples of argumentative written English texts by British and American student writers consisting of a total of 325,000 tokens.

6. Persuasive Versus Argumentative writing

Persuasion and argument are often used interchangeably. The former one is a broad term, which embraces many tactics designed to move people to a position, a belief, or a course of action, whereas the latter one is a specific kind of persuasion based on the principles of logic and reasoning and present an argument with the PROS (supporting ideas) and CONS (opposing ideas) or comparison and contrast of an argumentative issue (Lai, 2008). For the corpus collection in this study, the Malaysian students were asked to write about an argumentative topic in which they were assigned by the researcher.

7. ESL writing

English as a second language (ESL) is the use or study of English by speakers with different native languages. A piece of writing can be considered as ESL writing when a text is written by ESL writers. English in Malaysia is considered as a second language and therefore, in this study, ESL students are refereed Malaysian students who contributed to this study.

8. Concordance

Concordance or Key Word in Context (KWIC) is a list of all of the occurrences of a particular search term in a corpus with a few words to either side (Baker, Hardie, & McEnery, 2006). In this study, it includes an electronic list of entries from the corpus containing the DCs along with their context. This study used concordance function in the WordSmith version 5.0.

9. Type and token

The number of tokens in a corpus refers to the total number of words while the number of types refers to the total number of unique words. For example, the word ‘however’ may occur 177 times in a corpus, but it only counts as one type of word.
10. Normalized or Standardized Frequency

A frequency expressed relative to some other value as a proportion of the whole -- for example, a frequency of a word relative to the total number of words in the corpus. As there were two corpora in this study with different size, normalized frequency was set to per 1,000,000 tokens.

11. Correlational Analysis

Samah (2013) states that correlation analysis is to examine, evaluate and assess strength or the weakness of the relations between variables. A positive correlation can be found where the high values of one variable are linked with the high values of the other variable(s). In contrast, a negative correlation implies association of high values of one with the low values of the other(s). Correlation can vary from +1 to -1. Values which are close to +1 represent a high-degree of positive correlation, and values close to -1 show a high degree of negative correlation. Values close to zero indicate poor correlation of either kind, and 0 indicates no correlation at all. While correlation is useful in discovering possible connections between variables, it does not prove or disprove any cause-and-effect (causal) relationships between them. In this study correlational analysis is performed to determine if there is any relationship between quality of writing and the frequency of DCs use.

12. Error Analyses

Making errors for the second and foreign language learners could be unavoidable part of their language production. From the perspective of norm or well-formedness of a sentence, error is observed as “an infringement or deviation of the code of the formal system of communication through which the message is conveyed” (Catalan, p. 66). Errors are alterations of the rules of the accepted norm and are termed as surface errors which may be further classified as semantically, syntactically, positionally, etc. In this study, error refers to the unintentional misuse of the DCs that are observable and clearly identifiable in the Malaysian ESL students’ writing.
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