Metadiscoursal connectors in linguistics MA theses in English L1 & L2

Nida Burneikaitė
Department of English Philology
Vilnius University
Universiteto 5, LT–01513
Vilnius, Lithuania
Tel.: +370 616 17334
E-mail: nida.burneikaite@flf.vu.lt

Abstract

It is now commonly agreed that written academic texts are dialogic and interactive. How do academic writers increase interactivity of discourse? How do they organise texts and communicate with readers? Text-connectors is one of the many metadiscoursal categories used by writers to arrange their arguments and involve their readers. This paper considers the use of text-connectors in the Master's thesis genre in Linguistics and analyses 70 theses by native and non-native (Lithuanian) students of English. The aim of the study is to work out a methodological framework for the analysis of text-connectors in the MA thesis genre and to compare the frequencies of text-connectors in native speaker (L1) and non-native speaker (L2) English theses as well as with frequencies in other genres. The classification of text-connectors developed in the study includes nine functional categories: addition, attitude, concession, contrast/comparison, illustration, restatement, result, sequence and summary; the procedural considerations cover the problems of reflexivity, multifunctionality, clustering and double use of text-connectors; the comparison of L1 and L2 theses shows an enormous overuse of text-connectors in L2 texts.

Keywords: text-connectors, metadiscourse, reflexivity, MA thesis genre, L1 and L2

1 Terminology and related research

Connectors seem to be one of the most-widely researched categories in contemporary text linguistics and discourse analysis. They have been referred to, however, by different names in different research, for example, conjunctions (Halliday and Hasan 1976),

conjuncts (Quirk *et al* 1985/91), linking adverbials (Biber *et al* 1999), transitions (Hyland 2005), linking adjuncts (Carter and McCarthy 2006), discourse markers (Swan 2005, Cowan 2008) etc. The term 'connectors' has been used extensively in studies of learner language (Granger 1998) and the term 'internal connectors' has been adopted in metatext research (Mauranen 1993, Bäcklund 1998). The terms 'linking words' and 'sentence connectors' have been common in EFL literature. In this study the term 'text-connectors' is used to refer to those connectors which perform metadiscoursal function only[1]. We should first clarify the difference between the metadiscoursal and non-metadiscoursal uses of connectors. Let us consider a couple of examples.

(1) *The final chapter of the thesis highlights several points. **First**, it aims to summarise the results of the study and ...* (L2)
(2) ***On the whole**, there is little evidence of systematic grading seen in the inclusion and treatment of irregular verb forms...* (L1)

The underlined connectors in (1) and (2) have a metadiscoursal function: they show the writer's explicit awareness and management of the ongoing discourse; they signpost the structure of the unfolding text and signal the structural links between the various parts of the developing argument. The distinction between metadiscoursal and non-metadiscoursal connectors draws upon Mauranen's (1993) distinction between internal and external connectors which follows Halliday and Hasan's (1976, 239-241) dichotomy of conjunctive relations. Within this framework, internal connectors express relations between entities of text, they refer to the linguistic world inside the text ("linguistic events") and are therefore self-reflexive (or metadiscoursal) uses of language, whereas external connectors express relations between entities of the real world which is outside the text ("experiential reality") and are therefore non-reflexive (or non-metadiscoursal) uses of language. The following examples illustrate non-metadiscoursal uses of connectors.

(3) *... students are encouraged to follow a set routine when they encounter an unknown word which is preventing comprehension. **First,** they are to attempt to guess the meaning by themselves. If this is impossible, they should ask a classmate or...* (L1)
(4) *... it was widely thought among the teaching staff that MG9 were on the whole, a more outgoing and talkative class.* (L1)

---

[1] Metadiscourse is self-reflexive language showing the author's explicit awareness and management of the discourse-as-process, which includes text organization (text-oriented markers), participants of the discourse process (participant-oriented markers), and author's attitude towards the discourse process (attitudinal markers). Connectors is one category of text-oriented metadiscourse (Burneikaitė 2007a,b, 2008, 2009a,b).

Both connectors refer to the world of education: *first* in (3) expresses temporal sequence of actions that learners make and *on the whole* in (4) expresses generalization made by teachers with respect to their students. Here, these connectors do not express either sequence of arguments within the text or generalization as a way of rounding up argumentation in text, which is the case in (1) and (2).

Another important distinction that should be drawn is between text-internal and sentence-internal connectors. Text-internal connectors are rhetorical choices made by the writer, showing his/her awareness of the discourse process and preferred ways of constructing an argument; whereas sentence-internal connectors are obligatory, they are not rhetorical choices made by the writer, but an integral part of the semantic-syntactic structure of the sentence without which a sentence would not exist. The two examples below illustrate this difference. In (5) *then* is structurally optional, it is used as a rhetorical strategy for emphatic purposes, alongside with the resultive marker *It follows*; in (6) *then* is structurally obligatory, it is used to signal sentence-internal structural relations of causality. Sentence-internal connectors are excluded from this study; our aim here is to analyse the rhetorical choices made by writers in developing persuasive discourse.

(5) *The category of gender in Modern English is inherently semantic, therefore, English nouns are not regularly inflected to distinguish between feminine and masculine. It follows, **then**, that many nouns in English are not marked and can be used as…* (L2)

(6) *When changes at the level of macrostylistics cause the translation to fit a literary genre different from that of the original, **then** the famous linguist speaks of a generic shift.* (L2)

The recent interest in the use of connectors has been vast, covering different communication modes, genres and languages (see Lattice Conference Book of Abstracts 2009). Metadiscoursal uses of text-connectors in academic settings have also been widely explored (see InterLAE Conference Abstracts 2008). It should be pointed out, however, that in Lithuanian linguistic scholarship text-connectors in academic discourse have been hardly researched. Whatever little research there exists, it has mainly been undertaken by specialists of the English language and has focused on either professional English academic discourse, e.g., textbooks, research articles (Verikaitė 2005), academic debates (Stungienė 2009), or learner writing: native-and non-native English learner essays (Bikelienė 2008). Lithuanian language scholars, to my knowledge, have investigated cohesion in scientific texts (Bitinienė 2009) and metalanguage in students' academic texts (Alaunienė and Valskys 2009); however, and unfortunately, it is not reported what particular academic genres have been looked at.

2 Aims, materials and procedure

The aim of this study is, first and foremost, to work out a methodological framework (classification of categories and procedure) for the analysis of metadiscoursal connectors in the Master's thesis genre, which could be used in further studies on a larger scale. A second aim is to describe the use of text-connectors in the MA thesis genre in Linguistics and to compare L1 and L2 texts in this respect. A valid description of text-connector patterns in English MA theses should allow us to make comparisons across languages, disciplines or genres. Although this particular paper focuses on text-connectors, it is part of a larger study which aims to answer broader questions: What metadiscoursal strategies are used by MA thesis writers to show their awareness and management of the ongoing discourse process? How do MA students organize their texts and interact with their readers?

The material used for the study consists of 70 Master's theses (958 629 words) in the discipline of Linguistics written in English L1 and L2 by students at 3 British universities (30 theses, 365 259 words) and 4 Lithuanian universities (40 theses, 593 370 words).

The first step in the analysis involved identifying text-connectors in the theses and determining their function. The second step was establishing relative frequencies of text-connectors in the L1 and L2 corpora and comparing them with the help of the Log-likelihood Calculator (Rayson 2004). Individual connectors were analysed with AntConc 3.2.0 software (Lawrence 2006).

3 Results

This paper reports the results of the first part of the study of text-connectors in the MA thesis genre in Linguistics in English L1 and L2. It proposes a methodological framework for the analysis of text-connectors, including categories of text connectors, their linguistic realisations as well as procedural considerations that should be made by the analyst. It then presents the frequency of text-connectors in the MA thesis genre and a comparison of frequencies between L2 and L1 theses. It also takes a contrastive look at the frequency of text-connectors in L2 theses from different cultural-educational backgrounds. In our case it's theses from Lithuania (our research) and theses from Hong Kong (Hyland's (2005) research which seems to be most suitable for comparison in terms of genre and scope).

3.1 Methodological framework: categories of text-connectors

The methodological framework for the analysis of text-connectors offered here has been arrived at after a careful study of existing taxonomies and after applying them in the analysis of MA theses. The taxonomy proposed in this study draws upon well-established classifications of connective categories such as Halliday and Hasan's (1976) additive, adversative, causal and temporal conjunctions; Quirk *et al*'s (1991) listing, summative, appositional, resultive, inferential, contrastive and transitional adverbial connectors; Biber *et al*'s (1999) linking adverbials to denote enumeration, summation, apposition, result, contrast and transition; Martin and Rose's (2003) transitions to express addition, comparison and consequence; Swan's (2005) twenty one categories of discourse markers; Carter and McCarthy's (2006) additive, resultative, contrastive, time, concessive, inference, summative, listing and meta-textual linking adjuncts and a few others. A detailed comparison of these classifications would be too lengthy and hardly necessary. What one can easily notice, though, is a clearly different approach taken by different scholars to the issue of connectivity in discourse and a certain inconsistency in the use of terminology, e.g., the term 'transitions' is used to refer to both a higher-level category of connectors and a lower-level category of a specific type of connectors.

Most of these classifications have been developed on the basis of both the spoken mode and the written mode of communication, which means that they cannot be applied without modification to the analysis of written academic texts. Also, some of the categories seem to reflect different criteria used as a basis for categorisation, such as functional / semantic (e.g., additive), formal (e.g., appositional) and pragmatic (e.g., meta-textual). In my taxonomy I have tried to use the functional basis for classification and to limit the list of categories to those applicable to written academic texts.

In metadiscourse research, scholars seem to take a rather broad approach to classifying text-connectors. For example, Mauranen (1993) uses one umbrella term 'internal connectors' without listing any subcategories; Hyland (2005), following Martin and Rose (2003), divides transitions into those expressing addition, comparison and sequence and for some reason leaves sequencers (such as *first, next)* under the category of frame markers. To analyse rhetorical choices made by MA thesis writers and compare them across disciplines or languages, we need a more focused classification of text-connectors applicable to the analysis of the Master's thesis genre which would help us establish which categories are preferred in certain disciplines and which linguistic realisations are favoured by various language users, whether L1 or L2.

Table 1 lists nine categories of text-connectors developed on the basis of the analysis of Linguistics Master's theses. The list is alphabetical and suggests no particular order of priority.

Category	Linguistic realisations in MA theses
addition	*Also, Moreover, What is more, Further (on), Besides, In addition (to this), To go further, Apart from that, Furthermore, Even more, Additionally, Complementarily, In turn, Too, And, In other words*
attitude	*In fact, Evidently, (Once) Again, Naturally, Actually, It goes without saying, In the same token, Admittedly, Indeed, Specifically, Possibly, Apparently, Truly, Clearly, In essence, Basically, Interestingly, Obviously, Certainly, (Un)fortunately, Briefly, Normally, Of course, In particular, Unexpectedly, More specifically / accurately, As a matter of fact, Undoubtedly, Primarily, Effectively, Notably, Oddly, Significantly, Importantly, (Not) surprisingly, Arguably, Incidentally, Ironically, In the first place, Similarly, Equally, Put simply, Broadly (speaking), Likewise, And, Now,* **Then**
concession	*However, Nevertheless, Still, Yet, In one way or another, Rather, These issues aside, Even so, In any case, Though, As a matter of fact*
contrast / comparison	*On the one / other hand, Whereas, Instead, Conversely, Contrarily, Alternatively, Meanwhile, By / In contrast / comparison, For one thing, But, And, Similarly, Likewise, Equally*
illustration	*For example / instance, e.g., To illustrate (this), such as, Namely, As / To take an example*
restatement	*That is, i.e., Or, To put it differently, In this sense, Put simply, In other words*
result	*Consequently, Therefore, As a result, Hence, Accordingly, It follows that, For this reason, Thus, So*
sequence	*First of all, First(ly), Second(ly), Third(ly), Finally, Next, Later, First and foremost, As a fifth point, To begin with, Last but not least, In the first place, Now,* **Then**
summary	*In conclusion / short / (total) sum / summary / general (terms), Broadly / Generally (speaking), On the / As a whole, (As a way of) Summing up, Overall, All in all, To sum up / generalise / cap it all / summarise (thus far), So, Thus,* **Then**

Table 1. A taxonomy of text-connectors in MA theses: categories and examples

3.2 Methodological framework: procedural considerations

A few points should be discussed with regard to the categories of text-connectors and their linguistic realisations given in Table 1 above as well as procedural decisions that have to be made by metadiscourse researchers. The methodological issues to be considered in the process of analysis include reflexivity, multifunctionality, clustering and double use of text-connectors.

3.2.1 Reflexivity

Although Mauranen (1993) suggests that all text-connectors show low explicitness of reflexivity, I would like to propose that some text-connectors can indeed show low explicitness, whereas some others show high explicitness of reflexivity. In simpler terms, some text-connectors have low reflexivity and some others have high reflexivity. To further develop this concept, we should consider the degree of reflexivity in relation to internal (metadiscoursal) and external (non-metadiscoursal) use of connectors and we shall notice that some connectors (e.g., *first, on the whole*) can function both internally and externally as in (1) – (4) above. We shall also notice that some other connectors (e.g., *in other words*) can function only internally as in (7) below.

(7) *A major way in which conceptual metaphors can be classified is their degree of conventionality. **In other words,** some metaphors are more deeply entrenched in every day use by ordinary people for everyday purpose than others.* (L2)

For a researcher, the connectors which can function both internally and externally often create a problem as they are rather ambiguous and it is not always easy to establish their function. Consider examples (8) and (9). The internal connector *in fact* in (8) refers to the world inside the text and is used as a rhetorical strategy for emphatic purposes, whereas *in fact* in (9) is quite ambiguous: Does it refer to the world of chemistry which is outside the current text and express actuality? Or does it refer to the writer's arguments which are inside the current text and express emphasis? I have opted for the second alternative.

(8) *… evidence for the practice of English-only is neither conclusive, nor pedagogically sound (Auerbach, 1993, pI5). **In fact** it is often detrimental to the students and the learning process (Chaudron, in Polio, 1994, pI59).* (L1)

(9) *Whorf uses the example of the words "empty drums" written on gasoline drums, which implies safety, **when in fact** they are likely to be more dangerous as they are filled with explosive fumes.* (L1)

3.2.2 Multifunctionality

We can see in Table 1 that there is no one-to-one correspondence between the categories and their linguistic realisations, in other words, the same linguistic expression can perform more than one metadiscoursal function. As shown in the examples below, the connector *then* can be used to express sequence as in (10), summary as in (11) or attitude (emphasis) alongside with restatement as in (12). Multifunctionality implies that manual analysis of each individual occurrence is essential in describing the functional use of text connectors, as no computerised count would be accurate in this respect.

(10) *In the following chapter (Chapter 2), the literature on the subjacency principle in UG ... is reviewed. This is **then** followed by Chapter 3 which outlines...* (L1)

(11) *The term Noirisme also came into use; very similar to Negritude, it focussed on Africa and was a name given to black nationalism. Both of these names, **then**, give positive meanings to the terms black and Negro.* (L1)

(12) *... topics may be subjective. This means that it is not simply that a text 'has' a macrostructure, but that such a structure is assigned to the text by a writer or reader. **In this sense, then**, like meanings in general, themes or topics are cognitive units.* (L2)

3.2.3 Clustering

Functional analysis of text-connectors has revealed that MA thesis writers often use text-connectors in clusters, i.e., more than one connectors are used to express more than one metadiscoursal functions, for example, sequence and concession as in (13), attitude and concession as in (14). This functional overlap creates a problem for an analyst – how is one supposed to categorise the cluster? I have resolved this problem by counting both functional elements in the cluster and ascribing them to their respective categories.

(13) *Important findings and arguments from opponents and proponents of an English-only policy will be looked at, followed by a specific look at the Japanese learner. **Firstly though,** a brief look at the issue from a historical viewpoint.* (L1)

(14) *... these figures are surprisingly low. **Interestingly however,** this result provides some experimental justification for the use of ...* (L1)

3.2.4 Double use

A similar problem is created by the double use of a particular functional category, for example, markers of contrast as in (15) or restatement as in (16). I have counted such double-markers as two markers as I believe that the writer has deliberately (whether consciously or unconsciously – is another issue) used two metadiscoursal markers to emphatically express the intended rhetorical function.

(15) *Synonymy is the phenomenon, which enables the speaker to express their ideas more precisely, **but, on the other hand,** it might cause misunderstanding.* (L2)

(16) *However, in some contexts to say that something is possible is to imply that the speaker will not object, **or, in other words,** that he/she gives permission.* (L2)

To finish off this section it should be stressed that this particular taxonomy has been developed for Master of Arts in Linguistics theses and could be applied in the analysis of

Master's theses in other disciplines as well as Doctoral theses / dissertations[2]. It may not, however, be applicable in the analysis of other academic genres such as essays, research articles, textbooks, science popularisations etc. Research evidence suggests that a certain academic genre presupposes a certain repertoire of metadiscoursal categories. For more on the genre factor see Section 3.3.2.

3.3 Text-connectors in Linguistics MA theses

The study has found that the relative frequency of text-conncetors in the MA thesis genre in Linguistics is 0.77. This figure presented on its own can hardly lend itself to any comment or interpretation. It may be interesting to note, however, that the relative frequency of all types of metadiscourse markers in MA theses is 2.45 (for a list of metadicourse markers see Footnote 1). This means that text-connectors make up about 31 per cent of the total use of metadiscourse markers in MA theses, which looks like a rather high count.

3.3.1 The interlanguage factor

Table 2 shows the frequency of text-connectors in English L2 (Lithuanian) theses in relation to English L1 theses and the ratio of text-connectors in the overall use of metadiscourse in the two corpora as calculated by Log-likelihood Calculator (Rayson 2004). The frequency of text-connectors in L2 texts is 0.90 and in L1 texts – 0.56, which indicates an enormously significant overuse (+ 355.06) by L2 writers. The oversue of all metadiscoure markers by L2 students, however, does not seem that huge (+ 155.50), but when we consider the ratio of text-connectors in the overall use of metadiscourse markers, we see that in the L2/Lithuanian-English theses text-connectors make up 35% of all metadiscourse markers, whereas in L1 English theses, text-connectors make up only 25 % of all metadiscourse markers. This clearly implies that L2/Lithuanian-English MA student writers rely quite heavily on text-connectors in their theses. This pattern has also been noticed in other interlanguage theses.

	L2	L1	Over-/Under-Use
Text-connectors	0.90	0.56	+ 355.06
All metadiscourse markers	2.60	2.20	+ 155.50

Table 2. Relative frequencies of text-connectors in English L1 and L2 MA theses

---

[2] In Master and Doctoral degree programmes the terms 'thesis' and 'dissertation' are used with little consistency. I use 'thesis' to refer to a work at the Master level and 'dissertation' to refer to a work at the Doctoral level.

Table 3 shows a comparison of the frequencies of text-connectors in Linguistics MA theses from Lithuania and transitions (as they are referred to by Hyland 2005) in theses from Hong Kong. Although this comparison is rather crude[3], we can see that Lithuanian students use fewer text-connectors than Hong Kong students, but the underuse (– 0.14) is statistically insignificant. This may imply that L2 students, regardless of their mother-tongue background, tend to overuse text-connectors in their MA theses. How can one account for the over-use of text-connectors in the two interlanguages? Why do Lithuanian (and possibly Hong Kong) MA students overuse text-connectors?

L2 Lithuanian English	L2 Hong Kong English	Over-/Under-Use
0.90	0.95	– 0.14

Table 3. Relative frequencies of text-connectors English L2/Lithuanian and L2/Hong Kong theses

A first possible reason could be instruction induced factors also known as the transfer of training: my general impression and experience of writing instruction at secondary and tertiary (BA) level in Lithuania suggests that the focus on text-connectors (commonly referred to as linking words or transition signals), particularly in essay-writing classes, is quite strong. The teacher and learner belief that the use of connectors improves the cohesion and the overall quality of writing (which is certainly the case as long as it is not exaggerated) leads to an over-reliance on connectors in written texts, often at the expense of other metadiscourse markers (as reported in Burneikaitė 2008). This problem is characteristic not only of Lithuanian English learner texts, but also of the wider EFL world: research suggests that EFL coursebooks over-emphasise discourse connectors and this may be a major cause of the overuse of discourse connectors in English learner texts (Meunier 2008).

A second possible reason for the overuse of text-connectors might be native language / culture induced factors also known as the transfer of the mother-tongue: Lithuanian users of English might be transferring their practices of writing in Lithuanian L1 to their English L2 texts. This, however, is highly unlikely in our case: research of Lithuanian academic writing at university level (Alaunienė and Valskys 2009) has found that metatextual markers are hardly used by Lithuanian L1 students in their academic texts, which implies that the transfer of the Lithuanian L1 tradition of academic writing is hardly a cause of the over-use of text-connectors in English L2 texts by Lithuanian students. In this context it may also be relevant to note that at secondary level writing courses in Lithuanian L1, cohesive markers are not given due attention: in a popular secondary school manual on

---

[3] Hyland's (2005) model, in general, takes a broader approach to metadiscourse than the model used in this study. As regards connectors, as noted in 3.1, it does not include sequencers into the category of transitions, and my model does.

teaching writing (Nauckūnaitė 2002), no reference to connectors is made, although in a similar manual for teaching public speaking (Nauckūnaitė 1998), reference is made to chronological and causal connectors (Lith.: 'chronologinės jungtys', 'priežasties jungtys'). This again implies that text-connectors have been neglected in Lithuanian text linguistics and writing pedagogy.

3.3.2 The genre factor

Comparative studies have been carried out in the use of metadiscourse across disciplines and genres. Hyland (2005) has found that in the discipline of Applied Lingistics the frequency of transitions in MA and PhD theses is 0.95, whereas in introductory coursebooks – 2.81 and in research papers – 1.28. Verikaitė (2005) has also reported generic differences in the use of conjunctions in textbooks and research articles. These findings strongly suggest that genre plays a key role in determining the use of rhetorical strategies in academic texts. Bäcklund (1998, 40) has maintained that "genre is a stronger influencing factor than national or professional culture when it comes to scientific articles and letters"; and Ädel (2003, 217) has stated that "genre exerts an influence on both the amount and the types of metadiscourse found in a text". The importance of genre in the use of metadiscourse strategies implies that writers – whether student or professional – should be aware of the patterns of language use characteristic of specific genres. Descriptive analysis should identify the various patterns on the basis of large scale genre research. This study is an attempt to contribute to such research.

4 Conclusions and implications

This study has aimed at developing a methodological framework for the analysis of metadiscoursal text-connectors in the MA thesis genre in Linguistics and establishing the overall frequencies of text-connectors in theses in English L1 and L2 as well as comparing them to frequencies in other genres. The conclusions of the study can be briefly presented as follows.

1. The methodological framework for the analysis of text-connectors in the Master's thesis genre consists of nine functional categories and their linguistic realizations whose list is certainly incomplete as the choice of specific connectors largely depends on the writer's individual preferences. The categories include markers of addition, attitude, concession, contrast/comparison, illustration, restatement, result, sequence and summary.

2. Procedural problems which have to be resolved by the metadiscourse researcher include reflexivity, multifunctionality, clustering and double use of text-connectors.

Without a thorough consideration of these issues, no valid research into metadiscourse is possible.

3. The relative frequency of text-conncetors in the MA thesis genre in Linguistics is 0.77, whereas the relative frequency of all types of metadiscourse markers is 2.45, thus, text-connectors make up about 31 per cent of the total use of metadiscourse markers in MA theses, which is a high ratio.

4. A comparison of the frequencies of text-connectors in the L2 and L1 English theses shows an enormous overuse of text-connectors by L2 students (+355.06). This overuse can be explained by instruction-induced factors such as (1) over-emphasis on connectors at secondary and tertiary (BA) level writing classes, often at the expense of other metadiscourse strategies; and (2) over-emphasis on connectors in EFL coursebooks. Another hypothetical cause – transfer of mother-tongue writing practices – has been rejected on the grounds that L1 Lithuanian students' academic texts show a sparse use of metatextual strategies.

5. A comparison of L2 English theses from Lithuania and from Hong Kong has shown rather similar frequencies of text-connectors, which implies that extensive use of text-connectors may be a characteristic feature of interlanguage writing at the MA level.

To give a comprehensive picture of text-connectors in the MA thesis genre, further analysis has to be made focusing on various categories of text-connectors and their specific linguistic realizations and looking into their frequency of occurrence, position in a sentence or any other issues.

The overall research implications of this study can be summarized as follows: in order to describe the use of text-connectors (and other metadiscourse markers) in the MA thesis genre and the strategies used by student writers to create interaction in texts, bigger numbers of MA theses representing more universities from L1 and L2 English cultures should be studied with more Englishes (e.g., American, Australian, Canadian) and more interlanguages included in the study.

When it comes to the implications for teaching, it could be suggested that the results of descriptive studies of the MA thesis genre should be used on academic writing courses by native and non-native English students alike, focusing exclusively on genre-based features of language use and avoiding the prescriptive approach, i.e., treating L1 texts as a norm which should be followed by L2 writers. Metadiscourse strategies, unlike lexical appropriacy or grammatical accuracy, is very much a matter of the writer's individual choice (certainly informed and guided by the conventions of the genre), which has little

to do with rules, normativity or prescription. It is my hope that the current interest in English as a Lingua Franca (see *Second International Conference of ELF Programme* 2009) will strengthen the descriptive agenda in interlanguage research, including studies of metadiscourse.

Acknowledgements

References

Ädel, A. 2003. *The Use of Metadiscourse in Argumentative Texts by Advanced Learners and Native Speakers of English. Unpublished PhD Thesis.* Göteborg University.

Alaunienė, Z., V. Valskys 2009. Metakalbos elementai akademiniuose studentų tekstuose. *Žmogus ir žodis. Didaktinė lingvistika* 11(1), 5–12.

Bäcklund, I. l998. *Metatext in Professional Writing: A contrastive study of English, German and Swedish.* Uppsala Universtitet.

Biber, D. *et al*. 1999. *The Longman Grammar of Written and Spoken English.* Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education.

Bikelienė, L. 2008. Resultive connectors in advanced Lithuanian learners' English writing. *Kalbotyra* 59(3), 30–37.

Bitinienė, A. 2009. Sakinių siejimo priemonių vartojimas mokslinio stiliaus tekstuose. *Žmogus ir žodis. Didaktinė lingvistika* 11(1), 21–26.

Burneikaitė, N. 2007a. Discourse labels in MA theses in English L1 and L2. *Language Teaching and Learning in Multicultural and Plurilingual Europe.* Vilnius: VU leidykla. 53–61.

Burneikaitė, N. 2007b. Text-organising metadiscourse in MA theses in English L1 and L2. *Kalba ir kontekstai. Mokslo darbai. II tomas.* 154–164.

Burneikaitė, N. 2008. Metadiscourse in Linguistics Master's Theses in English L1 and L2. *Kalbotyra* 59(3), 38–47.

Burneikaitė, N. 2009a. Evaluative metadiscourse in Linguistics Master's theses in English L1 and L2. *Kalba ir kontekstai. Mokslo darbai. III tomas.* 87–95.

Burneikaitė, N. 2009b. Endophoric markers in Linguistics Master's theses in English L1 and L2. *Žmogus ir žodis. Svetimosios kalbos* 11(3), 11–16.

Carter, R. & M. McCarthy. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English.* CUP.

Cowan, R. 2008. *The Teacher's Grammar of English: A Course Book and Reference Guide*. CUP.

Granger, S. (ed.) 1998. *Learner English on Computer.* London: Longman.

Halliday, M. A. K. & R. Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English.* London: Longman.

Hyland, K. 2005. *Metadiscourse. Exploring Interaction in Writing.* London: Continuum.

InterLAE Conference Abstracts. 2008. Available at: www.unizar.es/interlae/InterLAE_Conference_abstracts.pdf. Accessed: 1 November 2009.

Lattice Conference Book of Abstracts. 2009. Available at: www.lattice.cnrs.fr/IMG/pdf/BOOK-of-ABSTRACTS_LPTS.pdf. Accessed: 1 November 2009.

Lawrence, A. 2006. AntConc 3.2.0. Available at: http://www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp/ Accessed: 1 November 2009.

Martin, J. & D. Rose 2003. *Working with Discourse: Meaning Beyond the Clause.* London: Continuum.

Mauranen, A. 1993. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: A textlinguistic study.* Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.

Meunier, F. 2008. Frequent discourse connectors in English speech and writing: comparing native corpora, learner corpora and textbook material. *ESSE-9 Programme.* University of Arhus.

Nauckūnaitė, Z. 1998. *Iškalbos mokymas.* Kaunas: Šviesa.

Nauckūnaitė, Z. 2002. *Teksto komponavimas: rašymo procesas ir tekstų tipai.* Vilnius: Gimtasis žodis.

Quirk, R. *et al.* 1991. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language.* Longman.

Rayson, P. 2004. Log-likelihood Calculator. Available at: http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html Accessed: 1 November 2009.

Second International Conference of ELF Programme. 2009. Available at: http://www.soton.ac.uk/ml/research/elf_programme.html. Accessed: 1 November 2009.

Stungienė, A. 2009. Metadiscourse in academic debates. Abstract. *Language and culture: New Challenges for the Teachers of Europe. Conference Programme.* Vilnius: VU. 59–60.

Swan, M. 2005. *Practical English Usage.* OUP.

Verikaitė, D. 2005. Variation of conjunctive discourse markers across different genres. *Žmogus ir žodis. Didaktinė lingvistika* 7(3), 68–75.

Teksto konektoriai kalbotyros magistro darbuose

Nida Burneikaitė

Santrauka

Straipsnyje bandoma tyrinėti kaip realizuojama tarpasmeninė kalbos funkcija moksliniame diskurse, kaip sustiprinamas rašytinio teksto interaktyvumas, kaip struktūruojamas tekstas ir kuriamas dialogas su skaitytoju. Metadiskurso strategijų vartojimas yra vienas

iš būdų teksto paveikumui sustiprinti. Teksto konektoriai – tai metadiskurso kategorija, padedanti tinkamai sudėlioti argumentus tekste bei įtraukti skaitytoją į diskurso procesą. Tyrimu siekiama apibūdinti teksto konektorių vartojimą lingvistikos magistro darbuose. Tyrimo medžiaga – 70 magistro darbų, parašytų gimtąja ir negimtąja anglų kalba Britanijos ir Lietuvos universitetuose.

Straipsnyje pateikiami tyrimo pirmosios dalies rezultatai: (1) magistro darbo žanro teksto konektorių analizės metodologiniai metmenys: teksto konektorių funkcinė klasifikacija, susidedanti iš devynių kategorijų, jų lingvistinės raiškos pavyzdžiai bei tyrimo proceso probleminių aspektų analizė; (2) statistinės analizės rezultatai: teksto konektorių santykinis dažnumas magistro darbuose (0,77) bei dažnumų palyginimas gimtakalbių ir negimtakalbių studentų tekstuose (0,56:0,90), rodantis, jos negimtakalbiai (Lietuvos universitetų) anglų kalbos studentai vartoja daug daugiau teksto konektorių magistro darbuose (+355,06) nei gimtakalbiai. Tikėtina tokio gausaus teksto konektorių vartojimo priežastis – perdėtas dėmesys teksto konektoriams anglų kalbos pratybose vidurinio ugdymo ir bakalauro studijų pakopose bei anglų kalbos vadovėliuose. Gimtosios kalbos įtaka kaip galima gausaus konektorių vartojimo priežastis atmetama, nes kai kurie tyrimai rodo, jog lietuvių gimtosios kalbos akademiniuose studentų tekstuose metakalbinėms teksto siejimo priemonėms skiriama nepakankamai dėmesio. Gausus teksto konektorių vartojimas magistro darbuose būdingas ne tik Lietuvos, bet ir kitų kultūrų studentams, todėl galima teigti, jog tai yra bendras anglų kalbos tarpukalbės ('interlanguage') ypatumas.

Įteikta 2009 m. lapkričio 26 d.