

Coventry University Repository for the Virtual Environment
(CURVE)

Author names: Gardezi, S.A. and Nesi, H.

Title: Variation in the writing of economics students in Britain and Pakistan: the case of conjunctive ties

Article & version: Post-print version

Original citation & hyperlink:

Gardezi, S.A. and Nesi, H. (2010). Variation in the writing of economics students in Britain and Pakistan: the case of conjunctive ties. In M. Charles, D. Pecorari & S. Hunston (Eds.). *Academic Writing: At the Interface of Corpus and Discourse* (pp. 236-250). London: Continuum.

<http://www.continuumbooks.com/books/detail.aspx?BookId=132461&SubjectId=989&Subject2Id=936>

Copyright © and Moral Rights are retained by the author(s) and/ or other copyright owners. A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge. This item cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the copyright holder(s). The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

This document is the author's final manuscript version of the book chapter, incorporating any revisions agreed during the peer-review process. Some differences between the published version and this version may remain and you are advised to consult the published version if you wish to cite from it.

Available in the CURVE Research Collection: August 2012

<http://curve.coventry.ac.uk/open>

Chapter 12

Variation in the Writing of Economics Students in Britain and Pakistan: The Case of Conjunctive Ties

S. Amina Gardezi and Hilary Nesi

1 Introduction

Conjunctive ties are part of the metadiscoursal repertoire, and serve as an explicit means by which a writer can comment on a text and influence a reader's interpretation of it. A number of studies (e.g. Crewe, 1990; Green, Christopher & Mei, 2000; Milton & Tsang, 1993) have suggested that learners of English as a Foreign Language and English for Academic Purposes overuse these ties, particularly in sentence initial position. Various reasons have been proposed for this: it has been argued that some learners have only limited understanding of logical relationships, perhaps as a consequence of teaching that focuses on syntax rather than semantics (Bacha & Hanania, 1980; Zamel, 1983), that the overuse of conjunctive ties is an attempt to give a superficial appearance of academic style (Crewe, 1990), or that it is due to interference from the mother tongue, particularly with regard to fronting (Green et al., 2000). Such studies all assume a deficit on the part of the learner, and a need to approximate more closely to the academic writing conventions manifested by native speakers of English.

Contrastive rhetorical research suggests that metadiscoursal variations may sometimes be a matter of cultural choice, however, rather than level of language proficiency. Writers are influenced by local conventions, unconsciously acquired through intertextual processes, and divergence from British or American academic norms may thus be explained in terms of discourse community differences (e.g. Ahmad, 1997), socio-historic and socio-political factors (e.g. Salager-Meyer et al., 2003), and/or national intellectual styles (e.g. Clyne, 1987; Duszak, 1997). Rhetorical choices may also vary according to professional and disciplinary context (e.g. Dahl, 2004; Hyland, 2004, 2005; Mauranen, 1993; Shaw, this volume; Yakhontova, 2006).

The interaction between disciplinary and national factors has been examined by Mauranen (1993), Dahl (2004) and Yakhontova (2006). Mauranen studied

the work of a Finnish and an American economist writing in English, and found that the Finn used far less organizational metatext than the American. According to Mauranen, the Finnish school system 'consistently teaches that metadiscourse is not only superfluous, but the sign of a poor writer' (1993: 8), and she argues that the implicit Finnish style may be viewed by Finns as a negative politeness strategy, allowing readers the freedom to interpret meaning for themselves, without being patronized. Americans, on the other hand, seem to be aiming for positive politeness by explicitly providing readers with the information and guidance they need in order to interpret the text in the way the writer intends. As Dahl (2004: 1821) points out, 'within the Anglo-Saxon world . . . emphasis is put on communication with the reader, making this an explicit feature of the writing process'.

Dahl (2004) and Yakhontova (2006) examined the effect of two variables, language and discipline, on rhetorical choice. Yakhontova's comparative study of conference abstracts revealed a range of differences in structure, organization and pronominal use between applied mathematics and applied linguistics, and between English and two Slavic languages (Ukrainian and Russian). She concludes that such differences can best be explained in terms of inherited academic writing traditions within 'relatively closed national academic writing communities' (2006: 164). Dahl (2004) focused on metatextual variation, examining locational and rhetorical devices used in research articles across three disciplines and three languages (English, French and Norwegian). She found little national difference in the use of these devices in medical articles, but a significant difference in economics and linguistics texts (French writers used much less metatext than English and Norwegian writers). Medicine, chosen as representative of the natural sciences, had a low overall incidence of metatext; the smaller number of rhetorical markers indicated that writers tended to refer to their research rather than to the text (using 'research act' rather than 'text act' verbs, as classified by Bunton, 1999), while the smaller number of locational markers reflected the fact that medical research articles conform to a standard format, whereas economics and linguistics articles can be structured in a variety of ways and therefore require more navigational support. Dahl concludes that there is a more reader-oriented and writer-responsible academic writing culture in English and Norwegian, but she also notes that economics and linguistics research papers are more heterogeneous and require greater subjective interpretation than research papers in medicine, hence encouraging greater use of metatextual devices.

Hyland's studies of metatext in graduate student writing in Hong Kong (Hyland, 2004, 2005; Hyland & Tse, 2004) support Dahl's findings. When the distribution of metadiscourse markers was compared across six disciplines, totals were higher in applied linguistics, public administration and business studies than in computer science, electronic engineering and biology. This distribution was reflected across all of Hyland's ten metadiscourse categories,

including 'transitions', the commonest of his interactive markers, and the category which contains most conjunctive elements as defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976). According to Hyland (2005: 57–58) 'the figures reflect the greater role that explicit personal interpretation plays in the humanities and social sciences, where interpretations are typically more explicit and the conditions for establishing proof less reliable than in the hard fields'.

Such studies suggest that neither a more implicit nor a more explicit style is inherently superior, and that the appropriate amount of metatext depends on the readers' and writers' disciplinary, academic and cultural context. Mauranen (1993) and Duszak (1997) both advise writers seeking publication to take note of the dominant cultural style, however: 'texts with traces of alien patterns are dispreferred – sometimes returned for repair, or edited with a possible loss of the author's intentions' (Duszak, 1997: 21).

The problems surrounding learner writers' use of metatext are thus more complex than some writers in the field of English language teaching have implied. Learner writers may lack the language knowledge to realize metatextual functions, or may blindly apply textbook rules regardless of the message they want to convey, but prior studies designed to isolate national and disciplinary differences make it clear that they may also make apparently unconventional metatextual choices simply because they are conforming to an alien cultural norm, or to a disciplinary convention that their writing tutors are unaware of.

So far research has focused on rhetorical differences across disciplines and national languages, and there has been little exploration of the independent influence of local academic cultures. This study contributes to the debate by examining the essays of undergraduate students from Britain and Pakistan, two groups who share the same L1, and who study in the same broad field, but who belong to different local discourse communities. We presume that undergraduate students will have been influenced primarily by local rhetorical norms, whereas the expert writers and graduate students considered in most prior studies are likely to have had exposure to a wider community of international scholarship. This therefore makes undergraduates particularly appropriate writers for a study of this kind, which seeks to investigate the influence of the local discourse community in isolation from other factors.

Metatext is acknowledged to be a concept that is difficult to define and delimit (Dahl, 2004; Hyland, 2005; Mauranen, 1993) but conjunctive relations are probably the least problematic metatextual markers, and the easiest to identify. This, combined with the fact that their overuse is a noted feature in EAP and EFL student writing (Crewe, 1990; Green et al., 2000; Milton & Tsang, 1993), encouraged us to focus on conjunctive elements in this study. Our experience with both Pakistani and British student writers led us to hypothesize that the Pakistani group would use far more conjunctive ties in their writing than their UK counterparts. If this was the case, it would indicate

the need for awareness raising, especially on the part of writing tutors and Pakistani undergraduates planning to study at postgraduate level and perhaps publish outside their local setting.

2 Method

A small corpus of 56,142 words¹ was created, consisting of ten assignments written by British students (20,313 words), and ten assignments written by Pakistani students (35,829 words). The concordancing program *AntConc* (Anthony, 2006), was used to identify and compare the various types of conjunctive adjuncts occurring in the two subcorpora, and examine them individually, using the techniques of discourse analysis. The complementary use of the two types of analysis enabled us both to quantify the distribution of the formal lexicogrammatical feature across the 20 assignments, and consider the meaning and purpose of each type of conjunctive adjunct in context, within each text.

The British subcorpus, a subset of the BAWE corpus,² was composed of assignments written by ten different native speaker undergraduates studying social science subjects (economics, sociology and politics) at British universities. All the British writers had received all their secondary education in Britain, and all the assignments had received merit or distinction grades (equivalent to an upper second or first class honours degree).

The Pakistani subcorpus consisted of assignments written by 10 different undergraduates from the departments of Economics at Lahore University of Management Sciences (LUMS) and Kinnaird College (KC). Both these institutions have a good reputation in Pakistan and internationally, and all the Pakistani assignments had been awarded distinction or merit grades by LUMS or KC tutors (A+, A or B+). All the Pakistani writers had been educated in the medium of English throughout their school and college life and used English both inside and outside the classroom. They regarded English as a mother tongue (alongside Urdu, in most cases).

None of the assignments in either subcorpus had been written under time constraints. The students had prepared their work at home, over a period of days, if not weeks, with ample time to revise and correct any careless errors. The Pakistani and British contributors were well matched in terms of age (18–20 years), formal English-medium education (approximately 14 years) and disciplinary area. However Tables 12.1 and 12.2 indicate that although the topics were similar, some of the Pakistani essays were considerably longer. Most of the British essay questions were more detailed than the Pakistani ones, with more references to specific economic models, but this should not be taken to imply that the Pakistani students wrote on more general topics. Both groups prepared for the writing tasks in class, and had been given reading lists and specific oral guidance.

Table 12.1 Components of the British subcorpus

No	Discipline	Title	Words
1	Economics	The Heckscher-Ohlin model and its relevance to policymakers. Describe the Heckscher-Ohlin model and explain the Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem. Provide a critique of the assumptions of the model. Is the Heckscher-Ohlin Theorem robust to the underlying assumptions? Explain and illustrate important points by using diagrams. Based on this critique, analyse the relevance of the model for policymakers.	1921
2	Economics	The extent to which a monopoly induces economic inefficiency depends, among other things, upon factors such as: (i) vertical integration in the market, (ii) horizontal market contestability, (iii) technology, (iv) the role of advertising and (v) market demand elasticity." Discuss.	2194
3	Sociology	Taylorism was a new form of relationship between employer and employee, introduced because of the development of the large capitalist corporation. Discuss.	1487
4	Economics	What relationship between unemployment and the real wage is predicted by the Shapiro-Stiglitz shirking model? Explain how an increase in the unemployment rate could reduce firms' expenditure on monitoring workers' behaviour.	2158
5	Economics	To what extent should policy be used to stabilize the economy? Discuss with examples from the UK.	2192
6	Economics	To what extent should policy be used to stabilize the economy? Discuss with examples from the UK	2188
7	Economics	Was the collapse of the Bretton Wood System inevitable? And what were its long run consequences.	3311
8	Sociology	What is 'Racism' and how do you account for its persistence in modern societies?	1549
9	Politics	Evaluate Marx's conception of the capitalist social order as antagonistic and crisis prone.	1556
10	Politics	Assess the centrality of the concept of 'embeddedness' to Polanyi's 'The Great Transformation' and its significance for IPE scholarship	1757
Total			20313
Average word length			2031

Sentences in the British subcorpus were somewhat longer on average than those in the Pakistani subcorpus (about 25.5 words per sentence as compared to 20). Sentence length could only be calculated approximately, however, because of some vagaries in punctuation.

The study focused on conjunctive adjuncts in the four major conjunctive categories, as described in Halliday and Hasan (1976): additive, adversative, causal and temporal. Various other terms are also used in the literature to describe

Table 12.2 Components of the Pakistani subcorpus

No	Discipline	Title	Words
1	Economics	The underdevelopment of development thought. Development betrayed: paradigms and paradoxes. An equation gone wrong: difference between theory and practice	4389
2	Economics	The underdevelopment of development thought. The discourse of development, the practice of dominance. At the crossroads; alternatives?	4215
3	Economics	The free market is the panacea that will extricate the Third World from the vicious cycle of underdevelopment.	2588
4	Economics	The origins, performance and future of Islamic economics	2205
5	Economics	Dimensions of human resource development	2797
6	Economics	Economic development of Pakistan.	6145
7	Economics	The process of economic development	4839
8	Economics	Discuss the concepts of external debt, debt burden and debt sustainability in a developing country context	3407
9	Economics	Is inflation a fiscal phenomenon in Pakistan?	3035
10	Economics	What are some of the causes of recent banking crises and how do they connect with the setting of exchange rates and other aspects of macroeconomics performance?	2209
Total			35829
Average word length			3582

such items, including ‘logical connectives’ (Crewe, 1990), ‘logical connectors’ (Milton & Tsang, 1993) and ‘linking adverbials’ (Biber et al., 1999), but there is consensus that their role is to help the reader interpret links between ideas internal to the discourse, thus excluding from these categories any markers of addition, comparison or consequence relating to the outside world. Following Halliday and Hasan (1976), in this study conjunctions marking logical connections between clauses or phrases were not considered, and only intersentential links were counted.

3 Findings

As can be seen in Table 12.3, all ten of the British assignments contained examples of at least three categories of conjunctive tie.

As can be seen in Table 12.4, all the Pakistani assignments contained examples of all four categories of conjunctive tie. Marked differences are apparent in terms of the quantity of conjunctive elements.

Table 12.3 Findings for the British subcorpus

Essay no.	Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal	Total
1	12	5	3	3	23
2	2	10	5	1	18
3	–	2	2	2	6
4	3	6	5	1	15
5	5	10	1	2	18
6	7	11	11	2	31
7	7	10	3	1	21
8	–	5	1	1	7
9	3	2	7	–	12
10	–	1	3	1	5
Total	39	62	41	14	156

Table 12.4 Findings for the Pakistani subcorpus

Essay no.	Additive	Adversative	Causal	Temporal	Total
1	15	19	16	8	58
2	9	12	8	1	30
3	13	10	6	1	30
4	7	7	4	2	20
5	7	7	6	1	21
6	17	18	9	2	46
7	14	14	2	3	33
8	15	3	17	7	42
9	2	6	20	6	34
10	8	8	23	4	43
Total	107	104	111	35	357

Differences in distribution between the two subcorpora were calculated using Rayson's Log-likelihood Calculator (Rayson, undated). This compares the frequencies of a given linguistic feature against the total number of words in two different-sized corpora, using Dunning's G^2 ratio as the statistical measure (Rayson & Garside, 2000). The higher the G^2 value, the more significant is the difference between the two frequency scores. A G^2 of 3.8 or higher is significant at the level of $p < 0.05$, and a G^2 of 6.6 or higher is significant at $p < 0.01$. Results are listed in Table 12.5. In this and subsequent tables, the relative frequency figure indicates occurrences per 100 words.³

Table 12.5 shows that the frequencies for adversatives and temporals in the two subcorpora were similar, but that there were significant differences in the distribution of additives and causals ($p < 0.05$). The British writers used adversatives considerably more than other types of conjunctive tie, whereas the Pakistani writers used adversatives, causals and additives to a similar degree.

Table 12.5 Relative frequency and log-likelihood scores

Category	British (20313 words)	Relative frequency	Pakistani (35829 words)	Relative frequency	G ² value
Adversative	62	0.31	103	0.29	0.14
Causal	41	0.20	111	0.31	5.84
Additive	39	0.19	107	0.30	5.94
Temporal	14	0.07	35	0.10	1.27
TOTAL	156	0.77	357	1.00	7.60

Table 12.6 The ten most frequently identified conjunctive ties

	Conjunctive ties	British	Relative frequency	Pakistani	Relative frequency	Total	G ² value
1	however	53	0.26	44	0.12	97	-13.65
2	therefore	22	0.11	25	0.07	47	-2.22
3	hence	7	0.03	34	0.09	41	+7.30
4	and	0	0.00	32	0.09	32	+28.74
5	but	3	0.01	28	0.08	31	+11.54
6	thus	5	0.02	25	0.07	30	+5.59
7	For example	13	0.06	9	0.03	22	-4.75
8	furthermore	6	0.03	12	0.03	18	0.06
9	first(ly)	8	0.04	8	0.02	16	-1.27
10	consequently	2	0.01	12	0.03	14	+3.36

As expected, the Pakistani writers were found to use a significantly greater number of conjunctive ties overall ($p < 0.01$).

The most frequently used conjunctive ties and their comparative frequency in the two subcorpora are listed in Table 12.6. In the G² value column, + indicates over-use in the Pakistani subcorpus relative to the British subcorpus, and - indicates under-use in the Pakistani subcorpus relative to the British subcorpus.

The use of these conjunctive elements is illustrated and discussed below. British examples are marked 'B', and Pakistani examples 'P'. This letter code is followed by the essay number and, in the case of the British examples, the BAWE corpus assignment code.

4 The Use of *However* and *But*

However was the most frequent intersentential link in both subcorpora, as it was in Shaw's corpora of literary studies writing (this volume). In the BAWE corpus as a whole it has a relative frequency of 0.16 per 100 words, so there was

highly significant over-use in the British subcorpus with respect to BAWE ($G^2 = 10.17$, $p < 0.01$) as well as with respect to the Pakistani subcorpus.

Sentence-initial *but* seems to serve a similar function to *however*, but marks the contrastive relation a little less strongly (see Example 1). The relative frequency of sentence-initial *but* was the same in the British subcorpus as in the BAWE corpus as a whole, but was significantly higher in the Pakistani subcorpus.

Example 1

It was just a plain biological theory designed to explain relation between mankind and its history. *But* ironically, development has become a justifiable victim of the evolutionary principle of ‘the survival of the fittest’. *Source: P 2*

Bell (2007) claims that sentence initial *but* is frequent in published academic writing, and Shaw (this volume) found that professional literary critics made greater use of it than British undergraduates. Shaw suggests that the low use by British students is probably the result of prescriptivist schooling which discourages the use of coordinating conjunctions as adverbials. Perhaps the Pakistani students had not been given the same advice as the British students, or perhaps, like the professional literary critics represented in Shaw’s corpora of published articles, they had chosen to ignore it.

Although Pakistani writers used *but* to connect sentences, none used *however* to connect clauses or phrases within sentences. There were three cases in the British subcorpus of *however* being used in this way, and Thompson (1997: 204) notes an increasing tendency to convert conjunctive adjuncts such as *however* and *therefore* into conjunctions marking intrasentential relations. Such cases were discounted from this study.

Of the instances of *however* as an intersentential link, 88 per cent in the British subcorpus and 93 per cent in the Pakistani subcorpus were sentence initial, whereas only 60 per cent are sentence-initial in the BAWE corpus as a whole. Shaw (this volume) suggests that ‘a tendency towards more initial placement is a marker of less skill’, and there do seem to be instances in the two subcorpora where it might have been more rhetorically effective to delay the placement of the adversative marker. Delayed placement allows for initial hedging, and enables other thematic elements to take up initial position, thus providing more scope for manipulation of the thematic structure of the text according to the perspective the writer wishes to take. This can be seen in Example 2, where the (British) writer places the first *however* in sentence-initial position, but draws attention to the conditional relation between the two clauses in the final sentence by placing the second *however* after *if*.

Example 2

This causes economic inefficiency in short term. *However*, in the longer run, when the patent has expired economic efficiency will resume as all firms

take advantage of the new technology, competing with the original firm. If, *however*, there were no patents, this long term gain in efficiency may not have taken place. *Source: B2, 0118a*

When instances of *however* and *but* are counted together, their frequency in the British and Pakistani subcorpora are not significantly different ($G^2 = 3.10$). This suggests that the two sets of essays have a similarly argumentative function, and the fact that adversative relations are signalled more often in these two subcorpora than in the BAWE corpus as a whole is likely to be due to the effect of genre, and possibly discipline.

5 The Use of *Consequently*, *Hence*, *Thus* and *Therefore*

Causal conjunctive ties tended to occur with greater frequency in the British and Pakistani subcorpora than they do in the BAWE corpus as a whole. Similarly Shaw (this volume) notes a much higher frequency of *thus*, *hence* and *therefore* in his maths, physics and engineering corpus than in his literary corpus; perhaps this reflects a particular requirement in these and related fields to express logical inferences and results, for example, in mathematical calculations, as in Example 3.

Example 3

If $r^* = n$, both B^* and y grow at the same rate. *Hence* b^* (debt to output ratio) stays unchanged over time. *Source: P 8*

Although *consequently*, *hence*, *thus* and *therefore* seem to be interchangeable in many contexts, and are often defined similarly in dictionaries, their distributions vary. The intersentential markers *hence* and *consequently* are comparatively rare in the BAWE corpus as a whole (0.01 per 100 words) and *thus* is only slightly more frequent (0.02 instances per 100 words), whereas *therefore* is relatively common (0.10 instances per 100 words). The British subcorpus more or less mirrored this pattern of distribution, but in the Pakistani subcorpus *hence* and *consequently* were more common, and *therefore* and *thus* were used with equal frequency (0.07 per 100 words). In some contexts *thus* seemed to have a wider scope than *therefore*, signalling a conclusion gradually arrived at rather than simply a logical consequence of the preceding proposition. Shaw (this volume) suggests that *thus* may indicate 'a less direct connection and a more summative function'; Halliday and Hasan (1976) also acknowledge this difference by classifying *thus* as an additive and *therefore* as a causal marker of conjunction.

In Example 4 *thus* is used as an intersentential link and *therefore* is used as an intrasentential link. By using two different markers to express similar relations within the same sentence the writer avoids repetition, but *thus* also seems to

function as the marker of a conclusion to an extended argument.

Example 4

It is *thus* the specific set of socio-legal structures belonging to modern industrial capitalism which facilitate, legitimate, incentivize and *therefore* encourage an instrumental rationality geared towards material gain. *Source B 10 (0075e)*

In both subcorpora all instances of intersentential *consequently* and *hence* and almost all instances of *thus* were sentence initial. However, whereas the Pakistani writers also followed this pattern of use for *therefore*, 50 per cent of the placements of intersentential *therefore* in the British subcorpus were delayed. As with *however*, delayed placement made possible the thematization of other sentence elements.

6 The Use of *And*, *Furthermore*, *For Example* and *Firstly*

In the British subcorpus greater use was made of additives signalling an exemplifying role for subsequent information: *for instance* and particularly *for example*. The Pakistani writers, on the other hand, made significantly greater use of markers signalling a sequence of propositions of equal status, such as *furthermore* and particularly sentence-initial *and*, which was not used at all in the British subcorpus and is comparatively rare in the BAWE corpus as a whole (0.01 per 100 words). British writers probably avoid sentence-initial *and* for the same reasons that they avoid sentence-initial *but*, because teachers in British schools have traditionally advised against it.

In both subcorpora temporals were the least favoured conjunctive ties. They were sometimes used to enumerate the stages of an argument, as in Example 6, and additionally four of the introductions in the Pakistani subcorpus employed sequences of temporal markers to map out essay plans, as in Example 7.

Example 6

There are *three reasons* for this. *Firstly* the culture of colonialism and the belief that the 'Other' is inferior is still apparent in our society today. *Secondly* these beliefs are reinforced through the economy, as capitalism exploits ethnic minorities, and ensures that they are viewed as less skilled, and *finally* racism is embedded in our political system through the policies of political parties and the links they make between non-white immigrants and social problems. *Source B 1 (0111a)*

Example 7

First I will define external debt followed by a set of indicators to assess a country's debt burden. *Then* I will examine what it means for a country's debt to

be sustainable. *Lastly* I will present a simple framework depicting the dynamics between debt management, inflation and fiscal adjustment. *Source: P8*

Some of the British writers also provided introductory plans, but they employed fewer conjunctive ties, and signalled not only sequential but also causal clause relations (see Example 8). According to Martin (1992: 185–193) the causal ('consequential') as opposed to temporal signalling of clause relations enables connections between events to be 'modulated', so that 'one event is seen as *enabling* or *determining* the other rather than simply preceding it'.

Example 8

By firstly investigating the interlinked web of contributive causes of the Bretton Woods breakdown, before discussing the various ways in which events post 1971 have been shaped by the consequences of the preceding era, this essay aims to address both the inevitability of the breakdown and the long term consequences of such a development. *Source: B7 (0399c)*

7 Conclusion

The aim of this study was to ascertain whether use of metatext, and specifically conjunctive adjuncts, was affected by the local academic culture. We found a shared preference for causal and adversative as opposed to temporal conjunctive adjuncts in both subcorpora, reflecting both the relative sophistication of university-level writing, and the requirements of the argumentative essay which focuses on contributing factors and conflicting views (e.g. 'What are some of the causes of recent banking crises?' (*P 10*); 'Assess the centrality of the concept' (*B 10*)).

Pakistani writers tended to produce shorter sentences, with more frequent sentence-initial ties and greater use of ties which mark a sequence of equally important propositions. British writers were more likely to delay placement of conjunctive adjuncts, and to make more sparing use of those which simply announced the addition of new information. British sentences, being longer, also contained more clauses linked by coordinating conjunctions. Typical differences can be seen in Example 9, where all three ties are sentence initial, and Example 10, where the placement of *therefore* in sentence 4 is delayed and some propositions in sentences 3 and 4 are intrasententially linked by the conjunctive use of *hence* and *and*.

Example 9

(1). Statistics show that 18 per cent of the bank deposits were denominated in dollars. (2). *And* this made bank liabilities sensitive to changes in the exchange rate. (3). *Hence* when there was devaluation in the peso the debt

burden of the banks increased. (4). The private sector also found it difficult to service their debts. (5). *As a result* bad loans amplified liabilities and losses for banks. *Source: PIO*

Example 10

(1). *However* we now turn to the situation in which trade can occur between the two countries. (2). *First*, recall that in autarky, p_h is greater than p_f that is (p_x/p_y) is greater in H. (3). If trade can occur, consumers in country H will observe that good X is relatively cheaper in country F, *and hence* make some of their purchases of X by importing from F. (4). Producers in F *therefore* respond by increasing supply, *and* this clearly causes p_h to fall. *Source: BI (0111a)*

Both sets of essays met departmental requirements, displayed similar levels of scholarship and demonstrated positively polite consideration of the reader by explicitly marking clause relations. Marked differences in style probably reflect local practice, and/or the prescriptions of local teachers. The Pakistani writers seem to have been encouraged to use sentence-initial conjunctive adjuncts to link each new proposition. The British writers may have had more exposure to expert argumentative discourse, introducing them to alternative initial thematic elements. At the same time they seemed to have been proscribed the use of *and* and *but* as conjunctive adjuncts linking sentences, although at least some of them did not seem to have been taught the complementary rule which proscribes the use of *however* as a coordinating conjunction.

Neither of these sets of writing is presented as a model to which learner writers should ultimately aspire. University students are still undergoing apprenticeship into the discourse of their field, and the argumentative essays that they are required to write belong in any case to a different genre from those they might produce in the future as professional writers. A comparison of the two subcorpora does have pedagogical implications, however. It illustrates the signalling choices available to writers of argumentative text, so that learners can increase their own repertoire, and it draws attention to differences in the choices made by writers in different local discourse communities, so that learners can adjust this repertoire to conform to a different set of expectations, if they wish. Conformity to the local style may be the safest choice during undergraduate studies in the home country, but as Duszak (1997) points out, students' success can be adversely affected if they persist with the local style when they move on to study or publish outside their local discourse community.

Acknowledgement

The British subcorpus in this study is a subset of the British Academic Written English (BAWE) corpus, which was developed at the Universities of Warwick,

Reading and Oxford Brookes under the directorship of Hilary Nesi and Sheena Gardner (formerly of the Centre for Applied Linguistics [previously called CELTE], Warwick), Paul Thompson (Department of Applied Linguistics, Reading) and Paul Wickens (Westminster Institute of Education, Oxford Brookes), with funding from the ESRC (RES-000-23-0800).

Notes

- ¹ Word counts exclude titles, tables of contents, formulae, tables, footnotes and bibliographies.
- ² The British Academic Written English corpus, see acknowledgement above.
- ³ For comparison with Shaw's data (this volume) the occurrences of conjunctive adjuncts per 100,000 words were 768 for the British subcorpus, and 996 for the Pakistani subcorpus.

References

- Ahmad, U.K. (1997). Research article introductions in Malay: Rhetoric in an emerging discourse community. In A. Duszak (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 273–303). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Anthony, L. (2006). *AntConc*. [Computer software]. Retrieved from www.antlab.sci.waseda.ac.jp (accessed 13 May 2009).
- Bacha, N.S., & Hanania, E.A.S. (1980). Difficulty in learning and effectiveness of teaching transitional words: A study on Arabic speaking university students. *TESOL Quarterly*, 14, 251–254.
- Bell, D. (2007). Sentence-initial *AND* and *BUT* in academic writing. *Pragmatics*, 17, 183–201.
- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow: Longman.
- Bunton, D. (1999). The use of higher level metatext in PhD theses. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, S41–S56.
- Clyne, M. (1987). Cultural differences in the organisation of academic texts. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 11, 211–247.
- Crewe, W.J. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44, 316–325.
- Dahl, T. (2004). Textual metadiscourse in research articles: A marker of national culture or of academic discipline? *Journal of Pragmatics*, 39, 1807–1825.
- Duszak, A. (1997). Cross-cultural academic communication: A discourse-community view. In A. Duszak, (Ed.), *Culture and styles of academic discourse* (pp. 11–39). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Green, C.F., Christopher, E.R., & Mei, J.L.K. (2000). The incidence and effects on coherence of marked themes in interlanguage texts: A corpus-based enquiry. *English for Specific Purposes*, 19, 99–113.
- Halliday, M.A.K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Hyland, K. (2005). *Metadiscourse: Exploring interaction in writing*. London: Continuum.
- (2004). Disciplinary interactions: Metadiscourse in L2 postgraduate writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 13, 133–151.
- Hyland, K., & Tse, P. (2004). Metadiscourse in academic writing: A reappraisal. *Applied Linguistics*, 25, 156–177.
- Martin, J.R. (1992). *English text: System and structure*. Amsterdam: Benjamins.
- Mauranen, A. (1993). Contrastive rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English economics texts. *English for Specific Purposes*, 12, 3–22.
- Milton, J., & Tsang, E.S. (1993). A corpus-based study of logical connectors in EFL students' writing: Directions for future research. In R. Pemberton & E.S. Tsang (Eds), *Studies in lexis* (pp. 215–246). Hong Kong: HKUST Language Centre.
- Rayson, P. (undated). *Log-likelihood calculator*. Retrieved from ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html (accessed 13 May 2009).
- Rayson, P., & Garside, R. (2000). Comparing corpora using frequency profiling. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Comparing Corpora*. Annual Meeting of the ACL, Volume 9 (pp. 1–6). Morristown, NJ: Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Salager-Meyer, F., Ariza, A., & Zambrano, N. (2003). The scimitar, the dagger and the glove. Intercultural differences in the rhetoric of criticism in Spanish, French and English medical discourse (1930–1995). *English for Specific Purposes*, 22, 223–247.
- Thompson, G. (1997). *Introducing functional grammar*. London: Arnold.
- Yakhontova, T. (2006). Cultural and disciplinary variation in academic discourse: The issue of influencing factors. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 5, 153–167.
- Zamel, V. (1983). Teaching those missing links in writing. *ELT Journal*, 37, 22–29.