On Adverbial Conjuncts in Chinese English Majors`Dissertations and Theses: A Corpus-based Investigation

Wenbin Hua[1, *]

[1]*School of Foreign Languages, Hubei University of Science and Arts, Xiangyang, 441000, China*

*Corresponding author: 27020584@qq.com

Abstract: As a subset of cohesive devices, adverbial conjuncts contribute to form a coherent structure of units of discourse. It is inevitable for Chinese English majors to write a dissertation or thesis at the end of their study. Their preferences of choosing adverbial conjuncts and the overuse, underuse and misuse of those adverbial conjuncts result in some features of Chinese English. Based on Quirk`s theory of adverbial conjuncts, by analyzing the occurrence frequencies of adverbial conjuncts in a self-built corpus, which consists of 0.4 million words of dissertations and theses from English majors of 20 different universities in China, the writer found out some features of China English in utilizing adverbial conjuncts, in which listing conjuncts are the most frequently used category, while transitional and inferential adjuncts are the least frequently used ones. The features in turn will give teachers and students inspiration of improving their academic writing.

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Writing, with its importance in real communication, has attracted many linguists' attention. In the book Cohesion in English, Halliday &Hasan [10] first put forward the conception 'text' and define it as 'any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole'. From then on, the basic unit of linguistic study has shifted from sentence to text. Byrne [2] claims that when we write 'we produce a sequence of sentences arranged in a particular order and linked together in certain ways. The sequence may be very short--perhaps only two or three sentences--but, because of the way the sentences have been put in order and linked together, they form a coherent whole, which we call a text'.

As substantial literature has shown, academic prose is a rhetorically sophisticated artifact that displays a careful balance of factual information and social interaction. In other words, apart from propositional content, academic writers are also concerned about the effective means of its textual organization and its conformation to the expectations of its prospective readers. With an orientation to the reader, writers of academic articles organize facts and arguments into meaningful patterns, so that their success in gaining acceptance for their work is at least partly dependent on the strategic

manipulation of various structural and rhetorical features. Hedges [13-14] [19], modality [3] [12], adverbial stance [2], evidentiality [4], citations [7] [14], reporting verbs [21] and metadiscourse [5] [14] are only a few of the elements in the literature examined for their contribution to the negotiation of a successful relationship between writer and reader and text. In this paper, we will study another type of rhetorical devices, namely, the English adverbial conjuncts, which help to realize the academic writer's concern for both textual organization and potential audience.

Adverbial conjuncts (or conjunctive adverbs) are generally defined as words or phrases that connect the idea in one sentence/clause with the idea in another. Biber [2] has discussed this set of linking devices as sentence connectors, which conjoin two independent sentences/clauses and explicitly mark logical relations in discourse. Within our framework, as a subset of cohesive devices, adverbial conjuncts contribute to form a coherent structure of units of discourse, which results, on the one hand, from the connection between constituent units of the text; on the other hand, it also involves 'relations between such units and aspects of the communicative situation, which includes the speaker and the addressee, as well as their attitudes, beliefs and intentions. For Greenbaum & Quirk [9], as to 'conjuncts', their cardinal attribute resides in the capacity to connect parts of a discourse (two or more sentences, whole paragraphs, or even larger parts of an utterance), and this is achieved by 'expressing at the same time the semantic relationship obtaining between them'. In some other books, a conjunct is also denoted as an adverb or adverbial (such as so, in addition, however, secondly) that indicates the speaker's or writer's assessment of the connection between linguistic units (such as clauses).

Adverbial conjuncts have always been a crucial component in article writing for Chinese English-majors in their dissertations or theses. Thus, it becomes effort-worthy to carry out a corpus-based study of them in the English writing of dissertations or theses, written by senior English-majors in some Chinese Universities.

1.2 Literature reviews

Adverbial conjuncts in academic writing has been studied by many scholars in China. In Taiwan, Hao-jan Howard Chen [11] developed a corpus-based approach to compare the differences of the top fifteen linking adverbials used by English native speakers, Taiwanese EFL learners and French EFL learners. It may be briefly summed up as follows. So and therefore are mostly used by Taiwanese EFL learners, while thus is never utilized in their writing to demonstrate resultative function. Besides, compared to native speakers, Taiwanese EFL learners prefer to use although rather than though.

On the basis of Granger and Tyson [8] and Altenberg and Tapper[1]'s research, Luo Yi [18] collected data from postgraduates in People' s Liberation Army's University, which consist of 67 theses in diverse field of linguistics and 33 theses written by native speakers. He found that Chinese learners tended to use much more adverbial conjuncts in their academic writings and there exist troubles in the discrimination of different semantic categories. According to 20 selected adverbial conjuncts, Pan Fan and Feng Yuejin [22] tried to seek differences from non-English major postgraduates' corpora and native speakers' corpora, and they obtained similar results with Luo Yi. Findings indicate that both of learners prefer the same type of linking adverbials. However, there are sill differences in the way of choosing linking adverbials to express various semantic relations. Lei Lei [15] conducted an empirical study of the use of adverbial conjuncts in the academic writing of Chinese EFL doctoral students in order to figure out the overused and underused ones. He collected 20 doctoral dissertations of applied linguistics written by Chinese EFL doctoral learners and 120 published journal articles written by professional writers to compile the respective corpus. Also Liu's [16] adverbial conjuncts list and taxonomy framework are adopted by him to carry out the retrieval. What the study indicates is that Chinese doctoral students share a higher proportion in the use of adverbial conjuncts than the professional writers and generally overuse certain words, such as besides

and actually. So as to probe into the features of Chinese EFL learners about their use of adverbial conjuncts in written and spoken productions, Liu Guobing [17] carried out a comparative study between native and non-native speakers. It is found that despite an overall frequently use of linking adverbials, Chinese EFL learners tended to show two opposite inclinations in the use of them in diverse registers. Besides, more and more postgraduates have attempted to do corpus-based study of adverbial conjuncts in recent years [6] [23].

1.3 Gap

However, when the writers tries to search for relevant studies by typing keywords like 'conjuncts' on CNKI (China National Knowledge Infrastructure), one of the biggest databases in China, only 29 results are relevant, of which only 6 are about discourse markers. Though the means of using 'conjuncts' as a keyword is far from sufficient, it partly suggests that more attention should be paid to the study of conjuncts. In addition, more studies on adverbial conjuncts undertaken in China are comparison between native speakers and non-native speakers or about non-English majors`, postgraduates` or professional academic writing. As advanced English learners, senior English-majors` writing habits will be more representative. The primary goal of the present paper is to present, describe, and analyse the conjuncts used in selected Chinese English-majors`dissertations and theses in details, and attempt to conclude what features China English when it comes to the choice of conjuncts in English writing.

1.4 Questions

Thus, questions proposed by the writers are as follows:
Question 1: What conjuncts do Chinese senior English-majors opt to choose in their dissertation or theses writing?
Question 2: What are the overuse, underuse and misuse of adverbial conjuncts in China English?

1.5 Theoretical Framework

Various suggestions could be taken up for classifying conjunctions. There is no single, uniquely correct inventory of the types of conjunctive relation; different classifications are possible, each of which would highlight different aspects of the facts. In the paper, when developing our framework, we have benefited from such discussions on conjuncts provided by Halliday & Hasan [10], Quirk et al [20], and Biber et al [2].

According to Halliday and Hasan [10] in Cohesion in English, the concept of cohesion is set up to account for relations in discourse, but in rather a different way. Cohesion refers to the range of possibilities that exist for linking something with what has gone before. Halliday [10] proposed some headings that may be useful for analysis purposes. These are opposition, classification, additive, adversative, verificative, temporal, comparative, causal, conditional and concessive. But in this article, we shall adopt a scheme of just four categories by Halliday and Hasan [10]: additive, adversative, causal, and temporal. In Cohesion in English [10], additive conjuncts can be simple or complex, can denote apposition or comparison, mainly including: *and, and also, nor, and...not, further more, in addition, besides, alternatively, incidentally, by the way, that is, I mean, in other words, for instance, thus, likewise, similarly, in the same way, on the other hand, by contrast*. Adversative conjuncts denote the relation 'contrary to expectation', which may be derived from 'the content of what is being said, or from the communication process, the speaker-hearer situation'. They include: *only but, yet, though, however, nevertheless, despite this, in fact, actually, as a matter of fact, instead, rather, on the contrary, in any case, anyhow, at any rate* in this category. Causal conjuncts can be general: *so,*

thus, hence, therefore, consequently, accordingly, because of this, or specific: for this reason, on account of this, as a result, in consequence, for this purpose, with this in mind; They can express reversed causal relations: *for, because*, or conditional relations: *then, in that case, that being the case, in such an event, under those circumstances, otherwise, under the circumstances*, or respective relations: *in this respect, with regard to this, here, otherwise, in other respects, apart from this.* Temporal conjuncts contains three types respectively being simple relations, complex relations and conclusive relations: *then, next, afterwards, after that, subsequently, (just) then, at the same time, simultaneously earlier, before then/that, previously, at once, thereupon. on which; just before soon, presently, later, after a time, some time earlier, formerly, next time, on another occasion; this time, on this occasion; the last time, on a previous occasion, next day, five minutes later. five minutes earlier, meanwhile, all this time, by this time; up till that time, until then, next moment; at this point/moment; the previous moment, finally, at last, in the end, eventually.*

Perhaps, the most comprehensive attempt to categorize conjuncts in a systematical way is offered by Quirk et al [20] in A Comprehensive Grammar of English. They have defined conjuncts as a class of adverbials which speakers use to express '... his assessment of how he views the connection between two units'. In Quirk et al's typology, the class of adverbials consists not only of conjuncts but also of adjuncts and disjuncts as well. Conjuncts and disjuncts are distinguished from adjuncts in that the former are peripheral to clause structure, while the latter are integrated into the clause structure. On the other hand, conjuncts differ from disjuncts in that conjuncts mainly serve to connect the host utterance to the preceding discourse, while disjuncts, roughly speaking, convey some sort of comment on either the content or the character of their host utterance. Thus, according to Quirk et al's taxonomy, conjuncts are divided into seven major categories, including listing, summative, appositive, resultative, inferential, and contrastive and transition.

While Quirk et al`s classification of conjuncts seems to be quite adequate, we could not afford to neglect another systematic discussion on conjuncts provided by Biber et al [2]. In their millennium-significant work Grammar of Spoken and Written English, Biber et al have discussed adverbial conjuncts under the head of `linking adverbials`, and disjuncts under the term of 'stance adverbials'. According to these linguists, the primary function of linking adverbials is to state the writer's perception of the relationship between two units of discourse, while stance adverbials mainly convey the attitude or assessment of the writer with respect to the proposition contained in the main clauses. This distinction, as they have pointed out, is often not clear-cut because there exists an overlap of these two types of adverbials. For instance, certain stance adverbials can also have a connective function, like linking adverbials. Also, Biber et al. have further divided linking adverbials and stance adverbials into subcategories, which is similar to Quirk et al`s framework.

However, what is utilized in our paper is not Biber et al`s classification but Quirk et al's, in part due to the fact that the former has based their discussion on the latter's.

2. Methodology

2.1 Corpus

This study is based on a self-built corpus which includes theses and dissertations of more than 0.4 million words. All the theses and dissertations written by senior English-majors were chosen from 20 different Chinese universities.

2.2 Instrument

The list of adverbial conjuncts was drawn from Quirk et al [20]. The items in the list were individually searched in the corpus.

The software AntConc was applied to to investigate the corpus data. After identifying the frequency of occurrence of each conjunct in the corpus, we used raw frequencies and percentages to analyze the findings.

2.3 Procedure

Firstly, the writers make the research design by applying a corpus-based analysis. Secondly, in the data collection part, the writers collect theses and dissertations of senior English majors from 20 universities in China, and make a self-built corpus of about 0.4 million words, all in 200 txt files, each with about 2000 words . Thirdly, by utilizing the software AntConc, the writers search the frequencies of each adverbial conjunct in the corpus. Lastly, through analyzing the results, the writers answered the questions proposed earlier.

2.4 Data analysis

First of all, all the frequencies of each category will be listed table by table, in which a percentage and a total frequency will also be included. Then, to illustrate the preferences of using some specific adverbial conjuncts for Chinese English-majors and the overuse, underuse, and misuse of some of them in China English, examples will be given will be given in details. Finally, some conclusions will be drawn and suggestions will be given to Chinese English-majors to guide their academic writings in English. However, before we making analysis of the results, the following points concerning the study of adverbial conjuncts should be stated in advance.

First, there are many cases in which the concordancing software identifies words as conjuncts, but which are actually of another type of adverbials, namely, adjuncts. For example, the word *first* occurred very frequently in the corpus, while in some cases, *first* was used as an adjunct instead of being a conjunct, e.g.:

[1] ... The central bank will *first* allow the yuan to wobble by up... (D-69.txt)

Second, some adverbial conjuncts reappeared in more than one categories, due to the fact of their multifunction. For instance, the conjunct *then* can mark the relationship of enumerative, reinforcing, and antithetic.

[2] He eventually became a law clerk, *then* a court reporter, and finally a novelist. (enumerative) (D-11.txt)

[3] ...you were too hard on yourself *then*, and you still are. (reinforcing) (D-138.txt)

[4] You promise to help me; *then* you let me down! (Quirk et al)

After the software provided the raw frequencies of of listed adverbial conjuncts, we had to differentiate the ones with multilfunction and exclude those not used as conjuncts to avoid ambiguity. After that, we conducted the following steps of analysis.

3. Results and discussion

We examined the occurrence frequency of each of the 173 conjuncts listed by Quirk et al in our self-built corpus and arranged them them in frequency order, as shown in the following tables from 1 to 7. In table 8, we listed the overall figures for each type of conjuncts to show Chinese English-majors` tendency of choosing conjuncts in their academic writing.

It can be seen from Table 1 that the top five listing adverbial conjuncts are *more*, *also*, *first*, *then*, and *second*, while many others haven`t been utilized at all, including *on top of it all*, *to top it all*, *to cap it all*, *by the same token*, *and for another (thing)*, *for a start*, *last of all*, *second of all*, *three*, and *to start with*. In terms of subclassification, those English-majors choose additive conjuncts more frequently than enumerative conjuncts, and most students favor reinforcing over equative.

Table 1: Occurrence frequency of listing adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Listing			
1. Enumerative	first	533	11.48%
	then	300	6.46%
	second	187	4.02%
	finally	124	2.67%
	third	93	2%
	on the other hand	63	1.36%
	secondly	54	1.16%
	firstly	48	1.03%
	first of all	38	0.82%
	on the one hand	37	0.8%
	one	32	0.69%
	thirdly	18	0.39%
	next	10	0.22%
	in the first place	8	0.17%
	for one thing	6	0.13%
	lastly	3	0.06%
	in the second place	1	0.02%
	to conclude	1	0.02%
	to begin with	1	0.02%
	two	1	0.02%
	and for another (thing)	0	0.00%
	for a start	0	0.00%
	last of all	0	0.00%
	second of all	0	0.00%
	three	0	0.00%
	to start with	0	0.00%
Total Enumerative		1558	33.56%
2. Additive			
2.1 Equative	similarly	12	0.26%
	equally	12	0.26%
	likewise	5	0.11%
	correspondingly (formal)	1	0.02%
	in the same way	1	0.02%
	by the same token	0	0.00%
2.2 Reinforcing			
	more	1240	26.71%
	also	1219	26.26%
	in addition	132	2.84%
	too	129	2.78%
	further	109	2.35%
	again (formal)	64	1.38%

		frequency	percentage
	besides	60	1.29%
	moreover	45	0.97%
	then	20	0.43%
	furthermore	13	0.28%
	what is more	10	0.22%
	in particular	8	0.17%
	above all	4	0.09%
	on top of it all	0	0.00%
	to top it all	0	0.00%
	to cap it all	0	0.00%
Total Additive		3084	66.44%
Total Listing		4642	100%

Table 2: Occurrence frequency of summative adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Summative	therefore	502	68.11%
	thus	170	23.07%
	overall	30	4.07%
	to sum up	17	2.31%
	in conclusion	7	0.95%
	to conclude	6	0.81%
	(all) in all	5	0.68%
	altogether	0	0.00%
	in sum	0	0.00%
	then	0	0.00%
Total Summative		737	100%

Most of the conjuncts of this kind are not as frequently chosen. Table 2 shows that *therefore* is the most frequently chosen conjuncts, but with only 502 times used. It can be concluded that when writing dissertations or theses, Chinese English majors opt not to choose too many summative conjuncts.

Table 3: Occurrence frequency of appositive adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Appositive	for example	467	44.27%
	thus	170	16.11%
	especially	151	14.31%
	that is	112	10.62%
	for instance	46	4.36%
	in other words	40	3.79%
	namely	37	3.51%
	that is to say	32	3.03%
Total Appositive		1055	100%

Table 3 shows a moderate utilization of appositive conjuncts for Chinese English majors, in which all the appositive conjuncts are selected and there is no much difference in the occurrence frequency except for *for example* taking up 44.27 percent.

Table 4: Occurrence frequency of resultative adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Resultative	so	1085	54.06%
	therefore	502	25.01%
	thus	170	8.47%
	now	101	5.03%
	as a result	60	2.99%
	of course	28	1.40%
	hence	21	1.05%
	accordingly	18	0.89%
	consequently	16	0.79%
	as a consequence	4	0.20%
	in consequence	2	0.11%
Total Resultative		2007	100%

For resultative adverbial conjuncts, *so* takes up 54.06 percent, more than half, with 1085 times in all 2007 times appearing of resultative conjuncts, which may show the overuse of some conjuncts for Chinese English major.

Table 5: Occurrence frequency of inferential adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Inferential	in other words	40	45.45%
	otherwise	31	35.23%
	else	17	19.32%
	in that case	0	0.00%
	then	0	0.00%
Total Inferential		88	100%

As the least frequently-chosen conjunct, inferential adverbial conjuncts indicate a conclusion based on logic and supposition (Quirk et al). *Then* appear frequently in the listing category, it has been utilized as a inferential conjunct even once, in spite of the overlapping of functions of summative and listing.

Table 6: Occurrence frequency of contrastive adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Contrastive			
1. Reformulatory	better	212	6.93%
	rather	96	3.14%
	in other words	40	1.31%
	more accurately	3	0.09%
	alias	0	0.00%
	alternatively	0	0.00%
	more precisely	0	0.00%
Total Reformulatory		351	11.47%
2. Replacive	better	212	6.93%
	rather	96	3.14%
	again	64	2.09%
	on the other hand	63	2.06%
	worse	12	0.39%
	alternatively	0	0.00%
Total Replacive		447	14.61%
3. Antithetic	then	320	10.46%
	instead	104	3.40%
	on the one hand	37	1.21%
	on the contrary	31	1.01%
	in contrast	20	0.65%
	on the other hand	6	0.19%
	conversely	4	0.14%
	by contrast	2	0.07%
	in comparison	1	0.03%
	by comparison	0	0.00%
	by way of comparison	0	0.00%
	by way of contrast	0	0.00%
	contrariwise	0	0.00%
	oppositely	0	0.00%
Total Antithetic		525	17.16%
4. Concessive	only	730	23.86%
	however	398	13.01%
	still	173	5.66%
	at the same time	144	4.71%
	though	69	2.26%
	on the other hand	63	2.06%
	besides	60	1.96%
	of course	28	0.92%
	yet	19	0.62%
	else	17	0.56%
	nevertheless	15	0.49%
	after all	9	0.29%

	in any case	5	0.16%
	anyway	3	0.10%
	admittedly	1	0.03%
	in any event	1	0.03%
	that said	1	0.03%
	all the same	0	0.00%
	anyhow	0	0.00%
	at all events	0	0.00%
	at any rate	0	0.00%
	for all that	0	0.00%
	in spite of it all	0	0.00%
	in spite of that	0	0.00%
	nonetheless	0	0.00%
	notwithstanding	0	0.00%
	still and all	0	0.00%
Total Concessive		1736	56.75%
Total Contrastive		3059	100%

Contrastive conjuncts falls into four subclassifications, *better*, *rather* and *on the other hand* possess functions more than one, but we are not going to differentiate their functions as all of them belong to contrastive. *Only* is the most frequently-used one in this category.

Table 7: Occurrence frequency of transitional adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	Adverbial Conjuncts	frequency	percentage
Transitional			
1.Discoursal	now	101	46.12%
	by the way	9	4.11%
	by the by	0	0.00%
	incidentally	0	0.00%
Total Discoursal		110	50.23%
2.Temporal	meanwhile	44	20.10%
	originally	35	15.98%
	eventually	21	9.59%
	in the meanwhile	4	1.83%
	subsequently	4	1.83%
	meantime	1	0.44%
	in the meantime	0	0.00%
Total Temporal		109	49.77%
Total Transitional		219	100%

Transitional conjuncts serve to shift attention to another topic or to a temporally related event, which consists of discoursal conjuncts and temporal conjuncts. Table 7 shows that they are not favored by Chinese English majors because they are utilized 219 times in the corpus.

Table 8: Occurrence frequency of seven types of adverbial conjuncts chosen by Chinese English-majors in their theses and dissertations

Category	frequency	percentage
Listing	4642	39.31%
Contrastive	3059	25.90%
Resultative	2007	16.99%
Appositive	1055	8.94%
Summative	737	6.24%
Transitional	219	1.85%
Inferential	88	0.77%
Total	11807	100%

Table 8 shows the overall occurrence frequency of all seven types of adverbial conjuncts in the corpus, from which the tendency of utilizing adverbial conjuncts can be clearly noticed. Listing conjuncts are the most frequently used category, while transitional and inferential adjuncts are the least frequently used, taking up only 1.85 percent and 0.77 percent.

The occurrence frequency above will not only presents Chinese English Majors` preferences of choosing adverbial conjuncts in academic writing, it will also illustrates the underuse, overuse and misuse of some conjuncts.

Of all the conjuncts listed above, the top ten most frequently used ones are: *more, also, so, only, first, therefore, for example, however, then,* and *better,* and 35 haven`t been utilized at all, which are: *by the by, incidentally, in the meantime, all the same, anyhow, at all events, at any rate, for all that, in spite of it all, in spite of that, nonetheless, notwithstanding, still and all, by comparison, by way of comparison, by way of contrast, contrariwise, oppositely, alternatively, alias, alternatively, more precisely, in that case, altogether, in sum, on top of it all, to top it all, to cap it all, by the same token, and for another (thing), for a start, last of all, second of all, three,* and *to start with.*

Although *more* was the largest occurrence frequency, it might be underused as an adverbial conjunct. The fact that *more* was the most frequently used one might be explained by the following reason that *more* can be used as a quantifier comparative of many, much, or in front of adjectives and adverbs to show comparative degree, like in the following examples:

Example 1: ...make the meaning *more* accurate... [D-32.txt]

Example 2: ...lexical chunks will have *more* advantages over the others... [D-62.txt]

While as as adverbial conjunct, *more* express the meaning of reinforcing which is usually formal and rarely used.

For summative conjuncts, *therefore* had the largest occurrence frequency, while in some dissertations and theses it was overused, which could have been avoided by utilizing similar substituent.

Some conjuncts were misused without given consideration to their hidden semantic constraints. Also some conjuncts frequently used in spoken genres were transferred to the genre of written English. According to the data, *actually*, which often appears in colloquial, were used very frequently in the academic writing, with about 84 times of occurrence.

4. Conclusion

From all the tables and analysis above, it is easy for us to answer the two questions raised in the introduction part.

It is safe to conclude that Chinese senior English-majors opt to choose listing conjuncts in their

dissertations and theses, which may be one of the features of Chinese English. The top 10 frequently used conjuncts include: *more, also, so, only, first, therefore, for example, however, then,* and *better.*

Examples can be given to illustrate that there are overuse, underuse and misuse of some conjuncts, which can be another feature of Chinese English.

Lack an understanding of different strategies of according to different registers may be one of the reasons why they overuse, underuse and misuse some conjuncts. What`s more, Chinese learners avoid using formal conjuncts like..., and overuse some colloquially marked ones such as *but, and, so.* This may be due to the factors that they lack a register awareness and they tend to transfer strategies common in spoken English into academic and written English.

All the findings above will give inspiration to teachers of academic writing to improve their teaching and students writing their dissertations and theses will also learn a lesson to improve their register awareness and avoid mistakes of overuse, underuse and misuse of adverbial conjuncts.

References

[1] Altenberg, B.& Tapper, M. (1998). The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. Learner English on Computer. Longman. pp. 80-93.

[2] Biber, D., &Finegan, E. (1988). Adverbial Stance Types in English. Discourse Process, 11, 11-34.

[3] Butler, C. (1990). Qualifications in Science: modal meaning and scientific text. The Writing Scholar: Studies in Academic Discourse. Newbury Park. CA: Sage

[4] Chafe, W. (1986). Evidentiality in English conversation and academic writing. Evidentiality: the lingistic coding of epistemology. Norwood, NJ: Ablex

[5] Crismore, A. (1990). Metadicourse in persuasive writing. Written communication, 8, 39-71

[6] Deng Fei. (2006). A Corpus-based Investigation of Adverbial Conjuncts, Journal of Mudanjiang University (4), 57-60.

[7] Dubois, B.(1988). Citation in Biomedical Journal Articles. English for Specific Purposes, 7, 181-94

[8] Granger, S.& Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and normative EFL speakers of English. World Englishes, 15 (1), 17-27.

[9] Greenbaum, S. & Quirk, R. (1990). A Student's Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.

[10] Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

[11] Hao-jan Howard Chen. (1998). Underuse, overuse, and misuse in Taiwanese EFL learner corpus. Paper presented at the international symposium on computer learner corpora, second language acquisition and foreign language teaching. Chinese University of Hong Kong.

[12] Hoye, L. (1997). Adverbs and Modality in English. London: Longman.

[13] Hyland, K. (1996). Writing without conviction: hedging in science research articles. Applied Linguistics, 17 (14). 433-54.

[14] Hyland, K. (1998). Academic attribution: Citation and the construction of disciplinary knowledge. Applied Linguistics, 20 (3), 341-67.

[15] Lei Lei. (2012). Linking adverbials in academic writing on applied linguistics by Chinese doctoral students. Journal of English for Academic Purposes, (11):267-275.

[16] Liu, Dilin. (2008). Linking adverbials an across-register corpus study and its implications. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics. London: John Benjamin's Publishing Company, 13 (4), 491-518.

[17] Liu Guobing. (2013). On the use of linking adverbials by Chinese college English learners. Journal of Language Teaching and Research.Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 149-155.

[18] Luo Yi. (2003). On the Use of Adverbial Conjuncts in Chinese learners` Academic Writing. Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages (1). 59-62.

[19] Markkanen, R. & Schroeder, H. (1997). Hedging and Discourse: Approaches to the Analysis of a Pragmatic Phenomenon in Academic Texts. Applied Linguistics, 10.

[20] Quirk, R. et al. (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of English. London: Longman.

[21] Thomas, S. & Haues, T.P. (1994). Reporting verbs in medical journal articles. English for Specific Purposes, 13 (2), 129-48.

[22] Pan Fan and Feng Yuejin. (2004). A Corpus-based Analysis of Connectors in Non-English Major Graduate Students` Writing. Modern Foreign Languages (2), 158-162.

[23] Yang Wei. (2010). A Corpus-based Analysis of Chinese Non-English Major College Students` Use of Linking Adverbials. Journal of Qiongzhou University (4), 153-157.