

**A Contrastive Rhetoric Study of Conjunct Use in Non-Native and  
Native English Academic Writing**

Soile Pietilä  
University of Tampere  
School of Modern Languages and Translation Studies  
English Philology  
MA Thesis (Pro Gradu)  
August 2007

Tampereen yliopisto  
Englantilainen filologia  
Kieli- ja käännöstieteiden laitos

PIETILÄ, SOILE: A Contrastive Rhetoric Study of Conjunct Use in Non-Native and Native English Academic Writing

Pro gradu –tutkielma, 67 sivua  
Syksy 2007

---

Tutkielmassa vertaillaan syntyperäisten ja ei-syntyperäisten englanninkielen puhujien kielenkäyttöä akateemisissa teksteissä. Tutkimus on soveltavan kielitieteen, tarkemmin sanoen sen alalajin kontrastiivisen retoriikan, tutkimus. Kontrastiivisuus tässä yhteydessä tarkoittaa, että vertailtavissa ilmiöissä keskitytään erilaisuuksiin, ei yhtäläisyyksiin.

Tutkimusmateriaalina on kansainvälisen politiikan artikkeleita syntyperäisiltä englanninpuhujilta sekä suomalaisilta kirjoittajilta. Tutkittavat artikkelit on julkaistu kansainvälisissä julkaisuissa tai suomenkielisen yliopiston politiikan tutkimuksen laitoksen omassa julkaisussa. Lähtökohtana on tarkastella eroavatko suomalaisten kirjoittajien tekstit retorisisilta tyylikeinoiltaan angloamerikkalaisten kirjoittajien teksteistä. Lisäksi tarkoituksena on selvittää eroavatko suomalaisten kirjoittajien tekstit englanninkielenkäytössään artikkeleiden julkaisu ympäristön ja oletetun lukijakunnan mukaan. Ennako-oletuksena on, että suomalaiset käyttävät erilaisia retorisia välineitä kuin syntyperäiset englanninpuhujat, ja että suomalaiset käyttävät enemmän suomenkielen vaikutuksesta johtuvia retorisia välineitä, kun he kirjoittavat suomenkieliselle yleisölle eivätkä kansainväliselle, englanninkieliselle lukijakunnalle.

Tutkimuksessa oletetaan, että on olemassa oma akateemisen diskurssin perinne, jolla on omat säädöksensä kielenkäytössä. Lisäksi kontrastiivinen retoriikka käsittää englannin olevan kansainvälisen akateemisen yhteisön hallitseva kieli, jonka retoriset tyylikeinot määrittelevät yhteisön kirjoittajien tyylin, vaikka he tulisivat muista kielitaustoista. Tutkimuksessa käsitellään myös sitä, miten erilaiset retoriset kaavat ja tyylierot kielessä vaikuttavat julkaisujen vastaanottoon ja vakuuttavuuteen.

Tutkimusaiheena on konjunktioiden käyttö akateemisessa kirjoituksessa. Konjunktioita käsitellään tutkimuksessa Halliday & Hasanin (1976) määritelmien mukaisesti. Konjunktioit toimivat tekstin osien ja argumenttien järjestäjänä sekä kirjoittajan oman kannan ja suhtautumisen osoittajana. Näin ollen konjunktioilla on valta vaikuttaa lukijan käsityksiin kyseessä olevasta aiheesta. Tutkimus toteutetaan selvittämällä jokaisesta artikkelista konjunktioiden kokonaismäärä sekä niiden sijoittuminen eri konjunktioiden alalajeihin. Näin pystytään vertailemaan kolmen eri tutkittavan ryhmän konjunktioiden määrällistä ja laadullista käyttöä.

Tutkielma osoittaa, että suomenkieliset kirjoittajat käyttävät akateemisessa ympäristössä erilaista kieltä kuin natiivit englanninpuhujat. Tulokset viittaavat myös siihen, että suomalaisten englanninkielenkäyttö on erilaista myös silloin, kun lukijakunnan odotetaan olevan suomalaista eikä englanninkielistä.

Avainsanat: kontrastiivinen retoriikka, konjunktio, natiivi ja nonnatiivi kielenkäyttö

**Table of Contents:**

1 Introduction.....1

2 Contrastive Rhetoric.....5

    2.1 Predecessors of Contrastive Rhetoric.....5

    2.2 Main Characteristics of Contrastive Rhetoric.....6

    2.3 What is ‘Good Text’.....6

    2.4 Example: Cultural Variation in Writing.....9

    2.5 Problems in Contrastive Rhetoric and the Study.....12

        2.5.1 Communicative Competence.....15

        2.5.2 Speech Community and Discourse Community.....17

3 The Study: Material and Methods.....20

    3.1 Analysis Principles.....23

    3.2 Points to Note.....24

4 Cohesion and Conjunction.....28

    4.1 Cohesion.....28

    4.2 Conjunction.....31

    4.3 Text Reflexivity.....37

        4.3.1 Text Reflexivity and the Rhetorical Role of Conjuncts.....40

        4.3.2 Example: Native Attitudes to Non-Native Writing.....44

5 The Study: Results.....49

    5.1 Summary of Results.....55

    5.2 Points to Note.....57

6 Conclusion.....61

Bibliography.....65

## **1. Introduction**

This study is a contrastive study of articles written by native and non-native speakers of English. I will examine rhetorical differences in the construction of different articles in the field of international relations. I plan to show that rhetorical variation typical of a cultural group does exist. The overarching argument in this study is that different rhetorical styles may affect the reception and credibility of a text as such within the English-speaking audience that is often considered dominant in the scientific dialogue; thus its rhetorical patterns are considered normative in contrastive rhetoric and that leaves other rhetorical variations vulnerable and subject for strict judgement. My aim will be to indicate just how these difficulties in and even breakdowns of communication could be overcome. The tools include changes in the attitudinal climate together with starting from the grassroots level of learning language.

I shall discuss my data within the framework of contrastive rhetoric (CR). It is a field of study in applied linguistics. Applied linguistics is concerned with real-world questions viewing language as its main subject. Applied linguistics is much engaged in generalising and theorising about its object of study although it derives from real, actual problems. In order to achieve increasingly adequate descriptions and explanations there are attempts to go beyond linguistics and draw on neighbouring disciplines. There is also a growing demand for social accountability. Contrastive rhetoric carries many of the features of applied linguistics, and by revealing tendencies in the language use of different cultural groups I wish to present some points of view on how CR could participate in solving problems that occur in using a foreign language in cross-cultural discourse. In this context, I find it appropriate also to distinguish between comparative and contrastive study. The former is engaged in observing similarities and differences in phenomena, while the latter concentrates on differences. When referring to non-native speakers of English, I mean those who use English as a foreign or second language, L2, and at points use the terms interchangeably. In Finland, for instance, the situation is such that although English is not officially taught as L2, it has gained a

position of wide recognition in many areas of everyday life. Actually, its use has become almost inescapable due to an amount of historical and societal facts in intercultural contacts.

The articles examined in this study are all from the field of international relations. In my view, they are noteworthy examples of texts with potential to affect people's opinions in important, widely present issues. The overall rhetorical purpose of academic discourse is to convince the readers that the author is making a valid claim. In other words, writers try to persuade their audience, usually the academic community, to accept their point and perhaps, to agree with it, this happening regardless of whether the point is presented as an argument or a fact. The fact of rhetorical variation deriving from one's cultural background is also a factor affecting the attitudes towards a text. My concern is how second and foreign language writers manage to make themselves heard and get their texts published in international journals and periodicals, which most often have native English speaking editors and reviewers. I will look at articles published in journals of international relations, and additionally I will study articles published in other forums than international journals and periodicals, namely working papers of a university department. The contrastive study takes account of articles written by native speakers of English from Britain and North America and articles written by speakers of Finnish who use English as a foreign language. The articles released outside the setting of international publications are all by Finnish writers, who are either more experienced researchers writing in a forum different from their international, scientific context, or novice writers potentially seeking acknowledgement of a larger, international and multicultural audience only at a later point in their academic careers. I will concentrate on the differences in the texts by native speakers and L2 speakers and, what is more, I will contrast the L2 texts of different publishing environments to see if the texts differ according to the media or expected readership of the writings. My aim is to examine through a textlinguistic frame of reference whether there are distinguishable rhetorical features by Finnish writers that are different from those of native users of English. I will also introduce some means of describing expectations

and norms as well as overcoming problems and hindrances that rhetorical variation may trigger. Much of this has to do with greater awareness of successful communication in language use.

The study is not a mere textlinguistic study, which is concerned with what generates a text into text in general. Textlinguistic principles that are taken into account are aspects of cohesion, or common text patterns, as reflecting possible text strategies. Likewise, this is not a study carrying a communicative approach either, although it would undeniably be an interesting tool with which to look into the subject, since now the study does not view the articles only as a media of persuading or convincing and how they succeed in the aim, but the study builds on the notion of clarity and comprehensibility of messages in communication and also touches upon the question who exactly judges the clarity and readability of a message. Therefore, the study is textual, rhetorical, and contrastive. As a textual study, textlinguistic variables, namely those of cohesion, are taken into focus, and the research methods are textual, rising from the text itself. As a rhetorical study, it observes the choices of textual variables in the text as means of persuasive communication. The questions leading the research are posed from the rhetoric point of view in finding out what is the effect or intended effect of a particular choice. Inescapable as it is, being an L2 study, unintended effects bring an additional side-flavour to the messages. Finally, as a contrastive study, the material is taken from two different writing cultures with two language backgrounds. In my study, I will work on the data on the basis of some previous, even renowned studies in CR and the principles they address (Mauranen 1993b, Yli-Jokipii 1996, Tirkkonen-Condit 1996). Later on in chapter 3, I will introduce a thorough description of the methods and theory as well as a wider frame of reference I employ in the course of the study.

In her study on writing and identity, Roz Ivanic presents an intriguing argument, which I find adequate for my work as well (Ivanic 1998, 32): “Writing is an act of identity in which people align themselves with socio-culturally shaped possibilities for self-hood, playing their part in reproducing or challenging dominant practices and discourses, and the values, beliefs and interests which they

embody.” To my experience, this is what people come across in academic writing, when they need to conform to the norms and expectations of their field and the register of academic environment. In my study, I wish to demonstrate that this is the case even more so when people are writing in a foreign language, whose code is not as familiar to them as that of their native tongue’s.

## **2. Contrastive Rhetoric**

This chapter discusses the notion of contrastive rhetoric and how it is used in language research combining both linguistic and cultural features. First, predecessors of CR are mentioned and then the main characteristics of CR as we recognize it today are presented. Finally, some examples of cultural variation in texts are given to show how CR has been employed in linguistic work.

The modern function of contrastive rhetoric is to investigate cultural differences in writing patterns. Robert Kaplan (1966) was the pioneer to first draw attention to such differences. Later, his work has motivated many other linguists interested in sorting out typical differences between writing cultures. Nowadays the studies show a varied set of descriptive frameworks and different kinds and levels of writing investigated, resulting in a variety of aspects of texts. Much of the research has been directed towards pedagogical considerations. Contrastive rhetoric has the potential of revealing more about the phenomena behind language, and thus facilitating interaction between different cultures.

### **2.1 Predecessors of Contrastive Rhetoric**

Ulla Connor (1996, 13-14) has distinguished some fields of study preceding contrastive rhetoric. Everything originated from an effort to improve language pedagogy at a time when interference from L1 was considered the biggest problem in L2 acquisition. First there was a) contrastive analysis which studies mistakes made by L2 learners caused by L1; then came b) error analysis which aims at systematically describing errors in the performance of L2 learners, and it evolved into c) the study of 'interlanguage' which is a system of discourse distinct from both the native and the target language. Later, with psycholinguistic orientation, the demand for interdisciplinary studies came into existence and the combination of both theoretical perspectives and practical methodology was much sought after, and this finally resulted in a study close to CR as we know it.



## **2.2 Main Characteristics of Contrastive Rhetoric**

Here I find it necessary to make a distinction between contrastive linguistics (CL) and translation science. Vehmas-Lehto explains that they both study communication in two or more languages.

One of the fundamental differences between the two has been the concept of equivalence. As to the equivalence of the translation and the source text, translation science has not settled for linguistic correspondence but various other factors connected with both linguistic and extralinguistic context have also been taken into account (Vehmas-Lehto 1987, 63). Contrastive linguistics has also developed in the same direction: the narrowness of linguistic thinking has given way to the study of language as a means of human interaction and CL has much turned from linguistic to communicative competence, and consequently to pragmatics and textlinguistics. Nowadays there are increasingly many attempts to make use of the results in CL study in the field of translation science.

The term contrastive rhetoric refers to a comparison of the writing conventions of various languages and cultures, and this is often linked with research on how they differ from the perceived norm of writing in American or British English, for typically in CR Anglo-American English patterns are considered as the norm. This is also why I concentrate on other languages' relationship towards the English language. Often there are considered to be two ways of dealing with distinctive features found through contrastive study, those being either acquiring the existing, approved norms of native English speakers or striving to maintain the diversity of varied patterns of discourse (e.g. Cmejrková 1996, 138).

## **2.3 What Is 'Good Text'?**

CR is concerned with what makes a good text, which is in fact a matter of internalised values resulting from the socialisation process in one's own society. Thus it can be stated that there is no such thing as a 'good text' outside a cultural context. Yet most discourses about texts and writers

are based on notions of good texts and writers as generally accepted as 'good'. CR views writing as a cultural process which results in different kinds of texts in different cultural contexts. As for rhetorical variation, Mauranen (1993a, 5) has noted that some features can also be expected to be due to disciplinary cultures and not just national cultures. There are some fixed features required of, for example, a poem or an economics text. In addition, "culture-driven text features, again, tend to hold across disciplines and genres but be typical of a national culture" (Mauranen 1993a, 5).

Norman Fairclough has studied the notion of 'appropriateness' in language use. The very concept appears of value when associated with studies in CR. Fairclough, however, examines it in view of critical language awareness (CLA), an orientation to language and language use with notice on their societal value and effect. In the following, some mutual features of CR and CLA are introduced with the help of Fairclough's discussion.

Fairclough(1992b, 48) suggests appropriateness models in sociolinguistics or in educational policy documents be seen as ideologies, that is as ways of projecting imaginary representations of sociolinguistic reality serving the dominant section of society or of a social institution. By dominance he means "not the elimination of all but one practice, but the relative marginalisation of non-dominant practices, or the incorporation of non-dominant practices into dominant ones" (Fairclough 1992b, 49). Fairclough strongly emphasizes how these 'doctrines of correctness' and theories carry a double role in society. First, they help to naturalise hegemonic practices, and secondly, they incorporate political projects of groups who aspire to hegemony in the domain of language (Fairclough 1992b, 51). Fairclough leaves it unmentioned what such groups could be, but in this contrastive rhetoric study it is possible to view the academic community and its linguistic traditions of treating (Anglo-American patterns of) English as the norm as a factor empowering native speakers of English to be one such group. The hegemonic groups offer a simplified view of a multifaceted reality, a misrepresentation of sociolinguistic realities. In the international academic world, there is a frequent fear that many minor groups of users of the English language are pushed

aside due to their peripheral nature. This has been proved in many multicultural studies on writers (e.g. Mauranen 1996, Flowerdew 2001). However unaspired, sometimes even a most blatant case of discrimination or marginalization has to do with plain unawareness and intuition. Fairclough sees that even though not all members of a speech community succeed in or admit to acting in accordance with shared ideas of appropriateness, 'it is a natural enough aspiration and project on the part of those trying to impose (their) order upon a society or a social institution' (Fairclough 1992b, 51). It is only normal that the academic discourse community needs common rules to play by, that is shared linguistic tools with which to observe the worldly phenomena. In contrastive rhetoric studies it is contested that the common linguistic tools often mean imposition by certain language groups, leaving others undervalued. CR strives to discover the essence of phenomena that are the cause for dispute among different groups.

Fairclough (1992b, 53) insists that appropriateness models inhibit a critical understanding as well as critical language practice by foregrounding normativity and training in appropriate behaviour and expression. In CR, however, it is not agreed whether there even is a clearly identifiable, unproblematic norm of writing in a language to follow. In accord with CR studies, Fairclough wants to encourage learners' own linguistic practices towards other possibilities than those offered by appropriate usage. Fairclough (1992b, 54) states that learners themselves have the option whether to maintain or challenge the prevailing sociolinguistic order through their own language use. He adds that they nevertheless need to be informed of the possible judgement they may encounter. It is argued here that contrastive rhetoric as well as critical language awareness do embrace a societal approach with the capability to offer learners the means and understanding that act as preconditions for meaningful choice and effective citizenship in the domain of language.

I point to the essence of contrastive rhetoric and its implication of proper language use in text analysis with the help of some example studies. They deal with cultural variation in writing, and they comprise examining business writing in Finnish, British and American cultures, and

argumentation in newspaper editorials in the same cultures. The examples are mentioned here in order to suggest the kinds of phenomena CR observes and investigates, and to lay a basis for my own study and the sort of findings that are expected to be encountered in it. On the whole, the results of the respective studies by Yli-Jokipii (1996) and Tirkkonen-Condit (1996) have a close connection with what was also found in the present study, looking at academic writing in Finnish, British and North American cultures and in two languages, Finnish and English. Only researchers are able to provide some deeper background and more far-reaching theories on the phenomena encountered which their larger data and different methods of research altogether make possible. That is why they are accentuated here in the connection of the study.

#### **2.4 Example: Cultural Variation in Writing**

Yli-Jokipii (1996) has observed business writing in three cultures, Finnish, British and American, and in two languages, Finnish and English. In the study, notable findings on power roles and social distance were made. Finnish writers do not always exercise the social power which belongs to them at some stages of the business deal. They even employ linguistic items that reduce power from the writer and seem to remove power from themselves to the other party. The Finnish business writer does not challenge the reader by using, for instance, the imperative form (Yli-Jokipii 1996, 319). This can all be seen as a sign of the writer's aspiration to help the other maintain face. Bülow-Moller (1989) discusses this in her overview of key (or tone) of interaction, pointing out that a speaker with real power in the communication situation can also choose not to employ the powerful features on the hearer, thus making the arguments more appealing by feigning that the speaker is on the same level and has the same possibilities to influence the communicative situation as the hearer in order to save the hearer's face (Bülow-Moller 1989, 113). The Finnish writer is also seen as avoiding referring to himself or herself as an individual and instead identifies with the company. Same type of conclusions were arrived at in the present study, since the study results show that

Finnish writers altogether use less persuasive and interpersonal elements such as conjuncts in their texts. The type of cohesion is usually perceived as including meanings by and attitudes of the writer. Likewise, the phenomenon of de-personalizing oneself in a text links with powerful language use and the notion of tone of interaction as suggested by Bülow-Møller (1989). In my study I will be referring to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) conceptions on conjunctive relations. They say among other things that conjunctive relations represent the generalized types of connection that people recognize holding between sentences, referring more specifically to the speaker's communication role (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 232). It, on its part, comprises the meaning that the speaker assigns to him- or herself in the communicative situation. It is this communicative role that the Finnish speakers deny themselves as regards conjunct use. On the whole, it is Yli-Jokipii's contention that the shared values of a society are rooted in linguistic choices and that is how these choices can reveal us more about the wider interpersonal attitudes of the native users of a language (Yli-Jokipii 1996, 325). It has been suggested that references to 'the silent', 'reserved' or 'shy Finn' would be replaced by 'the non-intrusive Finn' or 'the deferential Finn'.

Tirkkonen-Condit (1996) has studied argumentation in American, British and Finnish newspaper editorials. In the study, suggestions are made for what lies in the background of cultural variation in writing (and allegedly general behaviour) typical to Finns. Tirkkonen-Condit (1996, 258-259) states that the first reason for why Finns can be described as relatively poor in argumentation skills is that essay writing in Finnish schools is focused rather on expository writing and richness of facts instead of taking a stand or arguing for a viewpoint. Secondly, Finnish culture has been seen as a communication-reticent culture, in which silence is valued and expression of disagreement is felt to be somewhat face-threatening. Finnish culture is also said to carry a tendency towards context dependence, which in written discourse implies that the writer expects the readers to recognize the writer's status so well that there is no need for explicit argumentation in order to believe what the writer has to say. Most interestingly, Tirkkonen-Condit (1996, 259) argues that Finnish society

manifests a widespread consensus in party politics and industrial relations. There should be no difficulty in applying these research results to a wide range of areas of life, such as academic writing. All these factors make it seem plausible that Finnish argumentation and request styles and practices differ from those of the Anglo-Americans.

This actually seems to be the case, judging from the results of the study at hand. The smaller amount of conjuncts used in the texts by Finnish writers and a narrower setting in which they were employed in comparison to the Anglo-American texts suggest that the Finnish care not organize the text more expressly than the developing of the text already naturally implies. Or, rather, they do not feel the need to articulate the organization and development in so many words, since the structure is already in the text as it is, as a result of what has gone before and will be presented next. Also, the interpersonal intrusion in expressions is kept to the minimum at least in their conjunct use. For it is also said that the use of conjuncts does not really add anything to the text itself, it is considered as a nice extra feature but not necessary for the text as a whole (here, see e.g. section 4.3.1 and the study on non-native writing and native revising by Ventola and Mauranen).

However, it must be highlighted that variation also occurs, in addition to highly different cultures, in cultures which have frequently been in contact with each other and whose languages and cultures are seemingly rather similar (Mauranen 1993a, 17-18). Writers with different cultural backgrounds reflect, for instance, varying assumptions of shared knowledge and different notions of politeness. Researchers have suggested this in connection with the British and American cultures, where the Americans pursue a reader perspective more closely and the British tend to employ primarily negative politeness strategies (e.g. Yli-Jokipii 1996). What is more, however extensive a study and its data, it is not possible to escape the point of personal variation in style of writing either. In this study I will argue that the communicative situation generally affects the text production when a Finn writes in different textual environments and to a different audience. The results of my three-way study show that when a Finnish researcher writes for an audience closer to

the international discourse community, s/he employs somewhat different argumentative tools than when writing to an audience presumably coming from a Finnish background.

### **2.5 Problems in Contrastive Rhetoric and the Study**

Here I will discuss some problems regarding contrastive rhetoric in general and the study at hand in particular. A big problem in the field of contrastive rhetoric results from the fact that the texts studied tend to be long, for shorter texts are less likely to have all the characteristics of written discourse, and examining rather long segments, even whole books, is also relatively slow (Kaplan 1987, 18-19). Plenty of research has concentrated on a certain part of the text, e.g. abstracts or conclusions of articles. I myself will be looking at the articles as a whole in order to find out more about regularities in the texts, and this difficulty of handling the text structure as whole and complete in my analysis has not escaped me either. Another problem according to Kaplan (1987, 18-19) lies in the absence of a definition of text types. It is, for example, not profitable to compare expository with narrative texts or to compare narrowly field-defined texts with more broadly speculative texts. This is the major argument for why I concentrate on articles in a more specified field of international relations.

Again, Connor (1996, 15) has pointed out that CR has not developed a large enough body of ESL (i.e. English as a second language) data to be able to compare stages of acquisition of linguistic and rhetoric patterns. Instead, researchers in CR have employed a number of different analyses and a unified methodology has not been developed, which can be said to be somewhat typical of ELT (i.e. English language teaching) and applied language studies. An analytic model should namely at least include the semantic network, the grammatical and rhetorical structures, the question of audience and even the propositional structure (Kaplan 1987, 18-19). Also, it is often left undefined whether there is a clearly identifiable, unproblematic norm of writing in English (or in any other language, for that matter) to follow. According to Kachru (1995, 24), among other researchers, most

studies in CR are based on style manuals or textbooks in rhetoric for characterising English patterns instead of examining actual English writing. Kachru continues that most methodologies in language research are said to be essentially based on a Western rhetorical tradition and it can be inferred that the methodologies used are influenced by researchers' positionalities which as such are complex and incomplete. For instance, Indian English is the second largest variety of English used in today's world. In other words, one could easily assume that "writing in other languages is compared with some idealized notion of English" (Kachru 1995, 25). Text patterning has to do with cultural adaptation to certain rhetorical and structurizing means. For example, Ulla Connor and Robert Kaplan (e.g. *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text* 1987) have conducted a lot of research on cultural patterning of text, and they have suggested different patterns typical of different cultural and language-entities. It is, however, obvious that much more research work needs to be done on this. The fact that there is, however, often thought to be a norm of writing to conform to surely influences the attitudes towards a text. The question arises as to who produces the text and who processes it in the end: their age, gender, culture -whether they belong to a minority or the majority- rapidly become at issue.

Anna Mauranen has done a large amount of pioneer research on rhetorical differences between Finnish writing in English as their L2 and the native language users of English. It is her work that has inspired me as a researcher in scanning for phenomena worth observing and in presenting the research questions. Consequently, many problems rising from the subject in some of her work and in the present study coincide. In Mauranen's (1993b, 48) study on cultural differences in academic rhetoric, she lists the basic problems she was to face when beginning with her research. She states that the Anglo-American culture is not a homogeneous unit such as the Finnish culture is. The national backgrounds are much more diverse than is the case in Finland, and thus require a greater amount of abstraction and simplifying in order to be able to treat them as a unit for study purposes such as the current study. For instance, I define the cultural division in the data to include Finnish,



British and North American writers, for one of the writers is originally from Canada. It is not taken into consideration here what the Canadian effect on the text production is like. As a result, I speak of the Anglo-American variety of writing. Then again, the purpose of a contrastive study is to observe differences that arise from different cultures by definition. Furthermore, the main focus is on the products of the cultures, developing in different writing situations, and not on the cultural influence on language in general.

Another problem for Mauranen is that the notion of a native speaker is also less clear as an Anglo-American notion than in the Finnish setting. In Flowerdew's 2001 study on attitudes of journal editors to non-native speaker contributions, again, one point under discussion is the very concept of a non-native speaker. As a whole, native speakers of English have a wider range of norms and perceptions with which they refer to their first language. What is more, the native status of all writers of every text cannot be established with corresponding certainty as in the Finnish setting. In the present study, problems arise from the fact that it is difficult to ascertain that the Finnish writers have not gained experience in and adapted the Anglo-American academic rhetoric for instance through a position in a university in an English-speaking country etc. This would most probably echo in their use of academic rhetoric when writing in an environment other than an English-speaking setting. Because it is my hypotheses here that if academic writers really are sensitive to different rhetorical expectations of the target audiences, and simultaneously capable of absorbing different rhetorical models acquired in reading and using them in their writing, Finns would be expected to employ more Finnish rhetorical patterns and expressions when writing to a Finnish-speaking audience. From this follows that some rhetorical strategies might also be expected to be more Anglo-American when the writings are to face an international, English-speaking audience. One's experience in an English writing culture could lead to misrepresenting results in the third group of writers in the data, that is Finns writing in English for an audience with presumably native Finnish background. Further problems regarding this study include the fact that the amount

of data is relatively small, and can thus present only some preliminary conjectures of the types of results a larger amount of data together with wider study principles and phenomena would provide.

All this contributes to the learning and teaching of language, which should take into account the study of literacy, language policy questions, information management etc. As Robert Kaplan (1987, 20) puts it, if one of the objectives of literacy is to teach people to write, then it is logical to ask “to write what, for whom and to what end”. In the next chapter I will first introduce the notion of communicative competence and continue to discuss the realization of speech and discourse communities, where Kaplan’s suggestion is tested in real communication situations.

### **2.5.1 Communicative Competence**

Communicative competence and performance can be said to be one of the major themes in contrastive rhetoric today. Sajavaara has described learning of a foreign language as extending the competence into another code reality; it becomes a question of what needs to be added to or altered in the communicative competence of one’s mother tongue in order to operate in a foreign language (Sajavaara 1977, 73). This is not merely a linguistic or grammatical problem but it is recognized from the contrastive point of view that producing, receiving and interpreting messages requires various skills from a person. At least the following types of fields of study for this can be listed: First, linguistic research (phonetics, syntax, semantics, lexicon, text), second, psycholinguistic research (how the speaker/writer, listener/reader and other participants view discourse), third, social psychological research (the roles of the participants), and fourth, sociolinguistic research (norms). It can be stated that also in cross-cultural communication the focus in learning or acquiring a language is increasingly shifting to the individual, for it is nowadays justly emphasized that communication always takes place between two or more more or less heterogeneous persons. There has been a growing trend to study language understanding and text comprehension as aspects of human cognition. In Shirley Ostler’s (1987, 178) words on features of cultural variation, rhetorical

arrangement is the feature that is most difficult to change, because it is the one of which language learners are hardly aware. Rhetorical skills are rarely taught in language classes, and this results in reproducing the only patterns the students are familiar with, i.e. the ones closest to their native writing. In the present study, academic discourse is handled as a specific genre, with its own norms and regularities in language use between participants in the discourse. As Mauranen (1993b, 25) puts it in her study on cultural variation in academic rhetoric: “It seems, then, that academic discourse is bound to rhetoric by its social nature as well as its nature as an instrument of thought”. With a social aspect to it, academic discourse is concerned with many people’s and institutions’ interests, together with the general interest of humankind in gaining new knowledge through effective interaction. Multiple representations of the same reality are possible for people as individuals, and it is this individual consciousness together with social consciousness that motivates the need to negotiate a common system of perceiving the world in language. All this together with increase in language variation presents a series of new challenges to language use, only a few of which will be discussed in this study.

In one of her several studies in the field of applied linguistics and contrastive rhetoric, Mauranen discusses the concept of discourse competence in the light of academic journal articles by native and non-native writers of English and native-language writers of Finnish (Mauranen 1996). She repeats the proposition of contrastive rhetoric, how the very core of knowing a language is commonly taken to manifest itself in knowing its vocabulary and syntax. It has also been the recognized aim of language teaching to produce communication flawless in vocabulary and grammar. Thus, whatever is in the written text above the sentence level is easily viewed to be more universally shared across (users of) languages, and additionally a more direct suggestion of the writer’s ability to construct larger units of meaning and to think (Mauranen 1996, 195-196). In her study, Mauranen wants to demystify the notion of discourse construction ability and show its relation to language-specific skills. As she puts it, “The ‘logical’ progression of a text is therefore

not a straightforward reflection of a writer's ability of thinking clearly, but a product of culture and the textual resources of a language" (1996, 195). With an increasing amount of language teaching and testing material mentioning 'discourse competence' or 'discourse proficiency' as a source of concern, Mauranen urges the future language teaching to begin taking the phenomenon more seriously in the light of new research being done. She mentions that although the term 'discourse' appears rather early in communicative models of language competence, it is hardly ever associated with connectedness of discourse and situational appropriateness simultaneously (Mauranen 1996, 197). In fact, there have been claims that conventions for organizing discourse cannot be fully understood or taught due to their complex nature.

Mauranen (1996, 226) also alludes that the use of a foreign language imposes an 'extra processing load' on the writers, which then causes problems of text management not encountered in their L1. Furthermore, throughout her study the effect foreign language teaching principles have had in the results are clearly emphasized (Mauranen 1996, 226). They undeniably have a tradition of focusing on the individual sentence or utterance, in spite of the more communicative goals referred to on occasion. The very nature of discourse competence is completed with specific text-construction skills in addition to culture-specific text strategies. The notion of awareness in non-familiar strategies of text construction is linked up with change of attitude and expectations from the part of native speakers. The differences do not necessarily result from 'faulty thinking' or incompetent argumentation (Mauranen 1996, 227).

### **2.5.2 Speech Community and Discourse Community**

Linguist Svetla Cmejrková (1996) is engaged in contrastive language research. She has studied the differences which occur in academic writing (in English) by Czech and English students in particular. In this context, Cmejrková speaks of the sociorhetorical concepts of speech community and discourse community. Romy Clark (1992, 118), among others, has stated that the notion

‘academic discourse community’ implies that there is actually a set of shared values and beliefs, i.e. of discursal conventions to be employed in the academic setting, and that these conventions establish what is legitimate knowledge and what are the appropriate ways of learning and writing about it. In the academic setting, the authority in the higher scale of the mental hegemonic system is the native speakers, the often considered ‘legitimate owners’ of the language. They also serve as gatekeepers to the discourse community through their positions as editors and reviewers of international journals and periodicals (see e.g. Flowerdew 2001).

According to Cmejrková, (1996, 139) the two concepts of speech community and discourse community ought to be separated. First, speech communities are said to be centripetal, that is, they tend to absorb people into the general fabric, while discourse communities are centrifugal, in other words, they tend to separate people into occupational or speciality-interest groups. Also, members of a speech community are granted the membership by birth, accident or adoption, whereas a discourse community is joined by persuasion, training or some relevant qualifications. To sum up what Cmejrková (1996, 139) says, “a discourse community consists of a group of people who link up in order to pursue objectives that are prior to those of socialization and solidarity, which are characteristic of a speech community”. In a study such as the one at hand, it is observed how well writers of a particular speech community with the same national and linguistic background adjust to and assume the norms of a discourse community, namely the larger academic community. Cmejrková discusses linking the notion of a discourse community with the literary-critical concept of interpretive community. In doing so, she relates the issues of linguistic and stylistic conventions to those of interpreting experience and regulating the worldviews of group members (Cmejrková 1996, 140). However, it is deemed in this study that an individual writer has a chance to either adopt the norms of a discourse community or neglect them and stay with the variety of discourse one feels closest to, let it be that it may subject the writer under harsh observation among other members of a discourse community. In her study of 1996, Svetla Cmejrková considered the

interactive nature and style of discourse in the Anglo-Saxon stylistic tradition of writing. She compared the Anglo-Saxon stylistic tradition of academic writing to the Czech monological, written manifestation of language. Cmejrková sees it that the Anglo-Saxon tradition views theory of communication and discourse in its pedagogical application, and thus as teachable, acquirable, testable and as a phenomenon that can hence be qualified. In other words, if style of discourse can be taught, then it should also be learnt. The style of communication is also under observation in one's adjusting to the academic community. In addition to being able to produce valuable research, it is a question of being able to present it in a desired manner. When discussing the assets of belonging to a minority group of a discourse community (bearers of a language and culture), Cmejrková states that "it is a great advantage to be outside, in time, space, and culture" (1996, 141). With this she wishes to point that only when observing from a distance or a margin can one begin to distinguish elements in another culture, not to mention one's own. The dialogue of the centre and the margin is continuous and can reveal things about all those taking part in it.

Having introduced many aspects of contrastive rhetoric research and language usage in general, I will next present the material and methods of the present study.

### **3. The Study: Material and Methods**

This chapter first describes the text material used in this study, and how it was gathered and analysed. It presents the phenomenon of cohesion and how it is viewed in the data. The chapter also presents hypotheses specifying the research questions that the study aims at providing answers for.

In my study, I will look at different articles published in periodicals and journals on the area of international relations. The total number of the articles is 12 (A-L). It is a three-way study, presenting articles by native English writers (articles A-D), and Finnish writers writing in English (E-L). The texts by Finns are gathered from two different media, i.e. from international journals (E-H) and working papers of a Finnish university department (I-L). The articles have been chosen on the basis of the writers' nationality and also to some extent on the media where the articles were published, for there are preferences as to the most widely-read and appreciated journals and periodicals in each field, including international relations. The national backgrounds and the history of the writers' possible international academic careers have been checked in order to ensure that there are as few as possible factors influencing their style of writing most natural to them. Sometimes there would be a mentioning of the background of the writer in the context of his/her article, and sometimes the Internet and its search engines have been of use. However, there is no opportunity to control the general L2 skill level of the non-native writers. This is not a very important matter in research of this kind, but variation in language skills may affect some of the interpretation of the phenomena under observation.

The overarching argument in this study is that there are inevitably factors stemming from one's cultural background in different styles of writing and argumentation in spite of the language in which they are communicating in a given context. The main research question in view of which the material is analysed is as follows: How does academic rhetoric differ in terms of selected text features in international relations articles written by native speakers of English and by Finns as non-native speakers of English using English as their second or foreign language? Furthermore, how

does the use of academic rhetoric differ regarding the publishing environment of the articles? To summarize, how do the rhetorical features differ in texts produced by writers from different national cultures on the one hand, and then again how do they differ when there is a different audience reading and evaluating the texts?

According to Mauranen (1993b, 47), in contrastive linguistic studies the approaches chosen for comparison (or contrasting) can be typified in three different terms. They are formal, notional and functional. My approach here is mainly functional. As Mauranen (1993b, 47) explains it, the formal comparisons require starting from a formal category, usually a grammatical one, in a specific language, and the notional category expects the variables studied to be universal regardless of the language. The functional category does not start from a category specific to one language only, but it defines the linguistic expressions in terms of a larger language system. Textlinguistic comparisons are especially suitable in the functional category, since they allow linguistic expressions to be categorized according to their textual function even if the groups do not form consistent classes by semantic criteria or in terms of grammatical form.

The present study is thus defined as textlinguistic and functional. It is also a qualitative rather than a quantitative study, as is typical of textlinguistic studies. The approach is derived from the practice of not concentrating on statistical distinctions but emphasizing characteristic tendencies of the material samples. The findings in the phenomena studied are interpreted against the background of the whole developing text. The texts studied tend to be long, which limits the number of articles studied. Any larger statistical significance cannot be expected to rise from them, even if some of the results can be offered a prominent background for interpretation in simple quantification as well. In the study, simple quantification is used to suggest plausibility of the hypotheses presented rather than to test the hypotheses in the statistical or classical sense. All this on its part influences the generalizability of the results, which should be treated as results of a case study that can be continued under wider circumstances than the setting is able to provide us here.



In view of earlier definitions, the present approach is distinctly text-based. Since there is only one analyst making claims and judging the interpretation rising from the suggestions, the arguments are often said to lack any further validity. This could be said to be a feature bringing about more care in generalizing the results outside the study, although through times researchers have worked on an individual basis, yet presenting their study results to the scientific community as perfectly valid. However, there are as many interpretations of a text as there are readers. A text is always studied by an individual reader, and the reader is socialized into a culture, which further influences the interpretation on its behalf. By its nature, contrastive linguistics assumes there to be differences as well as similarities between cultures and their interpretations of interaction. In other words, the analyst's interpretation of the subject is validated here from the text itself.

In addition, the present study is descriptive rather than normative. It does not attempt to draw further conclusions on people's and culture's ways of interacting in general, and it by no means necessitates to evaluate the results and different rhetorical systems found in the texts. However, some standards for discussing the findings in the texts are required in order to be able to comment on the results. Some criteria for judging the rhetorical acceptability in the target culture (i.e. the international academic community) are needed. Gathering comments from people representing the very community would have been too time-consuming and also unreliable, due to interpretation of the claims of individual analysts. What is more, some studies have been conducted on the reception and revising of L2 scientific articles (Ventola and Mauranen 1991), and the results show that people tend not to comment on lacks of skill in producing rhetorically competent text in particular, lest such lacks exist or not. Thus in the study, the fact that the articles have been accepted for publishing in renowned journals or periodicals, or that the writers have been asked to contribute to the working papers of the university department, reveal something of the expected developing of text as a whole, most probably including its rhetorical patterns. In all, the target audience and the people representing the relevant community are the reviewers and editors of the journal in question. Thus

all the texts that have passed the point of getting published are here treated as good texts. The point that the working papers are construed for a Finnish audience, smaller in scale than the international academic community of the journals, and possibly for an (L2) audience approving of the texts relying on the Finnish set of rhetoric structuring even when written in English, is a point of interest in the data here.

I chose academic writing as a subject of study due to personal experiences as a foreign language writer in an academic environment - although lacking closer international linkages myself - and I think it is increasingly necessary in today's world to be conscious of the factors which might hinder further understanding and credible argumentation in intercultural contexts. I also chose the more specified field of international relations on account of my personal interest and further belief that it quite persuasively carries the potential for and realization of intercultural communication, as the notion international relations suggests. Communicating in the respective field can affect the conceptions of the readers worldwide. It will be my aim to reveal some of the problems people writing in a foreign or second language face when interacting with an audience different from their own cultural background, and suggest how discourse participants can become more aware of the different traditions and thus overcome lapses or even breakdowns of communication.

### **3.1 Analysis Principles**

This chapter presents the analysis principles of the study at hand. Later, there are explanations to the details of the procedure itself. First of all, I observed and counted each conjunct of the three groups and 12 articles, and placed them in a table created following Halliday and Hasan's (1976) scheme. I counted the words in each article and accordingly comprised a percentage for the sum of conjunctions out of the words in that article. This was also done separately for each four groups of conjuncts: the percentage shows how many of all the conjuncts in the article belong to a specific group (additive, adversative, causal, temporal and the subclasses). Then I created an average

percentage of overall conjunction quantity as well as the sum in each group of conjuncts for each three groups of articles, i.e. group A-D, group E-H and group I-L.

### 3.2 Points to Note

Some points to note in the analysis are presented here. In this context, some concepts of conjunctive relations are already discussed with the terms according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), although they will be introduced fully later on in section 4.2 on conjunction. The terms are used here in order to illustrate the difficulties faced in analysing the data material and dividing the conjuncts in correct categories. Many conjuncts are ambiguous in nature in that their division in the categories is not always clear. This is because several conjuncts appear in more than one slot of conjuncts.

Additionally, in some cases it was necessary to extend the range of conjuncts belonging in each category. In other words, an amount of interpretation of particular terms and analysis of the textual environment was required. All this is discussed with specific wording of the conjunct categories explained in further detail later on in the study.

As Halliday and Hasan point out, there is plenty of interpretation involved in the managing of cohesive relations, stemming from the context, intonation and overall expression. This interpreting of the use and meaning of conjuncts is apparent for example in the writers' use of *thus* as an either additive, appositive and exemplificatory relation, exemplifying and explaining what it is the writer means to say. Another way of employing *thus* is through its causal, general and simple relation, showing a causal relation with what has gone before and what is to follow due to that. The author of article I gives us many good examples of the use of *thus* as an additive and exemplificatory or causal relation. The following example, where the italics are my own, is found on p. 160:

The representatives of states, who in fact derive their power from the principle of sovereignty, tend to stress its external, negative aspects. The only positive aspect they usually have in mind is the legal equality of states *and thus* the international status of the political elites, irrespective of the physical size, ideological orientation, or the ethnic composition of the state. *Thus*, in its cynicism of power, the doctrine of sovereignty is

genuinely universalist which creates, in turn, an interesting tension with its particularist applications in the political practice.

(Väyrynen 1998, 160)

Here, the first conjunct *thus* is used more in its additive, exemplificatory meaning, whereas the second carries a causal relation to the message. Another example from the same writer offers a more complex case of the use of *thus*. It is picked a bit later in the text, on p.160-161:

True, sovereignty may be an obstacle to the establishment of an interdependent international community and conducive to power politics, but it is also a precondition for the collective self-realization in an unequally organized international system. *Thus*, sovereignty is always Janus-faced; it both constrains and empowers. For instance, sovereignty is a source of economic rights which may assure the stable material progress of society. On the other hand, it has underpinned the development of capitalism on a national scale which, due to its competitive nature, engenders inequality and even exploitation.

(Väyrynen 1998, 160-161)

Here, it can be stated that the division of the two types of conjunction, additive and causal, is not always clear. Is sovereignty ‘always Janus-faced’ *because of* the facts stated before, or does the writer emphasize the ambiguity of sovereignty in writing open in the example how he considers sovereignty (‘it both constrains and empowers’)?

The most notable distinctions are made between the rather close meanings of the *but* relation as either adversative ‘proper’ or as adversative contrastive, external. Also, the *and* relation as either additive simple or adversative contrastive may not always be self-evident. Here, Halliday and Hasan approach the question with the help of their division into external and internal types of conjuncts. They give an example of external (adversative, contrastive) *and*, and of internal (additive, simple) (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 321). In the case of external *and*, the conjunction is located in the phenomena which basically form the content of what is being said, as in ‘They gave him food and clothing. And they looked after him till he was better.’ In the case of internal *and*, the conjunction is placed in the interaction itself, i.e. the social process which represents the whole of speech event, as in ‘They gave me fish to eat. And I don’t like fish.’

Another point to note is that as an analyst I have been forced to extend the range of terms that belong to each category from those which Halliday and Hasan distinctly mention. In real language

use the number of conjuncts is almost infinite. For example, the summary table of conjunctive relations (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 243) places *though* in the slot of adversative, ‘proper’, simple. I took expressions that can be interpreted similarly to go together with the adversative category, such as *although* and, on occasions, *while*. Also, the slot of additive, apposition, exemplificatory is said to include expressions such as *for instance*. I included expressions *such as* and *including* to fit in with the additive category. Here, again, there were many instances where it was difficult to distinguish between the suitable categories for a certain expression in a certain context. Such expressions varying in their meaning include the already mentioned *thus*, *while*, *still* and *again*, to name but a few. The overall environment and tone, the semantic cohesion, were the decisive factors which effected the choice of category in each case. For example, in text C the writer uses *while* in the sense of adversative, ‘proper’, close to *though* and *although* as in the case on p. 527:

*While* my concerns here are primarily theoretical, I seek also to suggest some of the directions in which this analysis might further understandings of the functioning of liberal security communities.

(Serfaty 2003, 527)

Again, in text K, the writer employs *while* in its adversative, contrastive sense approaching the meaning of *whereas*. Here is the sort of example on p. 413-414:

Over against the kingdom of God, so full of light and radiance, stands the kingdom of Satan, where the powers of darkness prevail. Satan strives to prevent the extension of Christ’s kingdom, *while* Christ’s mission is to destroy the kingdom of Satan.

(Harle 1998, 413-414)

Additionally, *while* can function in its perhaps most obvious form, namely the meaning of *meanwhile*.

Furthermore, direct quotes in the articles were naturally left outside the analysis; in other words, the conjunctives in the citations are not included in the overall number of conjuncts. Abstracts, footnotes and endnotes are also left out, and only the main text, the text body, is taken into consideration.

A further point of attention in analysing the data was the fact that in two groups of articles there were articles written by the same person. Namely, articles E and I, and similarly F and K are written by the same writer. It was of great interest to contrast the two texts with each other in each case and see whether the style differs according to the medium. As a reminder, texts E and F are by Finnish writers and published in journals, texts I and K are by Finnish writers writing for a university department publication. Furthermore, the texts E and F are from an earlier stage of the writers' academic careers, and texts I and K are written at a later point in their careers. This choice is made in order to view the distinctions between both the writing environment as well as the typifying of the writers as individual stylists upon their language.

#### 4. Cohesion and Conjunction

In this chapter I will examine the subject of research, i.e. the rhetorical device of cohesion, more specifically that of conjunction. In addition, I will discuss some phenomena also having to do with text production and interpretation which bring some more light onto cohesion and conjunct use in the study material, and I will suggest some further directions for contrastive rhetoric studies. I will introduce the concept of text reflexivity as presented in Mauranen (1993b). She follows Halliday and Hasan's (1976) ideas on usage of conjunctive relations and presents some general findings on Finnish people's use of conjuncts. Then I will discuss the present study in the light of John Flowerdew's (2001) research on non-native writing and native revising of academic texts. Through work such as his, it is possible to realize what sort of issues non-native writers, such as those in the present study, are facing when writing to an audience more extensive than their native environment.

##### 4.1 Cohesion

The main object of research in the current study is cohesion. Here I will discuss the phenomenon of cohesion more widely. In the research data the feature is examined through the use of conjuncts (also known as *links*, *connectives* and *connectors*; the terms are used here interchangeably). Other types of cohesion include reference (pronominals, demonstrative and definite article, comparatives), substitution, ellipsis and lexical cohesion. Creating or indicating cohesion is, however, not the only function that connectors carry. They also facilitate the reading process by directing the reader to an intended direction, including emphasizing the writer's own choice of direction the text is to take and imposing it on the reader through the means of connectors. Conjuncts also contribute to the overall sense of text reflexivity, as will be explained below. I will employ Halliday and Hasan's (1976) notions of cohesion and conjunction. In this chapter, some general observations on cohesion are also provided by Anne-Marie Bülow-Møller (1989) and Michael Hoey (2001) before moving on to more specific definitions of conjunction by Halliday and Hasan (1976).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) discuss the overall meaning of cohesion for the text as a whole. According to them, “the expression of the semantic unity of the text lies in the cohesion among the sentences of which it is composed” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 293). Thus, cohesion helps to create text through its role in providing ‘texture’, (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 298). By texture Halliday and Hasan (1976, 299) not only mean continuity in the text, but also the organization of each segment of discourse, thematic patterns in the text and the like. Halliday and Hasan (1976, 300) even argue that “there has to be cohesion if meanings are to be exchanged at all”. They point out that the continuity referred to here is in a matter of fact a semantic one. And, that “this is what makes it possible for cohesive patterns to play the part they do in the processing of text by a listener or a reader, not merely signalling the presence and extent of text but actually enabling him to interpret it and determining how he does so” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 303). While all other types of cohesion are treated as lexicogrammatical, conjunction especially creates a semantic connection, and there are numerous possible ways to interpret such conjunctive relations. Halliday and Hasan use a basically fourfold scheme, which they have further divided into different subsections (the scheme will be presented in chapter 5 of the study). But, what is more, as Halliday and Hasan (1976, 323) point out, the *expression* of cohesive relations still involves both the semantic and the lexicogrammatical systems in all cases, i.e. “both choices in meaning and their realization in words and structures”.

Anne Marie Bülow-Moller (1989, 131) defines cohesion as “the relation that the interpretation of one element is dependent on that of another in the text”. In different textual contexts and environments, there are seen to be certain ways more appropriate than others to employ cohesion, and it will be of importance to distinguish how to employ the device of cohesion effectively. This is the case, because proper use of cohesion is also a representation of the norms of the writing conventions. Bülow-Moller (1989, 131) makes a preliminary distinction between cohesion and coherence, saying that the latter is generally used to mean over-all interpretability in a situation or context, whereas the former can be considered a special case of the main area of coherence. In



cohesion, mental connections and associations alter a string of words into a message, and this is done through a complex system of syntactic, semantic and pragmatic dependencies. She stresses that connections and dependencies within a text are typically observed at different levels: ‘higher’ levels investigate how writers make relevant links to form texts (involving terms *local coherence* and *global coherence*), and ‘low’ level concentrates on phenomena associated with textual cohesion as explained above (including notions of *co-reference*, *collocation*, and *connectors*, the latter discussed below). Local level and global level in cohesion refer to levels of text organizing. On local level, the organizing takes place at a sentence level, while global level makes use of text above the sentence level.

In connection with cohesion, Bülow-Moller (1989, 133) mentions the co-operative principle which exists between the writer and the reader. With local and global coherence the writer can point to either a locally coherent formulation of elements or to a complete plan in context with what has been said before in the text (Bülow-Moller 1989, 132-133), but in the end it is the reader who judges whether the tips to follow are leading him or her to a right direction in the writer’s text development. Coherence elements can include references to contrast, elaboration, time sequence, cause etc.

Michael Hoey (2001, 27) on his part deals with the concept of cohesion, or conjunction, from the perspective of writer signalling to reader through moment-by-moment guidance. The writer is to take special care that the reader interprets the writing in a proper, expected way: otherwise the rest of the argument will also be lost. This is why the writer employs a variety of signalling devices so as to provide the connections between his stretches of text as unambiguously as possible (Hoey 2001, 28). Hoey (2001, 30-31) divides the relations between clauses or sentences into sequence relations and matching relations. The former connects with the notion of local coherence, as Bülow-Moller presented it above, and the latter with global coherence. Sequence relations put clauses or sentences in some order of priority in time, space or logic. Typical sequence relations are time

sequence, cause – consequence, means – purpose, and premise – deduction (Hoey 2001, 30). Matching relations, then, do not participate in ordering of things, but statements are linked with a view to what additional information they can give of one another. They include relations such as contrast, similarity, exemplification, preview – detail, and exception (Hoey 2001, 31). All relations are signalled by a variety of subordinators and sentence conjunctions.

All in all, it can be stated that cohesive devices are various and complex in their use. In this study, the point of departure is, as Halliday and Hasan (1976, 332) put it, that “a particular text, or a genre, may exhibit a general tendency towards the use of certain features or modes rather than others”. What is more, they emphasize further points regarding the role of the individual writer, asking if a particular speaker or writer favours one type of cohesion over other, and if the density of cohesive ties in the text varies and can the variation be seen to systematically relate to some other factor or factors (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 332-333). This means that writers too, not just text genres, have different means of expressing cohesion, and employing conjunction is only one of them. What Halliday and Hasan also imply is that there may be some variation in how a writer uses certain distinct elements in each group of different kinds of cohesion. I aim at covering the existence of cohesion through the use of conjunction in the research data of the current study.

## **4.2 Conjunction**

Halliday and Hasan (1976, 226) state cohesion to be a relation between sentences instead of a relation within the sentence. They define conjunctive elements as not cohesive in themselves, but cohesive indirectly through their specific meanings (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 226). They do not primarily touch upon the immediate text that precedes or follows the elements, but “they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse”.

Conjunction is described as a “specification of the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 227). Conjunctive elements link

semantic relations through structural means that do not include other grammatical or linguistic elements. As a consequence, as Halliday and Hasan (1976, 227) point out, it follows that when conjunctive elements are expressed on their own, unaccompanied by other explicit connecting factors, they have a highly cohesive effect. Halliday and Hasan make an addition to this statement, regarding the role of reference items, other markers of cohesion. They say that “given a particular semantic relation which CAN operate conjunctively (*i.e.* which takes on a cohesive function when expressed on its own), then any expression of that relation, with or without a demonstrative or other reference item, will be considered to fall within the category of conjunction” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 231). To put it simply, all the following examples have a conjunctive adjunct as an expression of cohesion: *As a result/As a result of this/As a result of this move/As a result of his caution, they avoided the worst of the storm.* Halliday and Hasan (1976, 232) stress that “it is the conjunctive relation rather than the particular nominal Complement following the preposition that provides the relevant link to the preceding sentence”. What is more, they emphasize that conjunctive relations are not logical but textual in that they represent the generalized types of connection that people recognize holding between sentences. This is called the speaker’s communication role (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 240). It refers to the meaning the speaker/writer allots to himself as a participant in the communicative situation. It can in turn be divided into experiential and interpersonal experiences, the former representing the linguistic interpretation of experience and the latter participation in the speech situation (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 238). Halliday and Hasan use the terms external and internal for the types of functional components of meaning. In conjunctive relations, the former exploits the phenomena that language is used to talk about, and the latter uses the phenomena inherent in the communication process, in the interaction between speaker and hearer (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 241). In analysing the data for the current study, the two conjunctive relations of external or internal have been left without further notice, since they do not have further meaning to the quantitative results of the study. Instead, they *were* used as a guideline

in dividing conjuncts into their slots in the fourfold system in the earlier phase of the study.

Halliday and Hasan's plan relies on the division between the two in realising the relations and meaning of conjunctive expressions.

In the study, I have followed Halliday's scheme for dividing conjuncts into four different groups (I additive, II adversative, III causal and IV temporal) and further into subgroups. All four family groups involve the capacity to employ what is called external and internal conjunction. External in how events in narratives are structured, and internal in how to order the presentation in texts. Short descriptions of the four main groups are given here to suggest which sort of phenomena were dealt with in analysing the data. It is almost impossible to present them in a finite manner, but rough descriptions of the four main groups and their subgroups following Halliday and Hasan's (1976) example are given. Again, a point to note is that many of the groups are interlinked, and at times it was laborious to separate one conjunct from another in terms of the category they belong to in each case where the conjunct occurs. Such cases are presented and explained further. The main tool for finding a fitting category was the semantic meaning the conjunct carries, judging from a given textual context.

In general, conjunctive adjuncts include adverbs (*but, so, then, next, accordingly, subsequently, actually, therefore, thereupon, whereat*), other compound adverbs (*furthermore, nevertheless, anyway*), prepositional phrases (*on the contrary, as a result, in addition*), and prepositional expressions with *that* or other reference item, where the latter is either optional or obligatory, depending on the situation (*as a result of that, instead of that, in addition to that, in spite of that, because of that*) (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, 231). The normal case is, with of course some exceptions, that conjunctive adjuncts have first position in the sentence, and their meaning is seen to extend over the entire sentence in question. Here are the different types of conjunctions according to Halliday and Hasan (1976, 233-273) with examples of each.

## I. ADDITIVES

Additives strive to add something to what is already existent. The typifying example of additives is the *and* relation. Actually, Halliday and Hasan name the logical relations of *and* and *or* to be more coordinative than purely cohesive. But, as they point out, “it is a fact that the word *and* is used cohesively, to link one sentence to another, and not only by children” (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 233). It is the semantic relations the word enters which include it into the general category of conjunction. In other words, the coordinate relation is structural, whereas the additive relation is cohesive (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 234). There are always subcategories to each main group of conjuncts, such as the following:

- a. Additive simple (external and internal): additive (*and*, *and also*, *and...too*), negative (*nor*, *and...not*, *not...either*, *neither*), alternative (*or*, *or else*).
- b. Complex additive relations (internal), emphatic: additive (*furthermore*, *moreover*, *besides that*, *add to this*, *in addition*, *and another thing*), alternative (*alternatively*).
- c. Complex additive relations (internal), de-emphatic: afterthought (*incidentally*, *by the way*).
- d. Appositive relations (internal): expository (*that is*, *I mean*, *in other words*, *to put it another way*).
- e. Comparative relations (internal): similar (*likewise*, *similarly*, *in the same way*, *in this way*).

## II ADVERSATIVES

The basic meaning for adversatives is ‘contrary to expectation’. The most typical example of adversatives is the *yet* relation. The word *but* is close to being as typifying, but in addition to being merely adversative, it also carries the logical meaning of *and*, being a shorthand expression of *and however* (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 237).

- a. Adversative relations ‘proper’ (‘in spite of’) (external and internal): simple (*yet*, *though*, *only*), containing ‘and’ (*but*), emphatic (*however*, *nevertheless*, *despite this*, *all the same*).

- b. Contrastive relations ('as against') (external): simple (*but, and*), emphatic (*however, on the other hand, at the same time, as against that*).
- c. Contrastive relations (internal): avowal (*in fact, as a matter of fact, to tell the truth, actually, in point of fact*).
- d. Corrective relations ('not...but') (internal): correction of meaning (*instead, rather, on the contrary*), correction of wording (*at least, rather, I mean*).
- e. Dismissive (generalized adversative relations) ('no matter...still') (external and internal): dismissal, closed (*in any/either case/event, any/either way, whichever...*), dismissal, open-ended (*anyhow, at any rate, in any case, however that may be*).

### III CAUSALS

The exemplifying case of causal relations is the *so* relation. All causals regularly combine with initial *and*. The distinction between external and internal types of cohesion is here more vague than in most other contexts. Halliday and Hasan (1976, 257) suggest, that it is "probably because the notion of cause already involves some degree of interpretation by the speaker".

- a. Causal relations, general ('because...so') (external and internal): simple (*so, thus, hence, therefore*), emphatic (*consequently, accordingly, because of this*).
- b. Causal relations, specific: reason (mainly internal) (*for this reason, on account of this*), (internal) (*it follows, on this basis*); result (mainly external) (*as a result, in consequence*), (internal) (*arising out of this*); purpose (mainly external) (*for this purpose, with this in mind/view, with this intention*), (internal) (*to this end*).
- c. Reversed causal relations, general: simple (*for, because*).
- d. Conditional relations ('if...then') (external and internal): simple (*then*), emphatic (*in that case, that being the case, in such an event, under those circumstances*), generalized (*under the circumstances*), reversed polarity (*otherwise, under the circumstances*).

e. Respective relations ('with respect to') (internal): direct (*in this respect/connection, with regard to this, here*), reversed polarity (*otherwise, in other respects, aside/apart from this*).

#### IV TEMPORAL

The temporal relation means that one sequence is simply subsequent to the other. Its simplest expression is the *then* relation. Halliday and Hasan point out that external forms of the 'here and now' temporal expression are not cohesive; they are deictic. In other words, they refer to the present situation in the real world instead of presupposing anything in the preceding text (Halliday and Hasan 1976, 264). Internal forms of the 'here and now' reality, then again, do function as conjuncts.

- a. Simple temporal relations (external): sequential (*(and) then, next, afterwards, after that, subsequently*), simultaneous (*(just) then, at the same time, simultaneously*), preceding (*earlier, before then/that, previously*).
- b. Complex temporal relations (external): immediate (*at once, thereupon, on which, just before*), interrupted (*soon, presently, later, after a time, some time earlier, formerly*), repetitive (*next time, on another occasion, this time, on this occasion, the last time, on a previous occasion*), specific (*next day, five minutes later, five minutes earlier*), durative (*meanwhile, all this time*), terminal (*by this time, up till that time, until then*), punctiliar (*next moment, at this point/moment, the previous moment*).
- c. Conclusive relations (external): simple (*finally, at last, in the end, eventually*).
- d. Sequential and conclusive relations (external) (correlative forms): sequential (*first...then, first...next, first...second...*), conclusive (*at first... finally, at first...in the end*).
- e. Temporal relations (internal): sequential (*then, next, secondly...*), conclusive (*finally, as a final point, in conclusion*).
- f. Temporal relations internal (correlative forms): sequential (*first...next, first...then, first...secondly, in the first place, to begin with*), conclusive (*...finally, to conclude with*).

- g. ‘Here and now’ relations (internal): past (*up to now, up to this point, hitherto, heretofore*), present (*at this point, here*), future (*from now on, henceforward*).
- h. Summary relations (internal): culminative (*to sum up, in short, briefly*), resumptive (*to resume, to get back to the point, anyway*).

## V CONTINUATIVES

Although we have all the time been talking about a fourfold system, Halliday and Hasan (1976, 267) do actually have a fifth category called ‘other conjunctive items’ or ‘continuatives’. They are identified as individual items which, “although they do not express any particular one of the conjunctive relations identified above, are nevertheless used with a cohesive force in the text”. In this context, Halliday and Hasan (1976, 268) talk about the meaning of intonation as a conjunctive device. They mention six items in their discussion: *now, of course, well, anyway, surely, after all*.

### 4.3 Text Reflexivity

Text reflexivity is a linguistic notion dealing with how texts refer to themselves. Conjuncts are one means of expressing text reflexivity in their organising and interpersonal effects on the text, and the features and characteristics described here apply to conjunctive relations as well. Text reflexivity is just another point of view on observing the linguistic phenomena arising out of conjunct use, for example. Some texts use the term *metatext, metadiscourse, or metalanguage* when talking about phenomena close to text reflexivity. Mauranen (1993b, 145) suggests that metalanguage as a term involves slightly problematic views of language referring to language. It includes the various ways that natural languages have for talking about language, and it also involves the ways that texts in general are thought to refer to themselves. Text reflexivity is more suitable for studies that are concerned with how texts refer to themselves and not to other texts. In other words, intertextual features of texts (commenting on, evaluating, or referring to other texts; even texts that may have



been earlier paraphrased in the text itself) are not taken into consideration. Text reflexivity deals with the current text under discussion, and it sees the text about text as part of the text formation as a whole. Reflexive elements in a text are those which refer to the text itself, and not to the propositional material, or the primary subject matter, in the text, which have to do with text-external phenomena. Mauranen (1993b, 147) stresses the distinction between the meaning and content of a text, or metadiscourse from discourse that is not 'meta'. The total meaning of a text is the sum of all its component parts, sometimes creating even a whole other reality behind or above the textual stage, when a reader's individual interpretation is added to the overall meaning the text carries. The propositional content, then again, can be said to exist independently of the particular text it is expressed in.

Another distinction within the frame of the notion metatext or text reflexivity is made between elements that are either organising or attitudinal. In Mauranen's view, "together, these could be called integrative approaches to metatext" (1993b, 148). What they integrate is the writer's presence in the creation and developing of the text to the reality of the proposition, or the Hallidayan ideational component of language. Mauranen (1993b, 149) discusses Halliday's conception of metadiscourse and how his system only recognises integrative approaches in terms of conjunctive relations and modality. Conjunctive relations (in the form of conjunctive adjuncts, adverbs, prepositional phrases) are discussed here as connectors, relating to the very reflexivity of the text more specifically. Modality then refers to the interpersonal components of language through degrees of the positive and negative polarities of certainty. It only employs a relatively small number of fixed expressions (*may, must, certainly, probably*) along with an open category of paraphrasing and metaphorical expressions. Mauranen (1993b, 149) states that "It is the class of conjunctive elements which is particularly problematic for text analysis". It is usually discussed under the heading of metatext in most approaches, but Halliday includes a division of two other metafunctions inside the class: the *internal* and *external* metafunctions (Mauranen 1993b, 149-150).

The internal metafunctions refer to use of connectors for expressing relationships between elements in the text itself, whereas external metafunctions express relations outside the text. Mauranen employs the division in her analysis to further deepen the realisation of different types of reflexivity in texts, although she simultaneously states that “Halliday’s (1985: 332-3) distinction between ‘implicit’ and ‘explicit’ modality is not relevant to reflexivity . . . Modal expressions can only be regarded as reflexive if they also contain an expression of textual awareness, not only a stand in relation to a proposition, however explicitly indicated” (Mauranen 1993b, 153).

In addition to separating the propositional component of the text about text, and to distinguishing between the organising and attitudinal components in a text, text reflexivity expresses the writer’s self-awareness in the text, his or her explicit authorial presence in the writing. This is what Halliday and Hasan (1976, 239-241) argue of conjunctive relations. The division of the speaker’s communicative role into experiential or interpersonal through the use of conjuncts is similar to what Mauranen alludes to by authorial presence in the text. By linguistically putting the realisation of self-awareness forth through reflexive use of language, the reader is also made aware of the writer’s intrusion in the developing of direction, and the reader is guided towards an intended interpretation of the text. Text reflexivity has an important rhetorical role in text. It is therefore a meaningful means of persuasion.

To sum it up, text reflexivity (and conjunct use) is in this study regarded as “the writer’s explicit commentary on his or her own ongoing text. It reflects the writer’s awareness of the text as text, and therefore includes references to the text itself as text or as language” (Mauranen 1993b, 154). Text about text necessarily works in relation to the propositional content of the text. It is thus separate from it. As a consequence, it is involved in producing the reader’s interpretation of the text in accordance with the writer’s purposes.

### 4.3.1 Text Reflexivity and the Rhetorical Role of Conjuncts

In this section I will discuss the meaning of connectors in creating the overall sense of text reflexivity. In the English language, connectors comprise conjunctions (*and, yet, so, then* etc) and linking adjuncts (*consequently, at the same time, as a result* etc). Mauranen (1993b, 159) discusses the distinction between internal and external connectors in this context again. In practice, text-internal and text-external phenomena are difficult to separate in the writing from the writer's mind and his or her representation of the factual world. Especially theoretical papers are seen as complicated with regard to this type of division, since the study, or the argument, does not exist independently of its expression. This has also been noticed in the present study and its handling of data. The fact that the same connectors can be used to organise both an argument and a text, or to be included in the internal or external conjunct category, adds to the complexity of separating between the two types of connectors. In the words of Mauranen (1993b, 161), "The writer's interpretations and perceptions of external reality stand in the same relation to a text. They both reflect the reality as mediated by the writer's consciousness".

Mauranen (1993b, 161) asks whether connectors ultimately add anything to text, what they are needed for in the first place. She repeats that connectors are commonly perceived as elements indicating relationships that are already there in the text, "by virtue of the meanings of the proposition that they link" (1993b, 161). Mere contribution to cohesion would not appear an adequate reason for employing connectors in text, since the relationships they emphasize already exist. This, among other things, emphasizes the point of writer participation in bringing forth his/her own views through cohesion.

The capacity to facilitate the reading and adopting process through cohesive devices is another feature under discussion in Mauranen (1993b, 162). It is by no means the case that connectors are the only way to increase the readability of the text, but it appears that other things being equal, connectors do add to the facilitation of text comprehension. What is more, since the use of

connectors does not appear compulsory in view of cohesion or text readability, the choice made by the writer to use them would seem to back the fact that connectors serve the writer's cause in putting his or her propositions and arguments through. It is assumed here that especially in persuasive writing such as academic texts connectors are used among other things for this purpose.

In a small informal experiment conducted and presented by Mauranen (1993b, 163-168), the use of connectors as rhetorical devices was tested among experimental subjects. The results show that connectors have a convincing, authoritative and logical effect on the informants, and all the features are rhetorical effects. They are all also features required of a good academic paper. Furthermore, Mauranen (1993b, 168) adds that in the experiment connectors seem to indicate relationships between sentences that are not necessarily indicated by other means. This would then support the claim that connectors have an independent role in the text, and they do add to the text as such.

Ventola and Mauranen (1991) on the other hand conducted a study on non-native writing and native revising of the texts. The results show something about the connector use in Finnish writers' texts in English and how native English speakers view it. The researchers assume in the study that "the global generic structures constrain the combinational variable realizations of register, which in turn determine discourse and other linguistic structures in texts" (1991, 462). They say that it is the discourse choices in particular which account for the cohesive semantic organization. It is their view also that the writer can ease the reader's task of decoding the organization of the text with marked logical relations in certain linguistic signals that carry a linking or connecting function. Thus, global organization is formed through logically related and interlinked propositions and parts of a text (Ventola and Mauranen 1991, 463). Ventola and Mauranen follow Halliday and Hasan's (1976, 239-241) distinction between external and internal connector relations.

In Finnish academic writers' use of connectors Ventola and Mauranen (1991, 464) found three different kinds of phenomena which differed from those found in native writing. First, Finnish writers are said to favour certain connectors at the expense of others. This phenomenon became

evident also in the current study. The results in this study show that Finnish writers employ less variation in the types of conjuncts they use. The effect is more apparent, when they are writing to another audience than that of international academic community. The native speakers of English, on the other hand, present more varied conjunct usage, as do the other Finnish writers, who are writing to an allegedly English-speaking audience in an international journal. Ventola and Mauranen interpret the phenomenon to derive from being subjected to one-sided language teaching and the writers' tendencies to develop economic strategies for writing, that is, only remembering some of the possible connectors. Secondly, Finnish writers tend to use connectors relatively infrequently. However, it was also noted that writers who appeared to master the English language more proficiently, used connectors more frequently than other Finnish writers. Furthermore, the variety of the connectors they would use was larger. All this becomes evident also from the results of the study at hand. Native writers used most conjuncts in the texts altogether, but the second group of Finnish people writing in international publications had the second highest number of conjuncts. In addition, the third group of Finns writing in a non-international environment had the lowest level of conjunctive relations in their texts. It may be because they recognize their texts will be read and assessed by Finnish colleagues mostly, who will understand the language in all its imperfections, and thus no need for adjusting to more proficient language use in presenting the research exists. Also, it may be that these writers are unaware of such variation in their use of connectors, assuming that they are inexperienced and unfamiliar with the norms and models of the wider English-speaking academic world. As Ventola and Mauranen (1991, 464) put it, "the skilful use of connectors thus seems to reflect a generally high proficiency level in English". Finally, in their study the Finnish writers differed the most from their English counterparts in their infrequent use of internal connectors that links parts of texts together. English writers were found to use internal connectors, for instance, for creating parallel textual structures. The division between internal and external connectors was not in any way under observation in the present study, but the classification

was made upon other principles. To summarize Ventola and Mauranen's study (1991, 465), also considering the results of the present contrastive rhetoric study, in their use of connectors the Finnish writers were infrequent, fairly locally motivated and somewhat haphazard and monotonous. All this causes the finer distinctions and nuances possible in each meaning category to threaten to stay unnoticed at least to a native audience. The reader, on his part, has to work harder in order to obtain the intended logical meanings between propositions and parts of text. The researchers interpret this to have to do with the fact that in the Finnish language, connectors are commonly used less frequently and less explicitly. As a consequence, Finnish writers do not consider it necessary to mark certain logical relations in English. As Ventola and Mauranen (1991, 465) put it, connectors can thus be seen as "extra decorations, not as necessary contributions for understanding the text". With the variety of nuances such statement involves, it is also my conception of the role of connectors.

In the text examples of Ventola and Mauranen's (1991, 487-488) study, the researchers discovered four distinct features which emerged when moulding a text into an allegedly more readable one, in other words, what are the things that a native reader corrects when reading a text by a Finnish writer. First, there is addition of reader-orienting material and material linking back to what has preceded in the text (*In this study...*). In other words, the results are contextualized. In addition, there is cohesion through comparisons, careful references and connectors. Secondly, there is addition of elements helping the reader anticipate what will follow in the text (*In two respects, ...*). Thirdly, there are more connectors which make the interrelationships between clauses explicit and show the global unfolding of the text as discourse (*in contrast*). In addition, the readers wanted to change the original thematic patterning of the text into one that was in their view more systematic. It can be argued that these are then the factors which Finnish writers have most problems with. In this light, it is also interesting what Cmejrková (1996) considered as interactive nature and style of discourse in the Anglo-Saxon stylistic tradition writing (discussed in section in

2.5.2 above). It is Cmejrková's (1996,141) view that the Anglo-Saxon tradition sees theory of communication and discourse as a teachable, acquirable, testable and assessable phenomenon.

#### **4.3.2 Example: Native Attitudes to Non-Native Writing**

In the present study, one of the greatest sources of interest and, consequently, frustration is the fact that it is not possible to receive valid information on the reception of non-native writing among a native English-speaking audience. Of the articles studied here, how are the Finnish writers' texts finally assessed -with the variety of rhetorical styles in them? Is there a difference compared to the native writers' texts in their argumentative value due to the variation in expressions, or are the other merits of the studies convincing enough in order to justify the research? It can only be gathered from general comments and statements from individual readers. In this study it will not be possible to collect information and present it here, but the arguments in the study are built upon results and assumptions presented in other studies of the kind. John Flowerdew has conducted research on the attitudes that international journal editors carry towards non-native speaker (NNS) contributions. In his 2001 study he interviewed 12 editors of leading international journals in applied linguistics and English language teaching. His aim was to try and discover how they see the issue of NNSs publishing in their journals and to observe how to support the successful publication by NNSs. All in all, the results included a questioning of the concept of the term 'non-native speaker', scanning of the attitudes of editors and reviewers to NNS contributions together with problematic as well as positive attributes to them.

Flowerdew justifies the purpose of the study by the trend toward globalisation, especially in connection with education and academic research. He is interested in the NNSs' perceptions, problems, and strategies as for publication in English. In Flowerdew's opinion it is alarming that some earlier studies show that almost a third of the respondents felt that attitudes and prejudices by referees, editors and publishers caused NNSs to be in a disadvantageous position when writing for

publication (Flowerdew 2001, 122). Flowerdew (2001, 122) writes: “In a globalizing world, to place NNSs at a disadvantage when it comes to publishing their work not only goes against natural justice but is also likely to be impoverishing in terms of the creation of knowledge”. It not only goes against individuals concerned but the development of the whole disciplines. Considering the positive attributes that NNS contributions embrace, Flowerdew (2001, 122) points to e.g. Anna Mauranen’s various studies on different cultural aspects bringing perspective and objectivity through alternative theories and approaches to the centre. What is more, it is said that NNSs are aware of many aspects of language which on the contrary are not so familiar to NSs, for example aspects of cross-cultural pragmatics (Flowerdew 2001, 143). NNSs also have access to their own NS contexts with regard to research situations and data. Such implications have been presented among contrastive rhetoric researchers throughout the world, e.g. Ventola and Mauranen (1991), Mauranen (1993; 1996), Cmejrková (1996), Ivanić (1998) and Kachru (1995). According to Kachru’s definition, language is the primary means of cultural transmission in that with its help social groups are integrated and individuals may discover their personal and social identity (Kachru 1995, 25). She states that different rhetorical styles also carry the capacity of enriching the writing experience of all users of English (and other languages), as the present orientation of research has found suitable (Kachru 1995, 23). Language would be enriched in that matters become ambiguous and are not so straightforwardly understood when viewing them from another perspective. Yet it should be recognized that communities may differ with regard to the functions, domains, roles of and attitudes towards literacy in their life in general. Regarding issues of power, access and the social construction of knowledge, Flowerdew discusses the English language and its hegemony. The concept of power and its unequal division cannot escape the discussion considering that NNSs seek to publish in international journals whose real gatekeepers, editors and reviewers, are mostly native speakers of English (Flowerdew 2001, 123-124).



The results showed that for the editors the distinction between NS and NNS was sometimes useful in practice, but on theoretical grounds they thought it to be problematic (Flowerdew 2001, 29). Also, they sought for *at least* equal treatment for NNSs, and instead of admitting any bias against NNSs (even if it existed), most of the editors were prepared to support the NNSs. It was said that only the meritorious research matters and not the language problems (Flowerdew 2001, 130-131). As for the attitudes of the reviewers, editors were satisfied with the overall state of affairs, although occasionally insensitive comments appeared in some reviews (Flowerdew 2001, 133). It was suggested that one way to ensure fair treatment would be to have more NNS reviewers on the editorial board, but some replies revealed that NS reviewers were sometimes more tolerant towards variation than NNSs.

When discussing the problematic aspects of NNS contributions, it was in many instances emphasized that many of the problems identified apply similarly to novice writers, both NS as well as NNS (Flowerdew 2001, 133). This, in turn, links up with what Cmejrková (1996, 141) said earlier in section 2.5.2 of the current study about the fact that the English language and its patterns are often viewed as teachable, acquirable, and thus rateable. As a result, there is no reason why a person willing to publish in English would not commit to learning such patterns. If one does not adjust their writing to the perceived norms of English, s/he can be accused of unwillingness to follow the scientific tradition in all; in other words, s/he is criticized as unfit.

The problems varied from surface errors (grammatical complexity, article usage), parochialism (non-generalizability of the research and arguments presented), unorthodox structuring of introduction and conclusion sections, absence of authorial voice (self-effacing and distancing the researcher from the research and the discourse community) to nativized varieties of English (Flowerdew 2001, 134-142). The editors did not regard surface errors to have a great impact on the publishability of the texts, since the journals have copy editors to deal with such issues. Only e.g. syntax or modality which led to difficulties in comprehension were viewed as problematic. Instead,

the editors viewed the problem of parochialism as the most serious impediment to NNS contributors, saying that “writers failed to indicate how their research addressed current issues in the international community of scholarship” (Flowerdew 2001, 135). In my opinion, this can well be a question of the editors’ positioning themselves at the very centre of the scientific world and failing to see the relevance of local research as a contributing element. The English (Western) world has never had to validate its research results to minority communities, but it is assumed that the results apply in general. Here I think it can also be the case that NNS writers show more rhetorical deviation to the amount that the generalizing particles which the editors call for do not become prominent enough in the text. In other words, such stylistic deficiencies affect the whole act of arguing.

In the current study, the problems discovered include the above-mentioned surface errors, lack of authorial voice as well as existence of nativized varieties of language. Surface errors, e.g. misspellings, article usage etc. were not paid any attention in the data analysis, but the lack of authorial voice together with nativized language correlate to some amount with the conjunct use in the material. Finnish writers’ use of conjunctive relations differs from that of native speakers of English both in amount and style. The variation is not very extensive, but it is perceptible all the same. This may cause some problems in the way native readers and reviewers observe the texts by Finns.

Sometimes the editors denied the meaning or whole existence of cultural variation, and took the gaps in expressions to be questions of skill (Flowerdew 2001, 137). Regarding the lack of authorial voice, some editors state that it may be a characteristic of a novice writer in general, whether NS or NNS (Flowerdew 2001, 138). Moreover, some editors did not want to associate such features with a particular cultural style, meaning, that again cultural variation is not regarded as a feature of further consideration. On hedging, the attitude was that the ones using more hedging were seen as more hesitant about the appropriateness of their work as well as their voice in a larger academic

community (Flowerdew 2001, 139). It is implied that the writer who does not recognize the overall meaning of argumentative details is left unacknowledged among the audience s/he is writing to, i.e. the larger academic community. Flowerdew (2001, 140) points out that previous research supports the explanation that some writers from East Asia are more self-effacing than their colleagues from the Anglo-American environment. It can well be the case with Finnish writers as well, as it is argued here in section 2.3 on business writing that Finnish businessmen prefer to identify with the company instead of referring to themselves as persons in control of the communicational situation. All in all, most of the editors interviewed agreed that different cultures may have different ways and nativized variation of presenting research, but that the key criterion of acceptability is whether or not the readership would be likely to understand it. This implies a need for larger awareness on both sides, NS as well as NNS.

## 5. The Study: Results

Here, I will introduce the final results of the amount and position of conjuncts in the twelve articles by the ten different writers presented in the form of tables. Table 1 shows the actual number and quality of conjuncts in texts A-D, articles written by native speakers of English and published in international journals. Table 2 shows the results of texts E-H, articles by Finns published in international journals, and in table 3 there are the results of conjunct use in texts I-L, articles by Finns published in a department of a Finnish university.

In the tables, the main conjunct types as presented in section 4.2 (additive, adversative, causal, temporal and continuatives) and their subcategories are divided into groups. The percentage in the upper row shows the proportion of conjuncts out of the total amount of words in the article. Furthermore, the actual number of conjuncts in the article is mentioned in brackets. After each conjunct category is shown how many percents of all conjuncts belong to this category. The average proportion of all conjuncts in the group of four articles is mentioned under the table.

There are some technical differences as to the texts' elements which influence the final results, and they will be discussed in section 5.2.

	A: 2,84% (127)	B: 2,65% (99)	C: 2,80% (248)	D: 4,96% (284)
<b>ADDITIVE</b>				
Simple	48	31	63	49
Complex, emphatic	3	2	6	14
Complex, de-emphatic	-	-	-	-
Apposition	16	5	32	24
Comparison	3	1	3	15
<b>TOTAL: ADDITIVE</b>	<b>55,12%</b>	<b>39,39%</b>	<b>41,94%</b>	<b>35,92%</b>
<b>ADVERSATIVE</b>				
'Proper'	16	28	51	75
Contrastive	15	5	20	30
Correction	1	2	10	4
Dismissal	1	5	2	12
<b>TOTAL: ADVERSATIVE</b>	<b>25,98%</b>	<b>40,40%</b>	<b>33,47%</b>	<b>42,61%</b>
<b>CAUSAL</b>				
General	3	7	7	17
Specific	2	-	1	-
Reversed	9	4	8	9
Specific	-	-	-	-
Conditional	2	-	4	4
Respective	-	1	7	-
<b>TOTAL: CAUSAL</b>	<b>12,60%</b>	<b>12,12%</b>	<b>10,89%</b>	<b>10,56%</b>
<b>TEMPORAL</b>				
Simple	3	2	3	1
Conclusive	-	-	-	-
Correlative	1	-	-	5
Complex, external	-	-	1	-
Internal	-	-	1	1
Correlative	3	-	11	11
'Here and now'	-	-	9	2
Summary	-	2	4	-
<b>TOTAL: TEMPORAL</b>	<b>5,51%</b>	<b>4,04%</b>	<b>11,69%</b>	<b>7,04%</b>
<b>CONTINUATIVES</b>	1	4	5	11
<b>TOTAL: CONTINUATIVES</b>	<b>0,79%</b>	<b>4,04%</b>	<b>2,02%</b>	<b>3,87%</b>

**AVERAGE A-D: 3,32%**

*Table 1. Articles A-D by English-speaking writers, published in international journals.*

	E: 3,08% (159)	F: 4,39% (124)	G: 3,38% (159)	H: 2,21% (161)
<b>ADDITIVE</b>				
Simple	40	27	36	35
Complex, emphatic	4	8	9	8
Complex, de-emphatic	-	-	-	1
Apposition	20	20	15	47
Comparison	19	1	6	-
<b>TOTAL: ADDITIVE</b>	<b>52,20%</b>	<b>45,16%</b>	<b>41,51%</b>	<b>56,52%</b>
<b>ADVERSATIVE</b>				
‘Proper’	25	15	21	15
Contrastive	13	15	28	16
Correction	8	6	3	5
Dismissal	2	1	1	1
<b>TOTAL: ADVERSATIVE</b>	<b>30,19%</b>	<b>29,84%</b>	<b>33,33%</b>	<b>22,98%</b>
<b>CAUSAL</b>				
General	4	8	11	9
Specific	-	-	2	-
Reversed	5	1	9	11
Specific	-	-	-	-
Conditional	-	-	1	-
Respective	3	-	1	4
<b>TOTAL: CAUSAL</b>	<b>7,55%</b>	<b>9,68%</b>	<b>15,09%</b>	<b>14,91%</b>
<b>TEMPORAL</b>				
Simple	-	1	4	3
Conclusive	-	1	-	-
Correlative	4	3	-	1
Complex, external	1	-	-	-
Internal	1	1	2	-
Correlative	1	1	1	1
‘Here and now’	1	5	7	1
Summary	1	-	-	1
<b>TOTAL: TEMPORAL</b>	<b>5,66%</b>	<b>7,26%</b>	<b>8,81%</b>	<b>4,35%</b>
<b>CONTINUATIVES</b>	7	10	2	2
<b>TOTAL: CONTINUATIVES</b>	<b>4,40%</b>	<b>8,06%</b>	<b>1,26%</b>	<b>1,24%</b>

**AVERAGE E-H: 3,02%**

*Table 2. Articles E-H by Finnish writers, published in international journals.*

	I: 3,52% (125)	J: 1,86% (108)	K: 3,01% (146)	L: 3,14% (137)
<b>ADDITIVE</b>				
Simple	20	34	32	29
Complex, emphatic	6	2	3	8
Complex, de-emphatic	-	-	-	-
Apposition	16	3	14	43
Comparison	5	2	3	2
<b>TOTAL: ADDITIVE</b>	<b>37,60%</b>	<b>37,96%</b>	<b>35,62%</b>	<b>59,85%</b>
<b>ADVERSATIVE</b>				
'Proper'	22	25	24	7
Contrastive	17	15	22	9
Correction	7	7	3	9
Dismissal	-	-	1	1
<b>TOTAL: ADVERSATIVE</b>	<b>36,80%</b>	<b>43,52%</b>	<b>34,25%</b>	<b>18,98%</b>
<b>CAUSAL</b>				
General	14	3	15	9
Specific	-	-	-	-
Reversed	5	2	3	6
Specific	-	-	-	1
Conditional	-	-	1	-
Respective	-	1	1	-
<b>TOTAL: CAUSAL</b>	<b>15,20%</b>	<b>5,56%</b>	<b>13,70%</b>	<b>11,68%</b>
<b>TEMPORAL</b>				
Simple	2	6	7	5
Conclusive	1	-	1	-
Correlative	-	-	1	-
Complex, external	-	-	2	1
Internal	2	-	2	1
Correlative	2	-	3	1
'Here and now'	-	4	3	1
Summary	1	-	1	4
<b>TOTAL: TEMPORAL</b>	<b>6,40%</b>	<b>9,26%</b>	<b>13,70%</b>	<b>9,49%</b>
<b>CONTINUATIVES</b>	5	4	4	-
<b>TOTAL: CONTINUATIVES</b>	<b>4,0%</b>	<b>3,70%</b>	<b>2,74%</b>	<b>0,0%</b>

**AVERAGE I-L: 2,78%**

*Table 3. Articles I-L by Finnish writers, working papers of a Finnish university department.*

The most obvious remark can be made on the average percentage of conjuncts in the three groups of articles. The native writer group, texts A-D, have the highest percentage at 3,32%. The second highest number is in the group E-H of Finnish writers whose texts are published in international journals, and their average percentage is 3,02%. The lowest percentage is found in the last group, texts I-L. They are by Finnish writers and published only inside a university department. Here the proportion of conjuncts in all text is 2,78%. In other words, the native users of the English language appear all in all to employ conjuncts in their argumentation more than the Finnish writers. Furthermore, the use of conjuncts varies when we look at the media where the texts are published. Finns writing to a mostly Finnish audience do not use conjuncts to the amount as they do when writing for an international audience.

Categories of additives and adversatives are the most general, due to the fact that conjuncts *and* and *but* are the most common in language use in the main. In general, the group A-D has most variation since it is the category with the highest number of conjuncts. Texts A and C have the highest number of conjuncts in the additive group (55,12% and 41,94%), like almost any other text in any group. On the other hand, texts B and D rate the highest in the adversative group (40,40% and 42,61%, respectively). In addition to B and D, the only text in the other groups is J with the highest concentration of conjuncts in the adversative group (43,52%). Relating to this, it is possible to say that the group E-H is most additive-based in that additives dominate the highest number of conjuncts in all the texts, text H having the percentage for additives as high as 56,52%.

In all, the three groups of articles do not in any other way differ from each other very radically, but, on the contrary, there is analogous variation in each group and in many of the individual texts inside the groups. Texts B, E, G and I, have the percentages distributed between the categories of conjuncts rather equally, as can be seen in the tables above. Only E has a high number of additives, 52,20%, but it is normal in all eleven texts to have a group of conjuncts distinctly different (higher or lower in number) from the rest of the conjunct categories. In fact, the rest of the conjuncts in text



E are shared relatively evenly between the rest of the conjunct categories. Other cases of distinguishable groups of conjuncts are presented here in short. The numbers of conjuncts are contrasted with the numbers the other texts of their group show in the same category of conjuncts. For instance, as pointed out above that text H has a high percentage for additives, it is only in comparison to other texts by Finnish writers published in international journals (texts E, F and G).

Text A has a high number of additives (55,12%) and a low number of continuatives (only one continuative in the text, leaving the percentage at 0,78%). Text C has a high number of temporal conjuncts (11,69%) compared to the other texts (5,51%, 4,04% and 7,04%), and text D is, as stated above, one of the few texts which have the highest amount of conjuncts in adversatives instead of additives. Text F has a high number of continuatives (8,06%) in comparison with the other texts (4,40%, 1,26% and 1,24%). The domination of additive conjuncts in text H leaves adversatives at a percentage of a low 22,98%. The same phenomenon is seen in text L, where the high proportion of additives (59,85%) decreases the number of the second big group of adversatives to 18,98%. Article J is the one with the most variation in general. It has more adversatives than additives and less causals (5,56%) than the other texts in the group (15,20%, 13,70% and 11,68%). It is also a text with the smallest percentage for conjuncts as a whole (only 1,86% whereas all the rest eleven texts have at least 2,21%). Text K only differs in its big number of temporals (13,70%; others 6,40%, 9,26% and 9,49%). Article L has, as mentioned earlier, a great division between the additive and adversative groups, but it also has less continuatives than any other text in the study: none. This is rather surprising, considering that the total proportion of conjuncts in the text is as high as 3,14%.

Comparing the pairs of articles with the same writer, text E with I and text F with K, there are some phenomena worthy of commentary here. First of all, it appears that the articles written by the same writer but published in different media *do not* differ from each other or the environment the texts are published in very much. Both texts E and I have a relatively high total percentage of conjuncts, 3,08% and 3,52%. For F and K the numbers are 4,39% and 3,01%. It is obvious that in K

the writer has employed fewer conjuncts altogether than in F, the text published in a journal. It was said that articles E and I both have little deviation from the average as for the division of conjuncts in their different categories, except that in E the proportion for additives is rather large (52,20%). Still, the rest of the categories have a fairly high number of conjuncts which are divided rather evenly in the article. In text I this division is even more equal: there is no category distinctly higher in percentage than any other. Also in article F the variation between different categories is somewhat larger than in K. In text F, the only phenomenon differing from the rest of the texts in the group (E, G and H) is the higher percentage of continuatives in the text, 8,06% (others: 4,40%, 1,26% and 1,24%). In text K, the point that stands out of the rest is the total number of temporal conjuncts in the text, 13,70% (others in the group: 6,40%, 9,26% and 9,49%). It can be stated that the writer of the texts F and K uses a wider variety of conjuncts compared to the others in their groups, since temporal and continuative relations are the most rare of all the categories. The writer of articles E and I does not employ the temporal relations any more extensively than the other writers in the text groups. For continuatives, the percentage is the highest in the group I-L (I: 4,00%, others 3,70%, 2,74% and 0%), and second highest in the group E-H (E: 4,40%, others 8,06%, 1,26% and 1,24%).

### **5.1 Summary of Results**

My aim was to see if the three different groups of texts differ from each other in their use of conjunctive relations. The groups were native English-speaking writers' texts published in journals or periodicals, Finnish writers' texts in English also published in papers of the field of international relations, and Finnish writers' texts in English in a publication of a Finnish university department of political science and international relations.

Native writers had most conjuncts and most variation in types of conjuncts in the texts altogether. The second group, Finnish writing in official, international publications, had the second

highest number of conjuncts, and the other papers by Finns had the lowest level of conjunctive relations in their texts. Also, variation of the types of conjuncts used is evident when comparing the two groups of Finnish writers' articles. Finns writing in an environment less international and closer to a Finnish-speaking audience do not employ variation in the types of conjuncts to the extent as the Finns writing in international journals and periodicals. The three groups of articles do not differ from each other very remarkably, but, on the contrary, there is analogous variation in each group and in many of the individual texts inside the groups.

I interpret the findings to point to the division of reader and writer responsibility in writing, the latter of which is said to be characteristic of authors with an English-speaking cultural background. Writer responsibility means that the writer makes an effort in helping the reader understand the arguments and reasons behind them through the means of various factors such as repetition and pointing to connections between phenomena (e.g. through conjuncts). Reader responsibility on the other hand relies on the reader's own intelligence in deducing the points of significance in the text, which for the cultures employing writer responsibility may appear an indicator of arrogance. This is said to be a Finnish feature of communication. Another feature under discussion in comparative studies of texts is context dependence, which in written discourse is said to mean that the writer expects the reader to recognize the writer's status so well that there is no need for explicit argumentation in order to believe what the writer has to say. This has been previously classified as a typically Finnish feature of argumentation (Tirkkonen-Condit 1996, 258). Judging from the study results, it is possible that the writers of the third group, i.e. Finns writing to other than an international audience with possibly less expectations of how to express oneself in English, do not care to manifest or highlight the relations of phenomena or the arrangement of text parts through conjuncts.

Furthermore, the articles written by the same writer but published in different media do not differ from each other very much. This finding points at the consistency of personal means of

expressing oneself regardless of the media of publication or the audience of the text. The writer in articles F and K employs a wider variety of types of conjuncts than others in the comparative groups of articles, which cannot be said about the writer in texts E and I. Next, I will discuss some more general points worth mentioning as regards the results of the study.

## **5.2 Points to Note**

There are some technical differences in the constituents of the texts as a whole. For instance, the writer in article J employs a large amount of direct quotes and citations from the study data in the text. As a consequence, the overall rate of conjuncts observed falls (the total proportion of conjuncts is here 1,86%), because such citations are omitted from the analysis. This partly explains why the amount of conjuncts in article J is so low. All in all, the extent of citation in each text is not under study here, but it does reveal something of the final percentage of conjuncts in the texts, and vice versa. If there are more conjuncts linking parts of text and arguments in it, there is bound to be less quotation from any other writer. Consequently, there is more direct arguing by the writer him/herself.

Also, the fact that some writers use more footnotes and endnotes as a suitable setting to explain themselves may affect the total number of conjuncts in the rest of the text itself. The use of such additive factors as regards the text entity may however often be dictated from above, i.e. from the editors of the journals the texts are published in due to a norm of textual appearance. Other writers are able to justify their ideas immediately in the main text, conjunct use serving as one means to do it. In this regard, it is the texts without many footnotes or endnotes that have more conjuncts appearing in the text, since footnotes and endnotes are not taken into consideration in the data analysis. The texts where there are no footnotes or endnotes are A, B, E, I, and K. The writer of article J uses footnotes to a large extent, whereas the writer of L only uses some. Endnotes can be discovered in articles C (especially plentiful), D, F, G, and H. Surprisingly enough, it would appear

that the use of footnotes or endnotes does not affect the overall number of conjuncts in the texts after all. Namely, the percentage of conjuncts in the articles where footnotes or endnotes are not employed is not particularly higher than in the texts where such markings occur. In fact, the highest rates are found in articles making use of footnotes or endnotes (C: 4,96% and F: 4,39%).

Furthermore, there are some texts, where the writer has employed listings of letters or numbers instead of linking parts of text and phenomena presented with conjuncts. Writers in articles D, F and K do this. The listing of agenda usually decreases the number of conjuncts in the text in that lists can be seen to deliver the argument as effectively as any conjunct, and that is without further explaining offered by the writer. However, the articles have a high proportion of conjuncts in the text, D: 4,96% and F: 4,39%. Only K has an average of 3,01%. Judging from this, it can be as well stated that the writers on the whole cherish the writer responsibility in making the text understandable to the reader by employing a number of conjuncts, at the same time aiding the interpretation of things presented in the texts. The listings of things and phenomena only support this strive for clarity and unambiguity. Or, on the other hand, it may also be that the writers are to indicate their own approaches to the subject at hand with wide conjunct use. A further point on the interpretation of conjunct occurrence is that in some respects conjuncts can serve in the realizing of powerful speech, often sought after in persuasive and argumentative academic texts, in that the more there are organizing, guiding and persuasive features such as conjuncts, the more there is bound to be power in the arguments. Also, they offer a way of producing language higher in formality, a feature of academic texts in particular, in presenting left-branching syntax (conjuncts usually hold the first, or left, position in the sentence), lists of phenomena as discussed above, contrast, analogies and alliteration. In other words, conjunct use can serve as a means for powerful and formal language, both requirements of effective academic writing. The final interpretation of the appearance of text and arguments it includes lies in the reader's immediate grasp, or in research covering a wider range of issues than the one at hand.

What is of further significance in view of data analysis, is the remark made by many theorists that using conjuncts includes a personal touch of the writer induced in the text. Especially, Halliday and Hasan (1976, 240-241) point to internal (or interpersonal) conjunctive relations. Conjuncts as a whole are said to divide the propositional component of the text about text, differentiate between the organising and attitudinal components together with expressing the writer's self-awareness in the text, making interpersonal relations recognizable. Obviously, excluding conjunct use, this personal tone is presented most simply by the use of the I-pronoun and similar expressions, e.g. through statements like *I think, in my point of view* etc. Also, there are ways of directing the reader through the text with specific guidance by the writer, present in expressions such as in text K (p. 418):

To document these assertions, *let us discuss some examples* of post-war and contemporary dualistic patterns in order to show that international politics in the post-war era and even in the 'new' Europe has been revolving around the 'enemy' issues. Especially, *I shall be analysing* the case of Euronationalism in the light of the suggested tradition.

(Harle 1998, 418)

This is rather different from expressions such as in text L (p. 463):

*The article has suggested that* de-territorialised spaces may allow new subjectivities to emerge.

(Väyrynen 1998, 463)

Here the writer distances herself from the developing of the article and the points introduced without allowing herself to be present through statements including the I-pronoun. In the analysis, I have not concentrated on such variety of intimacy in the arrangement of text or developing of arguments in detail. However, it is agreed that conjunct use has an effect on the tone of communication. The interpersonal and attitudinal characteristics of conjuncts will influence the formality and power of speech. Furthermore, I will simply mention here, that the extent of using the I-pronoun and correlating expressions may affect also the number of conjuncts occurring in the text. The 'I' expressions might suggest a tone of intimacy throughout the text through the use of internal conjunct relations, thus adding the number of conjuncts. Or, it may be the case that personal

pronoun expressions are introduced in the text at the expense of internal conjuncts, leaving interpersonal relations already dealt with and conjuncts hence unnecessary and surplus.

A noteworthy remark on the articles and their analysis as a whole needs to be mentioned here again. It is evident that any given writer, no matter however trained to be producing text in a certain environment and however adjusted to the criteria and norms in that context, has his or her own style of writing. All writers are in the end individuals with their own qualities, despite the fact that especially scientific writing aims at reducing this to the minimum in the name of neutral, logical research. These qualities stem from their culture, background as writers, tutoring they have received, the subconscious and various other factors. It may be the case that a writer may wish to distance oneself from the norms and expectations of any specific genre and produce text in a manner most innate to them. Some variation in rhetoric, for example, can easily be more accepted than other, as we have seen in various examples of previous researche presented in the current study, but in this study all texts considered here have been seen fit enough to be published in one medium or another. This tells us as readers that the texts carry all types of advantages to them, not simply unquestioned conforming to the norms of a discourse community. All in all, it is of course in the name of this methodological preciseness that the current is study is realized and precise results are sought for. However, the number of representatives in the data is relatively small so that larger inferences based on the results have to be considered carefully. For it is the case that individual variation is more apparent in smaller sampling than in larger ones, where it is possible to draw more general deductions based on the results.

## **6. Conclusion**

In this contrastive rhetoric study it was argued that native writers use different rhetorical means than non-native writers. The subject of research was the use of conjuncts in academic texts, the data consisting of three groups of texts: native and non-native writing in international publications and non-native writing in working papers of their L1 university department. It was my original aim to examine multiple rhetorical devices in this study in order to be able to state something that would apply in the data more substantially than the mere focusing on the amount or quality of conjuncts enables. The devices gauged worthy of further observation included text arrangement (paragraph arrangement, logical development of arguments, length and clarity of sentences etc.) and the voice of the writer (employing personalising text features, use of hedging, drawing of analogies or making of juxtapositions etc.). The features would possibly bring more light onto subjects such as tone of interaction, text reflexivity and the role relations of the writer/reader. However, in a thesis such as the one at hand, it was deemed expedient to concentrate on conjunct use in the data. The amount of data in this study is 12 articles as a whole, and a larger amount of material would be required, if one were to state anything further on the results. Therefore, some of the phenomena discovered in the course of the study require employment of other rhetorical and stylistic phenomena than mere conjuncts as well as a larger data in order to be wholly validated. In other words, this is a preliminary study, the ideas of which are better continued in another, wider context.

In this contrastive study, the texts by natives were the core against which the other texts were contrasted, since in contrastive rhetoric studies native Anglo-American rhetoric patterns are considered as the norm in academic writing. What is more, the writing of the non-natives was contrasted according to the publishing environment. The results of the study showed that non-native texts differ somewhat from the texts by native writers, both in the amount of conjuncts and the types of conjuncts used in the texts. Native writers use more conjuncts in their texts, and there is also more variation in the types of conjuncts used in comparison to the non-native texts. The contrast



was more noticeable in the Finnish writers' texts not published in international journals than in the texts in academic publications. It was discovered that when a Finnish researcher writes for an audience closer to the international discourse community, the writer uses somewhat different means of arguing than when writing to an audience presumably coming from a Finnish background. The writer's rhetoric style in the domestic environment is closer to L1 patterns than L2 expectations. In the Finnish language, conjuncts are generally used less frequently and less explicitly. Thus, it can be expected that the Finnish audience will understand and evaluate the text regardless of the stylistic deficiencies, and there is no need on the writer's side to further concentrate on linguistic issues. Also, the writer may be unaware of such imperfections in his or her language concerning conjunct use, or many other rhetoric devices for that matter.

Most importantly, the results showed that variation among the three groups is not very large although it is perceptible. Many rhetoric tools nevertheless carry the characteristic of being unrecognized and subconscious by the author as well as the audience, and even the slightest changes in the normative style of arguing affect the message and draw attention from the argument to the form of expression. In the study, it was discussed whether the skilful use of conjuncts is a sign of a higher proficiency of English, since the conjunct use of the group of Finnish writing in international journals is closer to that of the native speakers, and the writers are categorized as subjected to the norms of the international academic discourse community in that they are experienced in conducting research, reading and writing inside the community. However, even practised researchers do not completely measure up to standards and expectations of the language use of native language speakers. What is more, considering that neither group of Finnish writers has gained more experience in the academic setting but they happen to be writing for different audiences in this context, the results show that the variation is dependent on the environment and not the language skills or straightforward adjustment to the norms from the outside. Consequently, seeing that writers who can be thought to be more inexperienced in writing for an international

community or who use English as their second or foreign language make less use of organising, persuasive and interpersonal features of conjuncts, it can lead to a lack of conjunct usage suggesting a lack in scientific expertise as a whole, since it is a tendency discovered among novice writers. Also, the often mentioned idea of rhetoric patterns of a specific group being teachable, acquirable and hence rateable presses the responsibility of learning upon the people not mastering the code of this other group. With reference to this, it was suggested here that however extensive a study and its data, there is always the factor of personal variation in the styles of writing in addition to variation deriving from one's cultural and linguistic background. An individual writer may not in the end be willing to adjust to the expected norms of expression of a given discourse community. Naturally, the results are more consistent the larger the data, thus leaving less room for interpretation of personal variation. In the study, there were indicators of personal means of expressing oneself regardless of the media of publication or the audience of the text. The texts of the two writers which were studied in two categories of international and domestic publications, the texts being from different stages of the writers' academic careers, did not significantly differ from each other or the other texts in the publishing environment.

In this study, I have also tried to show that contrastive rhetoric study extensively reflects communicating with representatives of different cultures, and the fact that it is interdisciplinary also adds to the depth of CR research in presenting different interpretations of and recommendations for viewing language use in transcultural communication. Every language has norms for successful employing of devices of interaction. Furthermore, many fields of interaction among people rely on a system of their own. This is also the case in the specific area of academic discourse with a discourse community of its own. Yet, text features stemming from one's cultural background tend to hold across disciplines and genres. For instance, the Finnish language use is found, in this study and elsewhere, to support reader responsibility and context dependence, both suggesting a higher status of the writer compared to the reader, which may cause problems and frustration in communicating

with representatives of other cultures. When writing in a language other than one's own, different rhetorical devices may be difficult to master, regardless of the amount of expertise in the person's special field. It easily becomes a matter of questioning the writer's skills of conducting valuable research and ability to present the results in a desired manner instead of a question of producing research in an effective manner although having a different first language. However, throughout time populations essentially from all over the world have participated in the creation and development of knowledge in all fields, although today most of the information technology is controlled by the English-speaking world, Britain and America in particular. Thus it would be a tragedy to exclude some (a majority of!) communities and neglect them on the basis of writing conventions and the English-centred positions of today's scientific, academic and economic world. Attitudes of the kind would hurt not only the ones left outside but also those who would benefit from their contributions.

Out of features of cultural variation, rhetorical arrangement is the most difficult element to change, because people are hardly aware of it. It is also the feature often left undiscovered in language classes, and as a consequence learners will write to please the only audience that they know and have had any experience with, that is to say the members of their native-language communities. I am of the opinion that consciousness about rhetorical variation in all disciplines ought to be enhanced in cross-cultural communication. How all this will be done is better discussed in another context. Whether and when to prefer the prescriptive, Anglo-American norms of writing or culturally defined rhetorical habits and traditions is not an easy decision to make when seeking for more extensive acknowledgement than the writer's own cultural environment is willing to offer. However, since in the intellectual world the Anglo-American culture holds such an extensive position, it is useful for writers of minority cultures to be aware of the rhetorical variation on account of efficiency and credibility of their text.

## Bibliography:

### Primary sources

- A) Chalmers, Malcolm. 1993. "Developing a Security Regime for Eastern Europe." *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 30, No. 4, 427-444.
- B) Williams, Michael C. 1994. "The Discipline of the Democratic Peace: Kant, Liberalism and the Social Construction of Security Communities." *European Journal of International Relations*, Vol. 7, No. 4 December, 525-553.
- C) Serfaty, Simon. 2003. "Europe Enlarged, America Detached?" *Current History* March, 99-105.
- D) Kay, Sean. 2003. "Putting NATO Back Together Again." *Current History* March, 106-112.
- E) Väyrynen Raimo. 1993. "Finland and the European Community: Changing Elite Bargains." *Cooperation and Conflict* Vol. 28, No. 1 March, 31-46.
- F) Harle, Vilho. 1989. "Towards a Comparative Study of Peace Ideas: Goals, Approaches and Problems." *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 26, No. 4, 341-351.
- G) Kivimäki, Timo. 1993. "Strength of Weakness. American-Indonesian Hegemonic Bargaining." *Journal of Peace Research* Vol. 30, No. 4, 391-408.
- H) Aaltola, Mika. 1999. "Emergency Food Aid as a Means of Political Persuasion in the North Korean Famine." *Third World Quarterly* Vol. 20, No. 2, 371-386.
- I) Väyrynen, Raimo. 1998. "Reflections on Sovereignty and Nationalism." In *Tieto, valta ja maailmanpolitiikka – Knowledge, Power and World Politics: Scripta in honorem professoris Osmo Apunen sexagesimum annum complentis*, ed. Olavi Borg, Juha Holma, Jukka Paastela, Tarja Seppä. 155-165. Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Tampere.
- J) Rytövuori-Apunen, Helena. 1998. "A Hero of Our Time in the Mausolean Maze of Post-Soviet Social Realities." In *Tieto, valta ja maailmanpolitiikka – Knowledge, Power and World Politics: Scripta in honorem professoris Osmo Apunen sexagesimum annum complentis*, ed. Olavi Borg, Juha Holma, Jukka Paastela, Tarja Seppä. 299-322. Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Tampere.
- K) Harle, Vilho. 1998. "The Concept and Tradition of the "Enemy" in the Light of European Politics and Integration." In *Tieto, valta ja maailmanpolitiikka – Knowledge, Power and World Politics: Scripta in honorem professoris Osmo Apunen sexagesimum annum complentis*, ed. Olavi Borg, Juha Holma, Jukka Paastela, Tarja Seppä. 409-424. Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Tampere.
- L) Väyrynen, Tarja. 1998. "On the Border of Disorder? Violent Ethnopolitical Identification and Modern Territorial State." In *Tieto, valta ja maailmanpolitiikka – Knowledge, Power and World Politics: Scripta in honorem professoris Osmo Apunen sexagesimum annum complentis*, ed. Olavi Borg, Juha Holma, Jukka Paastela, Tarja Seppä. 449-463. Department of Political Science and International Relations, University of Tampere.

**Secondary references:**

Brumfit, C.J. 1983. "Language Variation and the Death of Language Teaching." In *Cross-Language Analysis and Second Language Acquisition 1*, ed. Kari Sajavaara, 125-132. Jyväskylä University.

Bülow-Møller, Anne Marie. 1989. *The Textlinguistic Omnibus: A Survey of Methods for Analysis*. Copenhagen: Nyt Nordisk Forlag Arnold Busck.

Clark, Romy. 1992. "Principles and Practices of CLA in the Classroom." In *Critical Language Awareness*, ed. Norman Fairclough, 117-137. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.

Cmejrková, Svetla. 1996. "Academic Writing in Czech and English." In *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*, ed. Eija Ventola and Anna Mauranen, 137-150. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Connor, Ulla. 1996. "Cross-Cultural Aspects of Second-Language Writing." In *Contrastive Rhetoric*, 12-27. Cambridge University Press.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992a. "Introduction." In *Critical Language Awareness*, ed. Norman Fairclough, 1-27. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.

Fairclough, Norman. 1992b. "The Appropriacy of 'Appropriateness'." In *Critical Language Awareness*, ed. Norman Fairclough, 33-54. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.

Flowerdew, John. 2001. "Attitudes of Journal Editors to Nonnative Speaker Contributions." *Tesol Quarterly* Vol. 35, No. 1 spring, 121-149.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. Essex: Longman Group UK Limited.

Hoey, Michael. 2001. *Textual Interaction. An Introduction to Written Discourse Analysis*. London: Routledge.

Ivanic, Roz. 1998. *Writing and Identity: The Discoursal Construction of Identity in Academic Writing*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Co.

Kachru, Yamuna. 1995. "Contrastive Rhetoric in World Englishes." *English Today* 11, 21-30.

Kaplan, Robert B. 1987. "Cultural Thought Patterns Revisited." In *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text*, ed. Ulla Connor and Robert B. Kaplan, 9-22. Reading (Mass.): Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Mauranen, Anna. 1993a. "Contrastive ESP Rhetoric: Metatext in Finnish-English Economics Texts." *English for Special Purposes* 12, 3-18.

Mauranen, Anna. 1993b. *Cultural Differences in Academic Rhetoric: a Textlinguistic Study*. Frankfurt am Main; Berlin; Bern; New York; Paris; Wien: Lang.

Mauranen, Anna. 1996. "Discourse Competence – Evidence from Thematic Development in Native and Non-native Texts." In *Academic Writing: Intercultural and Textual Issues*, ed. Eija Ventola and Anna Mauranen, 195-227. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Ostler, Shirley E. 1987. "English in Parallels: A Comparison of English and Arabic Prose." In *Writing Across Languages: Analysis of L2 Text*, ed. Ulla Connor and Robert B. Kaplan, 169-185. Reading (Mass.): Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Sajavaara, Kari. 1977. "Kontrastiivinen analyysi ja kommunikatiivinen kompetenssi." In *Näkökulmia kieleen*, ed. Kari Sajavaara, 59-82. Turku: Suomen soveltavan kielitieteen yhdistys.

Tirkkonen-Condit, Sonja. 1996. "Explicitness vs. Implicitness of Argumentation: An Intercultural Comparison." *Multilingua* 15-3, 257-274.

Vehmas-Lehto, Inkeri. 1987. "Translation Science and Contrastive Linguistics: Boundary Clearing and a Neighbourly Handshake." In *Applications of Cross-Language Analysis*, ed. Kari Sajavaara, 63-69. Jyväskylä: Jyväskylän yliopisto.

Ventola, Eija and Anna Mauranen. 1991. "Non-native Writing and Native Revising of Scientific Articles." In *Functional and Systemic Linguistics: Approaches and Uses*, ed. Eija Ventola, 457-492. Berlin and New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Yli-Jokipii, Hilikka. 1996. "An Approach to Contrasting Languages and Cultures in the Corporate Context: Finnish, British, and American Business Letters and Telefax Messages." *Multilingua* 15-3, 305-328.