

# A Corpus-Based Study of Connectors in Editorials of Korean and American English Newspapers\*

Hyangsook Kim (Hanyang University)  
Sung-Ho G. Ahn (Hanyang University)

Kim, Hyangsook & Ahn, Sung-Ho G. (2012). A corpus-based study of connectors in editorials of Korean and American English newspapers. *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning*, 15(4), 61-79.

This paper compares and analyzes the use of connectors, linking adverbials (LAs--*therefore, however, instead*) and coordinating conjunctions (CCs--*and, but, or*) in the editorials of Korean and American English newspapers. The purpose of the research was to see whether there are any significant differences in their use of connectors with regard to their semantic categories and their two formal types. The analyses have shown that LAs are more prevalent in K(orean)-corpora (61.7%/38.5%), while CCs are used more often (38.5%/61.5%) in A(merican)-corpora. The position-wise analyses have also shown that K-writers seem to prefer additive LAs such as *also*, which functions as a reinforcing linker, unlike A-writers who use *and* far more frequently. Furthermore, K-writers are shown to choose a relatively higher ratio of *however*, an emphatic adverb, and a lower ratio of *but*. This study claims that K-writers' such preference for expressions of emphasis and certainty is a case of L1 transfer of stylistics (or rhetoric) into English writing, and that it originates ultimately from the Korean culture of medial power distance. Its educational implications include that English connectors should be taught along with their stylistic imports, and that a curriculum-integrative instruction is needed which involves Korean and English teachers.

---

\* This work is an extensive revision of the first author's master's thesis. Its earlier version was presented at 2012 KAMALL Annual Conference at Konkuk University, Seoul, on October 27. We are grateful to the Conference audience, especially to Dr. Yoan Lee for valuable comments, to the three anonymous reviewers of *Multimedia-Assisted Language Learning* for their constructive comments, to Dr. Mun Woo Lee for her help and discussion, and to Mr. Stephen J. Beckett and Mr. Steven L. F. Wills for discussion and proofreading. The authors are still responsible for all the remaining errors.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The newspaper editorial is a persuasive text that represents a society and culture (Connor, 1996). Since it is a short writing of between 300 and 500 words, its writer mobilizes all the best strategies to catch the attention of the target reader efficiently and to persuade him or her to accept the conveyed view of the press. This interactive process presupposing the target readership is based on the common ground of culture and various ideas including those on the relationship between the editorial writer and reader, which will basically affect the content and form of the editorial of the local culture.

Since Korea and the United States have different target readerships and cultures, the editorials in the two cultures may be in different formal shapes, deliver different contents and deploy different ways of persuasion. In this regard, it will be very important to compare English newspaper articles produced in Korea with those produced in the United States. Such a comparison may reveal significant differences in ways of using persuasive devices as well as other potentially different cultural facets of the two countries.

The comparison may also shed significant light on English education. The English editorial writers in Korea must have arrived at the steady state on the curve of English learning (Han, 2004); hence analysis of their products may potentially reveal the last linguistic features of fossilization and help English educators in this country to devise interventions to wipe out such final tints in teaching Korean learners of English how to better write argumentative texts in their target language.

In writing an editorial the writer must construct a move structure and utilize stance markers (van Dijk, 1988). With regard to the first, Korean and American English editorial writers seem to adopt a common structure including the following five moves (Noh, 2009): setting up the headline, providing background information, addressing the issue, deploying arguments, and articulating a position (Ansary & Babaii, 2005).

With stance markers, in contrast, they seem to show different tendencies: Korean writers tend to make their points explicitly and strongly favoring expressions like necessity modals and subordinators, while American writers like to take a more moderate stance using hedging expressions like possibility modals and stance verbs with *to*-infinitive complements (Noh, 2009). As a contrastive linking device, more specifically, the Korean writers even seem to favor *however*, a linking adverbial, in clause-initial position while American writers use *but*, a coordinate conjunction, more frequently (Goh & Lee, 2008). In this vein, it will be interesting to examine extensively whether Korean and American writers show any favoritism for either of the two

sub-types of connectors, and diagonally any of their semantic sub-categories.

This recognition has led to the present corpus-linguistic work, investigating the patterns of using connectors in the Korean and American English newspaper editorials. The present study basically compares the frequency of connectors in the two groups of editorials with reference to their semantic categories and formal types, and to their distributional positions, and attempts to characterize the stylistic features, if any, of Korean writers of English editorials.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 1. Linking Adverbials and Coordinating Conjunctions

Linking adverbials (LAs)<sup>1)</sup> help to make the relationship explicit between two units of discourse by creating textual cohesion. They help develop arguments and signal the “connection between specific information and an author’s point” (Biber, Johansson, Leech, Conrad, & Finegan, 1999, p. 881). They are quite crucial for effective communication. If they are used appropriately, they play a positive role in enhancing clarity and comprehensibility in discourse. This is because as textual cohesion devices, they facilitate the process of natural discourse and help develop arguments, making the flow of information explicit enough to enhance readability (Yoon, 2006).

However, there is no precisely defined set of LAs for identifying and classifying them on the basis of corpus size and discourse type. Liu (2008) points out that their identification is difficult on account of “a lack of clear consensus among grammarians on these items” (p. 509). On top of understanding the appropriate connector usage, it is important to think through the argument before determining logical connectives reinforcing it (Crewe, 1990).

LAs connect discourse units of differing sizes; that is, they link the clauses or clausal constituents to other units of discourse (Biber et al., 1999, p. 762). More specifically, they link sentences (1), link a *to*-clause to the preceding main clause (2), connect clauses or phrases to phrases (3), connect independent clauses (4), and join equivalent grammatical items occurring after coordinating conjunctions (5).

---

1) Linking adverbials have been described by different names: “conjuncts” (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985), “conjunctive adverbials” (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999), “logical connectives” (Crewe, 1990), or “connectors”: (Granger & Tyson, 1996; Altenberg & Tapper, 1998; Bolton, Nelson & Hung, 2002; Yoon, 2006).

(1) *Linking sentences*

And it is also likely to help block the sudden influx or outflow of global hot money. **However**, they should pay heed to worries that banks might pass the tax on to consumers. <Korean Corpus #57:kt1>

(2) *Linking a to-clause to the preceding main clause*

Is it realistic, **for example**, to expect BP to contribute all potential compensation up front — even as much as \$20 billion, as the Democratic Senate leadership has suggested? <Reference Corpus #8:w2>

(3) *Connecting clauses or phrases to phrases*

It will help developing countries take up the green growth model by providing methodological support, **that is**, by drawing up strategies tailored to their needs. <Korean Corpus #7: KH2>

(4) *Connecting independent clauses*

The trend is toward less rather than more democracy; **for example**, large Russian cities have begun abolishing the direct election of mayors. <Reference Corpus #4: WT3>

(5) *Joining equivalent grammatical items coordinating conjunctions*

Because courses required for majors are often oversubscribed, some students are unable to graduate in four years and **therefore** must stay longer and pay extra tuition. <Reference Corpus #1:w2>

LAs appear in three different positions in a clause: at the beginning, the middle, and the final position (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999). The initial position is understood as a position before the subject or other obligatory elements of the clause. The medial position refers to the position right after the subject or an operator (the finite auxiliary or *is*), while the final position refers to the final position after all obligatory elements in the clause. The first is the most preferred position. When the linking devices are placed in this position, readers find it easy to process and understand the discourse. Their occurrence in the other positions is related to their registers and semantic roles in discourse. The three positions are illustrated in following examples.

(6) Initial position <Korean Corpus #30:KT3>

For now, no one is able to immediately confirm the Israeli allegations. **However**, it is difficult to dismiss the claims as groundless.

---

2) The abbreviations of the present study are: “KH” for Korea Herald, “KT” for Korea Times, “NY” for New York Times, and “WT” for The Washington Post. Also, “#7” in “#7: KH2” in example (1) refers to the 7<sup>th</sup> occurrence of *however* in its concordance from the Korea Herald corpus.

- (7) Initial position <Reference Corpus #4:WT3>  
The trend is toward less rather than more democracy; **for example**, large Russian cities have begun abolishing the direct election of mayors.
- (8) Medial position <Korean Corpus #3:KT2>  
Greater praise, **however**, should be given to their 105 Japanese counterparts, who must have mustered far greater courage and conscience to admit the historical wrongs committed by their ancestors.
- (9) Final position <Reference Corpus #14:NY1>  
Maybe that's why United decided to close the call center that fielded complaints. It urged customers to send an e-mail message or a letter **instead**.

As for coordinating conjunctions (CCs), they are used to “build coordinate structures, both phrases and clauses” (p. 79), connecting elements having equivalent syntactic function. *And*, *but*, and *or* are the main coordinators and *And* has the meaning of ‘addition’, *but*, ‘contrast’ and *or*, ‘alternative’ (Biber et al., 1999). When they connect clauses unlike LAs, their distribution is restricted to clause-initial position (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 1985), as exemplified in (10).

- (10) Teachers are pillars of any community, and Montgomery's are highly rated. **But** their compensation has outstripped the market place. <Reference Corpus #28: WT2>

In short, LAs link two units of discourses in various ways. In regard to CCs, they are used to build structures for organization. This section explicates the attributes of these two types of cohesive devices with exemplified descriptions so that a broad insight is given into the present investigation.

## 2. Previous Corpus-based Studies on Connectors

Connector studies have reported that L2 English learners display somewhat different features from reference groups overusing, underusing or misusing connectors syntactically and stylistically in their writings (Altenberg & Tapper, 1998; Bolton, Nelson, & Hung, 2002; Chen, 2006; Crewe, 1990; Field & Yip, 1992; Granger & Tyson, 1996; Yoon, 2006, among others).

Crewe (1990), for example, examines Hong Kong Chinese undergraduate students' writings and observes that Chinese students overuse connectives, most likely for “surface logicity”. Field and Yip (1992) makes a similar observation: that the written English by Cantonese speakers presented far more connecting devices than the corresponding native-speaker English

data. In addition, Korean EFL learners were found to overuse connectors (Yoon, 2006).

As mentioned above, many studies of connector use have compared ordinary learner corpora and native speaker corpora towards understanding learners' second language acquisition. Unlike learners in schools and colleges, newspaper journalists who are well versed in composing English writing, seem to be in the stage of 'steady state'. As Han (2004) claims, even though they expose themselves to target language input continuously with sufficient motivation and abundant opportunities to use it, they might nevertheless involve signs of fossilization which is characterized by "permanent lack of mastery of a target language" (p. 4). Thus, investigating the linguistic traits of Korean journalists may produce important implications for secondary education in this country.

As for the use of English by newspaper journalists, two studies (Goh & Lee, 2008; Noh, 2009) have examined multiple features (including connector distribution) of English newspapers published in Korea. More specifically Goh and Lee (2008) compare six high-frequency function key words from a corpus of the editorials of Korean English newspapers (of 100,959 words) with a native corpus covering the genre B (of 55,000 words) from the Freiburg-Brown Corpus of American English. Among the six, they observe that *however* is used with a significantly higher frequency in the Korean corpus compared to native data (129 vs. 43.7). Further, 85 out of their 129 occurrences are found in initial position, where the degree of intensity is the strongest, leading to a loss of a balance in the use of the word. In contrast, *but*, which denotes a light contrast, is used less frequently in Korean data. They report that the 'non-nativeness' can be best explained on the basis of linguistic differences and their transfer on a deeper level.

Noh (2009), on the other hand, is concerned with persuasive strategies in Korean and American English Newspaper editorials, and especially focuses on move structure and stance markers such as modals, subordinators, and first person plural pronouns. In her study, necessity modals (such as *must*) and subordinators are shown to occur more often perhaps for explicitness purposes in the Korean editorials, while possibility modals (such as *may*) and stance verb + *to* infinitive are displayed more for hedging purposes in the native editorials. In the case of *however* and *but*, she makes a parallel observation to Goh & Lee's (2008): Korean journalists use *however* three times more frequently than their native counterparts, but use *but* less frequently. These works suggest that Korean reporters tend to prefer more persuasive and direct methods than the native journalists.

As shown above, the connector-related use from the two studies (Goh & Lee, 2008; Noh, 2009) indicate that Korean journalists seem to choose a higher frequency of certain words such as *however*, and thus that they represent their stances in stronger terms and in a more explicit way.

This naturally raises the question: What pattern will Korean journalists show when they use connectors in general in editorials? Will they have specific traits compared to American journalists?

In terms of methods to examine connectors, previous researchers tended to adopt an existing classification system, to compile a control corpus with native students' writings, and examine them at the word-level dimension. Bolton et al. (2002) and Chen (2006), however, have adopted slightly different methodologies and reported that their different methods produced different results. The first have had three noticeable methodological differences. First, they compiled the control corpus from published materials rather than from native students' writings; second, they identified connectors only through processing their own data rather than relying on any existing classifications; lastly, they adopted a sentence-based analysis instead of a word-based analysis. Similarly, Chen (2006) used published articles as the reference corpus, and identified a list of conjunctive adverbials through processing the control corpus. Unlike the first, however, she adopted Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman's (1999) four-way classification system, a modified version of Halliday and Hasan's (1976), as well and undertook both word- and sentence-based analyses.

From a methodological point of view, therefore, it would be interesting to investigate connector use on the basis of published materials following an existing reliable system of classifying connectors.

### III. METHODOLOGY

#### 1. Purpose of the Study

The aim of the present study is to examine whether there is any difference in the use of connectors between English newspaper editorials written by Korean writers (hereinafter, K-writers) and those written by American writers (hereinafter, A-writers). To attain the aim, this work has adopted a corpus-linguistic approach to answer the following research questions:

- 1) Do Korean and American writers display a similar pattern of connector use with regard to their semantic categories?
- 2) Which formal type of connectors are more prevalent in Korean writers' English newspaper editorials - coordinating conjunctions or linking adverbials?
- 2-1) Will the word-based and sentence-based comparison produce the same patterns?

- 3) Is there any stylistic characteristic of Korean writers composing their English newspaper editorials in comparison with American writers?

To answer these questions, we have compiled and compared two Korean corpora (hereinafter, K-corpora) and two American corpora (hereinafter, A-corpora), to be described in the next section.

## 2. Corpora

The two sets of corpora, the K-corpora and the A-corpora, have been compiled respectively from the editorials of two major Korean English newspapers (*The Korea Times* (or KT) and *The Korea Herald* (or KH)) and of two major American newspapers (*The New York Times* (or NY) and *The Washington Post* (or WP)). The first corpora consist of a 40,652-word KT-corpus and a 36,581-word KH-corpus, for which we collected editorials from the Korea Times website during the period of from April 11th to May 31st, 2010, and from the Korea Herald website between May 10th to June 25th, 2010. Together, they constitute the K-corpora of 77,233 words and 2,836 sentences.

The second control corpora consist of a 40,616-word NY-corpus and a 36,337-word WP-corpus, for which we collected editorials from The New York Times website between May 1st to May 23rd, 2010 and from The Washington Post website between May 25th to June 20th, 2010. They together form the A-corpora of 76,953 words and 3,910 sentences. The details are summarized as Table 1.

(Table 1) General Profiles of the Corpora

	<b>K-corpora</b>	<b>A-corpora</b>
Tokens	77,689	77,453
Sentences	2,836	3,910

## 3. Identification of Connectors

This study has used WordSmith Tools (4.0) for the identification of connectors. Using its concordancer we first identified all connectors. We then sorted them manually again since LAs are sometimes ambiguous and the same forms of adverbials can have different functions.

We have generally followed Biber et al.'s (1999) in classifying connectors semantically and



defining adverbials, and have further identified and added other connectors encountered during data processing. That is, we identified 50 connectors and classified them into the following six semantic categories shown in Table 2.

(Table 2) The List of Connectors

Semantic classification	
Enumeration/ addition	first, in the first place, second, first of all, first and foremost, third, finally, and, also, in addition, likewise, similarly, moreover, to begin with, furthermore, besides
Summation	in conclusion, to sum up, overall
Apposition	for instance, for example, in other words, that is, namely, i.e.
Result/ inference	so, therefore, thus, hence, as a result, in short, then
Contrast/ concession	but, however, yet, though, in contrast, on the contrary, on the other hand, instead, by comparison, in fact, still, nevertheless, anyway, after all, or, even so
Transition	now, by the way

In this process, we made specific decisions in the following way:

- A. *And*, *but*, and *or* are counted only when they connect independent clauses.
- B. *Also* is counted when it is used as an additive linker. Cases of *also* used as circumstantial adverbials<sup>3)</sup> are not counted. Cases of *also* in *not only...but also* are not counted because they are connected just like correlative conjunctions. However, cases of *also* in *but also* independently are counted for this study.
- C. *Finally* and *first* are counted only when they are used to enumerate discourse units.
- D. *In short* and *in fact* belonging to stance adverbials<sup>4)</sup> are included in this study because these words mark their roles as LAs as well according to Biber et al. (1999).
- E. *Then* is counted only when it is used as an inferential connector. (e.g., A: *Oh, Dad is sixty-one.* B: *Is he? Well then she must be sixty.*); cases of *then* which mean ‘after that’ and ‘at that time’ are excluded since they are regarded as circumstantial adverbials.
- F. On top of these considerations from A to E above, most adverbials are carefully treated because their meaning can differ depending on their position, such as *still*, *though*, and so on.

3) Circumstantial adverbials add information about the action or state described in the clause, answering questions such as *Where?* *When?* *How?*: e.g., *for a week* or *so, on the floor, tomorrow, and often*.

4) Stance adverbials refer to the attitude of the speaker or writer towards their stance about the form or content of the message: e.g., *of course, I suppose, to put it mildly, and in fact*.

## IV. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

### 1. Frequencies of Connectors in K-corpora and A-corpora

This section reports the findings relevant to the first research question of whether K- and A-writers display a similar pattern of connector use with regard to their semantic types. Table 3 below displays the connectors found in the two, K- and A-corpora, grouped by six semantic categories. The first thing to notice is that the two groups exhibit a very similar pattern in using connectors with regard to their semantic categories. K- and A-writers produced a total of 745 and 748 occurrences of connectors in raw frequencies. In both corpora, they used connectors of contrast/concession (such as *but*) the most (49.8%/50%), supporting Kim's (1999) and Noh's (2009)

(Table 3) Frequency List of Connectors in K- and A- corpora

Category	K-corpora		A-corpora	
	Connectors	R.F.(%)	Connectors	R.F.(%)
Enumeration / addition	and (69), also (162), moreover (11), in addition (8), first of all (7), first (6), second, furthermore (5), in the first place, third (4), besides, similarly likewise, (2), to begin with, finally (1)	289 (38.8)	and (185), also (105), first, similarly, finally (4), moreover, in addition, second, likewise (2), first of all, in the first place, first and foremost (1)	313 (41.8)
Summation	in conclusion, overall, to sum up (1)	3 (0.4)	overall(2)	2 (0.3)
Apposition	for instance (20), namely, that is, in other words (5), for example (3)	38 (5.1)	for example (10), for instance, in other words (4), i.e. (1)	19 (2.5)
Result/ inference	so (12), therefore, thus (8), then (7), as a result, in short (3), hence (2)	43 (5.8)	so (21), then (7), therefore (4), thus (3), in short (2), hence, as a result (1)	39 (5.2)
Contrast/ concession	but (208), however (88), yet (16), instead (13), still, on the other hand, in fact (9), or (8), nevertheless (3), though, after all, on the contrary (2), anyway, even so (1)	371 (49.8)	but (273), yet (24), still (14), instead (12), however, in fact (11), though (9), after all (7), anyway (4), or, even so, nevertheless (2), in contrast, by comparison, on the other hand (1)	374 (50.0)
Transition	now (1)	1 (0.1)	by the way (1)	1 (0.1)
TOTAL	745		748	

(R.F.= Raw frequency/ %= of the overall connectors used, rounded off to one decimal place/ Items with the same frequency are marked only once.)

similar observation, then connectors of enumeration/addition (such as *also* and *and*) (38.8%/41.8%), and after that connectors of result/inference (such as *for example* and *for instance*) (5.8%/5.2%) and of apposition (5.1%/2.5%); they used connectors of transition the least frequently.

The overall picture suggests that advanced K-writers seem to generally utilize connectors from across the entire range of CCs and LAs to the same extent as native speakers do.

What does this show about K- and A-writers? Perhaps it means that both groups produce texts with similar flows of argumentation and a congruent organization of discourses whose semantic weaving is quite alike. This is compatible with Noh's (2009) observation that Korean and American English editorials seem to be similar in the move structure involving setting up the headline, providing background information, addressing the issue, deploying arguments, and articulating a position.

## 2. Frequency Comparison at the Word–Levels and the Sentence–Levels

This section presents the findings that are relevant to the second research question: Which formal type of connectors are more prevalent in K-writers' English newspaper editorials - CCs or LAs? Will the word-based and sentence-based comparison produce the same patterns? To answer these two related questions, we will compare the frequencies of the connectors of the two formal types at the word- and sentence levels.

As shown in Table 4, K-writers preferred LAs to CCs in raw frequencies and whether normalized per 10,000 words or 1,000 sentences. In every 10,000 words, for example, K-writers used 59.2 LAs but only 36.7 CCs; in contrast, A-writers used 37.2 LAs but 59.4 CCs. They show exactly an opposite tendency! K-writers are almost twice as likely to use LAs while A-writers favor CCs rather than LAs in a similar ratio. Between groups, K-writers favor LAs about 1.6 times more than A-writers, while the second favor CCs more than the first, at about the same ratio.

(Table 4) Frequency at the Word- and Sentences Levels

Connectors	K-corpora				A-corpora			
	R.F	per 10,000 words	per 1,000 sentences	%	R.F	per 10,000 words	per 1,000 sentences	%
LAs	460	59.2	162.2	61.7	288	37.2	73.7	38.5
CCs	285	36.7	100.5	38.3	460	59.4	117.7	61.5
Total	745	95.9	262.7	100	748	96.6	191.4	100

When the frequencies are normalized per 1,000 sentences, we observe similar patterns in group-internal comparisons: K-writers favor LAs about 1.6 times more than CCs, while the opposite is true with A-writers. Comparing between groups, however, we notice a distortion occurs: K-writers turn out to use LAs (162.2) more than 2.2 times than A-writers (73.3). In contrast, A-writers turn out to use CCs only about 1.2 times more than K-writers.

This is because K-corpora are written in much longer sentences (composed of an average of 27.23 words) than A-corpora (averaging 19.68 words per sentence).

To summarize, all the frequency comparisons show, as an answer to the first part of research question 2, that K-writers significantly prefer LAs to CCs, which is in sharp contrast with the tendency that A-writers depend heavily on CCs rather than LAs. This result is exactly in line with Goh and Lee's (2008) finding that Korean writers of English editorials prefer *however* to *but*, while American editorial writers show a reverse preference. Then, perhaps their interpretation can also be extended to the present difference; K-writers tend to make their points clearly and strongly.

Regarding the second part of research question 2, further, results in Table 4 show that analyses at word- and sentence-levels can produce different results. We have noticed that compared between groups, in particular, K-writers' preference for LAs tends to be exaggerated at the sentence-level analysis while A-writers' dependence on CCs is drastically mitigated. Such changes seem to be caused by the fact that K-writers tend to produce longer sentences (cf. Table 1), which cannot be attributed to L1 transfer because Korean editorials seemingly consist of shorter sentences than Korean English editorials or American editorials (Yoo, 2009). Whatever its cause, the discrepancy between results from word-level and sentence-level analyses must be accepted as a warning to research designs that only adopt either one level of the two.

### 3. Stylistic Characteristics of K-Writers

As for the third research question of whether there is any stylistic characteristic of K-writers composing their English newspaper editorials in comparison with A-writers, we have examined frequencies of connectors in terms of their distribution in clauses and their semantic imports. First, their occurrences are presented position-wise in Table 5.

(Table 5) Positions of Connectors in K-corpora and A-corpora

P. (Position)	K-corpora		A-corpora	
	R.F.	%	R.F.	%
Initial	512	68.7	593	79.3
Medial	210	28.2	145	19.4
Final	23	3.1	10	1.3
Total	745	100	748	100

This table shows that both K- and A-writers use connectors most frequently in initial position. This result is probably due to the fact that unlike LAs, CCs are restricted in distribution to initial position. More closely, A-corpora exhibit a higher percentage in this position, which is in line with the previous finding that A-writers rely more heavily on CCs as cohesive devices than K-writers do. K-corpora contain larger percentages of connectors in the other positions than A-corpora. This fact should be related to the fact that K-writers prefer LAs to CCs.

Next, we have examined the distribution of connectors with the highest frequencies and presented in Table 6 the connectors occurring at least 10 times per 10,000 words.

(Table 6) Types of Connectors in Three Positions

P. (Position)	Category	K-corpora		A-corpora		
		R.F.	per 10,000 words	Category	R.F.	per 10,000 words
Initial	but	208	26.8	but	273	35.3
	and	69	8.9	and	185	23.9
	however	43	5.5	yet	24	3.1
	yet	16	2.1	so	21	2.7
	so, instead	12	1.5	still	14	1.8
Medial	also	156	20.1	also	105	13.6
	however	30	3.9			
Final	however	15	1.9			
Total		549	70.7		622	80.4

(Items with 10 minimum occurrences each)

In the category of connectors of comparison/contrast, firstly, both K- and A-writers use *but* (26.8/35.3) much more frequently than *however* (11.3./1.4).<sup>5)</sup> The former writers use *however*

5) The figure “11.3” for K-corpora refers to the combined ratio of all three positions of *however* and “1.4” for A-corpora is counted in the same way with 11 occurrences of *however* in total (see Table 3).

much more often than the latter, and they use it in all three positions, but most frequently in the initial position. These observations are exactly in accord with and support Goh & Lee's (2008) findings, and strengthen their interpretation that Korean writers tend to emphasize their points clearly and strongly.

In the category of additive adverbs, secondly, K- and A-writers show an alternatively different pattern. K-writers use *and* (8.9) much less frequently than *also* (20.1), while A-writers use the CC (23.9) much more frequently than the LA (13.6). Position-wise, both K- and A-writers use the LA entirely in medial position. Since *also* has a reinforcing function (Quirk, et al., 1985), these facts on the frequency differences in K- and A-corpora further support the thesis that K-writers have a style of making their points clearly and forcefully while A-writers take a less imposing position.<sup>6)</sup>

In fact, Goh and Lee (2008) and Noh (2009) make this interpretation in connection with previous works like Kim (1999), who points out that unlike their American counterparts writers of Korean editorials tend to prefer direct and strong stance markers. The first scholars insightfully attribute the style of K-writers to a type of language transfer which leads their characteristics in Korean use to be reflected on their English writings. At the same time, they add that the K-writers' overuse of *however* in its emphatic and strong sense reveals their lack of insight into its proper use, which they seem to render as another case of L1 transfer on the proper position of LAs. These two interpretations are slightly contradictory because if the first is the case, it precludes the second from being the real cause of the style in question. In other words, if K-writers prefer clear and strong argumentation, they must intentionally choose *however* more frequently and put it in the initial position, not out of their lack of proper knowledge.

Noh (2009) also notices and is concerned with the same differences between K-writers and A-writers as Goh and Lee (2008) discuss. She seeks an explanation for the difference between K- and A-writers in their different strategies of persuasion. Relying on Meyer (1997) and Putnam and Wilson (1989), she maintains that hedging and slackening one's statement expresses a flexible attitude, helps maintain a bond with the reader, and is eventually a more efficient strategy in persuasion. According to her, whereas A-writers know how to be more efficient in persuading their readership, K-writers either have an "unpolished" strategy of persuasion because of the relatively short history of English newspapers in Korea, or that they maintain a condescending stance because the press has established itself as an authoritative institution

---

6) With regard to the frequency difference of *also*, both *too* (0.5/0.5 per 10,000 words) and *as well* (0.5/0.4) exert no influence on the ratio. The *so*-inversion form only occurring in A-corpora (0/1.0) is not significant, either.

under the Korean dictatorial regime in the past and assumed a position to educate the people out there.

It is agreeable that a hedging strategy can be an efficient way of persuasion in America; it is unbelievable, however, that K-writers of editorials are that ignorant of persuasive strategies and of their readership in Korea. Regarding K-writers, we believe Noh's second suggestion would lead to a more plausible explanation.

To summarize the discussion thus far, we adopt (i) Goh and Lee's first suggestion that K-writers have transferred their stylistics, or more specifically rhetorics, to English writing, (ii) Meyer's (1997) and Putnam and Wilson's (1989) thesis that hedging and slackening one's statement is a more effective way of persuasion in America, and (iii) Noh's second suggestion that K-writers seem to assume an authoritative stance in argumentation.

Assuming these, we will attempt to find an interpretation of the last two points in the difference between the Korean and the American ideas of the relationship between the writer and reader of the editorial. As suggested in Bhatia (1993), cross-cultural factors may be significant in genre analysis because local cultural constraints are likely to have implications for understanding "the way that certain [...] strategies are employed to accomplish specific intentions" (p. 38). In this attempt we more specifically adopt the Critical Discourse Analysis view that texts should be analyzed and understood in relation to their contexts, society, and culture. Richardson (2007) declares that "stylistic choices suggest a relationship between the journalist and the audience, in terms of friendliness or distance, familiarity or formality, a relationship of equals or of the speaker taking more of a pedagogic role" (p. 96).

This draws our attention to Hofstede's (2001) value domain of power distance. He puts Korea and the U.S. on the 27/28th and the 38th ranks, respectively: Korea is presented as a country of medial power distance, where social hierarchy is more prevalent and institutionalizes inequality, greater importance is placed on status and rank, and a more rigid value system determines the worth of each job. In contrast, America is a country of low power distance, where social practices minimize inequality and power distinctions. Given this, it is reasonable that K-writers are susceptible to assuming an authoritative position as opinion leaders and to having a more or less condescending attitude toward their readership, while A-writers are aware that maintaining a bond with the readership must be an effective way to persuade them.

Since culture is a product of history, the relatively more plain and prosaic style of American editorials and their culture of low power distance are reminiscent of the historic adjustment of the scientific discourse that was proposed in Britain, which Korean history lacks: According to Baugh and Cable (2002), Latitudinarian Anglicans and moderate Puritans argued in the Royal

Society in the 1660s that “the English prose for scientists should be stripped of ornamentation and emotive language. It should be plain, precise, and clear. The style should be non-assertive. Assent was to be gained not by force of words but by force of evidence and reasoning” (p. 254).

## V. CONCLUSION

To compare Korean and American English newspaper editorials, we have constructed two corpora representing English editorials produced in the two countries, and compared them corpus-linguistically focusing on connectors, which are significant tools for persuasion as stance markers. If we summarize the results, the first conclusion to draw is that K(orean)- and A(merican)-writers show quite a similar pattern in the semantic categories of connectors they use (Table 3). This seemingly means that as editorial writers the two groups construct similar types of discourses and texts, more specifically constructing the same move structure.

Secondly, K-writers use significantly more linking adverbials (LAs) and less coordinate conjunctions CCs than A-writers: The relative figures are 61.7%/38.5% in the use of LAs and 38.3%/61.5% in the use of CCs. Generalizing Goh and Lee (2008), we have attributed it to L1 transfer of connector use. We have also observed that when the frequencies are normalized at a word level and at a sentence level, the resulting figures can have quite a discrepancy. This strongly invites corpus-linguistic researchers to pay attention to the potential danger that the two ways of normalization may have by biasing figures and ratios.

The position-wise analyses of the two corpora, thirdly and lastly, show that K-corpora contain LAs (*also* and *however*) in a higher frequency than A-corpora do, and CCs (*and* and *but*) in a lower frequency. Since *also* functions as a reinforcing linker, the results strengthen the thesis that K-writers prefer to make their arguments in an emphatic manner (Goh & Lee, 2008; Noh, 2009).

Elaborating one of Goh and Lee’s (2008) two proposals, we have proposed that this distinctive argumentative style of K-writers is a case of L1 transfer of stylistics (or rhetoric) into English writing (Kim, 1999). Elaborating Noh’s (2009) suggestions, then, we have proposed that K-writers tend to assume an authoritative and condescending stance while A-writers seek to maintain a bond with their readership (Meyer, 1997; Putnam & Wilson, 1989), and that this difference is best understood as an aspect of their cultural difference in the value dimension of medial and low power distance (Hofstede, 2001).

The conclusions we have drawn from this study have a number of implications for English



education in Korea. First of all, it seems imperative that connectors be taught along with their rhetoric forces. Secondly, the findings regarding stylistic differences between K- and A-writers should be used to educate advanced learners of English, for example, in designing ESP-English for Specific Purposes (ESP) for Korean journalists and others who must write scientific or argumentative articles.

Thirdly, and more specifically, this calls for a curriculum-integrative instruction for advanced learners as early as in high school: the Korean language and the English language should be taught at least for a certain limited period of time in close cooperation of the Korean and the English teacher, which has never been tried at the secondary education level in Korea. Dealing with persuasive writing, a Korean and an English teacher may agree to synchronize relevant sections of their respective textbooks, so that they may deal with their respective material referring to the other's (Fogarty and Pete's (2009) sequenced model). Alternatively, selecting persuasion as theme, teachers of Korean, English, and other subjects may teach students how to write efficiently in a more integrative way (Fogarty and Pete's (2009) shared or webbed model).

Only this type of curriculum-integrative instruction will be able to fill up such gaps of education that current subject-wise instruction may be creating, as this study has revealed in the English writings of the very advanced users of English. In fact, this case constitutes a strong piece of empirical evidence for the necessity of curriculum-integration at the secondary level. Further, such a curriculum-integrative instruction will benefit significantly from data-driven learning ideas proposed for example, in Johns (1986) and Lee (2007).

This study has the following limitations. First, its corpora are relatively limited in scope and variety. It has simply assumed that K-writers must basically have learned English in Korea since it was impossible to obtain their profiles.

## REFERENCES

- Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M. (1998). The use of adverbial connectors in advanced Swedish learners' written English. In S. Granger (Ed.), *Learner English on computer* (pp. 80-93). London: Longman.
- Ansary, H., & Babaii, E. (2005). The generic integrity of newspaper editorials: A systematic functional perspective. *RELC Journal*, 36(3), 271-295.
- Baugh, A. C., & Cable, T. (2002). *A history of the English language* (5th ed.). London: Routledge.
- Bhatia, V. K. (1993). *Analysing genre: Language use in professional settings*. London: Longman.

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. Harlow, UK: Longman.
- Bolton, K., Nelson, G., & Hung, J. (2002). A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing: Research from the international corpus of English in Hong Kong (ICE-HK). *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 7(2), 165-182.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). *The grammar book: An ESL/EFL teacher's course* (2nd ed.). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Chen, C. W. (2006). The use of conjunctive adverbials in the academic papers of advanced Taiwanese EFL learners. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 11(1), 113-130.
- Connor, U. (1996). *Contrastive rhetoric: Cross-cultural aspects of second language writing*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Crewe, W. (1990). The illogic of logical connectives. *ELT Journal*, 44(4), 316-325.
- Field, Y., & Yip, L. (1992). A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. *RELC Journal*, 23(1), 15-28.
- Fogarty, R. J., & Pete, B. M. (2009). *How to integrate the curricula*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Corwin.
- Goh, G. Y., & Lee, S. W. (2008). A corpus-based analysis of the language of English news in Korea. *The Journal of Studies in Language*, 23(4), 601-619.
- Granger, S., & Tyson, S. (1996). Connector usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. *World Englishes*, 15(1), 17-27.
- Han, Z. (2004). *Fossilization in adult second language acquisition*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Hofstede, Geert. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, organizations across nations* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Johns, T. (1986). The concordancer: A language learner's research tool. *System*, 14, 151-162.
- Kim, Y. J. (1999). A textual comparison of Korean and American newspaper editorials: With reference to evidentiality. *The Sociolinguistic Journal of Korea*, 7(1), 119-149.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Harlow: Longman Group UK Limited.
- Lee, D.-J. (2007). *Corpora and classroom: A computer-aided error analysis of Korean students' writing and the design and evaluation of data-driven learning materials*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of Essex.
- Liu, D. (2008). Linking adverbials: An across-register corpus study and its implications. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 13(4), 491-518.
- Meyer, P. G. (1997). Hedging strategies in written academic discourse: Strengthening the argument by weakening the claim. In R. Markkanen, & H. Schroder (Eds.), *Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon in academic texts* (pp. 21-41).

Berlin: Walter de Gruyter & Co.

- Noh, M. J. (2009). *Persuasive strategies in English newspaper editorials in Korean and the U.S.: A focus on move structure and stance markers*. Unpublished master's thesis. Yonsei university.
- Putnam, L. L., & Wilson, S. R. (1989). Argumentation and bargaining strategies as discriminators of integrative outcomes. In M. A. Rahim (Ed.), *Managing conflict: An interdisciplinary approach* (pp. 121-141). New York: Praeger.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Richardson, J. E. (2007). *Analysing newspapers: An approach from critical discourse analysis*. New York: Palgrave.
- van Dijk, T. A. (1988). *News as discourse*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Yoon, H. S. (2006). A corpus-based analysis of connectors in Korean students' essay writing. *Korean Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 22(2), 159-178.
- Yoo, H. J. (2009). *A comparative analysis of English and Korean editorials for EFL reading instruction*. Unpublished master's thesis. Yonsei university.

Key words: coordinate conjunctions, linking adverbials, connectors, position, cohesive devices, transfer of stylistics, comparative rhetoric, curriculum integration, power distance

Applicable levels: primary education, secondary education, adult education

Author(s): Kim, Hyangsook (Hanyang University, 1st author);

heartk012@hanyang.ac.kr

Ahn, Sung-Ho G. (Hanyang University, corresponding author);

shahn@hanyang.ac.kr

Received: October 15, 2012

Reviewed: November 15, 2012

Accepted: December 15, 2012