

EFL Learners' Uses of Adverbs in Argumentative Essays

Ercan YILMAZ¹

Kenan DİKİLİTAŞ²

¹MA, School of Foreign Languages, Adnan Menderes University, Turkey,
ercan.yilmaz@adu.edu.tr

²Ph.D., Department of English Language Teaching, Bahçeşehir University, Turkey,
kenandikilitas@gmail.com

Article information

Submission	23/09/2016
Revision received	27/12/2016
Acceptance	18/03/2017

Keywords

Adverbs,
adverb use,
EFL learner
writing, proficiency
differences.

Abstract: Adverbs require a great deal of effort to be mastered, and even the most advanced users of that language have difficulty in using them correctly (Narita&Sugiura, 2006; Peacock, 2010; Lei, 2012; Leedham & Cai, 2013). The purpose of this study is to find out to what extent relatively high proficiency level EFL learners use different types of adverbs in their argumentative essays. For this purpose, a group of students who have previously taken an academic writing course are selected. To collect the data, a guided writing activity is applied in the target language. The data is analyzed quantitatively by taking the frequency of adverb use. The results show that EFL learners tend to use degree adverbs more than any other semantic category of adverbs. They also tend to overuse adverbs in their academic writing and use adverbs that are not appropriate in the academic prose. It is implied that there is a need for systematic explicit instruction of L2 adverbs and for raising learners' awareness in the meanings and functions of adverbs in L2 writing.

Anahtar sözcükler

Zarflar,
zarf kullanımı,
yabancı dil öğrencisi
yazısı,
yeterlilik farkları.

İngilizce Yabancı Dil Öğrencilerinin Tartışmacı Yazılarında Zarfları Kullanmaları

Öz: Zarf kullanımında ustalaşmak çok çaba gerektirmektedir ve o dilin en gelişmiş kullanıcıları bile onların kullanımında zorluk çekmektedir (Narita & Sugiura, 2006; Peacock, 2010; Lei, 2012; Leedham & Cai, 2013). Bu araştırmanın amacı nispeten yüksek yabancı dil yeterliliğine sahip olan İngilizce yabancı dil öğrencilerin tartışmacı metin yazılarında ne ölçüde farklı zarf türleri kullandıklarını öğrenmektir. Bu maksatla, daha önceki eğitim yaşamlarında akademik yazma becerisi üzerine bir ders almış olan bir grup öğrenci seçilmiştir. Verileri elde etmek için, öğrencilere hedef dilde yönlendirilmiş bir yazma etkinliği uygulanmıştır. Bu çalışmada, veriler zarfların kullanım sıklığına bakarak nicel olarak incelenmiştir. Sonuçlar, İngilizce yabancı dil öğrencilerinin derece zarfları geriye kalan tüm söz bilimsel zarf kategorilerinden daha çok kullandıklarını göstermiştir. Ayrıca, öğrenciler akademik yazılarında zarfları fazla kullanma eğilimi göstermekte ve akademik yazı biçimine uymayan zarflar kullanmaktalar. İkinci dildeki zarfların sistemli ve net bir şekilde öğretimine ve bu zarfların ikinci dil yazılarındaki anlam ve kullanımları konusunda öğrenci bilincinin artırılmasına ihtiyaç olduğunu belirtilmiştir.

1. Introduction

In written discourse, adverbs can perform a variety of rhetorical functions (Hinkel, 2004). With these functions come difficulties that ESL (English as a Second Language)/EFL (English as a Foreign Language) learners have in academic writing, and L2 (Second Language) writers often use directives and adverbs that do not complement the formal nature of academic writing. Also, a higher rate of intensifying/amplifying adverbs is used, and lower frequencies of hedging devices are used. These difficulties are described by Hinkel (2002) as a curse that cannot be broken. However, she also states that these difficulties can be handled with explicit instruction. Due to their various syntactic and semantic functions, which are sometimes overlapping and resulting in ambiguity (Quirk et al., 1985; Biber et al., 1999), adverbs are difficult to understand thoroughly by EFL/ESL learners (Hinkel, 2002).

This study bases its semantic and syntactic classifications of adverbs and adverbials on the work by Biber et al. (1999), see Table 1. It analyzes the use of adverbs and adverbials through corpus among registers. In the analysis and division of lexical classes, only adverbs that work as modifiers of adjectives and adverbs, adverbials of single words and adverbials of groups of words were included.

Adverbs are one of the least frequently used syntactic categories in the academic writing context, and even the most commonly encountered adverbs make up less than 1% (Biber et al., 1999) though they are among the most abundant word classes of all (Quirk et al., 1985). This is because adverbs function in different parts of sentences with several varying semantic roles that add to the meanings of sentences including time, place, manner, process, contingency, recipient, etc. Although adverbs are used by EFL learners with a high frequency, there is limited proficiency in their accurate use when it comes to writing academic texts. Adverbs require a great deal of effort to be mastered, and even the most advanced users of that language have difficulty in using them correctly (Narita & Sugiura, 2006; Peacock, 2010; Lei, 2012; Leedham & Cai, 2013), which in turn shows that grammatical proficiency does not guarantee the appropriate use of adverbs in written production.

Another problem identified by Hinkel (2004) shows the prominence of the problem. She highlights that high level EFL or ESL learners lack the ability to use appropriate adverbs and adverbials in relevant registers. For example, they resort to using *I think* or *It is really good* when they need to express stance or degree as opposed to using more formal forms of the same function, which points to a lack of register awareness. Although such choices do not affect the intelligibility of a sentence, it is important to notice that they might sometimes irritate the reader or listener. In academic writing, more formal expressions or academic words are desired; thus, raising register awareness seems to be of importance in the teaching of academic writing in the EFL classroom.

While assessing EFL learners' texts, teachers can often see how the texts written by EFL learners differ from each other, yet this difference is not always related to the level of proficiency as it might be assumed. In fact, students who have similar proficiency levels of English and produce accurate sentences throughout the text may achieve different scores for their writing. One reason for this difference might be the choice of lexical items. For instance, while one student prefers to use 'plain' sentences, the other student prefers to use sentences which contain more adverbs. Although both students produce accurate and advanced sentences, the student who prefers to use more adverbs seems to have a more sophisticated style of writing. This can be related to the fact that adverbs add meaning to sentences or even longer texts such as paragraphs.

Table 1
Semantic Category, Function and Sub-divisions of Adverbials

Category	Function	Sub-Division
Circumstance Adverbials	Place	<i>Direction, position, distance</i>
	Time	<i>Time position, frequency, duration, time relationship</i>
	Process	<i>Manner, means, instrument, agent</i>
	Contingency	<i>Reason/cause, purpose, concession, condition, result</i>
	Extent/Degree	<i>Intensifiers, Down-toners</i>
	Addition/Restriction	
	Recipient	
	Other	
Stance Adverbials	Epistemic	<i>Doubt/certainty, actuality/reality, source of knowledge, limitation, view point or perspective, imprecision</i>
	Attitude	
	Style	
Linking Adverbials	Enumeration and Addition	
	Summation	
	Apposition	
	Result	
	Contrast/Concession	
	Transition	

***Taken from Biber et al. (1999)

However, teachers also come across repetitive uses of adverbs which disrupt the flow of the text, particularly if these uses are not appropriate. The specific purpose is to find out to what extent relatively high proficiency levels use different types of adverbs and adverbials in their argumentative essays. It is also aimed to highlight the importance of using adverbs and adverbials in written discourse. These goals are attempted to be achieved through the quantitative analysis and qualitative displays of EFL students' adverb usage in their argumentative essays by comparing them with the academic prose component of the LSWE Corpus (Longman Spoken and Written English Corpus). The LSWE Corpus includes six registers but focuses mainly on the registers *conversation, news, fiction and academic prose*. Since it is stated in Biber et al. (1999) that the LSWE Corpus provides a sound basis for the analysis of grammatical patterns, this corpus was chosen to be the basis for comparison of the actual data. The findings may provide implications for classroom instructions on the use of adverbs in academic writing.

2. Review of literature

When compared to adjectives, which are very commonly required while defining a noun in a proposition and whose absence can result in ambiguity, adverbs are generally optional. That is, the meaning of the proposition would still have intelligibility even if most adverbs were to be dropped (Hinkel, 2004). In other words, we can establish effective communication even without using adverbs. However, they are important in that they play various roles in written and spoken discourse. They can alter the meaning of a sentence and have a variety of modifying functions for verbs, adjectives, adverbs, whole sentences or even longer parts such as paragraphs. Seeing this, it is obvious that they have many syntactic and semantic functions. In their study of automatic profiling of different word categories, Granger and Rayson (1998) looked at the differences between French English learners' argumentative essays and ICLE

(International Corpus of Learner English) and compared them with an equal number of argumentative essays they gathered from the LOCNESS (Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays). The results of the research show that adverbs make up 5% of the corpus in native speaker texts and about 6% in non-native speaker texts, which once more highlights the low frequency of their use in the language despite their abundance in variety. They state that short adverbs (only, also, even, so, very, etc.) were overused, especially those adverbs that indicate time and place, whereas adverbs ending with the *-ly* were underused. They also mention the tendency of learners to use speech-like expressions in their texts.

Hinkel (2003) also found the same tendency in her study in which she analyzed NSs' (native speakers) and NNSs' (non-native speakers) argumentative essays. She made a quantitative analysis of 569 essays obtained from four universities' first year routine writing skills assessment tests. The analysis of her study focused on 12 semantic classes of adverbials, and the results showed that the frequency of time and place adverbials were almost the same for the NSs and the NNSs. However, a significant difference was present in the frequency of amplifiers and emphatic adverbs. These two classes of adverbials are more common in the informal spoken English, and she points out that the reason for the advanced level and proficient NNS using these adverbials in their formal academic writings is that the majority of their exposure to English is spoken. In addition, she states that the more common a certain type of adverbial clause is in the conversational prose, the more likely it is to occur in academic essays.

A similar study was conducted by Hinkel (2005) on NSs' and NNSs' use of various hedging devices (functioning as stance adverbs) and intensifiers such as *totally*, *completely* and *always*. She analyzed 745 essays from NSs and NNSs who are proficient in English and who have had a considerable amount of education in English. The findings show that the NNSs used a very limited range of hedging devices. These were generally related to the conversational discourse just as it was the case with the intensifying adverbs. She points out that although NNSs have previously been enrolled in academic environments, the main input the L2 learners receive is the conversational discourse, and thus mentions the importance of instruction on topics as such.

Crawford (2008) is another researcher looking at the differences of native and non-native texts. He investigated the quantitative and qualitative accounts of place and time adverbs (*here*, *there*, *now* and *then*) in texts of L1 and L2 speakers of English. For the comparison of L1 and L2 differences, the American argumentative writing component of LOCNESS was used for L1, and the L2 corpora were selected from Germanic, Romance and Slavic typological backgrounds, namely German, Spanish and Bulgarian from ICLE. He also compared the data with the conversational academic writing components of LSWE. What he found was that there was no significant difference between the L1 and L2 speakers in terms of the frequency of those adverbs, but that there was a greater difference in students' writing and conversation.

Another study that investigates hedging is that of Yağız and Demir (2014). The study looked at general hedge tendencies of native and non-native writers of English and the differences in their use in 100 research articles, of which 50 belonged to native writers and the other 50 to non-native writers. The introduction, discussion and conclusion sections of the research articles were analyzed separately, and hedging was analyzed under 9 types of hedges: *epistemic modality verbs*, *quantifiers*, *conversational and informal*, *adverbs of frequency*, *nouns*, *adjectives and adverbs*, *introductory phrases*, *epistemic lexical verbs* and *vague*

references. Focusing on the types that could relate to the present study, no significant statistical difference was found between native and non-native writer uses in the categories of *adjective and adverbs* and *adverbs of frequency*. Yet the study states that non-native writers used adverbs of frequency less and adjectives and adverbs more than the native writers.

Orfano, Oliveira, and Tenuta (2014) investigated how Brazilian learners of English express modality in their academic writing through the use of adverbs. To analyze the data, they have used the sub-corpus of CABrl (the Corpus of Brazilian Learners of English) and LOCNESS. Their findings indicate that there was a statistically significant difference in the variety of expressions of epistemic modality adverbs used in the two corpora. Native writer texts displayed a higher variety of modality than learner texts. Moreover, they state that the Brazilian learners rely only on a rigid set of structures to express modality.

In their study of adverb use and language proficiency in young learners' writings, Perez-Paredes and Sanchez-Tornel (2014) have investigated the use of General Adverbs produced by a total of 616 learners from the 5th, 6th, 9th and 10th grade on the topic of food from three different nationalities: Chinese, Polish and Spanish. Their aim was to ascertain whether there is a difference in the frequency of adverb use as age increases. They state that Chinese learners in the study showed a constant increase as their age and proficiency level increased, which lead them to the conclusion that, in general terms, the use of adverbs increases with age although this was not completely valid for the two other groups whose increase was not constant. Yet the number of adverbs used in the 10th grade was the highest in all three groups. They suggest that the onset of adverb use is more likely to occur in grade 9 and mention that learners also start to use more sophisticated ones.

Liu (2014), in his corpus-based study, investigated the use of the 20 most commonly used frequency adverbs of Chinese college English learners' written and spoken English. For the comparisons of the Chinese learners' spoken and written English with the native speaker corpora, he used LOCNESS and LONDON-LUND, a spoken English corpus, as the control corpora and CLEC (College Learner English Corpus) and COLSEC (College Learners' Spoken English Corpus) for the Chinese corpora. The findings showed that there was only a 15% similarity in the use of adverbs between the learner corpus and the control corpus. The total amount of adverb use was almost two times more in the learner corpus than in the control corpus, and this reflects a significant overuse of certain adverbs such as *always*, *often* and *sometimes* in the learner corpus. For instance, *always* was used almost 3 times, *often* almost 4 times and *sometimes* almost 10 times more often in the learner corpus. However, there was also an underuse of frequency adverbs present.

A recent study by Sheikhan and Abdollahi-Guilani (2017) aimed to investigate how Iranian MA EFL learners used adverbs in their academic writing and also tried to find out if gender differences were present in the use of adverbs. They examined a total of 460 essays written in the argumentative and descriptive style. The essays were compared with three different corpora: Corpus of Contemporary of American English (COCA), Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English (LGSWE), and Researcher Corpus (RC). The results showed that Iranian learners have a tendency to overuse linking, stance, degree and manner adverbs whereas they underuse adverbs of place and time. In terms of gender difference, it is stated that females used a higher number of adverbs than males.

Linking adverbs are one of the semantic types of adverbs that are widely studied especially in academic writing. The nature of academic writing tends to include linking adverbs as they

connect/link words, sentences, or even longer stretches of texts such as paragraphs or even ideas or thoughts.

Trebets (2009) conducted an interesting study on conjunctive cohesion using a perspective other than learner texts. She analyzed the uses of linking adverbials and conjunctions in EU documents in a corpus based approach and provided implications for the teaching of ESP (English for specific purposes). For comparison, she used CEUE (Corpus of EU English) and the written component of the BNC (the British National Corpus). Her findings showed that the most frequently used semantic categories were additive, temporal and causal, and that adversative, clarifying and hypothetical adverbs were among the least common categories used in EU texts. The total number of additive appearances was 2.4 times higher than all other categories combined.

Peacock (2010) analyzed linking adverbials used in 320 published research articles across 8 disciplines which he further divided into science and non-science. The purpose of the research was to look at the interdisciplinary differences in the frequency, form and function of linking adverbials used by the authors of the research articles. The result showed that there was an increase and a change in the way linking adverbials had been previously used. Compared with the numbers in the LSWE corpus, his study showed that there was an overall overuse in the semantic categories of contrast/concession, addition and apposition. However, the results also showed an underuse in the category of result/inference and stated that disciplines show differences in the way they use linking adverbials and that non-science disciplines use more linking adverbials than sciences.

Another study that examines linking/conjunctive adverbs is that of Can (2011). He investigated the use of conjunctive adverbs of Turkish EFL learners' argumentative essays. His study analyzed 208 argumentative essays written by Turkish undergraduate students. The data was taken from TICLE, the Turkish sub-corpus of ICLE, and compared with essays on the same topic derived from LOCNESS. The comparison between learner essays in TICLE and LOCNESS showed that there was a statistical overuse in some adverbials in the categories of enumeration/addition, apposition, result/interference and contrast/concession. Analyzing the corpus syntactically, he found that Turkish students tend to use conjunctive adverbs most frequently in the initial position, followed by the medial position and least frequently in the final position.

Lei (2012), on the other hand, investigated the use of linking adverbials of Chinese doctoral students in their academic writing and compared them to the work of professional writers. The results indicated that the overall tokens of linking adverbials used were more common in the Chinese doctoral students' writing. While 33 linking adverbials were found to be overused, 25 were underused, and almost half of the underused adverbials were found to be adversative adverbials.

Another study on linking adverbials is that of Liu (2013). In the study, the use of linking adverbials in the speaking and writing of Chinese EFL learners was analyzed with a corpus based approach comparing learners' corpora and native speakers' corpora. The findings show that Chinese EFL learners use more linking adverbials in their speaking than in their writing, which is the opposite speaking-writing pattern to native speakers. It is also mentioned that Chinese learners have an overall tendency towards overusing linking adverbials. Yet they show different tendencies between registers such as overusing corroborative adverbials in speaking and underusing them in writing. These tendencies were all linked to factors such as

L1 transfer, pedagogical instruction, stylistic awareness, semantic understanding and pragmatic considerations.

Leedham and Cai (2013), whose study mainly focuses on the use of linking adverbials in the essays of L2 undergraduate students in universities in the UK, also talk about the notion of over and underuse, and the misuse of certain grammatical features in learner texts such as the use of informal language, pronouns and linking adverbials. They mention that at the starting point of their education in the UK, students are affected by their secondary education in terms of lexical item choice for academic writing. However, they also mention that these students will benefit greatly from the L2 environment and the samples that the students will encounter throughout their university education.

Considering all the previous research studies outlined above, the appropriate use of adverbs remains a problem for even advanced learners of English although EFL learners are taught adverbs at even an early stage of language learning (Philip, 2008). Common problems that are encountered in learner texts are overuse of certain types of adverbs and lack of register awareness. In the light of the previous studies mentioned above, the current study aims to investigate the adverb uses of intermediate and advanced level learners.

3. Methodology

3.1. Participants

The research was conducted at a state university in the western part of Turkey with 29 students who studied in the engineering faculty where the means of education was English. The data were collected in a lecture hall with 60 seats which provided comfortable seating for 29 students. Furthermore, the lecture hall was well located, allowing sun light to enter the hall easily, which in turn established a suitable learning, teaching or assessment environment.

The participants of this research are 29 EFL freshman year students who study in different departments of the engineering faculty. Sampling was done according to willingness of participation. This group of students consists of 11 females and 18 males. Furthermore, 21 of these 29 EFL students are of Turkish nationality, and the remaining 8 students are from countries other than Turkey such as Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Sudan and Morocco. The participants are divided into two groups according to their English proficiency level, which was determined through an IELTS exam. The first group includes 18 participants who have an IELTS band score of 4,0 to 4,5 which equals a B1 to B1+ level; the second group includes 11 participants who have an IELTS band score ranging from 5,0 to 7,5 which equals a B2 level and upwards. The gender distribution for each group is as follows: 7 female and 11 male participants in Group1, 5 female and 6 male participants in Group 2. All participants had taken a 16-week academic writing class before they took part in the study.

3.2. Research questions

The study seeks to find answers to the problem by focusing on the research questions below:

1. What is the frequency of adverbs used by B1 and B1+ proficiency level learners of English?
2. What is the frequency of adverbs used by B2 and C1 proficiency level learners of English?
3. Are there quantitative differences between the learners in terms of level and variety of adverb use?
4. Are there differences in the use of adverbs between the actual corpus and the LSWE corpus?

3.3. Procedures

The study was carried out in two stages. The first involved assessing learners' proficiency levels using the IELTS exam in order to establish the groups in this study. All participants were gathered in a lecture hall and took the listening, reading and writing sections on the first day, and the speaking section was completed the following day. The exam papers were evaluated, and the scores of each participant were determined. Two weeks after the exam, the second stage was initiated by asking the learners to write an argumentative essay. The reason for choosing argumentative essays is that writers of these tasks need to act strategically in the organization of argumentative elements. For instance, the writer needs to place logical relations between stance, claims, evidence and rebuttals and connect them with appropriate inferences (Toulmin, 1958). They were given one hour to write an argumentative piece on whether it could be justified that professional sportsmen earn far more money than other professionals.

3.4. Sources of data

The sources of data in this study were collected from 29 argumentative essays written by under-graduate students with intermediate and advanced level proficiency in English. The total number of tokens was counted, and the adverbs that were used were determined and further divided into semantic categories. The frequency rates of each semantic category were compared with the academic prose component of the LSWE corpus that Biber et al. (1999) displayed.

3.5. Data collection& analysis procedures

All participants were informed via e-mail when and where they were supposed to gather for the participation of the study one week beforehand. They were seated in a lecture hall in the 3rd hour. The third hour was chosen in an aim to eliminate factors which might affect the outcome of their writing; that is, tiredness in the morning and hunger towards lunchtime. In order to make sure that the topic was clear, it was explained both in English and in Turkish, written on the white-board of the lecture hall and projected on the wall. The participants were given one hour to write an essay regarding their point of view on the topic of whether it is fully justified that professional sportsmen earn a great deal more money than other professions do. After the one-hour time limit had finished, the papers were collected and put into a folder.

A total of twenty-nine learners provided 29 argumentative essays for this study. First, the written texts were content analyzed. Each use of adverb was coded, and sub-categories were identified, including seven semantic functions of adverbs used in the texts. The actual adverbs were then tabulated according to the frequency of adverb use by both groups. The percentages were calculated and compared to the corpus LSWE used by Biber et al. (1999). The emerging scores and varieties of adverb uses were quantitatively compared in order to reveal the potential impact of proficiency level on the use of adverbs.

3.6. Reliability and validity

To determine the different language proficiency levels of the participants, an IELTS test was applied mainly because it is a standardized test recognized almost all around the world including the UK, Australia and the USA. It consists of four sections: Listening, Reading, Writing and Speaking. The Listening and the Reading sections both consist of 4 parts whereas the Speaking section consists of three and the writing section only of two parts. There are no explicit measurements for the ability of grammar and vocabulary present in the IELTS exam.

However, they are measured inside the other skills as efficient production which is also related to the knowledge of grammar and vocabulary.

The categories and classifications of adverbs were checked by an expert in linguistics. Discussions over adverbs were held to ensure the categorization and seven semantic categories to be analyzed in the study were agreed upon by the researchers. To ensure inter-rater reliability, the identification of the types of adverbs was done by the researchers and the expert, and the identifications were compared.

3.7. Limitations and delimitations

This study consists of the analysis of only 29 argumentative essays written on one topic, and the total number of word tokens used in the actual corpus is 6058, which can be considered as a low number of tokens when compared to other corpus studies, and these 29 argumentative essays were collected from a one time writing activity. A higher reliability could have been achieved if the writing process had been repeated. Another limitation that the study has is the scores the students attained from the IELTS exam. Although IELTS is an internationally recognized standardized test, such exams require training in order to get used to the format of the exam. For all participants of the study, it was their first time taking the IELTS exam, and thus the scores might be lower than they could have been after some knowledge and training for the exam. The reason for such an assumption is that the researchers have had previous experience in preparing candidates for the IELTS exam, and that it might be possible even for native speakers of English to get lower scores than they actually should. Also, the grading of the IELTS exam might be considered another limitation. The writing section of the exam was graded by the researchers with the public version of the IELTS writing rubric. Although the researchers have some experience in the teaching, evaluating and scoring of the IELTS test, an expert in the field could have been consulted in order to assure inter-rater reliability.

4. Results

The results of the collected and analyzed data will be presented, and basic findings will be mentioned in this section. This section starts with table 2, which is based on the actual corpora established from the learners' written texts, and it shows the number of adverbs used by the learners of Group 1 which consists of B1 and B1+ proficiency level learners.

Table 2

Percentages of the Semantic Functions of Adverbs of Group 1

	Place	Time	Manner	Degree	Additive/ Restrictive	Stance	Linking
Group 1	5	26	13	42	25	13	27
	0.15%	0.77%	0.39%	1.25%	0.74%	0.39%	0.80%

As it can be seen in Table 2, the learners of Group 1 use degree adverbs more commonly than any other semantic group of adverbs. They used forty-two adverbs of degree, all of which function as intensifiers in the corpora consisting of 3373 words, and they make up 1.25%. The second most used semantic group of adverbs are the linking adverbs which were used twenty-seven times, followed by time adverbs which were used twenty-six times and additive/restrictive adverbs with twenty-five uses. The percentages for degree, time, and additive/restrictive are as following: 0.80% for degree adverbs, 0.77% for time adverbs and 0.74% for additive/restrictive adverbs. The instances of stance and manner adverbs were equal. Both were used thirteen times, and each makes up 0.39% of the total words used in the essays of Group 1. The least frequent semantic group of adverbs used by the learners is place

with only five appearances, making up 0.15%, which is almost three times lower than the amount of manner and stance adverbs.

Table 3

Percentages of the Semantic Functions of Adverbs of Group 2

	Place	Time	Manner	Degree	Additive/ Restrictive	Stance	Linking
Group 2	1	16	11	32	22	14	19
	0.04%	0.60%	0.41%	1.19%	0.82%	0.52%	0.71%

The results shown in Table 3 display the number and percentages of adverbs used by Group 2, which consists of eleven learners with English proficiency levels ranging from B2 to C1. The percentages were calculated according to the amount of the appearances of adverbs in the corpora established from the learners' argumentative essays. Learners in this group have used 32 degree adverbs, of which only one is used as a down-toner, and these 32 degree adverbs constitute 1.19% of the 2685 words used in the essays. The second highest frequency of adverb preference can be seen in the category of additive/restrictive adverbs. Learners have used additive/restrictive adverbs 22 times, which equals to 0.82% of all words in the corpora. Additive/restrictive adverbs are followed by linking adverbs with a use of 0.71%. Time adverbs were used 16 times and stance adverbs 14 times. With a percentage of 0.04% place adverbs have the least frequent use. Both groups used degree adverbs the most, and the reason why degree adverbs were used obviously more than the other adverbs might be due to the nature of the topic in the learners' essays. Table 4 provides the percentages of the semantic functions of adverbs of both groups.

Table 4

Percentages of the Semantic Functions of Adverbs of Both Groups

	Place	Time	Manner	Degree	Additive/ Restrictive	Stance	Linking
Group 1	5	26	13	42	25	13	27
	0.15%	0.77%	0.39%	1.25%	0.74%	0.39%	0.80%
Group 2	1	16	11	32	22	14	19
	0.04%	0.60%	0.41%	1.19%	0.82%	0.52%	0.71%

Degree adverbs dominate all other semantic functions of adverbs in both groups. While there are 42 uses of degree adverbs in group 1 and 32 in group 2, their percentages do not differ significantly: 1.25% in group 1 and 1.19 % in group 2. The reason for this is that each group was evaluated according to their own corpora. The two most frequently used degree adverbs by both groups are *so* and *very* and below are some excerpts of the use of these adverbs by the EFL students in this study. It needs to be mentioned that these uses are not incorrect; rather they are displays of the uses in the actual corpus.

Very

1. "And if they break some part of their body **very** badly, they cannot be able to play soccer any longer."
2. "Answer is **very** easy. There are 204 country in the world and each country have their own national football club and small football clubs for each city."
3. "I saw a runner who cried because of her damaged leg. I guess, it was **very** painful."

So

1. "... are training *so* hard every season of the year and they love to prove themselves to earn much more money than others."
2. "... he has a big house, and *so* many cars that he doesn't have any place in his garage, and a beautiful wife."
3. "If we think truly this is not fair but *so* many people spend their own talent."

The second most dominating semantic function of adverbs differs between the two groups: in Group 1, learners used linking adverbs (0.80%), and in Group 2, learners used additive/restrictive adverbs (0.82%). Time adverbs rank number 3 in Group 2 (0.77%), and additive/restrictive adverbs appear to rank number 4.

Table 5

A Qualitative Display of the Semantic Categories and Sub-divisions of Adverbs Used by Both Groups

	n	Place	Time	Manner	Degree	Add/Restr.	Stance	Linking
Group 1	18	<i>There, here</i>	<i>Always</i>	<i>Hard</i>	Intensifier: <i>very</i>	Additive: <i>Also</i>	Epistemic: <i>maybe</i>	Result: <i>so</i>
Group 2	11	<i>down</i>	<i>Usually, nowadays</i>	<i>Hard</i>	Intensifier: <i>so, more</i>	Restrictive: <i>just, even</i>	Epistemic: <i>maybe</i>	Result: <i>so</i>

Table 5 displays the adverbs that were outstanding in terms of their uses by all learners, and it also provides a display of which sub-divisions both levels have preferred. In the category of place, learners in group 1 used the adverbs *there* and *here* whereas group 2 only used one place adverb, *down*. The two groups also show a difference in the category of time. While group 1 prefers to use the adverb *always* with a higher frequency, the adverbs *usually* and *nowadays* are used more often by Group 2. When we look at the degree adverbs category of both groups, we can see that although both groups prefer to use intensifiers, they have their differences in adverb choice. The adverb *very* is used quite dominantly in group 1 while the intensifiers *so* and *more* dominate in group 2. In the additive/restrictive category, the two groups show differences in both the sub-division of the category and the adverbs used. For instance, in group 1, the adverb *also* dominates in the additive category whereas group 2 prefers to use restrictive adverbs more; that is, *just* and *even*. When it comes to the categories of manner, linking and stance, it can be easily seen that both groups show a tendency to use largely the same sub-divisions and adverbs. Despite the fact that both groups preferred to use *maybe* as an epistemic adverb, group 2, which has a higher level of proficiency, used a greater variety of adverbs in the category of stance in comparison to the other group.

A quantitative display of the adverbs used in the actual corpus by the two groups is provided in table 6. The semantic category of stance adverbs is the leading category in terms of variety of adverbs used with a total number of 14 different adverbs. Stance adverbs are followed by time and manner adverbs which share second in terms of variety with a total number of 13 different adverbs used, and interestingly, degree adverbs, which have the highest frequency rate as shown in table 4, are positioned third together with the linking adverbs with a total of 11 different adverbs used. For the additive/restrictive category, 7 different adverbs were used, and the category coming last is the place adverbs category with only 4 different adverbs used, namely, *there*, *here*, *inside* and *down*.

Table 6
A Quantitative Display of Adverbs Used in the Actual Corpus

Semantic category	Group 1N	Group 2	Total N of adverbs
Place adverbs			
There	2	0	2
Here	2	0	2
Inside	1	0	1
Down	0	1	1
Time adverbs			
Always	5	1	6
Then	3	2	5
Already	3	1	4
Now	2	0	2
Nowadays	0	2	2
Today	1	0	1
Generally	0	1	1
Yet	0	1	1
Usually	0	3	3
Sometimes	1	1	2
Never	1	0	1
Just	1	1	2
Every	5	2	7
Manner adverbs			
Enough	0	2	2
Excessively	0	1	1
More	0	3	3
Hard	3	3	6
Badly	0	1	1
Truly	1	0	1
Better	1	0	1
Well-known	1	0	1
Alone	1	0	1
Well	1	0	1
Constantly	1	0	1
Completely	2	0	2
Regularly	1	0	1
Degree adverbs			
Really	5	2	7
More	3	6	9
Very	16	6	22
So	10	9	19
Too	5	1	6
Most	2	1	3
Completely	0	1	1
Fully	0	1	1
Much	0	1	1
Greatly	0	1	1
Almost	0	1	1
Additive/Restrictive adverbs			
Also	9	5	14
Just	5	9	14
Only	7	1	8
Again	2	0	2
Similarly	1	0	1
Too	1	0	1
Even	0	7	7
Stance adverbs			
Maybe	7	2	9
Really	1	1	2
About	1	0	1
Generally	1	0	1
Actually	1	3	4
Like	1	1	2
Probably	0	1	1
Normally	0	1	1
Kind of	0	1	1
Somehow	0	1	1
Totally	0	1	1
Personally	0	1	1
Possibly	0	1	1
Of course	0	1	1

Linking adverbs			
However	1	2	3
Whereas	0	1	1
So	19	8	27
Firstly	3	2	5
Secondly	0	1	1
Thirdly	0	1	1
Then	0	1	1
Otherwise	0	1	1
Instead	0	1	1
Finally	2	0	2
Therefore	1	0	1

Table 7 provides a comparison of the most frequently used adverbs in the actual corpus and their frequency rates in the LSWE corpus displayed in Biber et al. (1999, p.561-562). To start with, the time adverbs *then* and *always* were used 5 times and 6 times. *Then* makes up 0,0008% of the actual corpus which is 4 times higher than in LSWE.

Table 7

Comparison of the Most Frequently Used Adverbs in the Actual Corpus and LSWE Academic Prose

Semantic Category	LSWE Corpus % Academic Prose	Actual corpus %	Group 1	Group 2
Time adverbs				
then	**0,0002 %	0,0008%	3	2
always	**0,0002%	0,001%	5	1
Place adverbs				
*there	---	0,0003%	2	0
*here	**0,0002%	0,0003%	2	0
Manner adverbs				
Hard	(-)0,0002%	0,001%	3	3
Degree adverbs				
*very	**0,0002%	0,004%	16	6
*so	---	0,0031%	10	9
*too	---	0,001%	5	1
*really	---	0,0011%	5	2
Additive/Restrictive adverbs				
also	**0,0002%	0,0023%	9	5
just	**0,0002%	0,0023%	5	9
only	(+)0,001%	0,0013%	7	1
even	**0,0002%	0,0011%	0	7
Stance adverbs				
*maybe	---	0,0015%	7	2
*actually	---	0,0006%	4	1
Linking adverbs				
So	**0,0002%	0,0045%	19	8

*common in conversational prose

** at least 200 appearances and less than 1000 appearances per 1 million words

(-) less than 200 appearances per 1 million words

(+) over 1000 appearances per million words

The adverb *always* comprises 0,001% which is 5 times the amount used in LSWE. Again, two adverbs were more frequently used when compared to all the other place adverbs in the actual data, which are *there* and *here*. Both share the same frequency of use, 0,0003% in the actual corpus; however, *here* and *there* are adverbs more commonly used in conversational prose rather than the academic prose. From the category of manner adverbs, the adverb *hard* was used 6 times making up 0,001%. The manner adverb *hard* is used less than 0,0002% in both the conversational and academic prose in LSWE. *Very*, *so*, *too* and *really* are degree adverbs

that are used more in the conversational prose rather than in academic prose. Their percentages of appearance in the actual data are 0,004% for *very*, 0,0031% for *so*, 0,001% for *too* and 0,0011% for *really*. Except for *very*, which makes up at least 0,0002% according to the corpus findings in LSWE, the other three seem to have no relevance in the academic prose. From the additive/restrictive adverb category the adverbs *also*, *just*, *only* and *even* were used at a higher rate than the other adverbs in that category. *Also* and *just* comprise 0,0023%, indicating a problem of overuse of those adverbs when compared to LSWE. Excerpts of the uses of *just* and *also* are given below as they are the most frequently used adverbs in this category.

1. “Some sports professionals usually don’t attend university courses, most of them are just talented and usually do a lot of practices by them self.”
2. “But one man or woman will score some goals and he/she will have expensive cars, shiny houses and money. Lots of money. And we will just watch them.”
3. “They want to earn a lot of money for this work is exhausting. Also, they are travelling constantly.”
4. “Also they have to be talented from birth. Otherwise, they cannot get fame worldwide.”

The percentage of *Only* is 0,0013%, which is quite similar to its appearance in LSWE. *Maybe* was used 9 times and makes up 0,0015%, while *actually* was used 5 times and comprises 0,0006% of the actual corpus. *So*, functioning as a linking adverb, was used 27 times making up 0,0045% of the actual corpus whereas *so* in LSWE has a percentage of 0,0002%. Finally, table 8 provides a general overview of the findings. Below are student excerpts for the uses of *so* as a linking adverb since it was used 27 times, of which 19 were by the lower proficiency level Group 1. Overall, as a linking adverb, *so* has the highest frequency of all adverbs.

1. “There are a lot of teams in this industry *so* there are many people who are fans.”
2. “... and as I know most of them has not any carrier, *so* they have to deal with that.”
3. “We are old persons *so* we have opinions about this situation.”

Table 8
General Overview of Findings

	Group 1	Group 2	Combined
N of Essays	18	11	29
N of Tokens Used	3373	2685	6058
Average Essay Length	187	244	209
Adverbs Used	151	115	266
N of Different Adverbs	43	49	69
Percentage of Adverbs	4,8%	4,28%	4,43%
• Degree Adverbs	1,25%	1,19%	1,22%
• Additive/Restrictive Adverbs	0,74%	0,82%	0,77%
• Linking Adverbs	0,80%	0,71%	0,75%
• Time Adverbs	0,47%	0,57%	0,69%
• Stance Adverbs	0,39%	0,52%	0,45%
• Manner Adverbs	0,39%	0,40%	0,39%
• Place Adverbs	0,15%	0,03%	0,1%

The current study consisted of 29 essays: 18 essays written by Group 1, and 11 essays written by Group 2. A total of 6058 word tokens were used in these 29 essays with an average length

of 209 words per essay. The findings show that although the average essay length of Group 2 was higher, Group 1 used more adverbs. While adverbs make up 4,8% of all words used in Group 1, this amount is lower in Group 2 with 4,28% though Group 2 uses a wider variety of adverbs.

When it comes to the analysis of frequency rates of the semantic categories of adverbs between the two groups, the order from the highest to the lowest for Group 1 is: degree, linking, additive/restrictive, time, stance, manner and place. Whereas the order for Group 2 is: degree, additive/restrictive, linking, time, stance, manner and place

5. Discussion

The quantitative findings enabled us to identify three major issues, including *lack of register awareness*, *proficiency differences*, and *variety and frequency*. Lack of register awareness is using elements that belong to one register; that is, conversational prose or academic prose, which is one of the problems that the EFL learners in this study have. Proficiency differences is the second theme that is discussed in this section as one of the aims of this study is to see whether the two groups use adverbs differently, and if so, if it can be linked to the difference in proficiency level of the groups. The last issue, variety and frequency, discusses the relation between the frequency and the variety of adverbs used in the actual corpus.

5.1. Lack of register awareness

Reading through the studies conducted on adverb use in EFL learners' written English, surprisingly, one often comes across one notion: there is a lack of register awareness. This is not a stereotype specifically for one group of languages, but rather true for the majority of languages throughout the literature, to name a few Spanish, Japanese, Chinese, Korean and Turkish EFL learners show a tendency to use speech-like expressions in their academic writing, which is not desired as the way a language is used changes according to the environment, situation or purpose it is used in. Hinkel (2003) stated that "... *the more common certain types of adverb clauses in conversational discourse, the greater the likelihood of their high frequency rates in L2 academic essays,*" and based this statement on the grounds that most academically-oriented learners encounter L2 exposure through conversational discourse.

Perez-Paredes and Sanchez-Tornel (2014) mention that although the non-native speakers in their study had optimal grammatical accuracy, they had chosen adverbs both in their written and oral production, which native speakers would have not chosen in the same context. They also supported the fact that NNSs lack in register awareness by pointing to previous research and linking it to the overuse and underuse of certain types of adverbs. Gilquin&Paquot (2008) also suggest that EFL learners tend to use speech like expressions in academic writing in their study of how EFL learners of different mother tongue backgrounds use rhetorical functions which are especially prominent in academic writing. Instead of linking this problem with over and underuse of certain types of adverbs, they came up with four explanations that might be the reason for the lack of awareness. They pointed towards the influence of speech, L1 transfer, and instructional and developmental factors. Two other studies that mention this problem are Babanoğlu (2014) and Liu (2014). Babanoğlu in her corpus-based study on oral-like features in Turkish EFL learners' argumentative essays, states that using oral features in argumentative essays may result in a negative impact on the stylistically appropriate tone. Liu (2014) suggests that it is important to raise register awareness in choices of frequency adverbs in order to improve student writing.

The present study found the same problem with the studies mentioned above. The data shows that learners used adverbs that are more typical for their informal spoken prose in their argumentative essays. The majority of those can be seen especially in degree adverbs; that is, *so*, *too*, *really* and *very*, which were used with a considerable amount in the actual corpus. Other adverbs that have been used inappropriately in the academic prose due to the lack of register awareness are stance adverbs such as *maybe* and *actually*, and the place adverb *there*. The following section is going to discuss the differences in proficiency level.

5.2. Proficiency differences

Naturally, one may assume that as proficiency level increases, texts written by learners become longer and more sophisticated. Thus, it is expected that adverbs also get more native-like both in the choice of adverbs made and in their frequency rates with the increase of the proficiency level of learners. In their study with young learners, Perez-Paredes and Sanchez-Tornel (2014) support the fact that uses of adverbs become more sophisticated as age increases.

Looking at the data of the present study, such a pattern is present. The most favored adverbs are degree adverbs for both Group 1 and Group 2. However, this particular tendency does not mean that all degree adverbs were used appropriately. As mentioned earlier, both groups used adverbs that do not suit the academic prose. Yet it can be seen that the group with a lower proficiency level of English has a higher tendency for misuse in prose. Group 2, which has a higher proficiency level of English, displays a lower frequency of misuses in terms of prose, and owing to this fact, we may say that as proficiency increases so does accuracy.

Another assumption that one might make would be that the total number of different adverbs used in the written production increases with proficiency level as more advanced learners are expected to have a larger range of vocabulary. This is justified in this study as Group 2 used 49 different adverbs whereas Group 1 used only 43. Nevertheless, Group 1 displays a higher frequency rate of adverbs in their essays, but this can be linked to repetitive uses of certain adverbs.

5.3. Variety and frequency

According to Philip (2008) adverb + adjective collocations are expected to be performed by advanced language learners in their academic writing. As intensifying adverbs are a major component of this type of collocation, learners are expected to be able to use them as well. Hinkel (2003) found in her study that the greatest difference between NSs and NNSs texts was the frequency rate of intensifiers and emphatic adverbs. NNSs tend to use these in much higher rates than the other semantic groups.

In this study, EFL learners have used 69 different adverbs distributed among all 7 semantic categories of adverbs. Having the greatest rate of frequency, degree adverbs make up almost one-third of all adverbs that are present in the data. Degree adverbs are followed by additive/restrictive, linking, time, stance, manner and place adverbs, given in order of frequency rates. However, an interesting finding is that despite the fact that stance adverbs come 4th in frequency rates and manner adverbs 5th, the former semantic category has been used with the greatest variety, and the latter shares its second place with time adverbials.

6. Conclusion

The results of this study have provided an in-depth understanding of how EFL learners use adverbs in argumentative essays, and to what extent these adverbs differ across different

proficiency levels. The data collected showed that although the total number of adverbs used is higher for the learners of lower proficiency levels, learners that have a more advanced proficiency level used more sophisticated and a greater variety of adverbs as it is expected since vocabulary knowledge increases together with the proficiency level. However, the overuse of adverbs in general terms does not change with proficiency level.

The EFL learners in this study tend to overuse adverbs, especially intensifiers. This can also be concluded from the fact that almost one out of three adverbs used in the argumentative essays of the EFL learners in the current study is a degree adverb. Another side effect that this has is that they use adverbs that are common in the conversational prose. Intensifiers are used more frequently in the conversational prose, and as exposure to L2 is to a great extent in this prose, EFL learners adapt these features of the conversational prose in their academic writing, which in turn causes problems. Intensifying adverbs such as *very*, *really* and place adverbs such as *there* are among some of the adverbs that are used in the academic prose due to a lack of register awareness.

To conclude, in this study of EFL learners' use of adverbs in argumentative essays, it was aimed to see whether differences among different proficiency levels are present and to see if findings would be present to add to the existing literature. The EFL learners in this study showed similar patterns of adverb use as other NNSs in previous studies. A major problem in the EFL students' essays in this study is that traces of the conversational prose can be seen and that a tendency to overuse is present. Although the misuse of adverbs, namely, using adverbs that are more common in speech in the academic prose, may be linked to EFL learners' exposure to conversational input; the lack of classroom instructions on the issue may also be shown as a cause for the lack of register awareness.

7. Recommendations and implications

The fact that adverbs are a problematic word class for language learners, albeit they are taught at even early stages of language learning, may be due to the fact that all words that cannot be classified as a noun, verb or adjective are classified as adverbs. Hence, adverbs are classified as the biggest class of all. The very nature of the adverb thus poses a serious problem for NNSs and should be given instructional importance. In order to overcome the problems that adverbs pose, language teachers, especially those teaching writing, should have an in-depth understanding of adverbs and their uses across registers as well. Biber et al. (1999) and Quirk et al. (1985) are good references for the understanding of the nature of adverbs. Research on EFL writing teachers and teacher research could also be conducted to add to the importance of classroom instructions.

To improve the proper use of adverbs in students' academic writing, awareness raising activities could be used to draw attention to the uses of adverbs. As also stated in Hinkel (2004), vocabulary building activities could be used to increase the lexical capacity of L2 learners and give them a wider range of adverbs to choose from by integrating adverbs into vocabulary instruction.

In addition, activities that highlight the meanings and functions of adverbs in sentences and larger discourse could be used for classroom instructions. For instance, learners could be given sentences which contain adverbs and then the same sentences without the adverbs. The comparison of the two sentences may make the learners realize how adverbs change the meaning of a sentence and how they function. This could also be applied to larger discourses depending on the proficiency level of the learner. However, apart from the semantic functions

of adverbs, it is also important to mention the importance of their syntactic functions as the placement of an adverb in the sentence may change the meaning immensely. Specific feedback on the uses of adverbs in learners' essays could be provided by highlighting the potential positions that the adverb can be inserted. Yet this should be done with care in the L2 classroom so as not to cause any confusion and might be delayed until L2 learners have gained proficiency in the language.

However, one should not overlook the importance of register awareness. As shown in the present study, learners tend to use adverbs in their academic texts that belong to the spoken register. Thus, finding ways to overcome this problem and constituting a more proficient use of adverbs is essential, and one way of achieving this can be the use of corpus in the EFL classroom. As we have come to a technological era, most EFL classrooms are equipped with computers that have internet access, and this could be a great opportunity to implement the use of the corpus-based approach into the EFL classroom. In that way, EFL learners would be able to come across more authentic texts and would be able to see the different registers each adverb is used in. To see its effects, more research on the implementation of the corpus-based approach into the EFL classroom would be of benefit to the existing literature.

Research on adverbs does not take up a lot of space in the literature, it generally focuses on the use of linking adverbs in students' writing, and most corpus-based analysis is mainly on the comparison of NSs vs. NNSs texts. However, not much research has been conducted on proficiency level differences, which could provide instructional information on the teaching of adverbs for different proficiency levels.

References

- Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., & Finegan, E. (1999). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.
- Babanoğlu, M. P. (2014). A Corpus-based study on the use of pragmatic markers as speech-like features in Turkish EFL learners' argumentative essays. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 136, 186-193.
- Can, C. (2011). Conjunctive adverbs in learner English: A usage-based approach. In A. Lyda, D. G. Baker, M. Blaszak, & T. Wasza (Eds.), *The Dialogue of Language, the Dialogue of Culture*, pp. 92-105. Warsaw, Poland: University of Silesia.
- Crawford, W. (2008). Place and time adverbials in native and non-native English student writing. In A. Adel & R. Reppen (Eds.), *Corpora and Discourse: The Challenges of Different Settings*, pp. 267-289. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Granger, S., & Rayson, P. (1998). Automatic profiling of learner texts. *Learner English on Computer*, 119-131.
- Gilquin, G., & Paquot, M. (2008). Too chatty: Learner academic writing and register variation. *English Text Construction*, 1(1), 41-61.
- Hinkel, E. (2002). *Second language writers' text: Linguistic and rhetorical features*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hinkel, E. (2003). Adverbial markers and tone in L1 and L2 students' writing. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 35(7), 1049-1068.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching academic ESL writing*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Hinkel, E. (2005). Hedging, inflating, and persuading in L2 academic writing. *Applied Language Learning*, 15(1/2), 29.
- Leedham, M., & Cai, G. (2013). Besides... on the other hand: Using a corpus approach to explore the influence of teaching materials on Chinese students' use of linking adverbials. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 22(4), 374-389.

- Lei, L. (2012). Linking adverbials in academic writing on applied linguistics by Chinese doctoral students. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 11(3), 267-275.
- Liu, G. (2013). On the use of linking adverbials by Chinese college English learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 4(1), 149-155.
- Liu, G. (2014). Investigating Chinese college learners' use of frequency adverbs: A Corpus-based approach. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 5(4), 837-843.
- Narita, M., & Sugiura, M. (2006). The use of adverbial connectors in argumentative essays by Japanese EFL college students. *English Corpus Studies*, 13, 23-42.
- Orfano, B. M., Oliveira, A. L., & Tenuta, A. (2014). Epistemic modality through the use of adverbs: a corpus-based study on learners' written discourse. *Letras&Letras*, 30(2), 104-121.
- Peacock, M. (2010). Linking adverbials in research articles across eight disciplines. *Ibérica: Revista de la Asociación Europea de Lenguas para Fines Específicos (AELFE)*, (20), 9-34.
- Pérez-Paredes, P., & Sánchez-Tornel, M. (2014). Adverb use and language proficiency in young learners' writing. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 19(2), 178-200.
- Philip, G. (2008). Adverb use in EFL student writing: from learner dictionary to text production. In *Proceedings of the XIII EURALEX International Congress, Barcelona, 15-19 July*, pp. 1301-1310.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvil, J. (1985). *A grammar of contemporary English*. London: Longman
- Sheikhani, F. L., Abdollahi-Guilani, M. (2017). A corporal investigation into the employment of adverbs on masters EFL candidates' academic essays. *Modern Journal of Language Teaching Methods*, 7(1), 156-167.
- Trebits, A. (2009). Conjunctive cohesion in English language EU documents—A corpus-based analysis and its implications. *English for Specific Purposes*, 28(3), 199-210.
- Toulmin, S. E. (1958). *The uses of argument*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yağız, O., & Demir, C. (2014). Hedging strategies in academic discourse: a comparative analysis of Turkish writers and native writers of English. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 158, 206-268.