Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Effects of L1 Transfer on L2: A Contrastive Analysis of Urdu and English Coordinating Conjunctions */and/* and */aur/*

Tahir Qayyum[1]   Shahida Khalique*[2]   Sobia Ahmed[3]

1. Lecturer, Department of English University of Kotli, Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of English University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir, Pakistan
3. Lecturer, Higher Education Department Govt. of AJ&K, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author:** | shahada.khalique1@ajku.edu.pk |

ABSTRACT

This study compares and contrasts the usage of /and/ and /aur/ within the framework of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH). Data on Urdu conjunctions appearing in various structures were obtained from an unpublished research paper on Conversation Analysis, while data on English conjunctions were obtained from several past studies. Hundred Graduating students (twenty five from each institution) from five different Higher Education Institutions of Kotli AJ&K (Pakistan) were provided with audio conversations in Urdu and asked to translate them into English (the target language). The written translations of the data were analyzed inorder to check the influence of L1 (Urdu) on the use of coordinating conjunctions of L2 (English). The findings divulge that the conjunction /aur/ poses hitches for Urdu speakers when translating L1 structures into L2, specifically in how the conjunction /aur/ is used in normal conversation. The study employs three possibilities of emergence in the comparative study of English and Urdu: no difference between the L1 coordinating conjunction /aur/ and its L2 counterpart "and," no similarity between the two, and a structure present in L1 but absent in L2. This study may assist English teachers and learners who have to deal with transfer of Urdu L1 structures to L2 (English).

| **KEYWORDS** | Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, English, Conjunctions, L1 Transfer, Target Language, Urdu |

Introduction

Coordinating conjunctions are ubiquitous in all languages, but in some languages, they play a crucial role in communication, making them vital for second language acquisition. Urdu is Pakistan's national language and serves as a lingua franca, while English is not only an official language but is also widely used in academic and non-academic settings. The coordinating conjunction "and" is used imperceptibly in both languages, which pose difficulties for second language speakers, particularly those whose first language is Urdu and are using English as a medium of communication.

The influence of L1 on L2 acquisition in Second Language Acquisition can result in either positive or negative transfer of L1 knowledge, structure, and cultural view into L2. Numerous theories consider the positive and negative transfer of L1 and have important pedagogical implications. The theories emphasizing positive transfer of L1 into L2, however, sometimes overlook factors beyond control. According to Cummins' (1983) dual-iceberg notion of L1 transfer to L2, L1 transfer is based on two separated proficiencies of the two languages, which are surface features (i.e., linguistic structures) and underlying features. Cummins' notion of Common Underlying Proficiency (CUP) suggests that there are universal principles and constraints shared by all natural languages, indicating that L1 transfer is monitored by Universal Principles and L1 structures can be easily transferred to

L2. Nonetheless, the cognitive view may face difficulties with cultural and language-specific interpretations. The perspective of no influence of L1 on L2 creates opposing ideas within Universal grammarians. Faerch and Kasper (1987) argue that L1 transfer has little to do with L2 learning since the innate language faculty operates under the same universal mental mechanisms. Similarly, Dulay and Burt (1972 and 1975) see no role of L1 in L2 learning as learning is facilitated by UG principles. This suggests that L1 and L2 follow the same UG principles and do not require L1 transfer into L2.

Negative transfer, on the other hand, focuses on comparing linguistic structures across different cultures and discourses, which is the main objective of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH) and Contrastive Rhetoric. CAH combines psychological aspects derived from the Behaviorist theory with linguistic analysis based on structuralism. According to Lado (1957), language and culture are interdependent, and linguistic structures are inevitably influenced by cultural factors. This cultural influence on language learning can result in difficulties when learners encounter differences in linguistic structures between their L1 and L2, leading to negative transfer from L1 to L2. James (1980) observes that learning difficulties often arise due to negative transfer of patterns from L1 to L2, particularly when the languages are dissimilar. Contrastive Rhetoric (CR) takes into account cross-cultural differences and cultural conventions that contribute to negative transfer in L2 learning. In this study, we focus on the negative transfer of L1 patterns by students when translating into L2, recognizing that the functions of the word /aur/ are pattern-dependent and culturally structured, highlighting the potential implications of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis (CAH).

This paper explores the multifaceted role of the Urdu conjunction /aur/ and the difficulties it poses for Urdu L1 speakers when transferring its structures/patterns to L2, specifically English. While traditional approaches in language pedagogy typically focus on conjunctions as connectives, cohesive devices, or coordinators, this paper argues that conjunctions serve a broader range of functions in language and should be studied accordingly.

Literature Review

Previous research on conjunctions tends to view them only as linking devices between two words, phrases, clauses, or sentences. However, recent studies have pointed out that conjunctions can also function as discourse markers, pragmatic markers, procedural devices, or explicit markers of semantic relations. The meanings conveyed by conjunctions can be structure-dependent and context-sensitive, making them difficult to translate for second-language learners. Halliday and Hassan (1976) introduced the concept of cohesion as the way in which the elements of a text are connected through grammatical, lexical, and semantic means, and they identified conjunctions as one of the primary cohesive devices that help to establish coherence and coherence in a text. In addition, conjunctions can also convey various relationships between the elements they connect, such as addition, contrast, cause-effect, and temporal relationships. It is worth noting that Halliday and Hasan (1976) classify conjunction types based on their discourse function, rather than simply their grammatical role (such as additives, adversative, causal and temporal). They also identify conditional and concessive conjunctions. They argue that understanding the discourse function of conjunctions is important for understanding how they contribute to the coherence of a text. In a nutshell, no matter what type of conjunctions scholars classify them as, their fundamental purpose remains either to coordinate or to provide cohesion in a sentence or a discourse.

Haiman and Thompson (1988) argue that it is a common expectation for conjunctions to serve as coordinators and have a basic and universal function throughout the syntactic structure. So, Conjunctions play a fundamental coordinating role in all languages, but the specific functions of coordinating conjunctions differ across languages. They can serve various purposes, such as syntactic linking, reference switching, or indicating non-finite tense. These differences demonstrate the variability of conjunctions across different languages (Haiman & Thompson, 1988). The observation indicates that the usage of coordinating conjunctions is a language-specific approach and dependent on its speakers. This suggests that the coordination patterns are also language-specific. The guidelines for using coordinating conjunctions are not as straightforward as they are perceived to be, as they are heavily influenced by the language type and the language users. However, the key aspect is to examine the structures that diverge from the standard usage.

Lester (1990) emphasizes that conjunctions serve as connectives between words or groups of words, which in turn join multiple clauses to form a single sentence. This linking function of conjunctions is essential for constructing coherent and cohesive discourse. Conjunctions can be used to link words, phrases, clauses, or sentences, and they play an important role in creating coherence and cohesion in a text or discourse. Lester (1990) and some other scholars (such as Baskervill and Sewell (1896), Kitis (2000) and Eckhard-Black and Whitle, R. (1992) exclude correlative conjunctions as a separate category and argue that they can be considered as a type of coordinating conjunctions because they serve the same function of linking or coordinating two or more words, phrases, or clauses. Nevertheless, three traditional types of conjunctions are agreed upon as coordinating, subordinating, and correlative conjunctions.

Sweetser (1990) argues against the approach of analyzing functional words like conjunctions in a prescriptive manner. Various studies indicate that the coordinating conjunction "and" in English is highly frequent and used extensively in spoken language. Eckhard-Black's (1992) definition aligns with the common understanding of conjunctions as linking words that connect words, phrases, or clauses. This linking function helps to create coherence and structure in language, allowing speakers and writers to express more complex ideas by connecting different parts of a sentence or discourse. The traditional view among many linguistic scholars and grammarians is that conjunctions primarily serve as connectors or coordinators between two words, phrases, clauses, or sentences. This view emphasizes the role of conjunctions in joining elements together and building a link between them. While there are other perspectives that see conjunctions as having additional functions, the traditional view is still widely accepted and commonly taught in language pedagogy. In a study of the British National Corpus by Leech, Rayson, and Wilson (2001), "and" was found to be the third most frequently used word in a collection of 100 million written and spoken language samples.

However, Leung (2005) highlights that conjunctions have been analyzed by different scholars using various labels such as discourse markers, pragmatic markers, procedural devices, and so on. This suggests that the role of conjunctions is not limited to just connecting or coordinating words, phrases, or clauses, but they also serve other functions in discourse, such as marking discourse boundaries, indicating speaker attitude, and conveying procedural information. Many authors argue that these classifications are not sufficient to capture the full range of functions that conjunctions can serve in language. Instead, they propose a more nuanced typology that includes additive, adversative, causal, and temporal conjunctions. According to Leung (2005), Rouchota refers to conjunctions as "procedural devices" and argues that conjunctions can have multiple meanings and functions beyond their traditional role as connectors or coordinators.

Sanders and Maat (2006) and Aidinlou and Reshadi (2014) both support the idea that conjunctions are explicit markers of semantic relations. They argue that these semantic relations are structure-dependent and context-sensitive, and that the meanings of conjunctions can be problematic when translated into a second language, as is the case with Urdu speakers trying to transfer the structures and patterns of the conjunction /aur/ into English.

Hertwig, Benz, and Krauss (2008) have pointed out that the rules for coordinating conjunctions, particularly the conjunction "and," do not always conform to a single probability. Many linguists have found that the meaning of "and" varies depending on the context of use in natural languages. Hertwig et al. (2008) investigated how people understand this conjunction through various methods. They found that even those who violate the rules of using "and" can understand the meaning by using the logical operator ^. However, these interpretations are considered ambiguous and violate the universal conjunction rules, according to the authors' argument. Therefore, the meaning of coordinating conjunctions is not always clear-cut and may depend on context and individual interpretation. While there is no such study conducted on Urdu conjunctions, it can be assumed that a similar frequency ratio of conjunctions can be expected in Urdu as well.

Material and Methods

The researchers employed Ellis's (1986) conceptual framework that considers the possibilities of emergence, within the theoretical framework of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, to carry out a comparative study of the coordinating conjunction /and/ and /aur/ in English and Urdu. However, due to limitations of time and space, only three possibilities of emergence were considered. Additionally, the study took into account the point of difficulty, as proposed by Johansson (2008), with a focus on the inter-language issues of Urdu speakers, particularly in the use of the coordinating conjunction /aur/ "and".

Data Collection

The researchers utilized self-collected secondary data, which was selected due to its significant use of coordinating conjunctions, a crucial aspect of second language acquisition. The data was shared with participants in written form to examine the challenges they faced while translating from L1 to L2. Additionally, previous studies on the usage of English conjunction "and" were consulted to identify patterns of usage. Hertwig, Benz, and Krauss's (2008) work on "Conjunction Fallacy and the Many Meanings of and" is a relevant source that addresses similar issues, albeit without an SLA focus.

Participants

The study included a sample of one hundred undergraduate English students from five higher education institutions located in Kotli Azad Kashmir. Both male and female students were equally represented in the sample, and participants were limited to those in their first semester who had already passed a secondary-level examination. These students were expected to have a good command of English and better language proficiency.

Sampling Technique and Data Collection Tools

To meet the time constraints, the researcher employed convenient sampling to select participants who were given a script of a recorded conversation to translate into the target language. The participants were permitted to discuss with others and refer to any

available written material. After 20 minutes, the translated material was collected from them on plain pages, and they were asked to discuss any difficulties they encountered during the translation process.

Results and Discussion

The following section discusses the influence of L1 transfer on the use of coordination conjunctions of L2 that is English.

No difference between L1 and L2 structure (1ˢᵗ hypothesis)

The initial step of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis involved examining what would happen if there were no differences between the structures, entries, or terms of L1 and L2. The coordinating conjunction "and" in English serves various purposes aside from simply linking words, phrases, or clauses. The research focused on the uses of "and" and its Urdu equivalent beyond its coordinating functions. Hertwig, Benz, & Krauss (2008) cited Lang's (1991) argument that the frequent use of "and" is dependent on the context for meaning, as demonstrated by the example:

Her husband is in the hospital and she is seeing other men.

Kitis (2000) also highlights that the aforementioned statement has meanings beyond its typical function of connecting two clauses or sentences. An analogous example exists in the form of a proverb in the Urdu language. The researcher extracted the following example from a conversation between a father and his son where the father used this expression to convey the suffering he was experiencing:

Chirya ki jaan ja rahi hai aur bachu'n ka khail ho rha hai.

This structure is commonly used by Urdu speakers. As per the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, when the utterance mode in L1 matches the mode in L2, positive transfer occurs. The example from natural conversation makes this point clear.

  A: *Suna hai chatri lay k jati hai school.*

       (I have heard that she goes to school carrying an umbrella.)

  B: →   *(laugh) han, aur wo bhi Kapru'n k sath matching.*

       (Yes, umbrella and the one that matches her clothes).

Positive transfer, which involves the shared syntactic transfer between L1 and L2, aids in the acquisition of a second language. The majority of participants used it correctly, with only minor variation, such as the use of "also" instead of "too" by half of them.

  A: *tu esi wja sy parasan ho*?

       (You are worried because of this reason)

  B: →   *Han.* **aur** *bhi buht sy misail hain.*

        (Yes. And there are many other problems too)

This excerpt from a natural conversation presents an intriguing structure. If /aur/ is taken as a conjunction and translated as "and," it would lead to a faulty structure.

However, in this case, /aur/ is being used as an additive rather than a traditional conjunction. This additive use of /aur/ is also common in English, as claimed by Halliday and Hassan (1976). Remarkably, all participants successfully transferred both the additive and conjunction uses of /aur/ from their first language to the second language, demonstrating that the structure of L1 is no different from that of L2 and positive transfer can occur in second language acquisition.

Table 1
No difference between L1 and L2 structure

Use of Urdu conjunction as:	No. of Students	Successful transfer of L1 into L2	Percentage	Failed to transfer L1 into L2	Percentage
An additive	100	100	100%	00	00%
coordination	100	100	100%	00	00%

The use of the coordinating conjunction /and/ and /aur/ as an additive is a common feature across many languages and typically aligns with L2 structures. When L2 learners have a fundamental understanding of the L2, it becomes easier for them to transfer such structures positively when the purpose remains the same in both languages. The same applies to the coordination function of "and/aur," which reflects positive transfer from L1 to L2, effectively achieving the communicative objectives.

No similarity between L1 and L2 structure (2nd hypothesis)

If the structure of a language's L1 differs from L2, it may have an impact on the acquisition of the second language. In Urdu, there are certain structures for /aur/ that are distinct and cannot be directly translated into English. For instance:

A : dil hi nahi krta aany ka.

(I don't feel like coming back (from there))

B : Yhi tu mosam hota hy na wahan enjoy karne ka.

(This is the kind of weather in which one can enjoy there, right?)

A: → ***aur*** *nahi tu kya bht maza aya.*

(And if not, then what, it was really enjoyable.)

The expression "aur nahi tu kya" is a multiword phrase used in Urdu to strongly agree with someone and validate their previous statement. In English, there is a syntactically complex equivalent structure that incorporates "and" as a conjunction. This creates a challenge for Urdu speakers trying to translate it into English. As the following table shows:

Table 2
No similarity between L1 and L2 structure

Use of Urdu conjunction:	No. of Students	Translation from L1 into L2	Percentage
Translated as "Yes"	100	48	48%
Translated as "Of course"	100	27	27%
Others	100	25	25%

When participants were asked to translate this structure into English, 48 of them responded with a stressed or lengthened "yes" to indicate strong agreement. 27 participants used "of course" as a strong agreement, and 25 found it difficult to translate and were unable to provide a satisfactory response. When asked about the problem, all of them acknowledged that such structures cannot be translated effectively and that they would either alter the sentence or simply use "yes" to indicate agreement.

This highlights the difficulty in translating language-specific patterns present in L1 but absent in L2 into a target language. Subsequently, the students were asked their opinion regarding the translation of such structures into English. Initially, most of them were uncertain whether such a structure exists in L2 or not. Some of them were convinced that transferring such patterns into English is impossible. This demonstrates that language-specific uses create challenges for L2 learners.

The Structure Present in L1 and Absent in L2

In the context of second language acquisition, when language learners encounter a situation where they cannot find a term, structure, or lexical entry in the target language, they either try to transfer the structure from their first language to the second language or skip it entirely due to its non-availability in the second language. The following example can further illustrate this point:

A: *school jati hy ab*?

    (does she go to school?)

B: *han jati hy.*

     (yes, she does)

A: hmmm

A: → ***aur?***

     (anything else)

 B: → ***aur*** *Koi kas Nahi.*

      (Nothing special)

  A: hmm

In this excerpt, the conjunction /aur/ is highlighted twice with arrows and bold font. In the study, participants were given this conversation and asked to translate it into their second language (English). However, 15 participants were only able to produce "anything" as a turn initiator for the first instance, while 26 translated it as "so". The remaining participants were unable to find an alternate word in English. In this context, /aur/ serves as both a topic initiator and an announcement of the closure of the previous topic by the speakers. See the data in the following table for clarification:

Table 3
The Structure Present in L1 and Absent in L2

Use of Urdu conjunction:	No. of Students	Transfer of L1 into L2	Percentage

Translated as "Anything/ anything else"	100	15	15%
Translated as "So"	100	26	26%
Others	100	59	59%

The absence of a specific feature or structure in L2, which is present in L1, results in negative transfer in SLA, according to the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis. This is demonstrated in English, where there is no corresponding construction for the language-specific feature of /aur/ in Urdu. Previous studies have not discussed the conjunction "and" in relation to this feature. In the second example, all participants translated /aur/ by de-emphasizing it and instead focusing on the second part of the utterance. They translated it as "nothing, nothing special, and nothing much." Specifically, 82 students translated it as "nothing special," while 10 came up with "nothing much," and eight simply said "nothing.

Table 4
The Structure Present in L1 and Absent in L2

Use of Urdu conjunction:	No. of Students	Successful transfer of L1 into L2	Percentage
Translated as "Nothing special"	100	82	82%
Translated as "nothing much"	100	10	10%
Translated as "Nothing"	100	08	08%

The L1 structure could not be transferred to L2, leading to negative transfer in SLA. Additionally, an intriguing feature was discovered in the Urdu construction that renders it more explicit.

A: *Khana khaya?*

        (Have you had lunch)

B: *han Kha lia rasty mein.*

        (Yes, I had the one on my way)

A: hmmmm

A: → ***aur*** *sunau*

        (what else?)

B: → ***aur*** *yar Musam buht kamal ka hai*

        (well, it's terrific weather outside)

A: *aham*

The participants were given this excerpt of a conversation to translate into their second language as best they could. All the other parts of the conversation were translated by everyone, but the utterance made by speaker "A" followed by "B" (indicated in bold with arrows) stumped many. A total of 55 participants could not even produce a single word or utterance to translate the first sentence "aur sunao" by speaker "A". Twenty-three of them,

however, attempted to transfer it to their second language as "anything new", nineteen as "tell me something (new)", and three as "any news".

Table 5
The Structure Present in L1 and Absent in L2

Use of Urdu conjunction:	No.of Students	Successful transfer of L1 into L2	Percentage
Complete failure	100	55	55%
Translated as "anything new"	100	23	23%
Translated as " tell me something"	100	19	19%
Translated as "any news"	100	03	03%

The structure that begins with /aur/ is a common feature of Urdu and some other Asian languages used for initiating a new topic when the previous one has been mutually concluded. However, this structure has no equivalent in English. In the subsequent line spoken by speaker "B", all the words except /aur/ were successfully translated by the participants. Since /aur/ did not seem to contribute much to the utterance, most of the participants left it untranslated, possibly because they could not find an equivalent in English. This demonstrates that the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis holds true, as the absence of an L2 entry results in negative transfer from L1 in SLA.

Table 6
The Structure Present in L1 and Absent in L2

Use of Urdu conjunction as:	No. of Students	Successful transfer of L1 into L2	%	Failed to transfer L1 into L2	%
"Aur Sunao"	100	00	0%	100	100%
/aur/ taken from the prior utterance	100	00	0%	100	100%

The results reiterate the difficulty of transferring language and culture-specific practices from L1 to L2 for L2 learners.

Conclusion

Variations exist across languages, including unique uses of conjunctions such as the Urdu conjunction "aur." This study reveals that such peculiar uses of conjunctions in Urdu serve multiple functions, including agreement, intensification, and topic initiation or formal announcement of closing the previous topic during conversations. Results from testing a limited sample of participants who acquired English as a second language indicate that positive transfer from L1 to L2 occurs when L1 offers similar structures and entries as L2. Conversely, negative transfer occurs when structures and entries from L1 do not align with L2. All participants in the study exhibited comparable results, validating the possibilities of emergence in SLA context, as suggested by Ellis (1986). The study also aligns with Johansson's (2008) finding that the degree of difficulty is equally significant when transferring L1 knowledge to L2 in SLA. However, this is a small-scale study restricted to undergraduate students of English from a single university, and different results may emerge from additional data. The study underscores the importance of incorporating L1 talk-in-interaction into second language acquisition research and practices to understand the difficulties encountered by second language learners when transferring their L1 knowledge and structure to L2. Wang (2004) has rightly emphasized the importance of L1 in L2 learning, highlighting its dynamic nature and multifaceted dimensions. In the context of SLA, teachers play a critical role in making pedagogic situations less problematic.

However, learners' cognitive operations are also crucial and require thematic focus rather than just structures. To promote learners' idea development, large-scale research using modern techniques can be helpful in coping with problematic situations. The use of L1 in L2 classrooms may not provide a solution, but gradual idea development can minimize complexities. Incorporating corpora of natural spoken text focusing on similar situations into L2 teaching can help learners maximize their exposure to the target language and facilitate easier learning. A syllabus that includes natural settings of spoken data is also essential to L2 learning.

References

Aarts, B. (2018). *English Syntax and Argumentation*. (2nd ed.). New York: Palgrave

Aidinlou, N. A., & Reshadi, E. (2014). A Comparative Study of the Use of Conjunctions and References in Electronic Mails vs. Paper-based Letters" *Journal of Language Teaching and Research. 5,* 611-615

Baskervill, W. M., & Sewell, J. W. (2015). *An English Grammar*. Lakewood, Colorado: Full Moon Publications.

Cummins, J. (1983). Language Proficiency and Academic Achievement [C]. In J. W. Oller, Jr. (ed.) *Issues in Language Testing Research [A]*. Rowley, Mass.: Newbury House.

Dulay, H. & Burt, M. (1972). Goofing: An indicator of children's second language learning strategies. *Language Learning*, 22(2), 235-251.

Dulay, H., & Burt, M. (1974). Natural Sequences in Child Second Language Acquisition. *Language Learning*, 24, 37-53.

Eckhard-Black, C., & Whittle, R. (1993). *Cassell's Contemporary German*: *A Handbook of Grammar, Current Usage and Words*, (1st ed.). Macmillan Pub Co.

Ellis, R. (1986). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Faerch, C. & Kasper, G. (1987). Perspectives on language transfer. *Applied Linguistics* 8, 111-36.

Haiman , J., Thompson, S. A. (Eds.). (1998). *Clause Combining in Grammar and Discourse. (Typological Studies in Language 8.)* Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31(7), 931-952.

Haliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. (1st Ed.). London: Routledge.

Hertwig, R., Benz, B., & Krauss, S. (2008). Conjunction fallacy and the many meanings of and. *Cognition*, 108, 740–753.

James, C. (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. New York: Longman.

Kitis, E. (2000). Connectives and Frame Theory: The Case f Antinominal Hypotextual 'And'. *Pragmatics & Cognition, 8*, 357-409.

Lado. R. (1957). *Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Michigan: University of Michigan

Leech, G. & Svartvik, J. (1994). *A Communicative Grammar of English.* (3rd Ed.). London: Longman.

Leech, G., Rayson, P., & Wilson, A. (2001). *Word Frequencies and Written and Spoken English: Based on the British National Corpus*. London: Longman.

Lester, M. (1990). *Grammar in the Classroom*. New York: Macmillan Pub Co.

Leung, C. (2005) *A Comparison of the Use of Major English Conjunctions by American and Hong Kong University Students*. LUNDS Universitet.

Sanders, T., & Maat, P. H. (2006). *Cohesion and Coherence: Linguistic Approach*. Utrecht University, Netherlands: Elsevier Limited.

Schiffrin, D. (1987). Discourse markers. Cambridge University Press.

Sweetser, E. E. (1990). *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge

Wang, L. (2004). Language learning in the L1-L2 interface. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 7(4), 303-325

Wang, W., & Wen, Q. (2002). L1 Use in the L2 Composing Process: An exploratory study of 16 Chinese EFL writers. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 11, 225- 246.