A Study of Cohesive Markers Used in L1 and L2 Essay Writing: Translation versus Direct Composition

ANONGNAD PETCHPRASERT
Department of English
University of Phayao, Thailand
anongnad.pe@up.ac.th

ABSTRACT

This study presents a comparative analysis of frequency rates of cohesive markers used in Thai and English written texts of graduate students who were speakers of Thai. In addition, the analysis describes the use of cohesive markers found in L1 and L2 essays with direct writing and translation. The effects of L1 transfers and participants' metalinguistic awareness were also investigated. Specifically, the study focuses on the frequency rates of uses of cohesion based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) cohesion analysis such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion, and conjunction in written texts. The purpose of the study is to determine the specific differences and similarities in the uses of cohesive markers in the essays. The quantitative analysis of the cohesive markers found in the English direct writing essays indicates that writers employ significantly higher frequency rates of personal reference and demonstratives than those in translation. Regarding translation method, the writers tend to rely on a repertoire of L1 rhetorical organization and language features in constructing the L2 written texts. The preponderance of cohesive markers used in L2 texts reflects the writers' attempts to construct ideas flow with the limitations of syntactic and lexical range.

Keywords: cohesion; direct writing; translation; Thai cohesion; English cohesion

INTRODUCTION

Research in L1/L2 writing has captured the attention of educators for decades (Friedlander 1990, Uzawa 1996, van Weijen, van den Bergh, Rijlaarsdam & Sanders 2009). Early studies show that L2 writers use L1 in L2 writing but the extent to which they do in their writing is unclear or the amount they use are not the same (Wolfersberger 2003, van Weijen, van den Bergh, Rijlaarsdam, & Sanders 2009). Since writers with low L2 proficiency tend to rely on their L1 than those who are proficient in L2, several studies have tried to investigate the L1 transfer in L2 writing process (Jones & Tetroe 1987 as cited in Wolfersberger 2003). In addition, the comparison between the bilateral compositions has been done for several reasons. Some early studies examined rhetorical organisation and cohesion in written texts (Berman 1994, Godó 2008, Mohamed-Sayidina 2010), writing proficiency (van Weijen, van den Bergh, Rijlaarsdam, Sanders, 2009), writing processes such as direct writing and translation (Kobayashi & Rinnert 1992, McCarthey, Guo & Cummins 2005, Xiaoyan 2007, Lifang 2008).

COHESION

The cohesion used in the study is based on Holiday and Hasan (1976): *reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion,* and *conjunction. Reference cohesion* indicates one item in a text points to another element for its interpretation. Reference ties are of three types: *pronominals, demonstratives* or *definite articles,* and *comparatives* (Witte & Faigley 1981). The category

of personal reference includes all specific deictic personal pronouns, possessive pronouns and possessive adjectives. The sentences below illustrate different types of reference cohesion.

1. *Pronominals*
(1) ***He*** relaxes and acts in ***his*** normal manner.

2. *Demonstratives or definite articles*
(2) ***This*** is part of growing up.
(3) It is easy to see ***the*** physical needs such as food and shelter.

3. *Comparatives*
(4) The ***older*** generation is often quick to condemn college students for being carefree and irresponsible. But those who remember their own youth do so ***less*** quickly.

(Witte & Faigley 1981, p. 191)

Likewise, pronominal, demonstrative and comparative references were found as references in Thai (Puprasert 2007). Pronominal references create cohesion in a text but in different forms such as nouns, zero pronouns or possessive pronouns as they are used to refer back to another linguistic form (Chanawongsa 1986 as cited in Puprasert 2007). Examples of Thai references with English translation are shown below.

1. *Pronominal*
(5) ***ไซมอน***อยู่ที่ไหน- ***เขา***อยู่ในครัว
Where's ***Simon***? - ***He*** is in the kitchen.
(Puprasert 2007, p. 53)

2. *Demonstratives*
(6) พันซื้อ***รถคันใหม่ รถคันนั้น***ราคาแพงมาก
Pun bought ***a new car***. ***That car*** is very expensive.
(Chanawangsa 1986 as cited in Noonkhan 2002, p 16)

3. *Comparatives*
(7) พระพุทธรูปที่***สวยที่สุด***ในประเทศไทย อยู่ที่จังหวัดพิษณุโลก
The ***most beautiful*** Buddha image in Thailand is in Phitsanulok.
(Noonkhan 2002, p 16)

Substitute is more frequently found in conversation than in written texts. According to Tangkiengsirisin's (2010) work, substitute is defined as "one linguistic item is replaced by another that contributes new information in a text" (p. 4). Subtypes of substitute are illustrated below.

1. *Nominal*
(8) A: Did you ever find ***a lawnmower***?
B: Yes, I borrowed ***one*** from my neighbor.
(Witte & Faigley 1981, p. 191)

2. *Verbal*
9) Eastern people ***take it seriously***, at least some of them ***do***.
(Clark 1983: 5 as cited in Puprasert 2007, p. 14)

3. *Casual*
(10) A: ***Is there going to be an earthquake****?*
B: It says ***so***.
(Halliday & Hasan 1976, p. 130)

Chanawongsa (1986) has found that substitute is less frequently used than other cohesive ties. According to her work, Thai substitutions are classified into three categories. The Thai example sentences with English translations are as follows.

1. *Nominal*
(11) ***เค้ก***ในร้านนี้น่าอร่อยทุกชิ้นเลย ฉันอยากกิน***เค้กอันนั้น***จัง
All cakes in this bakery seem delicious. I want to eat ***that one***.
(Noonkhan 2002, p. 16)

2. *Verbal*
(12) *"ต่อไปนี้ ผมจะให้เจ้าหน้าที่**ทำงาน**ในสิ่งที่ควรจะ**ทำ** ผมจะรับผิดชอบเอง"*
พ.ต.ท.ทักษิณ กล่าว…
"From now on, I will ask the officials to ***work*** in the things that they should ***do***. I will take care of it." Prime Minister Thaksin said…"
(Puprasert 2007, p. 83)

3. *Casual*
(13) *"ต่อคำถามที่ว่า **นโยบายต่อต้านก่อการร้ายของรัฐอาจจะทำให้เกิดการล่วงล้ำสิทธิมนุษยชนขั้นพื้นฐานของบุคคล**หรือไม่นั้น พบว่า 48% เห็นว่า **ไม่** …"*
*"*As to concerns that ***the anti-terrorism policies will be infringing on basic civil liberties***. It found that 48% believed it is ***not***…"
(Puprasert 2007, p. 84)

The word ***one***, illustrated by sentence (8) and (11) shows nominal substitute of the information contained in the preceding sentences. In addition, verbal and casual substitutes are also found in both Thai and English such as the word ***do*** [ทำ] in sentence (9) and (12). The interpretation of the italic elements (the word ***so*** and ***ไม่*** **[*not*]**) in sentence (10) and (13) depends in each case upon information contained in the previous sentences.

Ellipsis involves "a deletion of a word, phrase, or clause" (Witte & Faigley, 1981, p. 190). The omission of the word ***books*** in sentences (14); the word ***do*** in sentence (15); and the omission of the cause *killed Cock Robin* illustrate cohesion based on *ellipsis.*

1. *Nominal*
(14) Those ***books*** are interesting. I will buy ***two*** [books].
(Noonkhan 2002, p. 8)

2. *Verbal*
(15) A: Do you want to ***go with me to the store***?
B: Yes, I ***do***.
(Witte & Faigley 1981, p. 191)

3. *Casual*
(16) ***Who*** killed Cock Robin? – ***The sparrow*** ϕ [killed Cock Robin].
(Halliday and Hasan 1976, p. 210)

Chanawongsa's (1986) findings show that Thai verb phrases, noun phrases and clauses tend to be either repeated or deleted rather than substitution. There are three types of ellipsis in Thai: nominal as head (*adjective*, *noun phrase*, *clausal*, e*numerative*, or *determiner modifiers*), verbal (the omission of *the main verbs*, *auxiliary verbs*, or *the whole verbal elements*), and clausal ellipses (*question and response*, *statement and question*, or *statement and statement*). Examples of ellipsis in Thai appear below.

1. *Nominal*

(17) ฉันไปตลาด ϕซื้อกับข้าวมาหลายอย่างเลยเพื่อมาทำอาหารมื้อเย็น

I went to the market ϕ [*I*] bought a lot of food a lot for dinner.

(Noonkhan 2002, p. 17)

2. *Verbal*

(18) A: อยาก***กินไอศกรีม***ไหม

Do you want to ***eat some ice cream***?

B: อยาก ϕ (กินไอศครีม)

Yes, (I want to eat).

(Noonkhan 2002, p. 18)

3. Causal

(19) A: ดาวจะไปเชียงใหม่สัปดาห์หน้า

Daw will go to Chiang Mai next week.

B: เขาบอกคุณϕเหรอ

Did she say [so]?

(Noonkhan 2002, p. 18)

Lexical cohesion refers to the use of a related word or phrase or lexical item that is associated in the same way to the earlier part of the text (Chanawangsa 1986). Regarding Witte and Faigley's work, lexical cohesion can be classified as *reiteration* and *collocation.* Reiteration is divided into four subclasses, ranging from repetition of the same item to repetition through the use of a synonym or near-synonym, a superordinate item, or a general item (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Collocation refers to lexical cohesion "that is achieved through the association of lexical items that regularly co-occur" (Halliday & Hasan, p. 284, as cited in Witte & Faigley 1986, p. 193). The sentence examples of lexical cohesion appear below.

(20) His ***job*** is enjoyable. He has never been bored with his ***work***.

(Tangkiengsirisin 2010, p. 6)

(21) On a camping trip with their parents, teenagers willingly do the household chores that they resist at home.

(22) They gather ***wood for a fire***, help put up the ***tent***, and carry ***water from a creek or lake***.

(Witte & Faigley 1986,p. 193)

In sentence (20), ***work*** is simply repeated the word ***job***. In (21), Witte and Faigley showed collocation between the italic items in sentence (22) with ***camping trip*** in (21).

Regarding Thai lexical cohesion, the word ***ผู้หญิง*** [women] in (23) is presented equivalent of the word ***สตรี*** [ladies] which is a formal term.

23) มี***ผู้หญิง***จำนวนมากมาเข้าร่วมแลกเปลี่ยนความคิดเกี่ยวกับปัญหาของ***สตรี***ในสังคมไทย ณ สมาคมสตรี

Many ***ladies*** in the conference discussed problems of ***women*** in Thai society.

Conjunction intended to explicitly conjoin ideas and sentences. Halliday and Hasan distinguish five types of conjunctive cohesion—additive (such as *and, or*) adversative (such as *but, however, yet*), casual (such as *because, so*), temporal (such as *after, before, then*), and continuative (such as *after, all, of course*). These conjunctions intend to enhance connectivity of ideas in texts (Hinkel 2001) as well as to supply cohesive ties across sentence boundaries (Witte & Faigley 1981). Examples of these subclasses are illustrated below.

1. *Additive*

(24) This is the first time I have tried Japanese food, ***and*** I like it very much.

(Tangkiengsirisin 2010, p. 6)

2. *Adversative*

(25) Carol, ***however***, changed her behavior because she wanted to become part of a new group.

(Witte & Faigley 1981, p. 192)

3. *Casual*

(26) She is an efficient secretary, ***so*** her boss always admires her.

(Tangkiengsirisin 2010, p. 6)

4. *Temporal*

(27) Tom had a shower. ***Then*** he had breakfast.

(Tangkiengsirisin 2010, p. 6)

5. *Continuative*

(28) This is something we all learn as children and we, ***of course***, also learn which behaviors are right for which situations.

(Witte & Faigley 1981, p. 192)

Chanawangsa (1986) classified Thai conjunctions into sixteen subclasses including *additive, enumerative, alternative, comparative, contrastive, concessive, exemplification, reformulatory, causal, purposive, resultative, conditional, inferential, temporal, transitional, and continuative.* These subclasses are illustrated in the following examples with English translations (as cited in Noonkhan 2002, pp. 19-25):

1. *Additive*

(29) ***นอกจาก***แดงหล่อแล้ว เขายังรวยอีกด้วย

Dang is handsome. ***In addition***, he is very rich.

2. *Enumerative*

(30) วิธีการทำไข่เจียว ***ประการแรก*** ใส่น้ำมันในกระทะก่อน

In the process of making an omelet, ***first*** you should put oil on the pan.

3. *Alternative*

(31) เธอจะไปดูหนังกับฉัน ***หรือ*** เธอจะไปว่ายน้ำกับน้อย

Are you going to see the movie with me or go swimming with Noi?

4. *Comparative*

(32) ทอมทำท่า***ราวกับ***ว่าเขาเป็นดารา

Tom acts ***as if*** he were a star.

5. *Contrastive*

(33) สมศักดิ์ขยันทำงานมากเลย ***ขณะที่***น้องชายของเขาขี้เกียจมาก

Somsak works hard ***whereas*** his brother is very lazy.

6. *Concessive*

(34) มาลีไม่มีความสุข***แม้ว่า***เธอมีเงินมากมายจากธุรกิจส่วนตัวก็ตาม

Malee does not feel happy ***even though*** she has a lot of money from her business.

7. *Exemplification*

(35) กานต์ซื้อผลไม้มาหลายอย่าง ***เช่น*** องุ่น, ส้ม กล้วย และ มะละกอ

Kan bought many fruits ***such as*** grapes, orange, banana and papaya.

8. *Reformulatory*

(36) ประเทศไทยมีพรมแดนติดต่อเพื่อนบ้านสี่ประเทศ ***คือ*** พม่า ลาว กัมพูชา และ มาเลเซีย

Thailand is surrounded by four neighbors ***namely*** Burma, Lao, Cambodia, and Malaysia.

9. *Casual*

(37) มาร์ครถคว่ำตาย ***เพราะ***เขาไม่คาดเข็มขัดนิรภัย

Mark died in the car accident ***because*** he did not fasten his seat belt.

10. *Purposive*

(38) แดงต้องใช้เวลามากกว่านี้ ***เพื่อว่า***เขาจะได้ตรวจสอบเครื่องยนต์อย่างละเอียด

Dang needed more time ***in order that*** he could check the engine carefully.

11. *Resultative*

(39) วันนี้อากาศร้อนมากในตอนกลางวัน ***ดังนั้น*** ฉันจึงลงไปเล่นน้ำในแม่น้ำ

Today, the weather is very hot in the afternoon, **so** I have decided to go swimming in the river.

12. *Conditional*

(40) ***ถ้า***เธออนุญาตให้ปีเตอร์ไปงานเลี้ยงคืนนี้ ฉันจะไม่พูดกับเธอต่อไป

If you allow Peter to come to the party tonight, I will not talk to you anymore.

13. *Inferential*

(41) อ่านหนังสือสอบมามากแล้ว ***งั้น***ไปดูหนังกันสักเรื่องดีไหม

We have studied many books for the test. ***If so***, let's relax by going to see a movie.

14. *Temporal*

(42) หลังจากฉันกินข้าวเสร็จ***แล้ว*** ฉัน***ก็***นอน

I finished my dinner. ***Then*** I went to sleep.

15. *Transitional*

(43) A: ฉันต้องทำงานให้เสร็จ

I have to finish my work.

B: ***แล้ว***จะกลับบ้านกี่โมง

By the way, when will you return home?

16. *Continuative*

(44) เขาทำงานหนักเป็นสิ่งที่ดี***ซึ่ง***เจ้านายทุกคนชอบพนักงานแบบนี้

His hard working ***which*** makes all bosses love this kind of staff.

Drawing on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion in English, various types of cohesive devices in the flow of discourse gained reputation in studies in text linguistics. Following their cohesion taxonomies, researchers have undertaken further investigations of cohesion devices in English texts written by learners of different languages with different background. Among others, Dueraman (2007) found that the Malaysian and Thai writers used more reference and conjunction than reiteration and collocation in argumentative essays. There were no differences in the number of cohesive devices used between the high and low-rated essays. According to the results, she suggested further that Thai teachers should teach coherence to students and train them about the critical thinking with rational argument through constantly writing practices. Hinkel (2001) carried out a comparative analysis of median frequency rates of explicit cohesive devices used in academic texts of students who were speakers of English, Japanese, Korean, Indonesian, and Arabic. The study focused on native speakers (NSs) and nonnative speakers' (NNSs) texts. Regardless of their native language (L1), the results showed that speakers of Japanese, Korean, Indonesian, and Arabic employed sentence transitions and demonstrative pronouns at significantly higher median frequency rates than did native speakers in L2 texts, a majority of sentence transitions and demonstratives often demonstrated NNS writers' attempts to unify ideas with the limitations of syntactic and lexical range of accessible linguistic means. In the investigation of the cohesion with translation method, Silveira (2008) investigated the use of cohesion in a translated text in the area of management. The researcher analyzed a corpus of a short English text that a participant translated it from English into Portuguese. This task was part of the post-graduate programs. The findings of the study showed that substitute was not extensively used in either L1 or L2 texts. The participant rather deleted or changed

information in the text. In addition, transferring patterns of L1 to L2 made the L2 text awkward.

Because the uses of various cohesive devices in written texts vary in different languages, the present study is particularly concerned with how speakers of Thai employed the cohesive ties in different writing processes: direct writing and translation. These processes were used in the study as the way to investigate whether L1 influences on L2 writing. Since few studies on cohesion analysis in L1/L2 on direct and translation writing of Thai graduate students have been investigated, this study attempts to generate information and inspire further research in this area. With respect to Halliday and Hasan's taxonomies and Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992)'s subcomponents of writing, this study focuses on their criteria in order to analyse the participants' written texts and to evaluate their quality of writing.

PROCESS OF WRITING

The role of the native language extensively influences a second language acquisition which includes the use of forms and meanings, and culture. Lado (1957) stated:

> individual tend to transfer the forms and meanings, and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture-both productively when attempting to speak the language and to act in the culture, and receptively when attempting to grasp and understand the language and the culture as practiced by natives (p2).

According to Kaplan's (1972) claim, the errors in L2 writing are due to the interference of L1. He states further that second language learners write expository prose in English with different organisational patterns from those of native speakers as they can be seen as the rhetorical organisation from the L1 and culture. Regarding cognitive influence, Boroditsky (2001) found that abstract thoughts developed in L1 affected L2 use. He concluded that L1 thinking influenced learners for L2 meaning construction.

Several studies show that the transfer from learners' L1 to their L2 writing affects the quality of their L2 writing. For example, Wang and Wen (2002) examined how Chinese university students' L1 affected their writing and whether their reliance on Chinese was associated with their English proficiency. The results showed that students with higher English proficiency relied less on Chinese when they wrote in English than those with lower English proficiency. The students were more likely to rely on L1 when they were generating and organising ideas, but more likely to rely on L2 when engaged in writing a text. Likewise, Wang (2003) examined the frequency of adult Chinese ESL learners' language switching of L1 to L2 writing and the effects on the quality of their L2 writing. The study found that adult ESL learners' L2 proficiency did not decrease the frequency of language switching from L1 to L2 writing.

In the investigation of the quality of L1/L2 writing, the process of writing and its subcomponents have been investigated in several languages. In terms of subcomponents of the composing process, *content*, *organisation*, and *writing style* are mainly discussed in many research studies (Kobayashi & Rinnert 1992, Lifang 2008, Xiaoyan 2007, McCarthey, Guo & Cummins 2005). In the present study, Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992)'s subcomponents of writing were used to evaluate participants' writing ability and quality of written texts. The criteria including quality of content, organisation, and style is shown in Appendix 1.

As early research focused on comparison and relation between writing processes or methods, translation and direct writing methods have been widely investigated. To discover if

learners benefit from translation method or direct method, early research showed some interesting results. As initiated by Kobayashi and Rinnert (1992), their study involved both translation and direct writing. In terms of quality of content, organisation, and style, they found that lower-level writers tended to benefit from translation, whereas higher-level writers did not benefit much. Ting (1996) examined his own writing processes to understand how his L1(Chinese) affected his L2 (English) writing process. He found that many of his L1 writing strategies transferred into L2 writing; however, he also concluded, "different strategies require different threshold levels of L2 proficiency in order for the transfer to happen" (p. 139). Xiaoyan (2007) examined the relationship between translation method and direct writing method in Chinese and English. The results of the study show that the translation method had advantages over the direct method. Lifang's (2008) study showed that the quality the compositions are significantly influenced by the writing methods and this is associated with learners' L2 proficiency. The lower-level proficiency learners benefit most from the translation. Likewise, Lifang (2008) states that based on studies in this area, translation method may be beneficial in terms of organisation and complexity to the target language essays, especially for students at the lower level of proficiency.

This study investigates the use of cohesive markers in L1 and L2 compositions with direct writing and translation methods. In response to the paucity of literature on analysis of cohesion used in L1/L2 Thai students' writing and their quality of writing, the researcher investigated the following questions:

1) Is there significant correlation between quality of Thai and English writings (content, organisation, and writing style)?
2) What is the frequency of each type of English and Thai cohesion found in English and Thai essays?
3) How have both English and Thai cohesive markers been used in the essays?
4) What are the similarities and differences between English and Thai cohesive markers used in the essays?'

METHODOLOGY

PARTICIPANTS

The ten participants were all graduate students majoring in English whose L1 was Thai. Their English proficiency is at the low intermediate level based on the results from a standardized test.

INSTRUMENTS AND DATA COLLECTION

In line with earlier studies, the participants were asked to write on one topic directly in the native language and the other through translation (Kobayashi & Rinnert 1992, Xiaoyan 2007, Lifang 2008).Thirty compositions were analysed in terms of the quality of writings in Thai and English; and cohesion used (10 written directly in English; and 20 written first in English and then translated into English).

With respect to Lifang (2008), the selection of topics is based on styles of the topics; students' familiarity to the topics; cultural neutrality of the topics. Ten participants were asked to write on two different topics on six different days. They were not informed about the topics until the test date. Participants in this study were given 30 minutes to complete task one and 60 minutes to complete task two.

TABLE 1. Writing Prompts

Topic	Direct Writing	Translation	
	English	Thai	English
A person who has inspired me the most.	30 min	-	-
The most impressive place I have visited.	-	30 min	30 min

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

TEXT QUALITY

The analysis of the written texts was carried out in two stages. The first stage, the quality of 30 texts was assessed by four raters, two native English speakers for English compositions, and two Thai native speakers for Thai compositions. All raters are experienced in teaching writing at a tertiary level. The 30 texts were rated analytically, using a rating scheme (Kobayashi & Rinnert 1992) with three categories: *Content*, *Organisation*, and *Style* (language use). The raters assessed the texts using the holistic judgments on a 10-point scale for analytical 11 subcomponents.

Pearson product-moment correlation coefficients were used to determine the inter-rater reliability for each of pairs of the raters in direct writing and translation methods. The correlations between the rates of the 30 written texts (written directly in English; written first in Thai; and translation from Thai into English respectively) were calculated as the content (r = .73, .70, .73), organization (r =.74, .87, .75) and style (r = .80, .85, .81).

TABLE 2. Text Quality of English Direct Writing Method

Rater	Number of Essays	Content		Organisation		Style	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
1	10	3.56	.83	3.95	1.06	3.50	.68
2	10	3.86	.85	4.40	1.41	3.60	.75

TABLE 3. Text Quality of English Translation Method

Rater	Number of Essays	Content		Organisation		Style	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
1	10	3.20	.62	3.72	.81	2.85	.67
2	10	3.42	.75	3.80	1.04	2.90	.85

TABLE 4. Text Quality of Thai Direct Writing Method

Rater	Number of Essays	Content		Organisation		Style	
		M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
1	10	5.95	.87	5.86	.99	6.22	.87
2	10	5.88	.98	5.94	1.24	6.33	.84

As shown in Table 2 and 3, overall essays were low rated in content, organization, and style. The scores of the essays were below the mean of the total score (10 points). Notice that in Thai essays as shown in Table 4, they were rated at the average score of six across three categories.

In sum, the essays were low rated in both Thai and English across two writing methods: direct and translation. Only the Thai essays were at the average score (6 out of 10 points). Overall, writers were less skilled in both L1 and L2 writing.

THE COHESIVE MARKERS IN THE DIRECT WRITTEN TEXTS

To determine whether the participants used the same cohesive markers in the English and Thai written text carried out in two writing processes, the concurrences of classified cohesive ties: *reference, substitution, ellipsis, lexical cohesion,* and *conjunction*, were painstakingly tagged and counted by hand.

At the most general level of analysis, the data was examined based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) categories. As for Thai cohesion, the data were examined based on Chanawongsa's (1986) framework which is compatible to Halliday and Hasan's model of cohesion. The researcher used the modified models to code each cohesive tie and count the frequency of different types of cohesive ties. Findings from each cohesive tie are reported in details in the following sections.

By dividing the number of cohesive ties in an essay set by the method of writing, the findings showed general index of cohesive density.

TABLE 5. Frequency of Cohesive Ties in Direct Written Texts

Classes of Cohesive Ties		*n*
Reference	Personal	366
	Demonstratives	61
Substitution		5
Conjunction		71

n = frequency of each cohesive ties found in the essays

Reference

As shown in Table 5, writers of the English direct writing use the highest frequency of *personal reference* (like "I, me, he, her", etc.) and possessive determiners (like "my, his, their", etc.). The largest difference in the occurrence of referential cohesion is reflected in the higher frequency of first-person pronoun *I*. This higher frequency of first-person pronoun in the low-rated essays may be a result of the less skilled writers' attempts to start writing a sentence and to avoid errors such as third-person pronouns or ambiguous pronouns. This finding is advocated by Witte and Faigley's (1981) results indicate that the less skilled writers avoid errors such as ambiguous pronoun reference, so they used low frequency of third-person pronouns in their writing. With regards to the use of "*the*" as a demonstrative reference, it commonly referred to as a definite article.

SUBSTITUTION AND CONJUNCTION

In the essays, there were five incidences of substitution. All of them were through the use of "*one"* references of either things or people. For example:

> CEO of Air Asia [an airline] is the ***one*** who has ambition, politeness, and responsibility to his employee.

Regarding the conjunction, the writers used high frequency of additive conjunction *and;* adversative conjunction *but.* The low rated essays are more dense in most commonly used conjunction like *and, but*. Overall, though conjunction functions well as it creates cohesion in their essays, the writers use a few of conjunction types. As a result, they contributed less elaboration in their writing.

In sum, the findings show a greater use of first-person pronoun at the beginning of their sentences. It is also found a redundancy of definite reference and conjunction in the essays. Regarding the definite reference *the*, some of them seem to be a flaw as the writers did not provide initial information before using it.

THE COHESIVE MARKERS IN THE THAI-ENGLISH WRITTEN TEXTS

TABLE 6. Frequency of Cohesive Ties in Texts

Classes of Cohesive Ties		Thai	English
		n	*n*
Reference	Personal	100	157
	Demonstratives	1	5
Ellipsis		7	2
Lexical cohesion	Repetition	28	23
	Superordinate	1	3
Conjunction		88	101

n = frequency of each cohesive ties found in the essays

REFERENCE

The finding shows a large different proportion of the personal reference used in the Thai and English essays. Further analysis shows that the greater use of *personal reference* (*I, we, they, it, you, she*, and *he*) is found in the English essays. In Thai essays, the largest occurrence of referential pronouns are reflected in the higher frequency of first-person pronouns (ฉัน, ข้าพเจ้า, ดิฉัน, ผม: I; เรา: we) in Thai essays. Here is an example of a student's writing. The first sentence is his Thai statement, then he translated it into English as you have seen them below.

> สองปีที่ผ่านมา ***ผม***มีโอกาสได้ไปสถานที่แห่งนี้ [หมู่บ้านแม่กำปอง]
> Two years ago, ***I*** had a good opportunity to visit this place [Mae Kampong village].

Another interesting observation is that writers rather omitted a subject in Thai sentences than those in English. For example, there is pronoun omission of ***เรา*** [***we***] in Thai but it is found in English translation. The following example of a student's writing illustrates this characteristic:

> ในยุคปัจจุบัน ϕเป็นยุคแห่งการติดต่อสื่อสารที่สะดวกสบาย ไม่ว่าจะทั้งทางโทรศัพท์ อินเตอร์เน็ต หรือแม้แต่การเดินทางขนส่ง
> Nowadays, ***we*** live in communicative era that easy to communicate such as by phone, via internet, and transportation.

In addition, the frequency of *demonstrative reference* used between the English translation and English direct written texts is not significantly different. Interestingly, this type of reference is found in English essays, but none in Thai. The frequency suggests that the writers tend to establish relatively strong demonstrative reference in English essays with direct and translation methods. The analysis also indicates no comparative references found in Thai and English translated essays.

Among the demonstratives, *this* is most often used in the English written texts but found none of this reference type in Thai essays. In addition, the redundancy of reference in

both Thai and English essays seem to be a flaw because the writers failed to supply additional information at the points where they would be expected to appear.

ELLIPSIS

When comparing the amount of ellipses used between English and Thai, the number of occurrence of nominal ellipsis between the essays in both languages is different. Notice that the writers tended to drop the nouns before verbs in Thai essays rather than those in English. Writers may depend on their L1 because the nominal ellipsis is commonly found in verbal and written statements. These findings are advocated by several studies indicating that ellipsis is commonly used in verbal contexts and other written texts in Thai (Noonkhan 2002, Chanawangsa 1986).

REPETITION

Analyses of the essays in Thai and English reveal that repetitions of lexical items introduced earlier in the essays. For example, a writer used the same lexical item several times in a paragraph. Notice in the following Thai example, ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว*** (tourist attraction) is repeated six times. When comparing the same statement with the English translated text, ***attraction*** is repeated five times. In this case, the writer did not use *substitution* to replace a word. This finding shows that the writer does not have ability to extend the semantic domain of a number of differentiated lexical items. Analysis also points that low-English proficiency writers do not have vocabularies capable of extending, exploring, or elaborating lexical items. Likewise, Noonkhan (2002) found that Thai participants used repetition rather than substitution, in contrast, English native speakers tended to elaborately use different lexical items such as synonyms, superordinate or general words to replace a word in their writing. The following examples illustrating the findings of the present study:

> ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว***ที่สามารถช่วยผ่อนคลายความเครียดได้นั้นมีอยู่หลายประเภท เช่น ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว***เชิงธรรมชาติ ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว***เชิงวัฒนธรรม ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว***ทางศาสนาและอื่นๆ
> สำหรับ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว***ที่ข้าพเจ้ามักจะเลือกไปพักผ่อนคือ ***สถานที่ท่องเที่ยว***เชิงธรรมชาติ
> There are many kinds of tourist ***attraction*** which can help to relax, such as environmental ***attraction***, cultural ***attraction***, religion ***attraction*** and others. Environmental ***attraction*** is a choice of mine for relaxing.

CONJUNCTION

The findings are presented in Table 6. As the results of the analysis demonstrate, the essays in translation method include relatively few coordinators, resulting in short sentences without elaboration. The writers failed to employ cohesive markers in the essays and to impart the sense of parallelism and meaning balance to the texts.
For example:

> วัดศรีโคมคำเป็นที่ประดิษฐานของพระพุทธรูปที่ใหญ่และสวยงามที่สุดในล้านนาไทย ผู้คนชาวพะเยา***และ*** ***[and]*** นักท่องเที่ยว ที่มาเยือนจังหวัดพะเยาจะนิยมมากราบไหว้
> Srikomkum Temple has a big beautiful Buddha image. Most people in Phayao ***or*** the tourists who come to Phayao always go to this temple for worship the Buddha image.

In Thai essays, the writers employed coordinating conjunctions more than those identified in English essays such as *and, but*. However, the writers demonstrated the ability in

word selection in English more than those in Thai essays. This could be that some Thai words contain more than one meaning in English. For example, ***ยัง*** can be defined as *also, yet, still.* As a result, the meanings of ***ยัง*** vary among the additive and adversative. Consequently, this may result in the number of occurrence of conjunctions found in the written texts. For example:

…have you ever gone to respect Pha That Doi Suthep ***yet***?
…คุณล่ะเคยมาสัมผัสเชียงใหม่แล้วขึ้นไปนมัสการองค์พระธาตุดอยสุเทพแล้วหรือ***ยัง***

Based on the findings, it can be concluded that writers use substantially higher frequency of *personal reference* and *demonstratives* in English direct writing than those in Thai-English translation. Dueraman (2007) also found that Thai and Malaysian participants used the highest frequency of reference in their essays. Also contributing importantly to the greater use of lexical cohesion is the frequency with which the writers use *repetition* and *superordinate* in translation, while they are not found in English direct writing. *Conjunction* that is most commonly used in direct writing and translation are *and, but*. In addition, the writers fail to supply necessary information at the points where they should be appeared. Their essays show a much higher frequency of reference and conjunction redundancy. The researcher explored in depth found that overall the essays with direct writing include less variety of cohesive markers than those with translation method. All this is to suggest that the writers' initial composition affect their second language writing as the writers have more L1 working vocabulary capable of extending their ideas and expressing their complexity of the native language than those with direct writing. As a result, the writers seem to develop more ideas on the topic that they wrote as well as use more sophisticated words and a variety of cohesive markers in the translation method.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR TEACHING

Analysis of cohesion is a useful tool to investigate the development of L1 or L2 writing. Therefore, Halliday and Hasan's taxonomies are potentially essential in the analysis as they are used in this study. A study of cohesion in writing also yields interesting results on a writer's adequacy of cohesive ties in explaining or connecting an idea to the rest of the written text as well as the ability to apply it in their writing. This study compares the cohesive markers used in two different writing methods: direct and translation. The writers performed relatively low in their writing ability; however, the findings show fairly strong indication of the writers' elaboration and structural elements in L1 that affect L2 composition in which the discourse refers. In L2 essays, a relatively high frequency of the sentence transitions reflects the writers' attempts to unify the concept of their essays with the syntactic and lexical boundaries.

Another issue that needs to be addressed is the skill in translation. The results of the study clearly show that the writers tend to employ the same writing structure in L1 into L2 writing. Since Thai and English sentence structure is similar: *subject+verb+object* (SVO), the writers benefit from the pattern. However, there are many differences such as textual structure and grammatical rules between Thai and English. Therefore, the writers make a high frequency of grammatical errors in their essays.

An implication of this study is that some instructional techniques may be useful in teaching particularly in dealing with the cohesion in writing. First of all, English as Foreign language (EFL) learners have a limitation of cohesive devices used in English, a teacher may introduce them by starting with a list of commonly used cohesive markers as well as compare

them with those in Thai. The teacher then may show the learners a text that doesn't have any cohesive markers. After the learners read the text, they can be requested to select an appropriate cohesive marker to connect the sentences or paragraphs based on the relationship between them. At the same time, the teacher should give them feedback on a given task since it is necessary that experienced and new teachers should reflect upon their learners' performance (Petchprasert 2012).

LIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

This study had several limitations in data collection. Firstly, the participants were limited since there were only thirteen graduate students majoring in English who enrolled in the 2011 academic year; however, ten participated in the study. Secondly, all of the participants' English proficiency was at the low intermediate level as they distributed low-rated essays. As a result, the researcher could not contribute to the specific comparisons between the low-rated and high rated essays.

REFERENCES

Berman, R. (1994). Learners' transfer of writing skills between languages. *TESL Canada Journal*. *12*(1), 29-46.

Chanawongsa, W. (1986). Cohesion in Thai. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Georgetown University, the United States of America.

Clark, C. 1983. Cohesion in spoken and written English. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Harvard University.

Dueraman, B. (2007). Cohesion and coherence in English essays written by Malaysian and Thai medical students. Proceedings from Southern Thailand English Language Teaching/Cultural Change Conference.

Faigley, L. & Witte, S. (1981). Analyzing revision. *College Composition and Communication*. *32* (4), 400-414.

Friedlander, A. (1990). Composing in English: effects of a first language on writing in English as a second language. In B. Kroll (Ed.), Second language writing: Research insights for the classroom (*pp. 109–125*). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Godó, A. (2008). Cross-cultural aspects of academic writing: a study of Hungarian and North-American college students L1 argumative essays. *International Journal of English Studies. 8* (2),65-111.

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.

Hinkel, E. (2001). Matters of cohesion in L2 academic texts. *Applied Language Learning*.*12*(2), 111-132.

Jones, S., & Tetroe, J. (1987). Composing in a second language. In A. Matsuhashi (Ed.), *Writing in real time: Modeling production processes* (*pp.34–57*). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Kobayashi, H. & Rinnert, C. (1992). Effects of first language on second language writing: translation versus direct composition. *Language Learning*, *42*: 183–209. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-1770.1992.tb00707.x

Lado, R. (1957). Linguistics across cultures. Ann Arbor: Michigan University Press.

Lifang, Z. (2008). Comparison of two writing processes: direct versus translated composition. *Cross-cultural Communication*. *4(*1), 8-17.

McCarthey, S., Guo, Y., and Cummins, S. (2005). Understanding changes in elementary Mandarin students' L1 and L2 writing. *Journal of Second Language Writing. 14*, 71-104.

Mohamed-Sayidina, A. (2010). Transfer of L1 cohesive devices and transition words into L2 academic texts: the case of Arab students. *RELC Journal*. *41*(3), 253-266.

Noonkhan, K. (2002). Cohesion shifts in translation: a comparative study between Thai and English. Unpublished master's thesis. Srinakharinwirot University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Petchprasert, A. (2012). Feedback in second language teaching and learning. *US-China Foreign Language, 10*(4), 1112-1120.

Puprasert, N. (2007). A comparative study of English and Thai cohesion in news articles. Unpublished master's thesis. Kasetsart University, Bangkok, Thailand.

Tangkiengsirisin's (2010). Promoting cohesion in EFL expository writing: a study of graduate students in Thailand. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, *3(*16). 1-34.

Ting, Y. H. (1996). Looping forward: Drafting in my own language. *ELT Journal*. *50*(2), 135–142.

Uzawa, K. (1996). Second language learners' processes of L1 writing, L2 writing and translation from L1 into L2. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 5, 271–294.

Van Weijen, Daphne et al. (2009). L1 use during L2 writing: an empirical study of a complex phenomenon. *Journal of Second Language Writing*. *18*(4), 235-250.

Wang, L. (2003). Switching to first language among writers with differing second-language proficiency. *Journal of Second Language Writing*.*12*, 347–375.

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.

Wolfersberger, M. (2003). L1 to L2 writing process and strategy transfer: A look at lower proficiency writers. *TESL-EJ*: *Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language*. *7*(2), 1–15.

Xiaoyan, Z. (2007). The facilitating effect of translation on EFL (English as a foreign language) writing. *CELEA Journal*. *30*(4), 49-61.

Appendix 1

Criteria for Evaluating 11 Subcomponents of Writing

Categories	Criteria
Content	
1. Specifics	Vivid examples, supporting details
2. Developed Ideas	Explanation or elaboration of the main idea; ideas relevant to the given topic
3. Overall Clarity	Presentation of ideas easy to understand, not confusing
4. Interest	Writing capturing reader's attention with imaginative, insightful, unusual perspective
5. Thesis	Main idea point of view of writer clear, reasonable and representing the text (may be explicit or implicit thesis)
Organization	
6. Introduction	Opening focusing or pointing to what the writer will talk about, appealing to reader, preparing for what is coming
7. Logical Sequence	Ideas following logically within paragraphs
8. Conclusion	Synthesis of entire paper through summary, suggestions or predictions based on what has been said, strong finish preferred
9. Unity	Ideas throughout paper relating to main point
Style	
10. Vocabulary	Sophisticated range, variety, appropriate register
11. Variety of Form	Variety of sentence beginnings, participle phrases, subordinate clauses and discourse markers