English Language & Literature Teaching, Vol.27, No.2 Summer 2021
https://doi.org/10.35828/etak.2021.27.2.23

Different Roles of English Demonstratives by Korean University Students in Two Genres*

Hyo-Jung Lee
(Yeungnam University College)

Lee, Hyo-Jung (2021). Different roles of English demonstratives by Korean university students in two genres. *English Language & Literature Teaching, 27*(2), 23-42.

This study aims to identify to what extent Korean EFL learners' use of English demonstratives varies in different genres of essays. Both argumentative and narrative essays from the Yonsei English Learner Corpus were analyzed based on grammatical and phoric-level functions. It also compared whether these functions differ depending on writing proficiency levels. The frequency analyses revealed some variations between the genres. First, the pronouns occurred significantly more in argumentative writing, while the determiners appeared slightly more in narrative writing. In particular, the pronominal *this* was more frequent in argumentative writing, while the determiner *that* was rather frequent in narrative writing. Second, the anaphoric function did not distinguish the two genres, but the exophoric function differentiated them significantly. Namely, the anaphoric function was similarly frequent in both genres, except for the predominant use of the anaphoric *this* in argumentative writing; however, the exophoric function was more preferred in narrative writing, especially for the exophoric *this*. The deictic function was only found in argumentative writing. As for proficiency, *those* seems to present a linear progression from the low-to-high in argumentative writing, which was evidenced in various functions. The findings help to understand Korean university students' demonstrative development and use in English writing.

[demonstrative/reference/argumentative writing/narrative writing/L2 learner corpus/L2 writing]

* This work was supported by the Ministry of Education of the Republic of Korea and the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF-2019S1A5B5A07106649)

I. INTRODUCTION

In EFL/ESL contexts, demonstrative has been regarded as a beginning-level grammar that should be mastered at an early stage of language learning. The instruction has been implemented in a limited way based on the proximity. Many ELT materials and even well-known descriptive grammar books (Biber, Conrad, & Leech, 2002; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik, 1985) dealt only with simple grammatical and deictic functions (Leńko-Szymańska, 2004). As a result, L2 learners seem to have difficulty using them when their communicative situations go beyond their own knowledge level.

However, L2 learner corpora research has reported that the learners' demonstrative use develops in alignment with L2 proficiency (Leńko-Szymańska, 2004; Park, 2020). In other words, L2 learners tended to overuse or to underuse a certain type of English demonstratives at first compared to the native speakers, but such misuse improved gradually as their proficiency increased, although a native-like level was difficult. However, this line of studies has primarily examined argumentative essays (Blagoeva, 2004; Leńko-Szymańska, 2004; Oh, 2009; Petch-Tyson, 2000; Wang & Sun, 2006; Zang, 2015), and very few studies investigated other writing genres (Swierzbin, 2010; Park, 2020). It is, thus, limited to find out how frequently L2 learners employ demonstratives in other types of writing. In addition, most of the studies dealt with grammatical functions such as demonstrative pronouns and determiners and did not analyse other types of functions. Therefore, little is known on how much they use demonstratives as other functions and which functions are overused or underused in a particular genre of writing.

Besides, other genre-based corpus research has evidenced that the functions of demonstratives are different depending on genres and registers (Botley & McEnery, 2001a, 2001b; Gray, 2010; Gray & Cortes, 2011; Gundel, Hedberg, & Zacharski, 1988; Mignot, 2018; Strauss, 1993; 2002). For instance, analyzing the sentence-initial *this/these*, Gray (2010) pointed out that the demonstratives contribute to cohesion with different textual purposes across disciplines in research articles. Mignot (2018) demonstrated that *that* had a special elaboration function in a novel. Based on these outcomes from the expert writing, it is assumed that EFL learners' demonstrative use would differ depending on genres and functions, or both.

The current study investigates the use of English demonstratives in two genres of essays. For this purpose, a Korean learner corpus consisting of the argumentative and narrative genres is adopted. By comparing the frequencies of both grammatical and phoric functions (Halliday & Hasan, 1976), the study tries to identify whether these two functions can be distinguished by the genres. It also focuses on whether the functions are similar or different depending on writing proficiency. The findings of the study might provide valuable information on Korean students' English demonstrative development. It will also offer

instructors and material developers practical insights into teaching English demonstratives and designing English learning materials. Relevant research questions are guided below.

1. To what extent do grammatical and phoric functions of English demonstratives differ in argumentative and narrative writing, respectively?
2. Do these two functions differ according to writing proficiency levels?

II. RELEVANT LITERATURE

1. Definition of Demonstratives

Reference is defined as "the specific nature of the information that is signalled for retrieval" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 31). Demonstrative reference adds the meaning of distance to that concept and can be distinguished by different functions. First of all, demonstrative reference can be identified by its grammatical roles in a sentence, whether used as a pronoun or a determiner. In other words, when used as a head noun, it functions as a pronoun, while it serves as a determiner if it modifies the following noun within a noun phrase. Another distinction can be made depending on how the reference can be made clear. If it becomes clear by "an entity is known from the situation: either the immediate situation in which speech takes place or the wider situation which includes knowledge of the national situation, the world, or even the universe" (Bider et al., 2002, p. 71), it is called an *exophoric* or situational reference. If it makes clear by surrounding texts, it is called an *endophoric* or textual reference, in which *anaphor* refers back to the preceding texts, and *cataphor* points to the following texts. Example (1) presents how situational or textural references can be made depending on context. Examples (2) and (3) indicate the anaphoric and cataphoric functions of *this* and their underlined corresponding antecedents.

(1) ***That*** *must have cost a lot of money.*

(Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 33)

(2) *I can't get any reliable information. **This** is what worries me.*

(Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 70)

(3) ***This*** *is what worries me**:** I can't get any reliable information.*

(Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 70)

In (1), *that* can be either anaphoric or exophoric. If there is a sentence like *"I've been on holiday in Tahiti."* before (1), *that* serves as an anaphor. Otherwise, if the meaning is interpretable from an extralinguistic situation, it functions as an exophora. The final distinction is related to extended and text reference. Extended reference is literally defined as the referent's extension, meaning "more than just a person or object, it is a process or sequence of processes, and grammatically refers to a clause or string of clauses, not a just a single nominal" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 52). Unlike this, text reference only allows the singular forms of *this* and *that* functioning as pronouns in English, making the referent "transmuted into a fact or report" (ibid, p. 52). In their analysis of the last two chapters' demonstratives in *Alice's Adventures in Wonderland*, Halliday and Hasan (1976) found that extended references had accounted for most of the uses (31 out of 51). As illustrated in (4), what *it* means is not a simple noun phrase but a whole process of considering what to say while curtseying. In (5), what *this* refers to has been transmuted to the fact that my daughter is all grown up and going away to college.

(4) *The Queen said: 'Curtsey while you're thinking what to say. It saves time.*
(Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 52)

(5) *My daughter is all grown up and going away to college. **This** is so bitter-sweet.*
(Kolhatkar, Roussel, Dipper, & Zinsmeister, 2018, p. 558)

As seen above, demonstratives can be realized as a variety of forms and functions. Under those concepts, the remaining two sections overview some studies conducted in various genres and the EFL/ESL contexts.

2. Demonstrative Use in Different Genres.

Numerous corpus-based research investigated English demonstratives across genres and registers. For instance, Gray (2010) and Gray and Cortes (2011) revealed that determiners occurred more frequently than pronouns in such academic articles as Education and Sociology (Gray, 2010) and Applied Linguistics and Materials and Civil Engineering (Gray & Cortes, 2011), reminding us that "demonstrative determiners and pronouns have been largely under-researched in terms of describing how accomplished authors actually use the structures" (p. 32). Besides, the textual function of the sentence-initial position of *this/these* was effective in carrying "the meaning of the antecedent into the current proposition" (Gray, 2010, p. 175) to connect into new information.

Moreover, several studies have evidenced that the actual use of language goes beyond teachers' observations. For instance, Leńko-Szymańska (2004) at first assumed that "deixis

rarely surfaces in argumentative and academic writing" (p. 90). However, the actual research revealed that 20 to 26 % of demonstratives were used as a deictic function in academic journals (Gray & Cortes, 2011). Furthermore, contrary to the prescriptive perception that demonstrative pronouns create "ambiguous referents" (Strunk & White, 2000), the pronouns in research articles were proven to be favourable to convey more abstract ideas, embracing or condensing a wide stretch of ideas (Gary, 2010; Gray & Cortes, 2011). Mauranen (1993) revealed that highly competent Finnish writers used fewer text references than the native English writers in research articles, predominantly overusing pronouns over determiners.

On the other hand, Mignot (2018) examined *this* and *that* using the novel Lolita (Nabokov, 1955), based on her belief that one novel would have much richer context information than a large scale of electronic-multiple corpora. The general distribution was as follows: *that* (560) occurred more than *this* (317), each of which had more determiners than pronouns (*that* with 455 determiners and 105 pronouns vs. *this* with 182 determiners and 135 pronouns). She assumed that *that/those* were not enough to designate referent, so more elaboration was necessary for further reference process, as evolving and being constructed. On the contrary, *this/these* were stable and used to designate or confirm what has just been written, summarize a list or take up a previously described situation. In fact, she pointed out that the patterns of *that/those* with post-modification were more frequent than those of *this/these* without them. This assumption was empirically verified in Leńko-Szymańska's (2004) study, in which the BNC writers used *those* with various types of post-modifications. Relevant examples are illustrated in the following, as in (6), (7) and (8).

(6) *Oh, you cannot imagine (as I had never imagined) what* ***these women*** *of principles are.*

(Nabokov 1955, p. 83, recited from Mignot, 2018)

(7) *… she theatrically drew aside a curtain to reveal what I judged was* ***that part*** *of the room where a large and unfastidious family usually slept.*

(Nabokov 1955, p.24, recited from Mignot, 2018)

(8) *What stopped me was the awful feeling that if I meddled with fate in any way and tried to rationalize her fantastic gift, that gift would be snatched away like* ***that palace*** *on the mountain top in the Oriental tale which vanished whenever a prospective owner asked its custodian how come a strip of sunset sky was clearly visible from afar between black rock and foundation.*

(Nabokov 1955, p. 171, recited from Mignot, 2018)

To sum up, it seems evident that each genre has distinctive features on the patterns of demonstrative use and their functions. It is thus expected that the findings may bring insight into L2 learners' demonstrative use.

3. Demonstrative Use in EFL/ESL Contexts

L2 learner corpus research on English demonstratives has focused on how frequently ESL/EFL learners use demonstratives in argumentative writing. Although not many studies exist, to the best of my knowledge, they reported that overall, the European EFL learners tended to use demonstratives more than native speakers (Blagoeva, 2004; Leńko-Szymańsk, 2004). For instance, both the Polish learners of English (Leńko-Szymańska, 2004) and the Bulgarian learners of English (Blagoeva, 2004) used them much more frequently than the BNC writers. On the other hand, the Korean EFL learners were likely to use them less often than the native students of the Louvain Corpus of Native English Essays (LOCNESS) (Oh, 2009; Lee, 2021). In a similar vein, the EFL learners with diverse backgrounds of Dutch, French, Finnish, and Swedish had a tendency to underuse demonstratives compared to the LOCNESS native students (Petch-Tyson, 2000).

However, these studies shared several features. First, the EFL learners tended to overuse *that* and underuse *this* compared to the native speakers. Second, they generally use fewer text references than native speakers. Third, there were some variations across proficiency groups and had no consistent results for a certain type of demonstratives. Oh (2009) revealed that Korean college students tended to overuse *'that'* as a pronoun and underuse '*this/those'* as a pronoun and '*these'* as a determiner. She also emphasized that the nouns after *this* were limited in variety, and the fewer text references made the arguments less convincing. Lee (2021) confirmed her findings in terms of the singular demonstratives of *this* and *that*. However, there were some discrepancies for plural demonstratives, especially for the high-level learners' quantitative better performance for *those* as pronouns than the native students.

In line with the recent corpus-based research, Jin (2019) examined linguistic contexts surrounding the anaphoric use of *this/these* in academic writing by the university and graduate students in an ESL context. The results revealed that the learners' use was closely related to their writing proficiency because more advanced learners used more syntactically complex antecedents and shell nouns than less proficient learners. However, there remained a limitation with no reference corpus to compare their use with native English speakers.

Park (2020) explored the Korean EFL high and college students' demonstratives in argumentative and narrative essays collected in an experimental setting. The results showed that *this/these* were preferred in argumentative essays, while *that* was dominantly

preferred in narrative writing. In terms of proficiency levels, the high-level learners' determiner use increased in both genres, while their pronominal use increased only in narrative writing. Moreover, the determiner use was positively correlated to writing quality in both genres; however, for the pronominal use, *this* was only correlated to writing quality for argumentative writing and *that/those* for narrative writing.

Kang (2005) analysed Korean EFL college students' cohesive devices and discourse features in narrative writing. By taking a cross-linguistic approach, she compared the Korean learners' narratives in Korean and their English narratives with the native students' English narratives. The results indicated more demonstratives in their Korean narratives than in the native students' narratives. In Korean narratives, they had a tendency to choose demonstratives predominantly rather than other reference devices to compensate for no article system in the Korean language. In English narratives, they were more likely to use determiners than the native students via lexical repetition instead of using appropriate pronouns.

III. METHODOLOGY

1. Data

The data used in this study was drawn from the Yonsei English Learner Corpus (YELC), which consists of three parts: simple sentence construction task, narrative essays, and argumentative essays. Among them, two parts of the narrative and argumentative essays were used for the current study. The topics of the corpus include that *what was your favorite extracurricular activity in high school? What made you join the activity* for part 2 (Rhee & Jung, 2014) and school discipline, animal experiment, public smoking, using a cell phone while driving, military service, Internet real-name system (Cheo & Song, 2013).

The YELC levels were constructed by adding three additional proficiency levels to the Common European Framework of Reference for Language (CEFR) consisting of six proficiency levels (i.e., Basic: A1, A2; Intermediate: B1, B2; Proficient: C1, C2). The writing samples evaluated by trained native speakers were classified into the nine proficiency levels (i.e., A1, A1+, A2; B1, B1+, B2, B2+; C1, C2).

TABLE 1

The Corpora

	A1	A2	N1	N2
Number of essays	150	150	39	39
Number of words	38734	11992	14969	4199
Demonstratives	490	128	168	42

The current study chose the intermediate groups (B1, B1+, B2, B2+) and the high groups (C1, C2) through random sampling by strictly following those two frameworks. Due to the small number of essays equivalent to the C1 and C2, the number of writing samples included in the high-level corpus was relatively small. Table 1 above displays the number of essays, total words, and demonstrative frequencies by proficiency levels in each genre.

2. Data Analysis

Using the web-based Concordance tool *AntCone* (version 3.5.8., Anthony, 2019), all the instances of demonstratives of *this, these, that,* and *those* were calculated. The demonstrative *that* was tagged with a CLAWS (a part-of-speech tagger) to exclude *that* used as a conjunction, relative pronoun, and an adverb used as an intensifier. Subsequently, manual analyses were performed to exclude the remaining errors for the tagged parts.

All instances of demonstratives were coded manually into grammatical functions and phoric functions. First, depending on whether a demonstrative is used as an independent head or followed by a noun, grammatical functions were categorized. Second, the phoric functions were coded based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) reference system. If a demonstrative had a textually identified antecedent, it was coded as anaphora or cataphor following the direction of the antecedent. *Situational reference* is defined as "if the referent is fully specified by the context and no further specification is needed" (ibid, p. 59), which means the antecedent is inferred outside the text. A deictic use is defined as "a pointing device in which readers are directed to a certain part of the text" (Gray, 2011, p. 39), in which the examples include such items as *article, study, research, figure,* and *section*. For the current study, if a demonstrative refers to the essay or topic itself, it was coded as a deictic function. Finally, a series of Log-likelihood analyses[1] were then performed to determine the statistical significance between the two variables.

IV. RESULTS

1. Overall Frequency Distribution of Demonstratives

Table 2 illustrates the raw and normalized frequencies of demonstratives in two genres, including two proficiency levels. In brief, argumentative essays produced more demonstratives than narrative essays, and within each genre, *this* ranks the highest

[1] http://ucrel.lancs.ac.uk/llwizard.html

frequency, followed by *that*, *these*, and *those*. Table 3 below summarizes the raw and relative frequencies of grammatical functions of each demonstrative in two genres. However, the log-likelihood chi-square results indicate that the learners used significantly more pronouns in argumentative writing (χ^2 =12.69, p < .001), although using determiners more often in narrative writing. Such tendency for more frequent use of overall determiners in narrative writing was reported in Kang's (2005) and Park's (2020)' studies.

TABLE 2

Overall Frequency of Demonstratives

	A1	A2	N1	N2
this	201 (51.89)	60 (50.03)	67 (44.75)	17 (40.48)
these	95 (24.52)	19 (15.84)	23 (15.36)	7 (16.72)
that	168 (43.37)	25 (20.84)	68 (45.42)	15 (35.72)
those	26 (6.71)	24 (20.01)	10 (6.68)	3 (7.14)
Total	490 (126.50)	128 (106.73)	168 (112.23)	42 (100.02)

Note: A1: low-level argumentative writing A2: high-level argumentative writing; N1: low-level narrative writing; N2: high-level narrative writing. Frequencies are normalized per 10, 000 words and rounded to two decimal points.

2. Grammatical Functions of Demonstratives in Two Genres

TABLE 3

Results of Chi-square Tests Comparing Grammatical functions in Two Genres

	ARG	NAR	LL	*p*	+/-
Pronoun	238 (0.47)	54 (0.28)	12.69	.001***	+
this	100 (0.20)	18 (0.09)	9.89	.01**	+
these	13 (0.03)	4 (0.02)	0.13		+
that	111 (0.22)	28 (0.15)	3.94	.05*	+
those	14 (0.03)	4 (0.02)	0.02		+
Determiner	380 (0.75)	156 (0.81)	0.75		-
this	161 (0.32)	66 (0.34)	0.31		-
these	101 (0.20)	27 (0.14)	2.72		+
that	82 (0.16)	54 (0.28)	9.56	.01**	-
those	36 (0.07)	9 (0.05)	1.33		+

(Relative frequency between two variables). The significance was set when the log-likelihood value was higher than 3.84 at p < .05, 6.63 at p < .01, or 10.83 at p < .001.

For individual items, *this* occurred more frequently in argumentative writing than in narrative writing (χ^2 = 9.89, p < .01). The high frequency of the proximal demonstratives *this/these* in academic prose was reported in the previous studies in this area (Biber et al., 2002; Nishimura, 1996). In addition, while the pronoun *that* appeared more frequently in argumentative writing (χ^2 = 3.94, p < .05), the determiner *that* was more frequent in narrative writing (χ^2 = 9. 56, p < .01). Further N-gram analyses performed to see this discrepancy indicated that the most frequent cluster in narrative writing was *that time*,

approximately 25% being time-related clusters (27 out of 106). Meanwhile, the construction *that's* appeared the most in argumentative writing, accounting for almost 4.7 % of a time-related combination (14 out of 292). The examples in argumentative writing are given in (9), (10), and (11) and the ones in narrative writing in (12), (13), and (14).

(9) ***That****'s why their job-preparing period lasts longer than the women's.*

(10) ***That****'s because it's a bad remembrance for a student who have received it.*

(11) *Regarding* ***that****, there would be some defections in the goods that animal used in experiments.*

(# 9, 10, 11 from argumentative writing)

(12) *After* ***that****, we go restaurant or call the take-out services for dinning.*

(13) *I got an opportunity to visit Paris with my school friends. We were all learning French at* ***that time****, but we had too little knowledge about french to speak to foreigners. While we visited Eiffel Tower, my friends and I got lost.*

(14) *I have a ring that have special meaning for me. It is a small ring I received when I was very young.* ***Since that time****, when I have a big test or other problem, I almost always wear that ring.*

(# 12,13,14 from argumentative writing)

3. Phoric Functions of Demonstratives in Two Genres

This section concerns the functional differences in frequencies between the genres. Table 4 below represents the results of log-likelihood chi-square tests comparing two phoric functions, including deictics, in two genres. First of all, the overall frequencies of anaphoric use are far greater than any other functions, supporting that “demonstratives occur extensively with the anaphoric function.” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 59). Particularly, the use of anaphoric *this* was significantly notable in argumentative writing (χ^2 = 6. 68, $p < .01$), while the anaphoric *that* was slightly more frequent in narrative writing. The following N-grams analysis found that the most frequent construction was *this is* in both genres, which was addressed in research articles (Gray, 2010) and argumentative writing (Lee, 2021).

Second, the cataphoric use appeared more in argumentative writing than in narrative

writing, approximating the .05 significant level. The previous studies mentioned that the cataphoric function was more like native speakers (Leńko-Szymańska, 2004; Wang & Sun, 2006). The examples are illustrated below in (15) and (16).

(15) *What I wonder about is **this** - have those people ever gave an enough attention to encouragement of Internet users by launching a campaign?*
(from argumentative writing)

(16) *when we are driving, It is dangerous to use **these applications**; games, productivity apps such as smart notes, scheduler or something, movie players.*
(from argumentative writing)

TABLE 4
Results of Chi-square Tests Comparing Phoric Functions in Two Genres

	A	N	LL	*p*	+/-
Anaphora	519 (1.02)	167 (0.87)	3.35		+
this	225 (0.44)	59 (0.31)	6.68	.01**	+
these	80 (0.16)	21 (0.11)	2.36		+
that	177 (0.35)	74 (0.39)	0.53		-
those	37 (0.07)	13 (0.07)	0.05		+
Cataphora	27 (0.05)	4 (0.02)	3.82		+
this	8 (0.02)	2 (0.01)	0.30		+
these	3 (0.01)	1 (0.01)	0.01		+
that	5 (0.01)	1 (0.01)	0.39		+
those	11 (0.02)	0 (0.00)	0.00		+
Exophora	57 (0.11)	39 (0.20)	7.76	.01**	-
this	15 (0.03)	23 (0.12)	18.15	.001***	-
these	31 (0.06)	9 (0.05)	0.51		+
that	9 (0.02)	7 (0.04)	1.95		-
those	2 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1.28		+
Deictic	15 (0.03)	0 (0.00)	9.62	.01**	+
this	13 (0.03)	0 (0.00)	8.33	.01**	+
these	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0		N/A
that	2 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	1.28		+
those	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0		N/A

Third, the function that made a significant difference between the genres was the exophoric function ($\chi^2 = 7.76$, $p < .01$), of which the exophoric *this* was predominantly more frequent in narrative writing ($\chi^2 = 18.15$, $p < .001$). Subsequent N-gram analyses demonstrated that the second-highest was *this time* in narrative writing, while *this situation* in argumentative writing, except for the first one, *this is.* It appears that *this* is more available to describe the current situation in argumentative writing, whereas to describe the current time in narrative writing, as in (17) and (18).

When it comes to *that* within the narratives, the frequency of the anaphoric *that* was

much higher than that of the exophoric *that* (0.39 vs. 0.04), which means that referring to antecedents exactly in the text occurred more frequently than just being implied. This appears to reflect a stylistic feature of written discourse, pursuing it as explicit as possible. For instance, the example in (19) seems to make the text more coherent than in (18).[2]

(17) *When scientists make a new medicine, they cannot apply to human's body directly. Because it can cause side effects. And it can make patients die. In* ***this situation****, people don't want to be a subject of medical experiments.*

(from argumentative writing)

(18) *In* ***this winter vacation****, i went to Seoul with my mom for colleage exam. Other can say how can it be interesting, but i think it is really embarrasing and exciting. I had been to Seoul when i was young but* ***this time****, it feels different. The city was really dynamic, busy and crowded.*

(from narrative writing)

(19) *I have a ring that have special meaning for me. It is a small ring I received when I was very young. **Since that time**, when I have a big test or other problem, I almost always wear that ring.*

(from narrative wringing)

(20) *My friend and I were already good at ski, so* ***this time*** *we decided to learn new thing, snowboard.*

(from narrative wringing)

(21) *Today, there are many debates about the physical punishment of childern in schools. Many medias broadcast* ***this arguments*** *everyday and* ***this topic*** *is one of the hottest issues.*

(from argumentative writing)

Finally, the deictic use is another one differentiating the genres ($\chi^2 = 9.62$, $p < .01$). While the deictic *this* occurred at the rate of 0.03 in argumentative writing ($\chi^2 = 8.33$, $p < .01$), it never occurred in narrative writing. As shown in (21) above, *this arguments* and *this topic* refer to the topic itself, as given in the writing prompt.

[2] All the extracts from the learner essays are provided without any correction of errors and spelling mistakes.

4. Different Functions across Writing Proficiency Levels in Two Genres

This section deals with the differences in frequencies for both grammatical and phoric functions according to proficiency levels. Table 5 illustrates the findings of log-likelihood chi-square tests on the differences for two grammatical functions across proficiency levels in argumentative writing.

TABLE 5

Results of Chi-square Tests Comparing Grammatical Functions across Proficiency Levels in Argumentative Essays

	A1	A2	LL	*p*	+/-
Pronoun	179 (0.46)	59 (0.49)	0.17		-
this	74 (0.19)	26 (0.22)	0.30		-
these	9 (0.02)	4 (0.03)	0.34		-
that	92 (0.24)	19 (0.16)	2.81		+
those	4 (0.01)	10 (0.08)	14.25	.001***	-
Determiner	311 (0.80)	69 (0.58)	6.72	.01**	+
this	127 (0.33)	34 (0.28)	0.58		+
these	86 (0.22)	15 (0.13)	4.79	.05*	+
that	76 (0.20)	6 (0.05)	15.37	.001***	+
those	22 (0.06)	14 (0.12)	4.14	.05*	-
Total	490 (1.27)	128 (1.07)	3.03		+

Overall, the frequency of pronouns increased as proficiency improved, although not significantly, whereas the frequency of determiners significantly decreased with the increased proficiency ($\chi^2 = 6.72$, $p < .01$). This tendency almost aligns with Jin's (2019) study, although her study only included the anaphoric use of *this/these*. In Park's (2020) study, a reverse pattern has appeared in a way that overall, determiners increased and pronouns decreased in the argumentative genre. Although some variations exist according to which types of demonstratives are compared, the less frequent use of *that* in the high-level corpus is almost similar to previous studies (Lee, 2021; Leńko-Szymańska, 2004, Oh, 2009; Park, 2020; Petch-Tyson, 2000).

On the other hand, the determiners of *these* and *those* showed a contrasting effect. While the determiner *these* diminished significantly in the high-level corpus ($\chi^2 = 4.79$, $p < .05$), the pronominal *those* increased highly significantly ($\chi^2 = 14.25$, $p < .01$) and significantly for the determiner *those* ($\chi^2 = 4.14$, $p < .05$), indicating a linear progression with the increased proficiency. As for *those*, further analyses revealed that the nouns following the determiner *those* were mostly derived from concrete words such as *those people, those students, those experiments, those teachers*, and *those things, except for those reasons.* These words appeared without any modifications, as in (22), or were combined with post-modifications, as in (23). Under Mignot's (2018) assumption, it seems that the meaning of

that/those is being constructed in referencing process, which resulted in different kinds of post-modifications in the current study. In (23), the noun phrase *those politicians* was post-modified with a relative clause, in which a new category of politicians is being made to provide a reason on why the writer disagrees with compulsive military service.

(22) *For example, getting up late are the most popular behavior that* ***those students*** *have.*
(from low-level argumentative writing)

(23) *All men should complete military service by contemporary laws, but I think that is an overkilling decision. It seems even hillarious when you think about this all-men-should-go law is enforced by* ***those politicians*** *who have tried everything to avoid military service themselves, and now trying everything to let their sons avoid military service.*
(from high-level argumentative writing)

Interestingly enough, the pronoun *those* in the current data mostly consisted of *those who*, as in (24). Accordingly, the use of *those* may be associated with the ability to use grammatical knowledge for elaboration. However, any examples of *that* supporting Mignot's (2018) assumption, as in (8) in Chapter 2, were not found from the current study.

(24) *Next, using real name on the Internet will only fringe people's right to speak and write their ideas freely, not keeping* ***those*** *who are willing to do bad things from doing that.*
(from the high-level argumentative writing)

TABLE 6
Results of Chi-square Tests Comparing Grammatical functions across Proficiency Levels in Narrative Essays

	N1	N2	LL	*p*	+/-
Pronoun	40(0.27)	14(0.33)	0.49		-
this	13(0.09)	5(0.12)	0.34		-
these	4(0.03)	0(0.00)	1.98		+
that	20(0.13)	8(0.19)	0.68		-
those	3(0.02)	1(0.02)	0.02		-
Determiner	128(0.86)	28(0.67)	1.50		+
this	54(0.36)	12(0.29)	0.56		+
these	19(0.13)	8(0.19)	0.87		-
that	48(0.32)	6(0.14)	4.28	.05*	+
those	7(0.05)	2(0.05)	0.00		-
Total	168(1.12)	42(1.00)	0.46		+

Other than that, Table 6 above exhibits the comparisons of grammatical functions across

proficiency levels in the narrative genre with the outcomes of log-likelihood chi-square tests. For the pronominal and determiners uses, any significant differences between the proficiency levels in the narrative genre did not occur. However, the only difference was the fact that the determiner *that* decreased in the high-level corpus ($\chi^2 = 4.28$, $p < .05$).

The next portions discuss the differences in phoric functions across proficiency levels within each genre based on the findings of log-likelihood chi-square tests. As shown in Table 7, in the argumentative genre, the anaphoric *that* highly significantly diminished in the high-level corpus ($\chi^2 = 11.26$, $p < .001$). The exophoric *that* significantly reduced and strictly speaking never occurred in the high-level corpus ($\chi^2 = 4.85$, $p < .05$). *That* represents shared familiarity or vague contexts in written discourse (Gundel et al., 1988). Hence, the high-level learners seem to avoid using vague references as their proficiency increases.

TABLE 7

Results of Chi-square Tests Comparing Phoric Functions across Proficiency Levels in Argumentative Essays

	A1	A2	LL	*p*	+/-
Anaphora	412 (1.06)	107 (0.89)	2.71		+
this	173 (0.45)	52 (0.43)	0.04		+
these	66 (0.17)	14 (0.12)	1.79		+
that	153 (0.40)	24 (0.20)	11.26	.001***	+
those	20 (0.05)	17 (0.14)	8.77	.01**	-
Cataphora	18 (0.05)	9 (0.08)	1.30		-
this	7 (0.02)	1 (0.01)	0.63		+
these	2 (0.01)	1(0.01)	0.14		-
that	4 (0.01)	1 (0.01)	0.04		+
those	5 (0.01)	6 (0.05)	4.85	.05*	-
Exophora	48 (0.12)	9 (0.08)	2.13		+
this	11 (0.03)	4 (0.03)	0.07		-
these	27 (0.07)	4 (0.03)	2.26		+
that	9 (0.02)	0 (0.00)	4.85	.05*	+
those	1 (0.00)	1 (0.01)	0.65		-
Deictic	12 (0.03)	3 (0.03)	0.11		+
this	10 (0.03)	3 (0.03)	0.00		+
these	0	0			N/A
that	2	0			+
those	0	0	3.03		N/A
Total	490 (1.27)	128 (1.07)			+

On top of all that, both the increased anaphoric and cataphoric uses of *those* in the high-level corpus displayed a close association with writing ability ($\chi^2 = 8.77$, $p < .01$; $\chi^2 = 4.85$, $p < .05$). In addition, the low-level learners' deictic functions, as indicated in Table 7, were more frequent and direct than the high-level learners. Examples (25) and (26) demonstrate the deictic use combined with *this* and *that*, respectively.

(25) *There had been debates over whether to maintain **this** or not. However, I strongly think **this** is not the right time to talk about men's necessity to go to the military service.*

(from high-level argumentative writing)

(26) *I don't agree **that question.** Smoking people is also one of the social group.*

(from low-level argumentative writing)

Finally, Table 8 below presents the differences in phoric functions, including proficiency levels, in the narrative genre. Similar to the argumentative genre in Table 7, the respective anaphoric and exophoric *that* were slightly reduced in the high-level corpus. However, the exophoric function in narrative writing increased overall in the high-level corpus. This is in contrast with the argumentative genre showing the overall decrease (See Table 7).

TABLE 8

Results of Chi-square Tests Comparing Phoric Functions across Proficiency Levels in Narrative Essays

	N1	N2	LL	p	+/-
Anaphora	137 (0.92)	30 (0.71)	1.59		+
this	48 (0.32)	11 (0.26)	0.38		+
these	17 (0.11)	4 (0.10)	0.10		+
that	62 (0.41)	12 (0.29)	1.50		+
those	10 (0.07)	3 (0.07)	0.01		-
Cataphora	2 (0.01)	2 (0.05)	1.52		-
this	1 (0.01)	1 (0.02)	0.76		-
these	1 (0.01)	0 (0.00)	0.49		+
that	0 (0.00)	1 (0.02)	3.04		-
those	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0.00		N/A
Exophora	29 (0.19)	10 (0.24)	0.31		-
this	18 (0.12)	5 (0.12)	0.00		+
these	5 (0.03)	4 (0.10)	2.25		-
that	6 (0.04)	1 (0.02)	0.26		+
those	0 (0.00)	0 (0.00)	0.00		N/A
Total	168 (1.12)	42 (1.00)	0.46		+

V. CONCLUSION

The current study investigated the Korean EFL learners' demonstrative use in two genres. The related studies on L2 learners' use of English demonstratives have mainly examined argumentative essays. However, under the assumption that their demonstrative use would be different across genres, the study compared the relative frequencies of grammatical and phoric functions in argumentative and narrative writing. It also analyzed to what extent

these frequencies differ depending on writing proficiency levels. The summaries of the results were as follows.

First, the analyses of grammatical functions displayed that while in argumentative writing, the pronouns were obviously more frequent, the determiners occurred slightly more in narrative writing. As for individual demonstratives, the pronoun *this* was noticeably preferred in the argumentative genre, whereas the determiner *that* appeared slightly more often in the narrative genre. Especially, the temporal usage of *that* was noticeable in the narrative genre, sometimes reflecting a written narrative feature.

Second, both exophoric and deictic functions differentiated the two genres. For instance, the exophoric functions occurred more in narrative writing, especially with the dominant temporal usage for the exophoric *this*. On the other hand, the anaphoric functions appeared evenly across the genres, thus, not greatly distinguishing the genres. In spite of that, the anaphoric *this* was highly prominent in argumentative writing. Besides, the deictic function, referring to the topic itself, was only found in argumentative writing.

Third, the type of demonstratives that showed a progressive developmental feature by proficiency levels was *those*, which was evidenced in various functions, such as pronouns, determiners, anaphora, and cataphora. On the contrary, the frequencies of *that* increasingly diminished along with proficiency improvement in both genres in general, showing a reverse pattern. This was especially obvious for the determiner, anaphoric, exophoric *that* in argumentative writing. This appears to improve genre awareness that avoids a colloquial or vague reference in academic writing. To sum up, the Korean university students' use of demonstratives varies according to types of demonstratives, genres, and proficiency, although some features are shared.

Based on these findings, this study has some pedagogical implications for teaching English demonstratives. First of all, teachers need to take into account various functions of demonstratives in teaching English demonstratives. For instance, exophoric functions are almost intuitive to use, so teachers may guide students to raise awareness for a particular usage across genres. This would be helpful for all levels of students to use demonstratives relatively simply and appropriately. However, since cataphoric functions may require more grammatical knowledge, teachers should carefully plan how to teach that function, considering the degrees of proficiency, especially when accompanied by different post-modifications. Although the high-level students in the current study could handle *those who*, to some degree, they never used *those which*. This seems to reflect the importance of pedagogical practice in language development.

In addition, teachers should consider the effectiveness of demonstrative pronouns and determiners to maintain coherence, respectively. In other words, determiners can be utilized when a long stretch of antecedents is condensed into concise lexical nouns, which might be more effective when combined with vocabulary instructions. Using a pronoun

might be a good strategy to achieve successful cohesion if appropriate nouns are not available in context. Concerning this issue, we need to develop the perspective that views demonstratives as a whole demonstrative structure in which the relationships of antecedents and references exist. Thus, further research may be necessary to investigate antecedent structures or various linguistic contexts in which demonstratives are used.

Finally, it is believed that when actually using English demonstratives in their writing, students might encounter the situations of using other references interchangeable with demonstratives, such as the definite article *the* and the pronoun *it*. Thus, comparing other referential devices along with demonstratives would be necessary for more effective instruction in English writing. Last but not least, this study may offer material developers useful information on how much a certain type of English demonstratives should be distributed in English textbooks for a balanced acquisition of English demonstratives.

REFERENCES

Anthony, L. (2019). *AntConc*. Computer Software. Version 3.5.8.

Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). *Longman grammar of spoken and written English*. London: Longman.

Blagoeva, R. (2004). Demonstrative reference as a cohesive device in advanced learner writing: A corpus-based study. *Language and Computers 49*(1), 297-307.

Botley, S., & McEnery, T. (2001a). Demonstratives in English: A corpus-based study. *Journal of English Linguistics, 29*(1), 7-33.

Botley, S., & McEnery, T. (2001b). Proximal and distal demonstratives: A corpus-based study. *Journal of English Linguistics, 29*(3), 214-233.

Cheo, J., & Song, J. (2013). The topical classification of essays by college student English learners using hierarchical clustering. *Research Institute for Language and Information, 17*, 93-115.

Gray, B. (2010). On the use of demonstrative pronouns and determiners as cohesive devices: A focus on sentence-initial *this/these* in academic prose. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 9*(3), 167-183.

Gray, B., & Cortes, V. (2011). Perception vs. evidence: An analysis of *this* and *these* in academic prose. *English for Specific Purposes, 30*(1), 31-43.

Gundel, J., Hedberg, N., & Zacharski, R. (1988). On the generation and interpretation of demonstrative expressions. In D. Vargha & E. Hajičová (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 12th Conference on Computational Linguistics, 1* (pp. 216-221). Budapest, Hungary: John von Neumann Society.

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

Jin, H. (2019). On the use of anaphoric use of demonstratives *this/these* in L2 academic writing. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes, 38*(1), 62-74.

Kang, J. (2005). Written narratives as an index of L2 competence in Korean EFL learners. *Journal of Second Language Writing, 14* (4), 259-279.

Kolhatkar, V., Roussel, A., Dipper. S., & Zinsmeister, H. (2018). Anaphora with non-nominal antecedents in computational linguistics: A survey. *Computational Linguistics, 44* (3), 548-572.

Lee, H. (2021). Korean university students' use of English demonstrative in argumentative essays. *Studies in English Education, 26*(1), 85-109.

Leńko-Szymańska, A. (2004). Demonstratives as anaphora markers in advanced learners' English. In G. Aston, S. Bernardini, & D. Stewart (Eds.), *Corpora and language learners* (pp. 89-107). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Mauranen, A. (1993). *Cultural differences in academic rhetoric*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Mignot, E. (2018). The demonstrative THAT and the elaboration of reference: A case of linguistic accommodation. *French Journal of English Linguistics, 25*. https://doi.org/10.4000/anglophonia.1574

Nabokov, V. (1955). *Lolita*. London: Penguin Books.

Nishimura, C. (1996). *Demonstratives in academic written English discourse*. Unpublished master's thesis. University of California, Los Angeles.

Oh, S. (2009). Korean college students' use of English demonstratives in argumentative essays. *English Teaching, 64*(1), 51-78.

Park, J. (2020). Use of demonstratives by Korean EFL students in argumentative and narrative essays. *Studies in Foreign Language Education, 34*(2), 25-49.

Petch-Tyson, S. (2000). Demonstrative expressions in argumentative discourse: A computer corpus-based comparison of non-native and native English. In S. Botley & A. McEnery (Eds.), *Corpus-based and computational approaches to discourse anaphora* (pp. 43-64). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.

Rhee, S., & Jung, C. (2014). Compilation of the Yonsei English Learner Corpus (YELC) 2011 and its use for understanding current usage of English by Korean pre-university students. *The Korea Contents Association, 14*, 19-29.

Strauss, S. (1993). Why 'this' and 'that' are not complete without 'it'. In K. Beals, G. Cooke, D. Kathman, S. Kita, K. McCullouoh & D. Testen (Eds.), *CLS 29: Papers From the 29th Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* (pp. 403-417). Chicago, IL: Chicago Linguistic Society.

Strauss, S. (2002). This, that, and it in spoken American English: A demonstrative system

of gradient focus. *Language Science, 24*(2), 131-152.
Strunk, W., & White, E. B. (2000). *The elements of style* (4th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
Swierzbin, B. (2010). Demonstratives' special place in the English reference system: Why that's important for English language learners. *Language and Linguistics Compass, 4*(10), 987-1000.
Wang, L. & Sun, X. (2006). A corpus-based study on demonstrative in argumentative discourse of Chinese EFL learners. *Modern Foreign Languages, 29*(2), 172-170.
Zang, J. (2015). An analysis of the use of demonstratives in argumentative discourse by Chinese EFL learners. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 6*(2), 460-465.

Example in: English
Applicable Language: English
Applicable Levels: Tertiary

Hyo-Jung Lee (Lecturer)
Yeungnam University College
170, Hyeonchung-ro, Nam-gu, Daegu, 42415, Korea.
E-mail: dument@daum.net

Received: April 25, 2021
Reviewed: May 28, 2021
Revised version received: June 4, 2021