

COHENSIVE DEVICE

employed in the process of this experiment and the result was satisfactory.

Another implication of this research lies in its message for material developers, and textbook writers. It proved that presentation of a list of cohesive devices is not enough. Textbooks should provide different kinds of meaningful exercises to make the students understand the meaning and functions of conjunctions in the context.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bacha N. S. and Hannania. (1980). "Difficulty in learning and the effectiveness of teaching transitional words": *TESOL Quarterly* vol. 14:12: 251-4
- Bandar, R. G. (1980). *From Sentence to Paragraph*. New York: HOLT, Rinehart & Winston.
- Brown, G. & Yule, G (1983). *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University press.
- Cohen, et. al. *Markers of cohesion*. (1979)
- Dubin & Olshtain. (1986). "The need to spend time generating daily practice". *Forum* vol. 33 no. 3, Cambridge University Press.
- Forghal, M. (1992). "Naturalness and the notion of cohesion in EFL" classes. *IRAL*, Vol xxx/1.
- Farhady, H., Jafarpoor, A., & Birjandi, P. (1994). *Language skill testing: From theory to practice*. Tehran Iran. SAMT Publisher.
- Halliday & Hassan. (1979). *Cohesion in English*. London. Longman.
- Hatch, E. & Farhadi, H. (1982). *Research and statistics for applied linguistics*. Massachuset Newburg Publication Inc.
- Hatim, B, & Mason, (1990). *Discourse and the translator*. New York Longman.
- Jerry, on. (1985). *Coherence and the structure of discourse*. Oxford University Press.
- Morton- Ann, et al. (1995). *Coherence in spontaneous texts*. Oxford University Press.
- Raimes, A. (1983). *Techniques in teaching writing*. New York: Oxford Univesity Press.
- Vivian Zamel. (1983). "Teaching those missing links in writing". *EFL Journal*, Volume 371/1: 22-29.
- Widdowson, H. G. (1978). *Exploration in applied linguistics*. Oxford University Press.

COHENSIVE DEVICE

In order to see whether the difference between the means of the control and experimental group was due to instruction or it had to be attributed to sampling error or chance a t-test was conducted. The result was $t=2.64 > 2.000$

The t-value exceeded the value of t-critical at 0.05 level which meant that there existed a significant difference between the two tests.

Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected; that is making the students consciously aware of the form and implication leads to significant improvement in their writing.

Conclusion

The null hypothesis in this research asserted that explanation, exercises and awareness of the form and implications of conjunctions have no significant effect on the improvement of Iranian students in using appropriate conjunctions in their writing. In trying to accept or reject the null hypothesis, sixty students who were adult male and female intermediate students were selected. They were divided into experimental and control groups, and both groups were given a pretest in the first session. The pretest consisted of two tests, one was a TOEFL test to determine the homogeneity of the groups and the other was a writing test consisting of completion items, multiple choice items, joining sentence item and a paragraph writing exercise. The result of pretest proved no

significant difference between the means.

Throughout the experiment, the experimental group went through the process of different types of contextual exercises in using conjunctions in their writing. Different types of functional drills were provided for them in order to make them understand the crucial role of these cohesive devices in the coherence of the text. In the last session after three months the same test was administered again as the posttest. The statistical analyses proved that explanations exercise and making the students consciously aware of the role of conjunctions is useful in improving their writing.

Pedagogical implications

The conclusions emerging from this study have implications for EFL teachers, testers and material developers.

The result of the study revealed that our traditional way of teaching conjunctions is inadequate. It also proved that when instruction is based on the proposed approach rather than on the more traditional methods suggested by textbooks, students can be expected to understand what the different conjunctions signify and learn to use them appropriately in their writing.

The result of this study was also in favour of new communicative approaches of language teaching. Recent communicative approaches emphasize the role of contextualization, using realistic and comprehensible input, authentic materials, as well as meaningful learning. All of the above mentioned concepts were

Tuesdays and Fridays at 8 in the morning. The whole instructional procedure took place within three months. At the end of the term a posttest of writing was administered to measure the achievement of instructional program.

Here you have a sample of a paragraph written by one of my students at the end of instructional period:

In order to write a good paragraph you should follow several steps. First, you should select a suitable topic. Since the topic is usually a general idea, it should be limited in a topic sentence. Then you should write a couple of supporting sentences to expand your idea.

There should be some relationship between the topic sentence and supporting sentences directly or indirectly. Finally you should end your paragraph with a logical conclusion. If your paragraph is about one main idea and there is relation between all the sentences and logical order of organization you have produced a good, cohesive, and logical paragraph.

Statistical analyses

To determine the effect of instructional treatment on the development of second language learners' abilities in writing the following statistical analyses were conducted.

In the first place in order to determine the homogeneity of the subjects the scores of TOEFL were employed. After finding the means and variances of the two groups an F-test was conducted. the following table illustrates the means and variances of the two groups

Subject	X	SD
Experimental	47.9	90.25
Control	45.8	138.14

Then an F-test was conducted to examine the homogeneity among the variances. The result of F-test was (1.53). It is less than the critical value of 1.84 and proves that these groups belong to the same population, i.e. there is no significant difference between them.

$$V1/V2=138.14/90.25=1.53 < 1.84$$

to check the internal consistency of the pretest, its reliability was estimated by two ways.

First it was estimated by K-R21 method. The result was 0.78 which shows a high degree of reliability and second the results of the pretest was correlated through Pearson's correlational formula. The result was 0.85.

Then the difference between the means of the two groups in pretest and posttest were calculated. The following two tables reflect the statistical features of pretest and posttest for each group and in general.

Groups Features	Control group	Experimental group	Total
	Group A	Group B	
X	283	275	558
\bar{X}	9.43	9.16	9.3
V	16.64	25.93	22.81
SD	4.43	5.05	4.78

Groups Features	Control group	Experimental group	Total
	Group A	Group B	
X	390	540	930
\bar{X}	13	18	15.5
V	38.66	18.3	34.65
SD	6.22	4.47	5.89

variances of the scores obtained for the two groups were calculated and compared through the F-ratio. Since the observed value of F was smaller than that of critical value, the two groups were considered homogeneous. Both groups were instructed how to use the conjunctions. The control group was taught by an instructor who used **Let's Write English** as the textbook, employing the traditional methods of teaching conjunctions through a list of conjunctions categorized according to their functions.

The experimental group was taught by the researcher.

During the first few weeks, most of students' writings were a group of unrelated sentences like these:

"I like fridays and I have several reasons for my interest. First I have free time and I can do every work that I like, such as go to the cinema or park. Also, I can go to the house of my relatives and my frinds and meet them. I can study my lessons and read my favour novels. Second, I can doing my personal responsible. For example, go to the bath (take shower), washing my dirty clothes, clean my shoes, doing my home work and so on. Third I can be with my family and enjoy of this, also I can help my mother in works of house, like cooking, lunch, clean the room, washing dirty dishes. Also, we (my family and me) can argue about our problems and try to solve those.

There are many differences between male and female teachers, at first male teachers teach in boys' and girles' School whereas female teachers teach only in girl's school. Then the male teachers put on every clothes for school whereas female teachres put on only uniform. Another the male teachers are more serious than female teachers. The male teachers do not always ask the students whereas female teachers ask the students every day. Next

the male teachers have no friendship with their students female teachers have friendly relationship with their students. The male teachers speak loudly in the class, but female teachers do not speak loudly in the class. At last, the male teachers do not have any works at home, but female teachers have a lot of works at home.

A quick survey of the above paragraphs shows that the main problem of the students is how to create coherence in their paragraphs. The ideas are good, The diction and structure is acceptable to some extent, but the relationship between the sentences are obscured. These examples reveal the English students' incapability in creating logical relationship between different fragments of discourse.

In order to solve the problem, This group was first taught the classification of linking devices according to their grammatical functions. In order to help the students understand how each type of conjunctions work within a sentence or between sentences, the coordination conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions and connective adverbs were introduced separately. The source book for this group was **A comprehensive Grammar of English Language**.

In order to make the students aware of the form and implications of conjunctions, the Farsi equivalentes of conjunctions with some examples were provided. The Students were asked to read some Farsi texts and the role of conjunctions in those texts were explained to them. This helped my students to understand the role of conjunctions within and between sentences.

In an attempt to contextualize these linking devices the students were provided with different kinds of completion exercises, sentence combining exercises, and exercises concerning longer units of discourse and writing practices.

My classes were held twice a week, on

COHENSIVE DEVICE

semantic and syntactic restrictions of conjunctions and give the students the erroneous idea that they can be used interchangeably. (Widdowson 1978, Vivian Zamel 1983)

Modern approaches, on the other hand, emphasize that connectives can not be understood without taking the discourse context in which they appear into consideration. They suggest that since lists of conjunctions do not demonstrate how cohesive devices establish the logical relationship between the ideas presented, they are ineffective as an aid in teaching these links. (Brown and Yule 1983, Forghal 1992) Widdowson (1987) makes the same type of criticism about teaching strategies that focus on conjuncts to be learned rather than on how these links make contextually related ideas clear and logical.

This study focused on the findings of modern approaches and by proposing a new method in teaching conjunctions, put it under scientific and elaborate investigation.

Research Methods and Procedure Subjects

In order to carry out the study, sixty students majoring in English from Payam Noor University in Damghan were selected. They were adult male and female students within the age range of 19 to 24. They were divided into two classes of 30, one of which was considered as the experimental group and

the other as the control group. These subjects were chosen randomly from among 150 students. The instructors of the two classes were different.

The subjects performed on the standard test of the TOEFL and a pretest of writing and a posttest of writing.

Instrumentation

Three instruments were used in this study. Two writing tests and a standard test of the TOEFL.

In order to check the homogeneity of the groups, the subjects were asked to take the TOEFL test in the first session. The test consisted of 180 multiple choice items of structure, vocabulary reading passage and writing ability. A pretest of writing consisting of completion items, completion exercises, sentence combining exercises, and some paragraphs for free writing were assigned to both the experimental and control group in the first session. The same test was administered to the subjects as the posttest after the completion of instructional program within interval of 12 weeks. The topics of the paragraphs were provided by the teacher and each time the subjects were to choose one topic out of three.

Procedure

Based on the results of the TOEFL test the

COHENSIVE DEVICE

INTRODUCTION

Cohesive devices are the syntactic realization of the logical relationship between ideas. These devices are crucial in writing because they turn separate clauses and paragraphs into connected prose, signalling the relationships between ideas and making obvious of meaning the writer is trying to communicate. (Jerry on 1983, Morton Ann 1995)

There are various devices which connect ideas in writing. Halliday and Hassan (1976); in their exploration of connective devices identified five major categories of connective devices, lexical cohesion, reference, substitution, ellipses, and conjunctions. While English language students need to learn and identify and use the whole variety of linking devices, they particularly need careful instruction in the use of conjuncts those connectives more specifically referred to in grammar books as coordinating conjunctions, subordinating conjunctions, and conjunctive adverbs or transitions. (Vivian Zamel 1983)

These linking devices establish relationships between ideas in successive sentences. Without conjunctions it would be extremely difficult to make sense of the connections between ideas. Conjunctions have anticipatory role, they prepare the readers to anticipate the ideas that follow. They tell

readers what to expect. "However" flashes contradiction ahead. "In fact" signals here comes a strong restatement of what has been said. "Therefore" means a conclusion or a consequence approaching, etc. (Bandar, 1980)

These linking devices are found to be problematic for English language students. Dubin and Olshtain (1980) found out that whereas native speakers of English generally learn to use these cohesive elements as they do other aspects of language, English students seem to have great difficulty in mastering them.

Cohen et al. found that non-native speakers of English were particularly troubled by markers of cohesions in their writings. Teachers of writing have all seen compositions in which the meaning or intent has been obscured, either because these links are inappropriate semantically or syntactically.

It seems that despite the critical role of conjuncts in writing. Students of English are not always able to take advantage of them. This may be primarily because of misleading methods in the instruction of these devices. (Bacha & Hanania 1980). Most compositions or writing texts or grammar books such as "let's write English" or "communicate what you mean" solely categorize cohesive devices according to their function. In fact, what the students are offered are lists of cohesive devices categorized according to function. This approach of teaching conjunctions ignores the

Many methodologists and researchers in the field of TEFL believe that conjunctions as the syntactic realization of the logical relationship between ideas should be taught contextually.

Widdowson (1978) and Hatim and Mason (1990) and Raimes (1983) and Dubin and Olshtain (1980) all point to the absurdity of presenting a list of cohesive devices in teaching and emphasize the role of context and contextual teaching. Based on this belief a study was carried out to evaluate the validity of the ideas expressed by these methodologists.

The aim of the present study was to examine the effect of a new instructional approach of teaching conjunctions on the students' ability of writing. The research was designed so that it would provide answers to the following questions.

- 1- Is there any relationship between the students' awareness of the form and the implications of conjunctions and their improvement in using appropriate conjunctions?
- 2- Does the students' knowledge of the form and the implications of the conjunctions help them to produce more coherent writings?

The following null hypothesis was formulated:

Ho: "Explanation exercises, and awareness of the form and implications of conjunctions in the source and the target language have no significant effect on the improvement of Iranian students in using appropriate conjunctions in their writings.

16

In order to answer the above questions 60 homogenous students majoring in English at Payam Noor University in Damghan were selected. They were randomly divided into two equal groups: experimental and control.

The experimental group was taught by the researcher himself and the control group was taught by another instructor.

Throughout the research these data gathering instruments were employed: a TOEFL test, a pretest of writing, and a posttest of writing.

In order to test the null hypothesis various statistical analyses were performed: 1. Measurement of F-ratio 2. Correlation of pretest and TOEFL 3. Computation of the reliability of the posttest by K-R21 method 4. Comparison of the means through t-test.

The result of the statistical procedure proved that explanation, exercise and the awareness of the form and implications of conjunctions have a significant role on the improvement of the students in using appropriate conjunctions in their writing. It also proved that this approach will lead to more coherent writings.

Key Words: conjunction, cohesive device, contextual teaching, discourse, communicative approach, lexical cohesion, coherence, Logical relationships

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF CONJUNCTION AS A COHENSIVE DEVICE IN TEACHING

COHENSIVE DEVICE

ABBAS MORADAN
SEMNAM UNIVERSITY

چکیده فارسی

بسیاری از محققان و متخصصان حوزه آموزش زبان انگلیسی به عنوان زبان خارجی عقیده دارند که حروف ربط به عنوان نمایش ساختاری روابط منطقی مفاهیم باید در متن آموخته شوند. ویدوسون^۱ در سال ۱۹۷۸ م به نقد روش های تدریس کتاب هایی پرداخت که به جای توضیح روشن و واضح روابط منطقی بین مفاهیم به ارائه فهرستی از حروف ربط اکتفا می کنند. بورخین^۲ در سال ۱۹۷۸ تأکید کرد که ارائه فهرست از حروف ربط، بیهوده است؛ چون چنین فهرستی این نکته را به زبان آموزان القا می کند که آن ها روابط منطقی مشابهی را بیان می کنند و می توانند جایگزین یکدیگر شوند. او در ضمن، روی این واقعیت تأکید کرد که: «فهمیدن حروف ربط بدون در نظر گرفتن متنی که در آن به کار رفته اند، غیرممکن است.»

بر اساس عقاید محققان پیشین و برای ارزشیابی نظریات آن ها در زمینه آموزش حروف ربط، تحقیق حاضر طراحی شد و به مرحله اجرا درآمد. هدف از این تحقیق این بود که اثر یک روش آموزشی جدید در زمینه تدریس حروف ربط را بر توانایی نوشتاری دانشجویان بررسی کند. سؤال های اساسی تحقیق به شرح زیر بودند:

۱. آیا بین آگاهی دانشجویان از شکل و معنی حروف ربط و بهبود توانایی آن ها در کاربرد صحیح این حروف، رابطه ای وجود دارد؟
۲. آیا دانش دانشجویان از شکل و معنی حروف ربط به آن ها در خلق نوشته های منطقی کمک خواهد کرد؟

برای پاسخ دادن به سؤالات فوق، ۶۰ نفر از دانشجویان دوره لیسانس مترجمی زبان انگلیسی از دانشگاه دامغان به صورت تصادفی انتخاب شدند. همه آن ها دانشجویان مذکر و مؤنث ایرانی در سنین بین ۱۹ تا ۲۴ سالگی بودند که اخیراً همگی در امتحان کنکور پذیرفته شده بودند. سپس دانشجویان مذکور به دو گروه تجربی و کنترل تقسیم بندی شدند. برای اطمینان از تجانس گروه های فوق در همان جلسه اول، یک آزمون تافل مشتمل بر ۱۸۰ سؤال به آن ها ارائه شد.

ابزارهای گردآوری اطلاعات به کار گرفته شده در این بررسی، عبارتند از: یک آزمون تافل، یک پیش آزمون نوشتاری و یک پس آزمون نوشتاری.

پیش آزمون نوشتاری در اولین جلسه ترم و پس آزمون نوشتاری در آخرین جلسه ترم برگزار شد. برای ارزیابی آزمون های فوق و حفظ صحت نتایج آزمون، سه مدرس به طور جداگانه آن ها را تصحیح و نمره گذاری کردند.

اینجانب به عنوان محقق، تدریس گروه تجربی را به عهده داشتم. ابتدا سعی کردم طبقه بندی حروف ربط را بر طبق کاربرد دستوری به آن ها بیاموزم. سپس با ارائه مثال های متنوع، آن ها را با کاربردها و تفاوت های ساختاری و معنایی این حروف آشنا کردم. برای تبدیل روند آموزش به آموزش جامع و قابل فهم و ارتباطی تمرین های مختلفی در زمینه ترکیب جملات با حروف ربط و یا تکمیل جملات به وسیله حروف ربط و یا ترکیب پاراگراف ها در یک متن جامع به آنان ارائه دادم؛ به گونه ای که دانشجویان بتوانند دقیقاً به تفاوت های شکلی و معنایی حروف فوق پی ببرند.

برای پاسخگویی به سؤالات تحقیق و آزمون فرضیه خنثی، تجزیه و تحلیل آماری متنوعی انجام گرفت. ابتدا واریانس به دست آمده در آزمون تافل محاسبه و به این وسیله تجانس و هماهنگی گروه ها مشخص شد. سپس نمرات پیش آزمون با نمرات تافل مقایسه شد تا روایی پیش آزمون محاسبه شود. روایی پس آزمون نیز با فرمول K-R21 محاسبه شد و دست آخر، میانگین نمرات دو گروه در پس آزمون و پیش آزمون از طریق آزمون t محاسبه شد.

نتایج تجزیه و تحلیل آماری ثابت کرد که توضیح دادن، تمرین کردن و آگاهی دانشجویان از شکل و مفاهیم حروف ربط، در بهبود نوشتار دانشجویان و به کارگیری حروف ربط مناسب در نوشته های آن ها نقش برجسته ای دارد و منجر به نوشته های منسجم تر می شود.

کلیدواژگان: گفتمان، رویکرد ارتباطی، ابزار انسجام، روابط منطقی، کلمات ربطی