

UNIVERSITY OF BABYLON

An Analysis of the Performance of Iraqi EFL University Students in Manipulating Correlative Conjunctions

A Thesis

Submitted to the Council of the
College of Basic Education, University of Babylon in Partial
Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master
of Education in Methods of Teaching
English as a Foreign Language

By

Muayad Mingher Al - Shemmery

Supervised by

Asst. Prof. Aasim A. Zbar Al -Dulaimy (Ph.D.)

Asst. Prof. Adil Al -Akkam (M.A.)

July 2008 A.D.

Rajab 1429 A.H.

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

﴿ نَرْفَعُ دَرَجَاتٍ مِّنْ نَّشَأٍ وَفَوْقَ كُلِّ

ذِي عِلْمٍ عَلِيمٌ ﴾

صَدَقَ اللّٰهُ الْعَلِیُّ الْعَظِیْمُ

سورة یوسف

الآية: 76

We certify that this thesis which is entitled (**An Analysis of the Performance of Iraqi EFL University Students in Manipulating Correlative Conjunctions**) was prepared by (**Muayad Mingher Ubied Al-Shemmary**) under our supervision at the College of Basic Education, University of Babylon in Partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language .

Signature:

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Aasim A. Zbar Al-Dulaimy (Ph.D.)

Date: / / 2008

Signature:

Supervisor: Asst. Prof. Adil Al-Akkam (M.A.)

Date: / / 2008

In view of the available recommendations, I forward this thesis for debate by the Examining Committee.

Signature:

Name: Abdul Salam Jawdat Jasim (Ph.D.)

Head of the Department of Higher Studies,

College of Basic Education

University of Babylon

Date: / / 2008

We certify that we have read the thesis entitled (**An Analysis of the Performance of Iraqi EFL University Students in Manipulating Correlative Conjunctions**) and, as Examining Committee, examined the student (**Muayad Mingher Ubied Al- Shemmery**) in its content, and that in our opinion it is adequate as a thesis for the degree of Master of Education in Methods of Teaching English as a Foreign Language.

Signature:

Name:

(Member)

Date: / / 2008

Signature:

Name:

(Member)

Date: / / 2008

Signature:

Name:

(Chairman)

Date: / / 2008

Approved by the Council of the College of Basic Education

Signature:

Name:Asst. Prof. Abbas Ubied Hammadi (Ph.D.)

Dean of the College of Basic Education

University of Babylon

Date: / / 2008

To

My Late Father

With Eternal

Love

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to praise **ALLAH HIS MAJESTY** without **HIS GRAND BLESSING** this study would not have come to light.

It is with particular pleasure that I express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors **Asst. Prof. Aasim A. Zbar Al-Dulaimy** and **Asst. Prof. Adil Al- Akkam** for their support, encouragement, and valuable suggestions throughout my study.

I offer my thanks to **Asst. Prof. Riyadh Tariq Kadhim Al-Ammdi**, Department of English, College of Education, University of Babylon, who suggested the topic of this study and for his cooperation.

Thanks are due to the jury members whose their modifications and comments are significant in preparing the test of the study. Special mention goes to **Prof. Muhammed J. Al-Seady**, Head of the Department of English, College of Education, University of Thi-Qar.

Ahmed Sahib Jaber (M.A. in English language and linguistics) and **Salih Mahdy Addia** (M.A. in Teaching English as a Foreign Language), Department of English, College of Education, University of Babylon, deserve my thanks for their assistance.

I want to thank everyone who helped me in my work in particular my colleague **Nisreen Abbas Khdhair** for providing me with certain references.

Finally, I wish to express my most grateful and love to my family, especially my sister **Iman** (M.A. in English language and linguistics) for their constant help, care, support and encouragement throughout my study.

ABSTRACT

The sections in this study are mainly concerned with correlative conjunctions as one of the constructions in English language on the one hand, and a problematic area for Iraqi learners of English on the other.

Therefore, the study aims at measuring the students' ability in manipulating correlative conjunctions, and identifying the types of errors made by Iraqi *EFL* university students and their sources in recognizing and producing correlative conjunctions. To achieve these goals, the study

is hypothesized that:

- 1-Most Iraqi *EFL* university students face difficulties in mastering correlative conjunctions.
- 2- Iraqi *EFL* learners' inaccurate responses at the production level may be attributed to misuse correlative conjunctions.

To confirm these hypotheses , a diagnostic test has been adopted and applied to a sample of (50) Iraqi *EFL* university students at their fourth year, Department of English , College of Education, University of Babylon during the academic year (2007-2008).Then, their responses are collected and analyzed to give the following results:

- 1-The students' performance in the whole test has revealed that Iraqi *EFL* university students face difficulties in mastering correlative conjunctions. This is evident from the number of their correct responses (906, 37.75%) in comparison with that of their incorrect responses (1494, 62.25%).

2- The highest rate of their incorrect responses to questions (3 and 4) that is (804. 67%) against (396. 33%) of their correct responses verify that the subjects misuse correlative conjunctions at the production level.

The subjects' errors are attributed to the following sources:

- (a) Intralingual transfer in which the subjects' errors form (921, 61.6%) of the subjects' total errors.
- (b) Communication strategies where the subjects' errors are (437, 29.3%) of the total errors.
- (c) Context of learning in which the subjects' errors constitute (104.7%) of the total errors.
- (d) Interlingual transfer where the subjects' errors comprise (32, 2.1%) of the total errors.

This study consists of five chapters. **Chapter One** presents the problem, aims, hypotheses, procedures, limits and value of the study. **Chapter Two** gives an account of conjunctions in English as linking devices, coordination, subordination and correlative conjunctions including their definitions; types; functions and usages since they form the main goal of the study. **Chapter Three** describes the test : its objectives, design, material selection, validity, reliability , subjects, and the scoring scheme adopted. **Chapter Four** analyzes the data and discusses the results. Finally, **Chapter Five** offers some conclusions, recommendations, and suggestions for further studies.

List of Tables

No.	Details	Page
Table 1	The Facility Value and the Discrimination Power of the Test Items	48
Table 2	Distribution of the Scores of the Test	49
Table 3	Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level in Question (1)	51
Table 4	Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level in Question (2)	52
Table 5	Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level in Questions (1 and 2)	53
Table 6	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level in Question (3)	54
Table 7	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level in Question (4)	55
Table 8	Subjects' Performance at the Production Level in Questions (3 and 4)	56
Table 9	Subjects' Total Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels in the Whole Test	57

Abbreviations and symbols

Symbol	Description
<i>CCO</i>	<i>Correlative Coordinator</i>
<i>CS</i>	<i>Correlative Subordinator</i>
<i>CC</i>	<i>Correlative Conjunction</i>
<i>EFL</i>	<i>English as a Foreign Language</i>
*	<i>Unacceptable</i>

Contents

Subject	Page
Acknowledgements	I
Abstract	II
List of Tables	IV
Abbreviations	V
Chapter One : Introduction	
1.1 The Problem	1
1.2 Aims of the Study	2
1.3 Hypotheses	2
1.4 Procedures	3
1.5 Limits	3
1.6 Value of the Study	4
1.7 Definitions of Some Terms	4
Chapter Two : Correlative Conjunctions	
2.1 Introduction	5
2.2 Conjunctions	5
2.2.1 Types of Conjunctions	7

Subject	Page
2.2.1.1 Coordinative Conjunctions	7
2.2.1.1.1 Some Uses of Coordinators	7
2.2.1.1.1.1 And	7
2.2.1.1.1.2 Or	9
2.2.1.1.1.3 But	9
2.2.1.1.2 Coordination	10
2.2.1.2 Subordinative Conjunctions	11
2.2.1.2.1 Some Uses of Subordinators	12
2.2.1.2.2 Subordination	13
2.2.1.3 Correlative Conjunctions	14
2.2.1.3.1 Correlative Coordinators	15
2.2.1.3.1.1 Either...or	16
2.2.1.3.1.2 Neither...nor	18
2.2.1.3.1.3 Both...and	20
2.2.1.3.1.4 Not...but	22
2.2.1.3.1.5 Not only...but also	23
2.2.1.3.1.6 Functions and Usages of Correlative Coordinators	25

Subject	Page
2.2.1.3.1.7 Parallel Structure	26
2.2.1.3.2 Correlative Subordinators	27
2.2.1.3.2.1 As...so	29
2.2.1.3.2.2 As ...As	30
2.2.1.3.2.3 Hardly ...when	31
2.2.1.3.2.4 The...the	33
2.2.1.3.2.5 Whether...or	33
2.2.1.3.2.6 If ...then	35
2.2.1.3.2.7 Though ...yet	36
2.2.1.3.2.8 Functions and Usages of Correlative Subordinators	38
2.3 Significance of Correlative Conjunctions	39
2.4 Correlative Subordinators and Coordinators	39
Chapter Three : The Test	
3.1 Introduction	41
3.2 Objectives of the Test	41
3.3 Selection of the Test Material	42
3.4 Test Design	43

Subject	Page
3.5 Validity	43
3.6 Reliability	44
3.7 The Subjects	45
3.8 Pilot Administration	45
3.9 Item Analysis	46
3.10 Final Administration	49
3.11 Scoring Scheme	49
Chapter Four : Analysis of the Data	
4.1 Introduction	50
4.2 Discussion of Results	50
4.2.1 Subjects' Performance of the First Question	50
4.2.2 Subjects' Performance of the Second Question	52
4.2.3 Subjects' Performance of the Third Question	53
4.2.4 Subjects' Performance of the Fourth Question	55
4.2.5 Subjects' Total Performance of Correlative Conjunctions in the Whole Test	56
4.3 Error Analysis	58
4.3.1 Sources of Errors	58

Subject	Page
4.3.1.1 Interlingual Transfer	59
4.3.1.2 Intralingual Transfer	61
4.3.1.3 Context of Learning	66
4.3.1.4 Communication Strategies	68
Chapter Five : Conclusions , Recommendations and Suggestions	
5.1 Introduction	70
5.2 Conclusions	70
5.3 Recommendations	72
5.4 Suggestions	73
Bibliography	74
Appendix I: The Letter to the Jury Members	83
Appendix II: The Test	84
Appendix III: Answers of the Test	88
Abstract in Arabic	92

Chapter One

Introduction

1.1 The Problem

As a starting point, a conjunction is a word whose function is to link , or put together, other words. Conjunctions can link words, phrases and clauses. In fact, understanding the proper uses of conjunctions can be of great value in writing clear, well formed sentences.

Conjunctions also show the relationships between the words and words groups that they connect. In English, conjunctions are divided into three kinds : coordinative, subordinative, and correlative conjunctions (henceforth *CCs*) (Chalker, 1989 : 237).

For Waldhorn and Zeiger (1967:41-2) coordinative conjunctions may join single words, or they may join group of words, but they must also join similar elements: subject+ subject , verb phrase + verb phrase , clause +clause and so on.

Subordinative conjunctions are those that connect a subordinate clause to main clause. As the name implies, the *CCs* are pairs of words that are used to link words or groups of words. The most important thing to mention when using them is that the words, phrases, clauses that are put together must be of the same kind. This means that nouns must be put together with other nouns, verbs with other verbs , adjectives with other adjectives...etc.

It is expected that most Iraqi English Foreign Language (henceforth *EFL*) university students may often face difficulties in using these conjunctions. They encounter difficulties in constructing correlative conjoining structures. This means that they may not join similar elements to make sentences.

Moreover, they may fail to join sentences whose *CCs* require subject operator inversion or concord between the subject and the verb or they may use one part of the *CC* leaving the other.

Thus, many students may not use them in their writing at all despite the fact that these conjunctions are used to arrange the ideas and join sentences / clauses or elements within the sentence.

To the best of the researcher's knowledge this topic has not been tackled yet. Hence, it might be an attempt to fill part of the gap in this area.

1.2 Aims of the Study

The study aims at:

1. Describing conjunctions and their types in general and *CCs* in detail.
2. Measuring the students' ability in manipulating *CCs*.
3. Identifying the students' errors and their sources in terms of recognizing and producing *CCs*.

1.3 Hypotheses

In view of the preceding aims, it is hypothesized that :

- 1-Most Iraqi *EFL* university students face difficulty in mastering *CCs*.

- 2- Iraqi *EFL* learners' inaccurate responses at the production level may be attributed to misuse *CCs*.

1.4 Procedures

To fulfil the objectives of this study the following procedures are to be done:

- 1- Presenting a general idea of the concept conjunctions as joiners and illustrating some types of *CCs*.
- 2- Designing a test by selecting a sample of Iraqi *EFL* university students as subjects for the administration of the test so as to achieve the aims of the study.
- 3- Stating the findings arrived at in this study, analyzing them and giving some suggestions for pedagogical use.

1.5 Limits

The study will be confined to:

- 1- Providing information about the following *CCs* :
either...or; neither...nor; both...and; not...but; not only...but (also); as...as; as... so; hardly...when ; whether...or; if...then; the...the; and though...yet since they are the most frequently used.
- 2- Investigating the use of the *CCs* by (50) students of fourth year , Department of English, College of Education, University of Babylon during the academic year (2007-2008) as they are the most advanced learners at the university level.

1.6 Value of the Study

The findings of the study are hoped to be theoretically and practically significant.

- 1- The theoretical value of the study will provide information for the researchers to do further related research work.
- 2- The practical value lies in providing the teachers with information about the problematic areas concerning *CCs*. It can also be useful in drawing the syllabus designers' attention to the preparation of remedial teaching programme.

1.7 Definitions of Some Terms

Conjunct is a term used in grammatical classification of words to refer to an item or a process whose function is to connect words or other constructions. The sub-classification of these connective items distinguishes coordinative conjunctions (coordinators) (e.g. *and, or, but*) and subordinative conjunctions (subordinators) (e.g. *when, because, if*) There are certain types of adverbials which are also referred to as conjuncts (e.g. *however, moreover, indeed*) (Swan, 1997: 81).

Correlative conjunctions are those conjunctions that are used to join words or groups of words. They always work in pairs to join grammatically equal parts, that the element following the first conjunction of the pair be grammatically equal to the element following the second (Wren and Martin, 1986: 207).

Chapter Two

2.1 Introduction

This chapter aims at presenting the theoretical framework of the study. It gives an outline of conjunctions in English as linking devices, their definitions and types.

Moreover, it sheds some light on the phenomena of coordination and subordination to see how the subject in question is related to these topics. In particular, the chapter deals with *CCs* whether they are coordinators or subordinators, their definitions; types; functions and usages. Finally, it makes a comparison between them.

2.2 Conjunctions

There are various definitions of conjunctions around. Herndon, (1976:61), for example, states that conjunctions are words like (*but* , *though*, *if* , *and*, *or* , *since*,*when*, *because*, *etc...*) used to combine words, phrases, clauses, and sentences, e.g.:

1- The flag is red, white, *and* blue.

In this regard, Halliday and Hasan (1976:226) say that a conjunction is a type of cohesive device. They point out that "conjunction is rather different in nature from other cohesive relation". Conjunctions are cohesive in themselves and by virtue of their specific meanings.

2- Jhon loves Mary, *but* is loved by Jane.

(ibid.: 203)

According to Yule (1996:88), conjunctions are those words like (*and, or, but, although, if...etc.*) used to link , and denote the relationships between the events and things .

3- I will phone you *if* the train is late.

(Swan and Walter,
2001:218)

On their part, Aarts and Aarts (1988:44) and Aarts(2001:46) see that conjunctions form a closed set of words which have a linking function. This means that conjunctions cannot be extended, (i.e.) how rarely in a language we create or invent a new conjunction.

4- The books are on the table *or* in the cupboard.

(Aarts ,
2001:46)

Moreover, (Strumpf, 1999:261) asserts that conjunctions are the connections used to join one word with another word or one group of words with another group of words.

5- My cats *and* dogs are great friends.

(ibid.:262)

Furthermore, Finch (2000:91) considers conjunctions as linking words whose functions are to connect words or other instructions together. He also expresses that they typically serve as hinges to link together two units, for instance, a noun with another noun or a clause with another a clause .

6- He will come *when* he is ready.

2.2.1 Types of Conjunctions

Wren and Martin (1985:86) classify conjunctions according to their syntactic function into the following :

- (a)- Coordinative conjunctions.
- (b)- Subordinative conjunctions.
- (c)- Correlative conjunctions.

2.2.1.1 Coordinative Conjunctions

Ehrlich and Murphy (1976:126-7) maintain that coordinative conjunctions (coordinators) are words that form the first type of conjunctions. They may join single words, phrases, or clauses, but they must always join equal elements.

Many grammarians like Roberts (1962:108), Anson and Schweger (1998:380) and Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999:472) agree that there are seven coordinators: *and, or, but, for, yet, so* and *nor*.

On the other hand, Quirk et al.(1985:920-2-7) believe that there are three central coordinators: *and, or,* and *but* . *For* is a subordinator that is often classified as a coordinator. *Yet, so,* and *nor* are conjuncts that resemble coordinators in some respects. They call all of them linkers.

2.2.1.1.1 Some Uses of Coordinators

2.2.1.1.1 AND

Quirk and Greenbaum (1977:257) maintain that *and* indicates that there is a relationship between the content of clauses, as follows:

(a)-The idea in the second clause is chronologically sequential to that in the first.

7- She washed the dishes *and* (then) she dried them.

(Quirk and Greenbaum , 1977:257)

(b)-The idea in the second clause is the result of the first.

8- I got very lonesome, *and* I wanted to talk to you .

(Bing, 1989:278)

(c)-The event in the second clause is in contrast to the first.

9- She is a bank manager *and* I am just a road- sweeper .

(Swan, 1995:46)

(d)-The event in the second clause suggests an element of surprise.

10- The door was open, *and* there was no guard in the corridor.

(Roperts, 1956:207)

(e)-The second clause is a condition of the first.

11- Give me your picture, *and* I will give you mine.

(Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999:474)

(f)- The idea in the second clause has a point of similarity to that in the first clause.

12- Italian food requires fresh vegetables , *and (similarly)* Southern food at its best depends on fresh ingredients.

(1 Web)

(g)-The second idea is an addition to the first one.

13- Relaxation also works well, *and* it is inexpensive .

(Flower and Aaron, 1998:189)

(h)- The second event adds a kind of comment on the first.

14- There is one thing you must realize *and* that is that I am leaving.

(Downing and Locke,
2006:286)

2.2.1.1.2 OR

Or can be used to give the following meanings as they are illustrated

by Quirk et al. (1985: 932-3).

(a)- It suggests that only one possibility can be fulfilled.

15- They will stay *or* they will go.

(Strumpf, 1999:263)

(b)- It denotes a restatement or correction of the first part of the sentence.

16-There are no rattlesnakes in this canyon, *or* so our guide tells us.

(2 Web)

(c)- It is used to show a negative condition.

17- Give me liberty *or* give me death.

(Kroeger, 2005:219)

(d)- *Or* is used to express a negative alternative without requiring an imperative.

18- You have to fix the car, *or* we cannot go on our trip.

(Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman, 1999:477)

2.2.1.1.3 BUT

Quirk et al.(1985:935) show the uses and the meanings of *but* by the following examples:

(a)- It expresses a contrast that is unexpected in view of the first clause.

19- Jhon is poor, *but* he is happy.

(b)- The second clause reveals a positive sense of what the negation in the

first event implies.

20- Jane did not waste her time before the exam, *but* studied hard every

evening.

In such cases the force of *but* can be emphasized by the conjunction *rather* or *on the contrary*.

21-I am not objecting to his moral *but* rather to his manners.

2.2.1.1.2 Coordination

Coordination is defined as a grammatical device for joining two or more elements of the same kind and function to constitute a compound sentence (Quirk et al., 1972:720).

22- I like Jhon *and* Jhon likes me.

Crystal (1997:93) declares that coordination is a term used in grammar to refer to the process or result of conjoining words, phrases, clauses that have equal or the same grammatical function.

23- You can go by air *or* by rail.

(Quirk et al., 1985:46)

24- His sons *and* daughter live in Buenos Aires.

(ibid.)

According to Kuiper and Allan (1996:262), coordination is the process of linking two grammatical units of the same type to produce a larger unit of the same kind, for example, two sentences that are combined by a coordinating conjunction like *and*, *or*, and *but* make a compound sentence. See also Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999:491)

25- I need to call, *but* I hate to spend money.

(Bing, 1989:277)

Similarly, Kroeger (2005:218) remarks that coordination is a way by which one clause can be embedded within another, two units belonging to the same kind are combined to constitute another unit of the same kind.

Syntactically, coordination is the relationship between units of equal status and similar form, so a repeated element may be omitted. Semantically, the contents of the two clauses are relevant to each other in some way.

26- Bill sold his car *and* (Bill sold) his motorcycle.

(Liles, 1971:85)

2.2.1.2 Subordinative Conjunctions

Subordinative conjunctions (or subordinators) form the second type of conjunctions that are important in creating subordinating clauses. The subordinative conjunction introduces its clause and joins it to the main clause (Waldhorn and Zeige, 1967:42).

According to Biber et al.(2000:86), subordinators are words which introduce dependent clauses and they are the most important marker of subordination. They fall into three classes :

- a) Simple subordinators like *although, as, because, since, though, if, when, unless, until, while, where(ver) ,when(ever) ...etc.*
- b) Complex subordinators as *such that, granting (that), in order that, so (that), as far as, as soon as, as if, as though...etc.*
- c) Correlative subordinators, see section (2.2.1.3.2).

2.2.1.2.1 Some Uses of Subordinators

Most of the above - listed subordinators may be used to introduce finite clauses, i.e., those whose elements consist of a finite verb (Quirk et al., 1985:998).

27- I agree *if* you do.

(Scott et al., 1968:163)

Several subordinators like *as if, as though, for, in order, whether* may be used to introduce to- infinitive clauses:

28- I do not know *whether* to put on the air-conditioning today.

(Quirk et al., 1985:1104)

Some subordinators may be used to introduce clauses with an (-ed) participle and verbless clauses like *although* , *as*, *if*, *though* , *unless*, *where(ver)*, *when(ever)*...etc.(Quirk et al., 1985: 1004)

29- *Unless* told otherwise, be here every night. .

30- *If* necessary, he will take notes for you.

(ibid.:1004-5)

In this regard, clauses with an (-ing) participle can be produced by the same subordinators for (-ed) participle clauses, except that the subordinators *where* , *wherever*, *as* (manner) and *as soon as* are excluded (Quirk et al., 1985:1005).

31- *When* returning merchandise, be sure to bring your receipt.

2.2.1.2.2 Subordination

Subordination is viewed by Quirk et al. (1985:44) as a term used to refer to the occurrence of one clause as part of another. Clauses that are embedded in other ones by a subordinating conjunction are called subordinate clauses (or dependent clauses) and the others are main clauses (or independent clauses), usually the relationship between them is one of part to whole.

32- It is irrelevant *whether* she is under sixteen .

(Quirk et al.,
1985:44)

In the same way, Greenbaum (1996:320) and Crystal (1997:370) show that subordination is a term used in grammar to refer to the process of joining linguistic units by a subordinator so that they have elements

with different grammatical functions, definitely a dependent clause with an independent one.

33- John left *when* the bus arrived.

(Crystal,
ibid.)

Peters (2004:107) believes that subordination is the relationship that results from linking two clauses by a subordinator so as to give one of them superior status that is known as the main clause (or independent clause), while the other is subordinate to it and so is called subordinate (or dependent clause).

34- *As* it is grew darker, we could hear the hum of mosquitoes.

(Quirk et al., 1985:
1083)

As it is defined by Downing and Locke (2006:277) subordination is a kind of relationship between clauses that form a sentence. This relationship is

one of non-equivalence in which the clauses have a different importance, the idea said to be of lesser or lower rank joined to one of greater rank by the subordinating conjunction (subordinator) which precedes the subordinate one.

35- We will go for a walk, *if* it is a nice day.

(Cook, 1983:155)

2.2.13 Correlative Conjunctions

To start, the word correlative is defined by Crystal (1997:96) as a term used in grammar to refer to a construction that uses a pair of connecting words.

In English , construction of this sort includes correlative coordinators and correlative subordinators (henceforth *CCOs* and *CSs* respectively).The *CCs* form the third type of conjunctions.

Leech, Dcuchar and Hoogenraad (1982:51) declare that the *CCs* are two conjunctions that occur together, one preceding one construction , and another preceding the other. They are of two types: *CSs* and *CCOs*.

According to Quirk et al. (1985:935,998), Leech and Svartvik (1994:267,386) and Biber et al. (2000:80,86) the *CCs* fall into two main categories:

a- Correlative Coordinators

b- Correlative Subordinators

2.2.1.3.1 Correlative Coordinators

Roberts (1968:371-2) states that the words *both*, *not*, *either* and *neither* can join with *and*, *but*, *or* and *nor* respectively to compose pairs named *CCOs*: *both...and*, *not...but*, *either...or*, *neither...nor*. He also emphasizes that the units joined by them must be equivalent elements.

36- *Not* John *but* Bill is here.

Similarly, Quirk et al. (1985:935-6) proclaim that *CCOs* are conjunctions which appear in pairs, usually an endorsing item and a coordinator. They add to this that these conjunctions join elements of the same kind.

37-He has met *both* her mother *and* her father.

In this connection, Strumpf (1999:226) points out that *CCOs* are pairs of words used to link words, phrases or clauses of equal rank. The principal pairs are: *both...and, either...or, neither...nor, not...but* and *not only...but (also)*.

38- *Not only* am I a fishman , *but also* I am a fabulous chef.

Biber et al.(2000:80) report that there are complex structures for each simple coordinator. They illustrate that these are the *CCOs* that show the meaning of addition , alternative or contrast. At the same time, they single out each of the conjoined elements.

39- *Either* you agree with it *or* you do not agree with it.

To conclude, the *CCOs* are conjunctions used to link words, phrases or clauses of equal status. They always go in pairs with one conjunction before one part of the element being linked and the other before the other part.

40-The book is *neither* interesting *nor* accurate.

(Azar,

1989:291)

From the researcher's point of view, it seems that many grammarians agree on two things: the *CCOs* come in pairs and join elements of the same rank. The next section will discuss them in detail.

2.2.13.1.1 Either...or

According to Swan (1995:171), *either* is a determiner meaning one or the other but not both. It can be used before a singular noun and takes a singular verb.

41- Come in Tuesday or Thursday. *Either* day is OK.

Quirk et al.(1985:782) denote that *either* can be used as additive adverbial.

42- Her mother is not coming *either*.

It is worth mentioning that when *either* is used without *or* , it acts as an adjective or pronoun.

43- *Either* movie seems to be a good choice.
(adjective)

44- *Either* seems like a good choice to me.
(pronoun)

(4 Web)

Either can be paired with *or* but not *nor* to form the *CCO*

either...or.

(5

Web)

According to Bing (1989:282), *either...or* emphasizes the meaning of *or* (i.e.) it states a choice between two possibilities.

Either...or may be used to link two sentences or two equivalent sentence elements of any kind .Consider the following examples:

45- *Either* you will confess, *or* I will complain.

(sentences)

(Wishon and Burks, 2005:

81)

46- He *either* speaks French, *or* understands it.

(verbs)

(Alexander, 1988:

11)

47- *Either* Dr. Smith *or* his son was going to call us.

(nouns)

(Sheeler, 1978:125)

48- You should speak *either* clearly *or* slowly.

(adverbs)

49- She is *either* beautiful *or* rich.

(adjectives)

(Al-Hamash and Abdulla, 1976:309-

10)

Moreover, *either* can be placed before the lexical verb even when the scope does not include the whole of the predication as in (50).When

either is in position before the lexical verb, the correlative clause introduced by *or* can be a full clause as in (51). It is important to mention that this case is also applicable to *neither...nor*, but *nor* is followed by subject operator inversion.

50- You can *either* write elegantly *or* clearly.

51- You can *either* write elegantly, *or* you can write clearly.

(Quirk and Greenbaum, 1977:
260)

Sometimes the construction *either...or* is used to talk about more than two possibilities.

52- Martha will *either* feed the cat *or* lock the door *or* turn off the lights.

(Baker,
1989:422)

Finally, It should be noted that if the subject is made up of both singular and plural words connected by *either...or* the verb agrees with nearest subject (Sabin, 2001:234).

53- *Either* the coach *or* the players are responsible.

54- *Either* the players *or* the coach is responsible.

(Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman ,
1983:320)

2.2.13.1.2 Neither... nor

We can use *neither* and *nor* as adverbs to mean **not** . They initiate a clause and are followed by inverted word order (Swan, 1995:358).

55- 'I cannot swim'. '*Neither* can I'.

56- Ruth did not turn up, and *nor* did Kate.

(

ibid.)

Furthermore, when both *neither* and *nor* appear at the beginning of a clause, that clause must also come with subject-operator inversion (Feignbaum, 1985:191).

57- *Neither* have the armies stopped their fighting, *nor* have they agreed to

discuss a cease-fire.

(

ibid.)

58- *Neither* is he dependable, *nor* is he trustworthy.

(Wishon and Burks, 2005:81)

It is stated that *neither* is a determiner meaning not one and the other used before a singular noun.

59- Can you come on Monday or Tuesday? I am afraid *neither* day is

Possible.

(Swan,

1995:363)

Eckersley and Eckersley (1960:125) mention that *neither* means 'not this and not the other' ; it is a rejection of both . It is singular in number and can be used as an adjective and pronoun.

60-*Neither* was good.

(pronoun)

61-*Neither* book was good. (adjective)
(4 Web)

When *neither* is joined with *nor* to form a correlative pair, *nor* functions as central coordinator, like *and*, *or*, and *neither* as an endorsing element like *either...or*. The construction *neither... nor* is used to express negation (Quirk et al., 1985:938).

62- David *neither* loves Joan, *nor* wants to marry her. (ibid.)

The *CCO neither...nor* gives the meaning of both negation and addition rather than alternative. It is considered the negative counterpart of the correlative *both ...and* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:237).

63- He *neither* wrote *nor* phoned. (Thomsan and Martin, 1986: 67)

The *CCO neither ...nor* does not join main clauses. It is used to coordinate noun phrases, adjectives, adverbs and verbs (Coe, 1980:197). Here are some examples:

64-*Neither* the president *nor* his secretary is interested. (nouns)

65-Tom is *neither* polite *nor* interesting. (adjectives)

(ibid.)

66- She *neither* spoke *nor* wept. (verbs)

(House and Harman,
1950:189)

As is the case with *either ...or* , if the subject is made up of both singular and plural words connected by *neither...nor* the verb agrees with nearest subject.

67- *Neither* the father *nor* his sons are here.

68- *Neither* the father *nor* his son is here.

(Schuster,
1965:342)

2.2.13.13 Both ... and

Both is a determiner indicating totality which applied to two persons or things. It takes a plural verb (Eckersley and Eckersley, 1960:128).

69- She has eaten *both* chops.

(Swan, 1995: 98)

It is also used as a pronoun , an adjective and adverb.

70- I have two brothers; they are *both* engineers. (pronoun)

71- *Both* men were found guilty.

(adjective)

(Eckersley and Eckersley, 1960:128)

72- We can *both* swim.
(adverb)

(Swan ,
1995:128)

Christophersen and Sandved (1971:82) explain that sometimes the conjunction *and* is closely linked with *both* which precedes the first of the elements to be connected by *and*. In this way, we get the *CCO both...and*.

73- *Both* Jack *and* Jill went up the hill.

(Ellsworth and Higgins,
1997:5)

In this respect, Flower and Aaron (1998:189) denote that *both ...and* emphasizes the additive meaning of *and* (i.e. adding one item or idea to another).

74- *Both* biofeedback *and* relaxation can relieve headaches.

In addition, Gucker (1966:73) clarifies that the *CCO both...and* can be used to join elements of the same class: noun with noun, adverb with adverb, adjective with adjective...etc.:

75- He added *both* sugar *and* cream.
(nouns)

(ibid.)

76- They worked *both* quickly *and* efficiently.
(adverbs)

77- Tom is *both* impolite *and* boring.
(adjectives)

(Coe,
1982:196)

Quirk et al. (1985:936) assert that *both...and* is not admissible to join full finite clauses, a feature it shares with the *CCO neither...nor*.

*78- *Both* Mary washed the dishes *and* Peter dried them.

In comparison with the correlatives *either...or* and *neither...nor*, the *CCO both...and* requires a plural verb when it joins words serving as subjects.

79- *Both* Jerry *and* his friend are going.

(Schuster, 1965:342)

It is significant to know that the main function of the *CCO both...and* can be carried out by the second part of the correlative (*and*), but not the first (*both*). This quality can be applicable to the correlative *either...or*. Thus, it is a matter of style to use these parts.

2.2.1.3.14 Not...but

For House and Harman (1950:189) and Roberts (1968:371), the negative particle *no(t)* can be joined with *but* to compose the *CCO not...but* to replace one idea by another. Similarly, Flower and Aaron (1998:189) note that the *CCO not...but* carries the meaning of substitution.

80-*Not* daggers *but* ballots are the proper weapon.

(House and Harman, 1950:190)

To put it in another way, the *CCO not...but* is used to refuse or deny one idea and affirm other, contrasting , idea

81- I do *not* agree with his principles, *but* at least he is sincere.

(Leech and Svartvik, 1994:138)

The construction *not...but* joins various elements that are treated as grammatically equal. Let us consider the following examples:

82- He came *not* to help , *but* to hinder us. (verbs)

(Quirk et al., 1985:941)

83- He was *not* of an age , *but* for all times. (prepositional phrases)

(House and Harman, 1950:198-90)

Additionally, the *CCO not...but* frequently occurs in a cleft sentence as in:

84- It is *not* the players , *but* the supports, that are responsible for football hooliganism.

(Quirk et al., 1985:941)

2.2.13.15 Not only ... but also

Certain adverbs and adverb phrases like *not only* can be placed initially in a sentence or clause. In this case, they are followed by subject-operator inversion for the sake of emphasis.

85- They *not only* rob you, they smash everything too.

86- *Not only* do they rob you, they smash everything too.

(Thomson and Martinet, 1986:

63)

Not only may be followed by *but* or *but also* to form the *CCO not only...but (also)* where *also* sometimes is omitted.

(Wren and Martin, 1986:87)

87- Your method is *not only* wasteful *but (also)* slow.

(Gucker, 1966:73)

Not only...but means 'addition' as *both...and*. However, in *not only ...but*, the idea of the first clause is known or expected, whereas that of the second is something unexpected that receives emphasis. For more emphasis, we add the adverb *also* after *but*.

88- They *not only* broke into his office and stole his books, *but* (they) *also* tore up his manuscripts.

(Quirk et al., 1985:941)

The more dramatic effect achieved by placing *not only* initially, with subject- operator inversion, as illustrated in the following example where the two conjoins are entire clauses.

89- *Not only* did they break into his office and steal his books, *but* they *also* tore up his manuscripts.

(ibid.)

Roberts (1962:200) postulates that the constructions involving the *CCO not only ...but also* should be in equal rank.

90- He was *not only* handsome *but* wealthy too. (adjectives)

(ibid.)

91- He built *not only* a house *but also* a garage. (nouns)

(Oliphant, 1962:101)

92- He *not only* marks his cross *but also* signs his name. (verbs)

(Waldhorn and Zeiger, 1967:42)

When two subjects are connected by *not only...but also*, the verb agrees with the subject nearest to it (Azar, 2002:353).

93- *Not only* my mother *but also* my sister is here.

94- *Not only* my sister *but also* my parents are here.

(ibid.)

It is noted that there are more than one *CCO* used to join sentences or elements of sentences. To use this or that *CCO*, it is a matter of style.

95- *Either* George *or* Mel washed the dishes.

96- *Neither* George *nor* Mel washed the dishes. (6 Web)

97-*Both* George *and* Mel washed the dishes.

98-*Not only* George *but also* Mel washed the dishes.

(6 Web

)

From the researcher's point of view , even the *CCO not...but* can be used to link the elements of the previous sentences.

99- *Not* George *but* Mel washed the dishes.

2.2.1.3.1.6 Functions and Usages of Correlative Coordinators

House and Harman (1950:188-9) observe that there is no distinction between the *CCOs* and other conjunctions except that they are used in pairs to correlate coordinate words, phrases, or clauses and so on.

100- *Either* Hamlet was mad, *or* he feigned admirably.

(ibid.)

Similarly, Gucker (1966:73) claims that the *CCOs* are always used in pairs to join structures of the same rank noun phrase with noun phrase , verb phrase with verb phrase , prepositional phrase with prepositional phrase ...etc.

101- He is *neither* for *nor* against it.

(Long ,
1961:33)

Moreover, the *CCOs* not only show equality but they also make the joining tighter and more emphatic. They are described that they are great when they join two ideas of the same kind.

(7
Web)

102- I have been having trouble with *both* grammar *and* reading.

(Pollock,
1982:62)

What is more, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1999:483) believe that the *CCOs* are found to help speakers and writers avoid repetition of identical elements. They think that the *CCOs* can be used to serve this purpose as well as emphasizing the coordination of grammatically similar elements.

103- Jhon did his work *neither* quickly *nor* interestingly.

(Leech and Svartvik, 1994:308)

It is recognized that the *CCOs* serve not only to join elements of the same status but to emphasize and clarify the intended meaning.

2.2.13.17 Parallel Structure

Kierzert and Gibson (1960:407) note that the idea of equal status in a sentence should be expressed in a parallel structure. It is a handy device by which the sentence gets its clarity and force. They add that parallelism is a simple way that can be explained as a balancing of noun with noun, a verb with another verb , a phrase with another phrase , a clause with another clause and so on.

104- The freshman asked *not only* for a big celebration *but also* for a especial holiday. (Warriner et al., 1985:21)

In the same way, Roberts (1968:372) remarks that the constructions joined by the *CCOs* must be of the same kind : two noun phrases, two verbs, two adjectives, two clauses...etc. He adds that this rule is called parallelism .

105- She *both* sings *and* dances. (Swan and Walter, 2001: 225)

Feigenbaum (1985:196) maintains that *CCOs* are used because the elements joined by them must be alike in structure. This structure helps the reader and the hearer understand that the elements in the sentence are equal. The elements that have the same grammatical structure are called parallelism.

106- The land belongs *not* to me, *but* to the government.

(Leech and Svartvik,
1994:138)

Moreover, Being (1989:280) points out that the structures that are joined by the *CCOs* should always be similar ones bearing related ideas. The sentence is incorrect if the parts following the conjunctions are not parallel.

*107- After school, she is *either* doing her homework *or* must take care of her children. (not parallel)

108- After school , she is *either* doing her homework *or* taking care of her children. (parallel)

It seems that lack of parallelism is seen as a problem in using *CCOs*.

2.2.1.3.2 Correlative Subordinators

To begin, House and Harman (1950:188-9) indicate that the correlative subordinators are the same as the conjunctions except that they come in pairs, the first marker introduces and emphasizes the relation of the elements to be joined by the second.

109- She knew the answer *as* quick *as* a flash.

(McCarthy and O'Dell, 1995:
76)

Another definition is presented by Quirk et al. (1985:999) who claim that the correlative subordinators form a small class of subordinators that combine two markers of subordination, usually the second correlative endorses the meaning of the first one.

110- *Though* he is poor, *yet* he is satisfied with his situation.

Similarly, Shaw (1986:128) shows that sometimes a few subordinating

conjunctions are linked to certain markers to form what are known as *CSs*.

111- The performance had *hardly* began *when* the light went on.

(Thomason and Martinet, 1986:302)

Besides, the *CSs* are conjunctions that consists of two markers one marking the beginning of the independent clause , and the other marking the beginning of the dependent clause. Sometimes, the second marker is optional (Leech and Svartvik, 1994:386).

112- *If* I had studied, (*then*) I would have passed the exam.

(Coe , 1980:202)

Biber et al. (2000:86) remark that the *CSs* represent a few subordinators that have a special relationship to a form in the subordinate clause. The subordinator and the form it connects with work to show the relation between the clauses.

113- *Whether* you want to finish your work *or* not is not my concern.

(Strumpf ,
1998:267)

It is important to mention that there are many *CSs* in English (see Quirk et al., 1985: 999-1000). However, the following ones will be the concern of the present study.

2.2.13.2.1 As...so

As is a subordinator used to introduce clauses of time, manner, reason, concession and condition.

114- *As* I enter the room, I saw the great picture facing me.
(time)

(Chalker, 1989: 222-8)

115- George wrote *as* his father did.
(manner)

(Close ,

1978:62)

It can also be used as a preposition as in the following example:

116- He has served three terms *as* captain.
(preposition)

(Gucker , 1966:44)

On the other hand, we have *so* which is a conjunct expressing consequence (Eckersley and Eckersley, 1960: 311).

Related to this point (Coe, 1980:201) claims that *so* can link two clauses, they are usually separated by a comma "," and the *so* clause comes second and expresses the consequence of the main clause .

117- I was late , *so* I ran .

(ibid.)

So can also be used to express a high degree of some quality.

118- I am sorry you are *so* tired.

(Swan, 1995:

536)

Biber et al. (2000:86) report that *as* with *so* form the *CS as...so* that introduces the propositional clause, (i.e.) a clause which expresses a proportionality or equivalenc of degree between two ideas. This construction consists of an initial subordinator *as* and the conjunct *so* which emphasizes the relationship indicated by the subordinator. The conjunction *so* can be omitted (except with the subject – operator inversion) as follows:

119- *As* the time went on, (*so*) their hopes began to wane.

(Quirk et al. ,

1972:755)

120- *As* the equations became more involved and detailed, *so* their connection to the basic phenomenon grew more tenuous.

(Leech and Svartvik ,

1994:120)

121- *As* you wish *so* do I .

(Strumpf ,

1998:267)

2.2.13.2.2 **As...as**

Quirk et al. (1985:1000,1127) postulate that the *CS as...as* is a construction used to introduce the comparative clause in which the comparison is one of equivalence – that is, an idea expressed in the main clause is compared with an idea expressed in the subordinate clause about some standard of comparison. The first *as* acts as degree modifier in the main clause while the second *as* is a subordinator that must come second to introduce the subordinate clause.

Alexander (1988:29) shows the comparison by the following equation: :

As + adjective / adverb + *as*

Let us take the following examples:

122- Jane is *as* healthy *as* his sister (is).
(adjective)

(Chalker,

1989:248)

123- Finish your work *as* quickly *as* you can.
(adverb)

(Gucker ,

1966:74)

2.2.13.2.3 **Hardly...when**

Hardly is as an adverb with a negative meaning. It can go with adjectives , verbs and so on.

124-They made him start work, even though he was **hardly** able to walk.

(Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanic ,
2001:188)

125- I **hardly** knew him.

(Eckersley and Eckersley,
1960:14)

When, on the same level, is a time linking word used to introduce a time clause. It gives information about the time at which something happens (Bosewitz , 1987:227).

126- **When** you leave the room switch the lights off.

(ibid.)

It is also used to introduce relative clauses, it is called a relative pronoun.

127- I will never forget the day **when** I first met you.

(Swan ,
1995:488)

To form the *CS* , **hardly** is followed by either **when** or **than** but the latter is informal (Quirk et al. 1985:999), while Wren and Martin (1986:87) maintain that **hardly** is followed by **when** or **before**.

128- **Hardly** had I sat down **when** the telephone bell rang again.

(Zandvoort and Van Ek,
1975:216)

129-The concert had *hardly* began *before* all the lights went out.

(Hewings ,
2005:158)

In contrast, Frank (1993:236) declares that it is unacceptable to all grammarians to use *than* or *before* in place of *when*.

In fact, we deepened on Quirk et al.'s concept because it is dependable in most of Iraqi English courses.

The *CS hardly ...when* is used with the past or past perfect tense to denote that one thing happened very soon after another.

130- She was *hardly* inside the house *when* the kids started screaming.

(Swan,
1995:227)

131- Mr. Jenkins had *hardly* begun his speech *when* he was interrupted.

(Alexander, 1988:176)

As a matter of fact, when a sentence begins with *hardly*, for more emphasis, we insert some suitable verb as *do, does, did*, before the subject if there is no helping verb.

132- *Hardly* did he hear the news *when* he wept aloud.

(Wren and Martin, 1986:86-7)

133- *Hardly* had the din faded behind them *when* they came upon another shouting crowd.

(Cobuild, 1992:346)

2.2.13.24 **The...the**

The in this correlative subordinator is an adverb, not the definite article. *The* goes with a comparative form in two clauses to say that things change or vary in proportion to something else. Actually, the second clause is a consequence of the first (Coe, 1980:208).

To interpret the connection between the first *the* and the second one, Eckersley and Eckersley (1960:342) suggest the following relation:

The + comparative ...*the* +comparative

The comparative may be pronoun, adverb, or adjective.

134- *The* more you work , *the* more you earn.
(pronouns)

(ibid.)

135- *The* sooner he leaves, *the* happier I will feel.
(adverbs)

(Frank , 1993:

271)

136- *The* brighter the light, *the* darker the lens.
(adjectives)

(Chalker ,

1989:249)

Sometimes the *CS the...the* is used in some proverbial expressions which has become very elliptical ,(i.e.) verbless structures.

137- *The* more, *the* merrier.

138- *The* sooner, *the* better.

(Eckersley and Eckersley,
1960:342)

2.2.13.2.5 Whether...or

Eckersely and Eckersely (1960:368) indicate that *whether* is a subordinator used to express doubt in indirect yes-no question.

139- He ask me *whether* I had seen the film.
(ibid.)

The correlative *whether...or* construction is used to introduce two types of subordinate clauses: alternative interrogative clauses and alternative conditional concessive clauses.

In the interrogative construction the *or*- clause is optional as in (140), while it is obligatory in the conditional concessive construction as in (141) .

140- They did not tell me *whether*, I should write to the manager (*or whether* I should see him personally).

(Quirk et al., 1985:1000)

141-*Whether* the story was true *or* (*whether*) the story was false , he should not have repeated it.

The subordinator *whether* can be repeated as in (140) above or omitted as in (142) where the second unit is an abbreviated form.

142-*Whether* the story was true or false, he should not have repeated it.

(Frank,
1993:260)

Repetition is optional in case of to- infinitive clause as in (143) but the subordinator is not repeated if the infinitival to is omitted as in (144).

143- He did not tell us *whether* to wait for him *or (whether)* to go on without him.

.
Quirk et al.,
1985:1053)

144- I do not know *whether* to wait for them *or* go on.

(Thomson and Martinet ,
1986:278)

Moreover, the *CS whether...or* can be used to introduce non-finite clauses as in (145), but *whether* may be omitted when the clause comes initially as in (146).

145- Sarah is always intense, *whether* working *or* playing.

146- Working *or* playing , Sarah is always intense.

(Quirk et al., 1985
:1100)

Furthermore, verbless clauses can be introduced by the *CS whether...or* .

147- *Whether* right *or* wrong , he usually wins the argument.

(Leech and Svartvik,
1994:192)

A simple way to form a clause with two alternatives is to add *or not* either indirectly or directly after *whether* as in (148) and (149).

148- That depends on *whether* it is a fine day *or not*.

149- That depends on *whether or not* it is a fine day.

(Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanic, 2001:584)

It is observed that in addition to the *CCO either...or*, there is the *CS whether...or* that also introduces alternatives, but it does not give a choice like the former.

2.2.13.2.6 If... then

If is a subordinator which initiates the subordinate clause in conditional clauses (Ranchan, 1981:40-42).

150- I shall lend you the money *if* you promise to return it next week.

On the other hand, *then* is an adverb that can occur in different positions in the sentences:

151- *Then* I went home.

152- I went home *then*.

(Eckersely and Eckersely, 1960:268)

Then is also used as a linking adverb as in the following example:

153- The car spun around, (and) *then* violated two stop lights.

(Leech and Svartvik,
1994:267)

Leech, Cruickshank and Ivanic (2001:134) argue that the subordinator *if* is followed by the optional conjunct *then* to form the *CS if...then* that expresses logical result. *If* introduces the subordinate clause and *then* comes at the end of the *if* clause to emphasize the relationship between the condition (*if...*) and its result (*then...*).

154- *If* the law has been broken , *then* the police will take action.

(ibid.)

155- *If* it shows, (*then*) we stay at home.

156- *If* I had a thousand pounds, (*then*) I would take a long holiday.

(Coe,

1980:202)

2.2.13.27 Though...yet

Though is a subordinator used to introduce concession elements (i.e. expressing contrast between two ideas).

157-*Though* I felt sorry for him, I was secretly pleased that he was

having difficulties . (Alexander,

1988:27)

Though is the shorter form of *although* but it cannot be replaced by *although* when it is used as a conjunct:

158- The children were well-fed, their mother was ill, *though*.

(Christophersen and Sandved ,
1969:87)

Yet is a second marker, a linking adverb, that also expresses contrast between the elements it joins and the idea introduced by *yet* is something that would hardly be expected (Eckersely and Eckersely, 1960:309).

159- The car was quite old, *yet* it was in excellent condition.

(ibid.)

Yet is a time adverbial meaning (*so far*) as in (160) and a sentence adverbial which means (*nevertheless*) as in (161).

160- Have not you finished the typing *yet* ?

161- *Yet* he has failed to produce any evidence to substantiate his claim.

(Leech and Svartvik ,
1994:231)

The subordinator *though* is followed by the optional conjunct *yet* to form the *CS though...yet* that suggests contrast. The subordinate clause comes first and the main clause is marked by the optional conjunct *yet* which emphasizes the relation denoted by the subordinator (Quirk et al. 1972:728).

162- *Though* all efforts fail, (*yet*) we shall never surrender.

(ibid.)

163- *Though* the plants are big, *yet* they are not very strong.

(Coe,
1980:201)

It is important to mention that *though* must be followed by *yet* and not by *but*.

164 - *Though* he is poor, *yet* he is honest.

* 165 - *Though* he is poor, *but* he is honest.

(Wren and Martin, 1985:87)

2.2.1.3.2.8 Functions and Usages of Correlative Subordinators

According to Leech and Svartvik (1994:386), the *CSs* are conjunctions that join two clauses: one becoming the main clause, and the other being the subordinate one.

166- I can be *as* stubborn *as* she can .

Similarly, Quirk et al. (1985:998-999) mention that the *CSs* are those conjunctions that have the function of joining clauses. They consist of two markers of subordination, the second correlative emphasizes the meaning of the first one.

167- *The* harder they worked, *the* hungrier they became.

In the same line of thinking, Strumpf (1999:266) asserts that the *CSs* always work in pairs to link the subordinate clause with the main one.

168- *Whether* you want to finish your homework *or* not is not my

concern.

Biber et al. (2000:86) clarify the function and the usage of the *CSs* by saying that there are a few subordinators that have a special relation to a form in the main clause. The subordinator and the form it correlates with show a connection between the clauses.

169- He had *hardly* died *when* the family arguments began.

(Chalker,

1989:244)

It appears that most grammarians have full agreement concerning the function and the usage of the correlative subordinators (i.e.) linking clauses.

2.3 Significance of Correlative Conjunctions

As a matter of fact, *CCs* are grammatical devices like other conjunctions used to create connection between the units of the same rank except that they appear in pairs.

Moreover, their effectiveness lies in their ability to introduce and stress the logical relation between the elements to be joined by them (House and Harman, 1950:188-9).

Furthermore, they help the speaker / writer avoid repetition of identical elements and provide cohesive relation within a text so as to put energy into writing (8 Web).

2.4 Correlative Subordinators and Coordinators

To begin, there are similarities as well as differences between the *CCOs* and *CSs*. Both of them work in pairs and have a joining function.

At one extreme, the *CSs* consist of two elements, usually the second element emphasize the relationship indicated by the first one. Sometimes, the second one is optional. Besides, one element precedes the main clause and the other introduces the subordinate one. This means that the *CSs* join clauses of unequal rank (Quirk et al., 1985: 999-1000).

At the other extreme, the *CCOs* are also composed of two elements, an endorsing item and coordinator, but the first element reinforces and clarifies the function of the second one.

Additionally, they join elements of any kind. In contrast to the *CSs*, the first element can be omitted in some cases (Quirk et al., 1985 : 935-6).

Wren and Martin (1985:207) make an important remark by saying that the *CCOs* are placed directly before the two parallel conjoined elements.

In other words, they join grammatically equal parts, that the element following the first conjunction of the pair be grammatically equal to the element following the second one.

Chapter Three

The Test

3.1 Introduction

In order to measure the subjects' performance in using *CCs*, a test is adopted. This chapter is devoted to give a description of this test and presents the procedures followed to fulfil the aims of the study. These procedures are : objectives of the test, material selection, test design, its validity and reliability and the subjects to whom the test has been applied.

Later, the chapter describes the pilot administration, final administration of the test and the scoring scheme.

3.2 Objectives of the Test

Brown (1987:219) believes that a test is a method that has the purpose of measuring the learner's ability in certain area. For Genesee and Upshur (1996:14) a test is a task or a form of measurement that elicits certain information from the test taker. According to this information, the present test has been designed primarily to discover the ability of the university students to master *CCs*. Considering the type of the test used (i.e.) a diagnostic one, it aims at measuring the areas of difficulty faced by *EFL* university students in using *CCs*. In addition to this, the test is used to identify the types and causes of the errors so as to suggest the remedial recommendations for such errors. Furthermore , the test is constructed to measure the performance of the students at the recognition and the production levels. The first two questions measure the students' responses at the recognition level, while the last two ones measure the students' responses at the production level.

3.3 Selection of the Test Material

All the items of the test have been chosen from some of the grammar books mentioned in **Chapter Two** as well as from **A University Grammar of English (Workbook) (1979) by R.A. Close**. In

addition, the selection of the test items has been approved by a jury of twelve experienced university lecturers⁽¹⁾.

(¹)

- 1- Prof. Muhammed J. Al-Seady (Ph.D.in Methodology of English Drama),
College of Education, University of Thi-Qar.
- 2- Prof. Salih M. Hameed (Ph.D. in Literature), College of Education,
University
of Babylon.
- 3- Asst. Prof. Abbas D. Darweesh (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation),College
of Education, University of Babylon.
- 4- Asst. Prof. Fareed H. Al-Hindawi (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of
Education,
University of Babylon .
- 5- Asst. Prof. Hameed H. Al- Mas'udi (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation)
College of Education, University of Babylon.
- 6- Asst. Prof. Razaq N. Mukeef (M. A. in Linguistics), College of Education,
University of Babylon.
- 7- Asst. Prof. Riyadh T. Al-Ameedi (Ph.D. in Linguistics and Translation),
College of Education, University of Babylon.
- 8- Lecturer Jassim M. Rayhan (Ph.D. in Methods of Teaching English as a
Foreign Language),College of Basic Education, University of Babylon.
- 9- Lecturer Maysa'a K. Hussein (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of Education,
University of Al-Qadisiya.
- 10- Lecturer Qassim A. Al- Sahlany (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of
Education, University of Babylon.
- 11- Lecturer Qassim U. Al-Azzawi (Ph.D. in Linguistics), College of
Education, University of Babylon.
- 12- Lecturer Wafa'a M. Faisal (Ph.D. in Methods of Teaching English as a
Foreign Language),College of Education, University of Babylon.

3.4 Test Design

The test has been designed to measure the performance of the subjects at the recognition and the production levels. It comprises four questions each of which contains twelve items (see appendix II). The first two questions are designed to test the subjects' responses at the recognition level.

Starting with the first question, the subjects are asked to distinguish between the true and false sentences. In the second question, the subjects are provided with a list of **CCs**. They are required to choose the appropriate conjunction in the suitable space without using the same conjunction again.

To measure the subjects' responses at the production level, the last two questions are designed to this purpose. Concerning the third question, it is put in such a way to see whether the subjects are able to combine sentences by using the given conjunctions to each item. Moving to the last question, the subjects are given a list of **CCs** and their task is to join sentences without using the same conjunction twice.

3.5 Validity

Many linguists such as Lado (1962:76), Harris (1969:19), Brown (1987:219) and Heaton (1988:159) present the notion validity which means the extent to which a test measures what it is intended to test. There are two types of validity : **face validity** and **content validity**. The former concerns not with what the test actually measures but with what it appears superficially to measure. It pertains to whether the test looks valid to the testees who take it, the administrative personnel who decide on its use, and other observers (cited in Weir , 1990:26). Additionally, the test has been exposed to a jury of experts (see 3.3) to assess its validity.

The members of this jury have decided the test as being valid. They suggested some modifications which have been taken into consideration by the researcher.

Concerning the latter, Harris (1969: 19) states that **content validity** should be based upon a careful analysis of the skill we wish to measure. Heaton (1988:160) adds that it is a kind of validity that depends on accurate analysis of the language being tested and of particular course objectives.

3.6 Reliability

Reliability is a necessary characteristic of a good test. For a test to be valid, it must provide consistently accurate measurements. Hughes (1989:4), Madsen (1983:179) and Brown (1987:220) remark that the reliability of a test refers to the stability of test scores on different occasions under the same or similar conditions. In other words, if you give the same test to the same subjects on two different occasions the test should give similar results ; it should have test reliability.

To achieve the reliability of a test, Heaton (1988:163-4) mentions different means of estimating the reliability such as : **test / retest, two parallel forms, split-half** , and **Kurder - Richardson**.

The method adopted to estimate the reliability of the present test is **Kurder-Richardson** method of which the following formula can be considered:

$$\mathbf{R} = \frac{N}{N-1} \left(1 - \frac{m(N-m)}{NX^2} \right)$$

Where :

R : represents reliability.

N : represents the number of items in the test.

m : represents the means of the test scores.

X : represents the standard deviation of the test scores.

After the application of this formula, it is seen that the reliability coefficient of the present test is (90%) which is a high positive correlation.

3.7 The Subjects

The sample of this study consists of (50) students of the fourth stage of the Department of English, College of Education, University of Babylon. It represents about (50%) of the total students population. They are native speakers of Arabic who have similar *EFL* background and their average age is twenty - two years old. Since they are more proficient and the most advanced learners of English on the university level, they are preferred to apply the test.

3.8 Pilot Administration

Before making the main administration of the test, a pilot study has been administrated on the fourth of May of the academic year (2007-2008) involving (10) students chosen from the Department of English, College of Education, University of Babylon. They have been selected randomly and they are excluded from the main test. In particular, the test is intended to estimate the time required for answering the test, to know whether the items are clear to the subjects, to find out which of

them needs modification and to evaluate item analysis. The pilot test has revealed that the time required to answer the whole items of the test is one hour. In addition, all the results got from the pilot administration have helped the researcher in making the final administration.

3.9 Item Analysis

Item analysis is a method of finding out how effective the test items are and of finding out if they indicate differences between good and weak students. Besides, it permits the identification of the items which are too difficult or too easy (Mousavi, 1997:68).

Heaton (1988:178) notes that the index difficulty (or facility value) of an item simply reveals how easy or difficult that a particular item proves in the test. It can be calculated by the following formula:

$$FV = \frac{R}{N}$$

Where:

FV: stands for facility value.

R : stands for the number of the correct answer.

N : stands for the number of the students taking the test.

After the application of this formula to the results of the test, it has shown that the item difficulty ranges between (**0.20 - 0.60**).See table (1).

According to Madsen (1983:181-2)," a test question is considered too easy if more than 90 percent get it right". He adds that "an item is

considered too difficult if fewer than 30 percent get it right ". As a result, the present test is satisfactory.

Item discrimination power, on the other hand, refers to the extent that distinguishes between students who did well from those who did poorly (Heaton, 1988:180).

The following formula has been used in order to find out the item discrimination power.

$$D = \frac{\textit{CorrectU} - \textit{CorrectL}}{N}$$

Where:

D = discrimination index

U = upper half

L = Lower half

N = the number of the students taking the test in one group.

(Heaton, 1988:180)

After the application of this formula, it has been found that the discrimination power is between (**0.20 – 0.60**). See table (1).

For Ebel (1972:399) "good classroom test items have indices of discrimination of 0.3 or more".

The following table shows the facility value and discrimination index of each item of the test.

Table (1)**The Facility Value and the Discrimination Index of the Test Items**

No. of Question	No. of Item	FV	D	No. of Question	No. of Item	FV	D
1	1	0.28	0.36	3	1	0.30	0.20
	2	0.33	0.33		2	0.28	0.50
	3	0.68	0.56		3	0.23	0.20
	4	0.28	0.43		4	0.25	0.30
	5	0.26	0.40		5	0.31	0.23
	6	0.33	0.20		6	0.26	0.20
	7	0.61	0.56		7	0.26	0.26
	8	0.23	0.33		8	0.30	0.20
	9	0.60	0.60		9	0.33	0.26
	10	0.28	0.30		10	0.43	0.46
	11	0.50	0.40		11	0.20	0.26
	12	0.23	0.33		12	0.21	0.43
2	1	0.21	0.30	4	1	0.20	0.20
	2	0.23	0.33		2	0.23	0.26
	3	0.30	0.20		3	0.21	0.30
	4	0.51	0.36		4	0.26	0.20
	5	0.40	0.53		5	0.31	0.36
	6	0.40	0.46		6	0.30	0.20
	7	0.38	0.43		7	0.23	0.46
	8	0.25	0.36		8	0.28	0.30
	9	0.25	0.23		9	0.25	0.36
	10	0.30	0.20		10	0.26	0.40
	11	0.30	0.26		11	0.35	0.30
	12	0.30	0.20		12	0.28	0.50

3.10 Final Administration

The main test was carried out on the eleventh of May 2008. The time assigned for the test was one hour. The instructions for each question were provided to the subjects. To save time and efforts, they were instructed to answer on the same papers . Moreover, they were required not to write their names on the test papers so as to avoid embarrassment.

3.11 Scoring Scheme

It is important to adopt a particular scoring scheme to achieve the objectivity and reliability of the test. The whole test has been scored out of (96). The distributions of the scores are as follows: two marks for each correct answer and zero for the incorrect one. The items left by the subjects without answer have also been given zero. The scoring scheme adopted for the present test can be illustrated in the following table :

Table (2)
Distribution of the Scores of the Test

No. of Questions	No. of Items	Scores	Percentage
1	12	24	25%
2	12	24	25%
3	12	24	25%
4	12	24	25%
Total	48	96	100%

Chapter Four

Analysis of the Data

4.1 Introduction

This chapter is devoted to analysis and discussion the results of the test. In this connection, the errors that the students made in using *CCs* are identified and illustrated statistically. To analyze the data, attempts are made to indicate the sources of these errors in order to get some information about the nature of the difficulties that Iraqi *EFL* university students encounter in this area.

4.2 Discussion of Results

In particular, this section presents the results of the subjects' performance on each question of the test. Besides, it presents the results of their performance of the whole test in terms of recognition and production levels. How far the subjects manage the *CCs* is determined by their correct responses that are necessary to verify or refute the hypotheses of the study.

4.2.1 Subjects' Performance of the First Question

The first question , as mentioned earlier in section (3.2) , is constructed to measure the subjects' responses at the recognition level. The subjects are asked to state whether the given sentences are grammatically correct or not. The results obtained after analyzing the

subjects' performance in each item of this question are presented in table (3) which shows how the subjects respond to each item in this question.

Table (3)
Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level in Question (1)

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	17	34	33	66
2	20	40	30	60
3	41	82	9	18
4	17	34	33	66
5	16	32	34	68
6	20	40	30	60
7	37	74	13	26
8	14	28	36	72
9	36	72	14	28
10	17	34	33	66
11	30	60	20	40
12	14	28	36	72
Total	279	46.5	321	53.5

Thus, table (3) gives the following results:

- 1-The total number of the correct responses is (279, 46.5%).
- 2-The total number of the incorrect responses including the avoided items is (321, 53.5%).

It is clear that most subjects have failed to give the correct answer for the first question.

4.2.2 Subjects' Performance of the Second Question

The second question is also designed to measure the subjects' ability at the recognition level. They are asked to choose the suitable *CC* from a list and put it in the appropriate place. Table (4) displays the subjects' total responses to each item in this question.

Table (4)
Subjects' Performance at the Recognition Level in Question (2)

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	13	26	37	74
2	14	28	36	72
3	18	36	32	64
4	31	62	19	38
5	24	48	26	52
6	24	48	26	52
7	23	46	27	54
8	15	30	35	70
9	15	30	35	70
10	18	36	32	64
11	18	36	32	64

12	18	36	32	64
Total	231	38.5	369	61.5

Accordingly, table (4) presents the following results :

- 1- The total number of the correct responses is (231, 38.5%).
- 2- The total number of the incorrect responses including the avoided items is (369, 61.5%).

It can be concluded from this table that most of the subjects have failed to give the correct responses for this question. Hence, the total number of correct responses is (231, 38.5%), whereas that of the incorrect ones including the avoided items is (369, 61.5%). The subjects' total performance of the first and second questions can be summarized in the following table:

Table (5)

Subjects' Total Performance at the Recognition Level throughout the Whole Test

Level	No. of Questions	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
Recognition	Q1	279	46.5	321	53.5
	Q2	231	38.5	369	61.5
Total		510	42.5	690	57.5

From the results above, it can be concluded that the subjects

encounter difficulty at the recognition level since the highest rate of their incorrect responses is (690, 57.5%), whereas that of the correct responses is (510,4P2.5%).

4.2.3 Subjects' Performance of the Third Question

The third question is constructed to measure the subjects' performance at the production level. The subjects are instructed to join sentences by using given *CCs* in each item. Table (6) sums up the subjects respond to each item in this question.

Table (6)

Subjects' Performance at the Production Level in Question (3)

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	18	36	32	64
2	17	34	33	66
3	14	28	36	72
4	15	30	35	70
5	19	38	31	62
6	16	32	34	68
7	16	32	34	68
8	18	36	32	64
9	20	40	30	60
10	26	52	24	48
11	12	24	38	76
12	13	26	37	74

Total	204	34	396	66
-------	-----	----	-----	----

Table (6) presents the following results:

- 1- The total number of the correct responses is (204, 34%).
- 2- The total number of the incorrect responses is (396, 66%).

From these results, it can be concluded that the number of the wrong use of *CCs* including the avoided items is (396, 66%) .It is higher than that of the correct use of these conjunctions which is (204, 34%). This reflects the subjects' inabilities to use most of the *CCs* in grammatical sentences.

4.2.4 Subjects' Performance of the Fourth Question

This question is designed to measure the subjects' productive knowledge in choosing the appropriate *CC* to join given sentences. The researcher displays the subjects' responses in the following table:

Table (7)

Subjects' Performance at the Production Level in Question (4)

No. of Items	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
1	12	24	38	76
2	14	28	36	72
3	13	26	37	74
4	16	32	34	68
5	19	38	31	62
6	18	36	32	64

7	14	28	36	72
8	17	34	33	66
9	15	30	35	70
10	16	32	34	68
11	21	42	29	58
12	17	34	33	66
Total	192	32	408	68

Therefore, this table gives the following results :

- 1- The total number of the correct responses is (192, 32%).
- 2- The total number of the incorrect responses including the avoided items is (408, 68%).

The results indicate that the subjects face difficulty in producing sentences that contain *CCs*. Table (8) illustrates the subjects' total performance of the third and fourth questions:

Table (8)

Subjects' Total Performance at the Production Level throughout the Whole Test

Level	No. of Questions	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
Production	Q3	204	34	396	66
	Q4	192	32	408	68
Total		396	33	804	67

It can be noticed that the subjects' productive knowledge is low which indicates that the subjects encounter difficulties in using *CCs*.

4.2.5 Subjects' Total Performance of Correlative Conjunctions in the Whole Test

The results of the subjects' performance of the whole test are presented in the following table which contains both the recognition and the production levels.

Table (9)

Subjects' Total Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels

Level	No. of Correct Responses	%	No. of Incorrect Responses	%
Recognition	510	42.5	690	57.5
Production	396	33	804	67
Total	906	37.75	1494	62.25

The table clearly reveals that the highest rate of the subjects' incorrect responses is (1494, 62.25%), whereas that of the correct ones is (906, 37.75%). This means that the number of the subjects' incorrect responses is higher than that of the correct ones and this indicates that the students encounter difficulty in using *CCs* on both levels: the recognition as well as the production. Therefore, the first hypothesis which states that most Iraqi *EFL* university students face difficulty in mastering *CCs* is verified.

At the production level, the table also shows that the highest rate of responses which is the wrong use of *CCs* is (804, 67%) in comparison with that of the correct ones which is (396, 33%). This means that the subjects misuse *CCs* and this is an assertion to the second hypothesis of the study which says that most Iraqi *EFL* learners' inaccurate responses at the production level may be attributed to misuse *CCs*.

The types of errors which are made by the largest number of the students can be summarized as follows :

- (1) Incorrect arrangement of sentences.
- (2) No use of punctuation marks.
- (3) Wrong choice of *CCs*.
- (4) Failure to use *CCs* in grammatical sentences.
- (5) Repetition of the same *CCs* in more than one place.
- (6) Giving no responses .
- (7) Lack of agreement between the subject and the verb.

4.3 Error Analysis

4.3.1 Sources of Errors

Jhonson and Jhonson (1998:110) suggest that error analysis is an approach that deals with the errors produced by the second language learners and how those errors are classified into types.

Moreover,(Keshavarz, 1999:42-3) sees that these errors are seen as evidence of the processes and strategies of language acquisition. They are no longer considered as evil signs of failure in teaching and /or learning to be eradicated, however, they are a necessary part of language learning process .

Furthermore, Corder (1967) states that error analysis is significant in three different ways. Firstly, the teacher will be able to know the proficiency level of his/her students. Secondly, errors provide the researcher with evidence of how language is learnt or acquired. Thirdly, committing errors is a device the learner uses in order to learn and is a way the learner has for testing his hypotheses about the system of the language he is learning (Cited in Keshavarz , 1999:44-5). However, the researcher may not find exactly the sources of errors because an error may be attributed to more than one source.

Corder (1973:290) remarks that when it comes to accounting for particular errors produced by the learner there is a large area of uncertainty and speculation.

For Brow (2000:223-7) errors can be attributed to four sources : interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, context of learning and communication strategies.

4.3.1.1 Interlingual Transfer

According to Yule (2006:167), some errors may occur due to transfer which means using expressions or structures from the first language performing in the second language. He claims that there are two types of transfer: positive and negative. The first occurs when the learners transfer items and structures that are the same in both languages. The second occurs when the units or structures of both languages are not the same.

Brown (2000:224), in this respect, notes that interlingual transfer is an important source of error for learners. He thinks that the early stages

of learning a second language are vulnerable to interlingual transfer from the first language. In these beginning stages, before the system of the second language is familiar, the first language becomes the only previous linguistic system upon which the learner can draw.

The researcher is going to give a possible answer to each item answered by the subjects depending on their answers (i.e. he only corrects the answers to give a clear idea about how to answer such an item).

From now on the number between brackets indicates the number of the test item. Some of the responses to items (3) and (5) in question (3) may reflect the influence of interlingual transfer.

Item (3), the possible answer:

Sometimes, it is *not only* wise *but also* interesting to listen to your parents.

* Sometimes, *not only* it is wise to listen to your parents *but also* interesting.

Item (5), the possible answer:

The real dignity of man is *not* in what he has *but* in what he is.

* *Not* the real dignity of man in what he has *but* the real dignity of man in what he is.

It seems that the subjects have depended on translation to realize the semantic features of those items. This means that they have relied on their first language (i.e.) Arabic. Using such wrong translation has produced those errors.

In item (3) the subjects may translate their sentences as follows:

* Sometimes, *not only* it is wise to listen to your parents *but also* interesting.

في بعض الأحيان لا يكون من الحكمة الإصغاء إلى الوالدين فقط بل كذلك من المتعة.

The same thing may happen in response to item (5).

* *Not* the real dignity of man in what he has *but* the real dignity of man in what he is.

ليست الكرامة الحقيقية للإنسان فيما يملك لكن الكرامة الحقيقية للإنسان فيما يكون.

Therefore, the sentences are wrong since they are ungrammatical ones.

Another example of such error can be seen in item (2) in the same question.

Item (2), the possible answer:

Your book is *neither* on your desk *nor* on that shelf.

* Your book *neither* on your desk *nor* on that shelf.

كتابك ليس على منضدتك ولا على ذلك الرف.

It is thought that the error in the above example is ascribed to interlingual transfer as the deletion of the verb to (*be*) is due to the influence of the first language. Accordingly, interlingual errors comprise (23, 2.1%) of the total number of the subjects' errors.

4.3.1.2 Intralingual Transfer

Richard (1974) remarks that intralingual transfer is the error caused by the target language itself. He adds that intralingual errors occur through the learning process of the second language at a stage when the learners have not really acquired the knowledge. Moreover, these errors

are also caused by the difficulty of language itself (Cited in Sattayatham and Honsa, 2008:5).

There are several factors that can be related to this source of errors such as *overgeneralization* which is caused by the misuse of words or grammatical rules. Concerning this error, the learner generalizes the rule he knows in situations sometimes it is applicable and sometimes it is not. *Ignorance of rule restriction* is defined as applying rules to contexts to which they do not apply. *Incomplete rules application* is the opposite of generalization or one might call it undergeneralization . In this case, the learners do not use all the rules. They attend to change or decrease the complicated rules to simpler ones because the learners try to achieve effective communication by using simple rules.(Sattayatham and Honsa, 2008:6)

Intralingual errors constitute the most common source of the subjects' performance at the recognition and production levels. Errors attributed to overgeneralization can be found in items (1) and (8) in question (1) as in the following examples:

Item (1), the possible answer:

We are leaving *not* the next week, *but* the week after.

We are *not* leaving the next week, *but* the week after.

Item (8) , the possible answer:

Hardly had I closed my eyes *when* I began to imagine the most fantastic shapes.

*Had I *hardly* closed my eyes *when* I began to imagine the most fantastic shapes.

These examples reflect clearly the incorrect application of the previously learned material to the present situations.

In item (1), most of the subjects may think that the word **not** is a particle of negation used to form negative with verbs only. Therefore, they may consider that the sentence is wrong since the negator **not** is moved out of its normal position. In this sense, they ignore the fact that this word can be used as part of the **CCO not ---but** which is used to connect correlative conjoining structures.

In item (8), the students may regard the word **hardly** as an adverb which has to come before the lexical verb which gives incorrect arrangement of sentences in this case. They pay no attention to the idea that the word **hardly** is part of the **CS hardly --- when** and if it comes at the beginning of the sentence it will require subject- operator inversion.

Other errors attributed to overgeneralization are mostly seen in item (10) in questions (2) and (3):

In item (10) in question (2), the possible answer :

She is **neither** beautiful **nor** clever, but everyone admires her.

* She is **as** beautiful **as** clever, but everyone admires her.

In the above wrong sentence, the subjects tend to use the **CS as---as** in a situation which is unfortunately unacceptable. Moreover, the second **as** should be followed by a noun, pronoun or clause not by an adjective.

In item (10) in question (3), the possible answer :

Though they are expensive, **yet** people buy them.

* **Though** they are expensive, people buy them **yet**.

Similarly, the same thing may be applicable to the conjunct *yet* which is also used wrongly by most subjects. In other words, they have failed to use it as a conjunct. They think that it is an adverb which talks about something that has not happened. They pay no attention to the truth that *yet* is used with *though* to form the *CS though---yet* that expresses contrast .

Another factor of errors is the *ignorance of rule restriction*. This error can refer to the subjects' failure to give grammatical sentences. Errors caused by this source are clearly noticed in items (4) and (10) in question (1).

Item (4), the possible answer:

They work *both* quickly *and* efficiently.

* They *both* work quickly *and* efficiently.

Item (10), the possible answer:

The author wants *not only* fame *but also* money.

*The author *not only* wants fame *but also* money.

Another error may be attributed to ignorance of rule restriction is the one that can be shown in question (3) in item (6).

Item (6), the possible answer:

If you hate violence, *then* you must hate war films.

**if* you hate violence *then* you must hate war films

In the above examples, the subjects make errors in grammar and punctuation . They do not know how to construct acceptable grammatical sentences because they violate the function of *CCs* which is joining elements of the same rank.

Other errors attributed to ignorance of rule restriction can be shown in items (5) and (6) in question (2).

Item (5), the possible answer:

I do not know *whether* to correct him *or* let him learn the hard way.

* I do not know *either* to correct him *or* let him learn the hard way.

Item (6), the possible answer:

The more she thought about it *the* less she liked it.

* *As* more she thought about it *so* less she liked it.

The previous errors may be attributed to ignorance of rules restriction because of the wrong choice of *CCs*. In this way, lack of knowledge of the rules that govern the choice of *CCs* is obvious in these cases and this is significant because when the subjects choose the correct conjunction they can produce such conjunction when it is required.

Incomplete application of rules is another source to which some of the subjects' errors may be attributed. Such errors can be seen in question (3) in items (11) and (12) .

Item (11), the possible answer:

Hardly did he hear the news *when* he wept aloud.

* *Hardly* he heard the news *when* he wept aloud.

Item (12), the possible answer:

The faster he drives, *the* earlier he arrives.

* He drives *the* fast, he arrives *the* early.

In the above instances, the subjects commit errors in using such *CSs* for joining sentences. According to their responses to item (11), they

have fronted the first part of the *CS* which is *hardly* but they have not inverted the subject and verb.

The same can be said concerning item (12). The subjects also use the rule partially, in a way that only the conjunction *the* is placed before the adjective. They have not fronted the conjunction as well as the comparative. So the deviant order of "the conjunction and the comparative " is clearly seen in this example. It seems that the students fail to use the *CCs* in grammatical sentences.

Other errors that may be ascribed to incomplete application of rules can be found, for example, in question (2) in items (9) and (11).

Item (9), the possible answer:

Both the quality *and* the variety of the food were excellent.

* *As* the quality *so* the variety of the food were excellent.

Item (11), the possible answer:

I am *not* happy *but* sad.

*I am *as* happy *so* sad.

As shown in the above instances, the subjects use the same *CS* in more than one place in an attempt to answer these items and neglect other *CCs* though the researcher told them " *not to use the conjunction twice*" in a note given to them with the question's instructions and orally. Therefore, incomplete application of rules may be the reason behind all these errors. Consequently, intralingual errors constitute (921, 61.6%) of the total numbers of the subjects' errors.

4.3.1.3 Context of Learning

Brown (2000:226) notes that the third main source of errors is the context of learning. This type may be attributed to the influence of certain factors, such as the classroom with its teacher and materials. These factors may affect the learner and can lead him to make faulty hypotheses about the second language.

Keshavarz (1999:112) states that teacher- induced errors are those that result from pedagogical procedures contained in a text or used by the teacher. In other words, these errors happen as a result of course design or teaching techniques.

The effect of context of learning can be found in items (1) and (12) in question (2) in which the subjects use the faulty *CCs* .

Item (1), the possible answer:

Though the plants are big, *yet* they are not very strong.

* *Either* the plants are big, *or* they are not very strong.

Item (12), the possible answer:

You can have *either* a dog *or* a cat. You cannot have both.

* You can have *not only* a dog *but also* a cat. You cannot have both.

Other errors may be attributed to the context of learning can be noticed in items (1) and (2) in question (4).

Item (1), the possible answer:

The higher we go, *the* less the pressure.

* *Either* we go high, *or* the pressure is little.

Item (2), the possible answer:

Hardly had the performance begun, *when* the light went on.

* *Though* the performance had begun, *yet* the light went on.

In the above examples, though the sentences are grammatically correct, yet they are semantically incorrect . The subjects use the *CCs* quite wrongly. This means that they do not distinguish between the meaning of the *CCs* which lead them to make such errors.

It is expected that these errors may be attributed to classroom presentation where several *CCs* are presented with insufficient explanations and practice because of the limited time allotted for teaching such topic. In addition, such errors may be ascribed to the little attention given to the *CCs* in grammatical textbooks. This may make the subjects unable to recognize those conjunctions. Hence, the total number of errors that is due to the context of learning is (104, 7%).

4.3.1.4 Communication Strategies

Schmitt (2002:179) states that the communication strategies are the devices which may be used by the second language learners to deal with problems or break- down in communication. These plans enable the learners to reach the intended communicative goal even when things do not go well.

Littlewood (1998:83) declares that when the second language learners are engaged in communication they have communicative intension which they find difficulty in expressing because of the little knowledge they have. Accordingly, they resort to ways of overcoming the gaps between communicative intent and the limited ability to express that intent.

Avoidance is one of these strategies which means leaving concepts with no answers (i.e.) giving no responses. Such strategy can be seen in question (4) in items (3), (5), (8) and (9).

Guessing is another strategy that may lead the subjects to make errors. Its influence can be seen through the subjects' responses to items (3), (7) and (11) in question (1). Keeping in mind that the second sentences are wrongly given by the subjects in the following items.

Item (3), the possible answer:

Whether we go by bus **or** train, it will take at least six hours. (T)

Whether we go by bus **or** train, it will take at least six hours. (F)

Item (7), the possible answer:

Either he **or** she is coming to change. (T)

Either he **or** she is coming to change. (F)

Item (11), the possible answer:

As time went on, (**so**) their hopes began to wane. (T)

As time went on, (**so**) their hopes began to wane. (F)

Other errors that may be ascribed to the communicative strategy can be found in items (1) and (4) in question (3).

Item (1), the possible answer:

Either the girls were serving the meal **or** their mother was.

***Either** the girls **or** their mother were serving the meal.

Item (4), the possible answer:

Both my sisters **and** my mother were born in Mexico.

* **Both** my sisters **and** my mother was born in Mexico.

In items (1) and (4), the students do not make an agreement between the subject and the verb. In terms of item (1), the verb should agree with the nearest subject, whereas a plural verb requires in case of item (4). This kind of error can be attributed to strategies of communication that are used by the second language learners to learn the language. As a result, the total number of errors caused by such errors is (437, 29.3%).

Chapter Five

Conclusions, Recommendations and Suggestions

5.1 Introduction

This chapter sums up the findings of the practical work of the study that can be inferred from the results. Moreover, it highlights some recommendations and suggestions for further studies in the area of *CCs*.

5.2 Conclusions

From the empirical work of the study, it can be concluded that:

1-The results of the study clearly indicate that *EFL* university students face difficulties in the recognition and production of *CCs* (i.e. they face difficulty in using them). In comparison with the correct responses (1494, 62.25%) made by the students proved such difficulty. This validates the first hypothesis which is most Iraqi university students face difficulty in mastering *CCs*.

2-The findings of data analysis for questions (3 and 4) show that the subjects face difficulty in using *CCs* to make grammatical sentences. This can be seen from the total rate of their incorrect responses to these two questions which is (804, 67%), whereas that of the correct ones is (396, 33%). This verifies the second hypothesis of the study which indicates that *EFL* learners' inaccurate responses at the production level may be attributed to misuse of *CCs*.

3- The study reveals the following types of errors:

- (a) Incorrect arrangement of sentences.
- (b) No use of punctuation marks.
- (c) Wrong choice of *CCs*.
- (d) Failure to use *CCs* in grammatical sentences.
- (e) Repetition of the same *CCs* in more than one place.
- (f) Giving no responses .
- (g) Lack of agreement between the subject and the verb.

4- The subjects' poor performance can be ascribed to the following factors which are ordered hierarchically according to the percentage of errors attributed to each :

- (a) Intralingual transfer which is (921, 61.6%) of the subjects' total errors. The subjects' dependence on their prior knowledge of the second language is due to incomplete understanding of such conjunctions which encourages overgeneralization, incomplete application of rules and ignorance of rule restrictions.
- (b) Communication strategies which form (437, 29.3%)of the subjects' total number of errors. The subjects resort to such attempts to structure what they mean.
- (c) Context of learning which comprises (104, 7%) of the subjects' total errors. Such errors may be due to the little attention given to the *CCs* in grammatical textbooks.
- (d) Interlingual transfer in which the subjects use the rules of the first language in producing the *CCs*. The rate of errors committed within this factor is considered the lower rate of all the subjects' errors which is (32, 2.1%) .

5.3 Recommendations

The study has come with a number of pedagogical implications which are :

- 1- Depending on the findings of the study, *CCs* are problematic to Iraqi *EFL* university students. Thus, the teachers have to focus on teaching these connecting words to develop a full understanding of *CCs*.
- 2- Reliance on the types of errors made by the subjects of this study, the teachers are recommended to take these errors into consideration and help their students to reduce them to minimum range.

- 3- Teachers are kindly asked to make the students aware of the rules governing the use of these conjunctions. So, this will lead not to confuse the uses of *CCs* .
- 4- Students have to be encouraged to use *CCs* in both speaking and writing to assign their misuse in such respect so as to improve their competence.
- 5- Attention has to be given to make a distinction between *CCs* and other types of conjunctions. This level of distinction will provide the students
with the knowledge they need about *CCs*.
- 6- In addition to the recommendations above, the results of this study can be useful in directing the teachers and the syllabus designers' attention
to the preparation of influential teaching programmes intending to help
the students overcome the difficulties they encounter.

5.4 Suggestions

The researcher recommends the following topics to be studied in this respect:

- 1-A further study can be constructed to find out the role of *CCs* in editorials.
- 2-A study can be carried out to show the use of *CCs* in English for special purposes.

3-A similar study that focuses on the importance of these conjunctions in literature texts.

4-A study can be handled to investigate the students' awareness of other *CCs*.

Bibliography

Aarts, B. (2001) *English Syntax and Argumentation*. (2nded.).London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Aarts, F. and Jan Aarts (1988) *English Syntactic Structures. Functions and Categories in Sentence Analysis*.London:Prentice Hall, Europe .

Alexander, L.G. (1988) *Longman English Grammar*. London and New York: Longman.

- Al-Hamash, K. and Jamal Jalal Abdulla (1976) *A Course in Modern English Grammar*. Baghdad: The Institute for the Development of English Language Teaching in Iraq.
- Anson, C.M. and Robert A. Schwegler (1998) *The Longman Handbook for Writers and Readers*. New York: Longman.
- Azar, B. S. (1989) *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. (2nd ed.). New Jersey: Prentice – Hall, Inc.
- (2002) *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. (3rd ed.). London: Longman.
- Baker, C. L. (1989) *English Syntax*. London: The MIT Press. Cambridge Massachusetts.
- Biber, D., Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad and Edward Finegan (2000) *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. London: Longman.
- Bing, J. M. (1989) *Grammar Guide : English Grammar in Context*. New Jersey: Prentice - Hall, Inc.
- Bosewitz, R. (1987) *Student's Grammar*. London: Penguin Books Ltd.
- Brown, H. D. (1987) *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. (2nd ed.). Englewood Cliffs. New Jersey: Prentice -Hall Inc.
- Brown, H. D. (2000) *Language Learning and Teaching*. (4th ed.). San Francisco State University: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Celce- Murcia, M. and Diane Larsen- Freeman (1983) *The Grammar Book. An ESL / EFL Teacher's Course*. Englewood Cliffs N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- (1999) *The Grammar Book*.

An ESL / EFL Teacher's Course. (2nd ed.).New Jersey:
Newbury House.

Chalker, S. (1989) *Current English Grammar*.London and Basingstoke:
London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.

Christopherson, P. and Arthur O. Sandved (1969) *An Advanced
English
Grammar*. Macmillan and Co. Ltd.

Close, R. A. (1979) *A Reference Grammar for Students of English*.
Moscow. Prosveshchenive: Longman Group.

----- (1990) *A University Grammar of English* (Workbook).
London: Longman.

Cobuild, C. (1992) *English Grammar*. London: William Collins Sons
and Co. Ltd.

Coe, N. (1980) *A Learner's Grammar of English*. Hong Kong: Thomas
Sons Ltd.

Cook, M.J. (1983) *Trouble Spots of English Grammar*. New York:
Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Corder,S.P. (1973) *Introducing to Applied Linguistics*. London:
Penguin Books Ltd.

Crystal, D.(1997) *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. (4th ed.).
Cornwall: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Downing, A. and Philip Locke (2006) *English Grammar: A University
Course*. (2nd ed.).London: Routledge.

Ebel, R. L. (1972) *Essential of Educational Measurement* . Englewood
Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice- Hall, Inc.

- Eckersley, C.E. and J.M. Eckersley (1960) *A Comprehensive English Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Ehrlich, E. and Daniel Murphy (1976) *English Grammar*. New Jersey: McGRAW-Hill Book Company.
- Ellsworth, B. and John A. Higgins (1997) *English Grammar Simplified*. Harper Collins College Publishers.
- Feigenbaum, I.(1985) *The Grammar Handbook*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finch, G. (2000) *Linguistic Terms and Concepts*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Fowler, H. R. and Jane E. Aaron (1998) *The Little, Brown Handbook* (7th ed.). London: Longman.
- Frank, M.(1993) *Modern English*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Regents / Prentice Hall.
- Genesee, F. and John A. Upshur (1996) *Classroom- based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Greenbaum, S. (1996) *The Oxford English Grammar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Gucker, P. (1966) *Essential English Grammar*. New York: Dover Publications. Inc.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and Ruqaiya Hasan (1976) *Cohesion in English*. London : Longman.
- Harris, D. P.(1969) *Testing English as a Second Language*. New Jersey: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

- Heaton, J. B. (1988) *Writing English Language Tests*. London: Longman.
- Herndon, J. H. (1976) *A Survey of Modern Grammars*. (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Hewings, M. (2005) *Advanced Grammar in Use*. (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Honsa, S. and Anchalee Sattayatham (2008) *Medical Students' Most Frequent Errors at Mahidol University*. Asian EFL Journal English Language Teaching and Research Articles. V.9. Issue 2. Thailand: Mahidol University.
- House, H. C. and Susan Emolyn Harman (1950) *Descriptive English Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Hughes, A. (1989) *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Johnson, K. and Helen Johnson (1998) *Encyclopedic Dictionary of Applied Linguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Keshavarza, M. H. (1999) *Contrastive Analysis and Error Analysis*. Tehran: Rahnama Publications.
- Kierzert, J. M. and Walter Gibson (1960) *The Macmillan Handbook of English*. New York: The Macmillan Company.
- Kroeger, P.R. (2005) *Analyzing Grammar: An Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kuiper, K. and W. Scott Allan (1996) *An Introduction to English Language, Sound, Word and Sentence*. London: Macmillan Press Ltd.

- Lado, R. (1961) *Language Testing* . London: Longman.
- Leech, G. and Jan Svartivk (1994) *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London and New York: Longman.
- Leech, G. Benta Cruickshank and Roz Ivanic (2001) *An A- Z of English Grammar and Usage*. London: Longman.
- Leech, G. Margaret Deuchar and Robert Hoogenraad (1982) *English Grammar for Today. A New Introduction*. London and Basingstoke: The Macmillan Press Ltd.
- Liles, B. L. (1971) *An Introductory Transformational Grammar*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Littlewood, W. T. (1998) *Foreign and Second Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Long, R. B. (1961) *The Sentence and Its Parts: A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Madsen, H. S. (1983) *Techniques in Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, M. and Felicity O'Dell (1995) *English Vocabulary in Use*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mousavi, S. A. (1997) *A Dictionary of Language Testing*. I.R. IRAN: Rahnama Publications.
- Oliphant, L. (1962) *A General Certificate English Course*. Liverpool, London and Prescott: C. Tinling Co. Ltd.
- Peters, P. (2004) *The Cambridge Guide to English Usage*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Pollock, C.W. (1982) *Communicative What You Mean*. University of
Denerer: Prentice-Inc.
- Quirk, R. and, Sidney Greenbaum (1977) *A University Grammar of
English*. London: Longman Commonwealth Printing
Press.
- Quirk, R., Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvick
(1972) *A Grammar of Cotemporary English*.
London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Quirk, R., Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech and Jan Svartvick
(1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar of English
Language*. London and New York: Longman.
- Roberts, P. (1956) *Patterns of English* .New York: Harcourt, Brace and
World, Inc.
- (1962) *English Sentences*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and
World, Inc.
- (1968) *Modern Grammar*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and
World, Inc.
- Sabin , W. A. (2001) *The Grammar Reference Manual* (9th ed.).New
York: The McGraw-Hill Companies.
- Schmitt, N. (2002) *An Introduction to Applied Linguistics*. Oxford:
Oxford University Press.
- Schuster, E. (1965) *Grammar, Usage and Style*. New Jersey: McGraw-
Hill, Inc.
- Scott, F.S., C.C., Bowley, C.S. Brockett, J.G. Brown, and P.R. Goddard,
(1968) *English Grammar : A Linguistic Study of its*

Classes and Structures. London: Heinemann Educational Books Ltd.

Shaw, H. (1986) *Handbook of English*. (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.

Sheeler, W.D. (1978) *Grammar and Drillbook*. U.S.A.: English Language Services, Inc. and Oxford University Press.

Strumpf, M. and Auriel Douglas (1999) *The Grammar Bible*. Los Angeles: Strumpf, M. and Auriel Douglas.

Swan, M. (1995) *Practical English Usage*. (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swan, M. and Catherine Walter (2001) *The Good Grammar Book*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thakur R.D. and Indu Ranchan (1986) *Vikas Book of English Grammar,*

Composition and Translation. V.1. New Delhi: Vani Educational Books.

Thomson, A.J. and A.V. Martinet (1986) *A Practical English Grammar*. (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Waldhron, A. and Arthur Zeiger (1967) *English Made Simple*. London:

W. H. Allen and Company.

Warriner, J.E., Mary Evelyn Whitten and Francis Griffith (1958) *English*

Grammar and Composition. London: Harcourt, Brace and Company, Inc.

Weir, C.J. (1990) *Communicative Language Testing* .Edition Published.
London: Prentice Hall International (UK) Ltd.

Wishon, G.E. and Julia M. Burks (2005) *Let's Write English for
Students of English as a Second Language*. New York :
American Book Company.

Wren, P. C. and H. Martin (1985) *High School English Grammar and
Composition*. New Delhi: S. Chand and Company Ltd.

Yule, G. (1996) *The Study of Language*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

----- (2006) *The Study of Language*. (3rd ed.). Cambridge:
Cambridge University Press.

Zandvoort, R.W. and J.A. Van Ek (1975) *A Handbook of English
Grammar*. (7th ed.).London: Longman.

Web Sites

- 1- [http:// www 2. gsu.edu /~ eslhp / grammar / lecture 9/Co sub.htm](http://www2.gsu.edu/~eslhp/grammar/lecture9/Co%20sub.htm)
- 2- [http:// grammar.ccc.comment.edu / grammar / conjunctions.htm](http://grammar.ccccomment.edu/grammar/conjunctions.htm)
- 3- [http:// www. johnsesl. com /templates / grammar /all conjunctions. Php](http://www.johnsesl.com/templates/grammar/allconjunctions.php)
- 4- [http:// grammar. uoregon. edu / conjunction / correlative.htm](http://grammar.uoregon.edu/conjunction/correlative.htm)
- 5- [http:// www. hubpages.com / hub /Grammar-Mishaps-Neither-Nor and
Either-Or](http://www.hubpages.com/hub/Grammar-Mishaps-Neither-Nor-and-Either-Or)
- 6- [http:// ace. acadiau. ca /english / grammar / gconjunctions.htm](http://ace.acadiau.ca/english/grammar/gconjunctions.htm)
- 7- [http:// www. virtualsalt. com / conjunction.htm](http://www.virtualsalt.com/conjunction.htm)
- 8- [http:// www.csun.edu/~ hcpasoo3 / coord.htm](http://www.csun.edu/~hcpasoo3/coord.htm)

Appendix I

The Letter to the Jury Members

University of Babylon
College of Basic Education
Department of English

Dear Sir / Madam,

It is intended to test the performance of Iraqi fourth year students of English Department / College of Education / University of Babylon in using the correlative conjunctions. The test draft contains four questions with a total of 48 items.

The first and second questions are designed to test the students' ability at the recognition level whereas the third and fourth questions are devoted to testing the students' responses at the production level.

Your suggestions and modifications will be hardly regarded.

Many thanks for your kind assistance

Muayad M. Al-Shemmary
M.A. Student in TEFL
Department of English
College of Basic Education
University of Babylon

Appendix II

The Test

Q1:- State whether the following sentences are grammatically correct (T) or incorrect (F). Write the appropriate letter in the space.

- 1- We are leaving not next week, but the week after.()
- 2- Though many people have tried to solve the mystery, yet nobody has succeeded.()
- 3- Whether we go by bus or train, it will take at least six hours.()
- 4- They both worked quickly and efficiently.()
- 5- Neither she spoke nor wept.()
- 6- I am as quite strong as I ever was.()
- 7- Either he or she is going to change.()
- 8- Had I hardly closed my eyes when I began to imagine the most fantastic shapes.()
- 9- If it was fine, (then) I would go for a walk.()
- 10- The author not only wants fame but also money.()
- 11- As time went on, (so) their hopes began to wane.()
- 12- More expensive the petrol becomes, the less people drive.()

(60 marks)

**Q2:- From the following list, supply suitable correlative conjunctions to fill the blanks without using the same conjunction twice:(either...or ; neither...nor ; both...and ; not...but ; not only...but (also) ; if...then ; whether...or ; as...as ;
; though...yet ; as...so; hardly...when; the...the).**

- 1- ----- the plants are big,---- they are not very strong.
- 2- ----- the strength of the defenders failed, ----- their courage grew.
- 3- ----- had I finished my breakfast----- the doorbell rang.
- 4- Please come ----- quickly----- you can.
- 5- I do not know ----- to correct him ---- let him learn the hard way.
- 6- -----more she thought about it ----- less she liked it.
- 7- ----- you do not buy me that toy, ----- I will scream.
- 8- ----- do students enjoy summer vacations, ----- they enjoy
Christmas
break.
- 9- ----- the quality ----- the variety of the food were excellent.
- 10- She is ----- beautiful----- clever, but everyone admires her.
- 11- I am ----- happy ----- sad.
- 12- You can have ----- a dog ----- a cat. You can not have both.

(60 marks)

Q3:- Combine the following sentences using the correlative conjunctions given in brackets making the necessary changes.

1-The girls were serving the meal. Their mother was serving it.(*either...or*)

2-Your book is not on your desk. It is not on that shelf. (*neither...nor*)

3- Sometimes, it is wise to listen to your parents. Sometimes, it is interesting to listen to your parents. (*not only...but also*)

4-My sisters were born in Mexico. My mother was born in Mexico.(*both...and*)

5-The real dignity of man is in what he has. The real dignity of man is in what he is . (*not...but*)

6-You hate violence. You must hate war films. (*if... then*)

7- I do not know if George washed the dishes. I do not know if Mel washed the dishes. (*whether...or*)

8-John is tall. His father is tall. (*as...as*)

9- You get older. You become less willing to change your ideas. (*as...so*)

10- They are expensive. People buy them. (*though...yet*)

11- He heard the news. He wept aloud. (*hardly...when*)

12- He drives fast. He arrives early. (*the...the*)

(60 marks)

Q4:-Join each pair of the following sentences into one sentence using correlative conjunctions: (either...or ; neither...nor ; both...and ; not...but ; not only...but(also) ; if...then ; whether...or ; as...as ; though...yet ; as...so; hardly...when; the...the)

Note:-You should not use the same conjunction twice and make suitable changes if necessary.

- 1- We go high. The pressure is little.
- 2- The performance had began . The light went on.
- 3- You like boxing. You hate it.
- 4- Henry is not the owner. His sons are the owners.
- 5- He wondered if he should wait for them. He wondered if he should go.
- 6- The night air was hot. They slept soundly.
- 7- The members are not interested. The president is not interested.
- 8- Tom is impolite. He is boring.
- 9- She cannot come to us. We will have to go and see her.
- 10- It is not cold. It was cold yesterday.
- 11- The television is boring. It wastes a lot of time.
- 12- Prices rise. The demand for higher wages will increase.

(60 marks)

Appendix III

The Test After Modification

Q1:- State whether the following sentences are grammatically correct (T) or incorrect (F). Write the appropriate letter in the space.

- 10- We are leaving not next week, but the week after. ()
- 11- Though many people have tried to solve the mystery, yet nobody has succeeded. ()
- 12- Whether we go by bus or train, it will take at least six hours. ()
- 13- They both worked quickly and efficiently. ()
- 14- Neither she spoke nor wept. ()
- 15- I am as quite strong as I ever was. ()
- 16- Either he or she is going to change. ()
- 17- Had I hardly closed my eyes when I began to imagine the most fantastic shapes. ()
- 18- If it was fine, (then) I would go for a walk. ()
- 10- The author not only wants fame but also money. ()
- 11- As time went on, (so) their hopes began to wane. ()
- 12- More expensive the petrol becomes, the less people drive. ()

(24 marks)

Q2:- From the following list, supply suitable correlative conjunctions to fill the blanks without using the same conjunction twice: (either...or ; neither...nor ; both...and ; not...but ; not only...but (also); if...then ; whether...or ; as...as though...yet ; as...so; hardly...when; the...the).

- 10- ----- the plants are big,---- they are not very strong.
- 11- ----- the strength of the defenders failed, ----- their courage grew.
- 12- ----- had I finished my breakfast----- the doorbell rang.
- 13- Please come ----- quickly----- you can.
- 14- I do not know ----- to correct him ---- let him learn the hard way.
- 15- -----more she thought about it ----- less she liked it.
- 16- ----- you do not buy me that toy, ----- I will scream.
- 17- ----- do students enjoy summer vacations, ----- they enjoy Christmas break.
- 18- ----- the quality ----- the variety of the food were excellent.
- 10- She is ----- beautiful----- clever, but everyone admires her.
- 11- I am ----- happy ----- sad.
- 12- You can have ----- a dog ----- a cat. You cannot have both.

(24 marks)

Q3:- Combine the following sentences using the correlative conjunctions given in brackets making the necessary changes.

1-The girls were serving the meal. Their mother was serving it.(*either...or*)

2-Your book is not on your desk. It is not on that shelf. (*neither...nor*)

3- Sometimes, it is wise to listen to your parents. Sometimes, it is interesting to listen to your parents. (*not only...but also*)

4-My sisters were born in Mexico. My mother was born in Mexico.(*both...and*)

5-The real dignity of man is in what he has. The real dignity of man is in what he is. (*not...but*)

6-You hate violence. You must hate war films. (*if... then*)

7- I do not know if George washed the dishes. I do not know if Mel washed the dishes. (*whether...or*)

8-John is tall. His father is tall. (*as...as*)

9- You get older. You become less willing to change your ideas. (*as...so*)

10- They are expensive. People buy them. (*though...yet*)

11- He heard the news. He wept aloud. (*hardly...when*)

12- He drives fast. He arrives early. (*the...the*)

(24 marks)

Q4:-Join the following sentences into one sentence using the

following correlative conjunctions: (either...or; neither...nor ;

both...and; not...but ; not only...but (also) ; if...then ; whether...or;

as...as ;though...yet ; as...so; hardly...when; the...the

Note:-You should not use the same conjunction twice and make suitable changes if necessary.

- 10- We go high. The pressure is little.
- 11- The performance had began . The light went on.
- 12- You like boxing. You hate it.
- 13- Henry is not the owner. His sons are the owners.
- 14- He wondered if he should wait for them. He wondered if he should go.
- 15- The night air was hot. They slept soundly.
- 16- The members are not interested. The president is not interested.
- 17- Tom is impolite. He is boring.
- 18- She cannot come to us. We will have to go and see her.
- 10- It is not cold. It was cold yesterday.
- 11- The television is boring. It wastes a lot of time.
- 12- Prices rise. The demand for higher wages will increase.

(24 marks)

Appendix IV

Answers of the Test

Q1/

1- **T**

2- **T**

3- **T**

4- **F**

5- **F**

6- **F**

7- **T**

8- **F**

9- **T**

10- **F**

11- **T**

12- **F**

Q2 /

- 1- **Though** the plants are big, (**yet**) they are not very strong.
- 2- **As** the strength of the defenders failed, (**so**) their courage grew.
- 3- **Hardly** had I finished my breakfast **when** the doorbell rang.
- 4- Please come **as** quickly **as** you can.
- 5- I do not know **whether** to correct him **or** let him learn the hard way.
- 6- **The** more she thought about it **the** less she liked it.
- 7- **If** you do not buy me that toy, (**then**) I will scream.
- 8- **Not only** do students enjoy summer vacations, **but** they (**also**) enjoy Christmas break.
- 9- **Both** the quality **and** the variety of the food were excellent.
- 10- She is **neither** beautiful **nor** clever, but everyone admires her.
- 11- I am **not** happy **but** sad.
- 12- You can have **either** a dog **or** a cat. You cannot have both.

Q3 /

- 1- **Either** the girls were serving the meal **or** their mother was.
- 2-Your book is **neither** on your desk **nor** on that shelf.
- 3- Sometimes, it is **not only** wise **but also** interesting to listen to your parents.
- 4- **Both** my sisters **and** my mother were born in Mexico.
- 5-The real dignity of man is **not** in what he has **but** in what he is.
- 6- **If** you hate violence, (**then**) you must hate war films.
- 7- I do not know **whether** Gorege **or** Mel washed the dishes.
- 8- John is **as** tall **as** his father.
- 9- **As** you get older, (**so**) you become less willing to change your ideas.
- 10- **Though** they are expensive, (**yet**) people buy them.
- 11- **Hardly** did he hear the news **when** he wept aloud.
- 12- **The** fast he drives **the** earlier he arrives.

Q4 /

- 1- *The* higher we go *the* less the pressure.
- 2- *Hardly* had the performance begun *when* the light went on.
- 3- *Either* you like boxing *or* you hate it.
- 4- *Not* Henry *but* his sons are the owners.
- 5- He wondered *whether* he should wait for them *or* go.
- 6- *Though* the night air was hot, (*yet*) they slept soundly.
- 7- *Neither* the members *nor* the president is interested.
- 8- Tom is *both* impolite *and* boring.
- 9- *If* she cannot come to us, (*then*) we will have to go and see her.
- 10- It is not *as* cold *as* it was yesterday.
- 11- *Not only* is the television boring, *but* it (*also*) wastes a lot of time.
- 12- *As* prices rise, (*so*) the demand for higher wages will increase.

ملخص الرسالة

تتناول فصول هذه الدراسة أدوات الربط المتلازمة في اللغة الانجليزية من جانب وبيان كونها أحد التراكيب التي يواجه الطلبة صعوبة في تعلمها من جانب آخر.

لذلك تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى تقويم أداء الطلبة العراقيين دارسي اللغة الانجليزية (لغة أجنبية) على استعمال هذه الروابط المزدوجة علاوة على اكتشاف أخطائهم وأسبابها على مستوي التمييز والإنتاج.

ولتحقيق الأهداف أعلاه قدمت الدراسة الفرضيات الآتية:

أولاً: " يواجه اغلب طلبة الجامعة العراقيين صعوبات في إتقان أدوات الربط المتلازمة. ثانياً: " تعزى الاستجابات غير الدقيقة للمتعلمين على مستوى الإنتاج إلى سوء استعمال هذه الأدوات.

ولإثبات صحة هذه الفرضيات صمم اختباراً " تشخيصياً" ونفذ على عينة من خمسين طالباً" من طلبة الجامعة العراقيين من دارسي اللغة الانجليزية (لغة أجنبية) في المرحلة الرابعة من قسم اللغة الانجليزية / كلية التربية / جامعة بابل. ثم جمعت الاستجابات وحلت لتعطي النتائج الآتية:

1- يواجه طلبة الجامعة العراقيون دارسو اللغة الانجليزية (لغة أجنبية) صعوبات في إتقان أدوات الربط المتلازمة وهذه الصعوبة توضحت في ضوء النسبة الأدنى لإجاباتهم الصحيحة (37 , 75 , 906 %) مقارنة مع إجاباتهم الخطأ (25 , 1494 , 62 %).

2- نسبة الإجابات الخاطئة (67 , 804 %) مقارنة مع نسبة الإجابات الصحيحة (33 , 396 %) في السؤالين (الثالث والرابع) جاء نتيجة سوء استعمال الطلبة لتلك الروابط.

3- تعزى أخطاء الطلبة إلى العوامل التالية:

(أ) أستعمال الطلبة استراتيجيات التعليم لقواعد اللغة الانجليزية ونسبة هذا النوع من الخطأ (61 , 6 , 921 %).

(ب) استراتيجيات الاتصال المنتقاة من قبل الطلبة في محاولة لملأ فجوة معرفتهم ونسبة الخطأ بسبب هذا العامل (3,437, 29%) .

(ج) سياق التعليم أذ نالت مثل هذه التراكيب قليلا" من الاهتمام في كتب النحو ونسبة هذا النوع من الخطأ (7,104, 7%) .

(د) تأثير اللغة إلام أذ كانت نسبة الأخطاء بسبب هذا العامل (1,32, 2%) .

تضمنت الدراسة خمسة فصول. قدم الفصل الأول مشكلة البحث وأهدافه وفرضياته والإجراءات المتخذة وحدود البحث وأهمية الدراسة. وتناول الفصل الثاني مفهوم الروابط باللغة الانجليزية وظاهرتي التنسيق والاختصاص والروابط المتلازمة متضمنا" تعاريفها وأنواعها ووظائفها أذ أنها تشكل الهدف الرئيس للدراسة. أما الفصل الثالث فقد خصص لوصف الاختبار الذي أجراه الباحث على طلبة المرحلة الرابعة من قسم اللغة الانجليزية في كلية التربية / جامعة بابل. يتضمن هذا الوصف أهداف الاختبار وتصميمه واختيار المادة وصلاحيته وثقته وعينة البحث و خطة حساب الدرجة المعتمدة. وقد تم تحليل البيانات ومناقشة النتائج في الفصل الرابع.؛ أخيرا" قدم الفصل الخامس عددا" من الاستنتاجات والتوصيات والمقترحات للدراسات المستقبلية.

جامعة بابل

تعميل أراء طلبة الجامعة العراقيين والراسي اللغة

الانجليزية لغة أجنبية في استعمال أدوات الربط

الملازمة

رسالة

تقدم بها الى مجلس كلية التربية الأساسية في جامعة بابل جزءاً من
متطلبات نيل درجة ماجستير تربية في طرائق
تدريس اللغة الانجليزية لغة أجنبية

مؤيد منغر الشمري

بإشراف

أ.م.ع. عاقله العنكح

نوز

أ.م.ع. و. عاصم عبوزنار الدببب

رببب 1429هـ

2008ع

