بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

﴿﴿ظَهَرَ الْفَسَادُ فِي الْبَرِّ وَالْبَحْرِ بِمَا كَسَبَتْ أَيْدِي النَّاسِ لِيُذِيقَهُم بَعْضَ الَّذِي عَمِلُوا لَعَلَّهُمْ يَرْجِعُونَ﴾﴾

صدق الله العظيم

(سورة الروم – آيه 41)

هيئة التحريـــر

_____

هاتف (00218924120663 د. على)

(00218926724967 د .أحمد)– أو (00218926308360 د. أنور)

البريد الالكتروني: **journal.alkhomes@gmail.com**

صفحة المجلة على الفيس بوك: **journal.alkhomes@gma**

قواعد ومعايير النشر

– تهتم المجلة بنشر الدراسات والبحوث الأصيلة التي تتسم بوضوح المنهج ودقة التوثيق في حقول الدراسات المتخصصة في اللغة العربية والانجليزية والدراسات الإسلامية والشعر والأدب والتاريخ والجغرافيا والفلسفة وعلم الاجتماع والتربية وعلم النفس وما يتصل بها من حقول المعرفة.

– ترحب المجلة بنشر التقارير عن المؤتمرات والندوات العلمية المقامة داخل الجامعة على أن لا يزيد عدد الصفحات عن خمس صفحات مطبوعة.

– نشر البحوث والنصوص المحققة والمترجمة ومراجعات الكتب المتعلقة بالعلوم الإنسانية والاجتماعية ونشر البحوث والدراسات العلمية النقدية الهادفة إلى تقدم المعرفة العلمية والإنسانية.

– ترحب المجلة بعروض الكتب على ألا يتجاوز تاريخ إصدارها ثلاثة أعوام ولا يزيد حجم العرض عن صفحتين مطبوعتين وأن يذكر الباحث في عرضه

المعلومات التالية (اسم المؤلف كاملاً– عنوان الكتاب– مكان وتاريخ النشر – عدد صفحات الكتاب–اسم الناشر– نبذة مختصرة عن مضمونه– تكتب البيانات السالفة الذكر بلغة الكتاب).

ضوابط عامة للمجلة

ـ يجب أن يتسم البحث بالأسلوب العلمي النزيه الهادف ويحتوى على مقومات ومعايير المنهجية العلمية في اعداد البحوث.

– يُشترط في البحوث المقدمة للمجلة أن تكون أصيلة ولم يسبق أن نشرت أو قدمت للنشر في مجلة أخرى أو أية جهة ناشرة اخرة. وأن يتعهد الباحث بذلك خطيا عند تقديم البحث، وتقديم إقراراً بأنه سيلتزم بكافة الشروط والضوابط المقررة في المجلة، كما أنه لا يجوز يكون البحث فصلا أو جزءاً من رسالة (ماجستير – دكتوراه) منشورة، أو كتاب منشور.

ـ لغة المجلة هي العربية ويمكن أن تقبل بحوثا بالإنجليزية أو بأية لغة أخرى، بعد موافقة هيئة التحرير.

– تحتفظ هيئة التحرير بحقها في عدم نشر أي بحث مخالف وتُعدُّ قراراتها نهائية، وتبلغ الباحث باعتذارها فقط اذا لم يتقرر نشر البحث، ويصبح البحث بعد قبوله حقا محفوظا للمجلة ولا يجوز النقل منه إلا بإشارة إلى المجلة.

–لا يحق للباحث إعادة نشر بحثه في أية مجلة علمية أخرى بعد نشره في مجلة الكلية ، كما لا يحق له طلب استرجاعه سواء قُبِلَ للنشر أم لم يقبل.

–تخضع جميع الدراسات والبحوث والمقالات الواردة إلى المجلة للفحص العلمي، بعرضها على مُحكِّمين مختصين (محكم واحد لكل بحث) تختارهم هيئة التحرير على نحو سري لتقدير مدى صلاحية البحث للنشر، ويمكن أن يرسل الى محكم آخر وذلك حسب تقدير هيئة التحرير.

– يبدي المقيم رأيه في مدى صلاحية البحث للنشر في تقرير مستقل مدعماً بالمبررات على أن لا تتأخر نتائج التقييم عن شهر من تاريخ إرسال البحث إليه، ويرسل قرار المحكمين النهائي للباحث ويكون القرار إما:

* قبول البحث دون تعديلات.

*قبول البحث بعد تعديلات وإعادة عرضه على المحكم.

*رفض البحث.

–تقوم هيئة تحرير المجلة بإخطار الباحثين بآراء المحكمين ومقترحاتهم إذ كان المقال أو البحث في حال يسمح بالتعديل والتصحيح، وفي حالة وجود تعديلات طلبها المقيم وبعد موافقة الهيئة على قبول البحث للنشر قبولاً مشروطاً بإجراء التعديلات يطلب من الباحث الأخذ بالتعديلات في فترة لا تتجاوز أسبوعين من تاريخ استلامه للبحث، ويقدم تقريراً يبين فيه رده على المحكِّم، وكيفية الأخذ بالملاحظات والتعديلات المطلوبة.

6

-ترسل البحوث المقبولة للنشر إلى المدقق اللغوي، ومن حق المدقق اللغوي أن يرفض البحث الذي تتجاوز أخطاؤه اللغوية الحد المقبول.

– تنشر البحوث وفق أسبقية وصولها إلى المجلة من المحكم، على أن تكون مستوفية الشروط السالفة الذكر .

-الباحث مسئول بالكامل عن صحة النقل من المراجع المستخدمة كما أن هيئة تحرير المجلة غير مسئولة عن أية سرقة علمية تتم في هذه البحوث.

– ترفق مع البحث السيرة علمية (cv) مختصرة قدر الإمكان تتضمن الاسم الثلاثي للباحث ودرجته العلمية وتخصصه الدقيق، وجامعته وكليته وقسمه، وأهم مؤلفاته، والبريد الالكتروني والهاتف ليسهل الاتصال به.

– يخضع ترتيب البحوث في المجلة لمعايير فنية تراها هيئة التحرير .

-تقدم البحوث إلى مكتب المجلة الكائن بمقر الكلية، أو ترسل إلى بريد المجلة الإلكتروني.

-اذا تم إرسال البحث عن طريق البريد الإلكتروني او صندوق البريد يتم إبلاغ الباحث بوصول بحثه واستلامه.

– يترتب على الباحث، في حالة سحبه لبحثه أو إبداء رغبته في عدم متابعة إجراءات التحكيم والنشر ، دفع الرسوم التي خصصت للمقيمين.

شروط تفصيلية للنشر في المجلة

–عنوان البحث: يكتب العنوان باللغتين العربية والإنجليزية. ويجب أن يكون العنوان مختصرا قدر الإمكان ويعبر عن هدف البحث بوضوح ويتبع المنهجية العلمية من حيث الإحاطة والاستقصاء وأسلوب البحث العلمي.

– يذكر الباحث على الصفحة الأولى من البحث اسمه ودرجته العلمية والجامعة أو المؤسسة الأكاديمية التي يعمل بها.

–أن يكون البحث مصوغاً بإحدى الطريقتين الآتيتين:_

1:البحوث الميدانية: يورد الباحث مقدمة يبين فيها طبيعة البحث ومبرراته ومدى الحاجة إليه، ثم يحدد مشكلة البحث، ويجب أن يتضمن البحث الكلمات المفتاحية (مصطلحات البحث)، ثم يعرض طريقة البحث وأدواته، وكيفية تحليل بياناته، ثم يعرض نتائج البحث ومناقشتها والتوصيات المنبثقة عنها، وأخيراً قائمة المراجع.

2:البحوث النظرية التحليلية: يورد الباحث مقدمة يمهد فيها لمشكلة البحث مبيناً فيها أهميته وقيمته في الإضافة إلى العلوم والمعارف وإغنائها بالجديد، ثم يقسم العرض بعد ذلك إلى أقسام على درجة من الاستقلال فيما بينها، بحيث يعرض في كل منها فكرة مستقلة ضمن إطار الموضوع الكلي ترتبط

بما سبقها وتمهد لما يليها، ثم يختم الموضوع بخلاصة شاملة له، وأخيراً
يثبت قائمة المراجع.

–يقدم الباحث ثلاث نسخ ورقية من البحث، وعلى وجه واحد من الورقة(A4)
واحدة منها يكتب عليها اسم الباحث ودرجته العلمية، والنسخ الأخرى تقدم
ويكتب عليها عنوان البحث فقط، ونسخة الكترونية على(Cd) باستخدام
البرنامج الحاسوبي(MS Word).

– يجب ألا تقل صفحات البحث عن 20 صفحة ولا تزيد عن30 صفحة بما
في ذلك صفحات الرسوم والأشكال والجداول وقائمة المراجع .
–يرفق مع البحث ملخصان (باللغة العربية والانجليزية) في حدود (150)
كلمة لكل منهما، وعلى ورقتين منفصلتين بحيث يكتب في أعلى الصفحة
عنوان البحث ولا يتجاوز الصفحة الواحدة لكل ملخص.

–يُترك هامش مقداره 3 سم من جهة التجليد بينما تكون الهوامش الأخرى
2.5 سم، المسافة بين الأسطر مسافة ونصف، يكون نوع الخط المستخدم
في المتن 12 Times New Roman للغة الانجليزية و مسافة و نصف
بخط 14 Simplified Arabic للأبحاث باللغة العربية.

–في حالة وجود جداول وأشكال وصور في البحث يكتب رقم وعنوان الجدول
أو الشكل والصورة في الأعلى بحيث يكون موجزاً للمحتوى وتكتب الحواشي

في الأسفل بشكل مختصر كما يشترط لتنظيم الجداول اتباع نظام الجداول المعترف به في جهاز الحاسوب ويكون الخط بحجم 12.

-يجب أن ترقم الصفحات ترقيماً متسلسلاً بما في ذلك الجداول والأشكال والصور واللوحات وقائمة المراجع .

طريقة التوثيق:

-يُشار إلى المصادر والمراجع في متن البحث بأرقام متسلسلة توضع بين قوسين إلى الأعلى هكذا: (1)، (2)، (3)، ويكون ثبوتها في أسفل صفحات البحث، وتكون أرقام التوثيق متسلسلة موضوعة بين قوسين في أسفل كل صفحة، فإذا كانت أرقام التوثيق في الصفحة الأولى مثلاً قد انتهت عند الرقم (6) فإن الصفحة التالية ستبدأ بالرقم (1).

-ويكون توثيق المصادر والمراجع على النحو الآتي:

اولا :الكتب المطبوعة: اسم المؤلف ثم لقبه، واسم الكتاب مكتوبا بالبنط الغامق، واسم المحقق أو المترجم، والطبعة، والناشر، ومكان النشر، وسنته، ورقم المجلد – إن تعددت المجلدات– والصفحة. مثال: أبو عثمان عمرو بن بحر الجاحظ، الحيوان. تحقيق وشرح: عبد السلام محمد هارون، ط2، مصطفى البابي الحلبي، القاهرة، 1965م،ج3،ص40. ويشار إلى المصدر عند وروده مرة ثانية على النحو الآتي: الجاحظ، الحيوان، ج، ص.

ثانيا: الكتب المخطوطة: اسم المؤلف ولقبه، واسم الكتاب مكتوبا بالبنط الغامق، واسم المخطوط مكتوبا بالبنط الغامق، ومكان المخطوط، ورقمه، ورقم اللوحة أو الصفحة. مثال: شافع بن علي الكناني، الفضل المأثور من سيرة السلطان الملك المنصور. مخطوط مكتبة البودليان باكسفورد، مجموعة مارش رقم (424)، ورقة 50.

ثالثا: الدوريات: اسم كاتب المقالة، عنوان المقالة موضوعاً بين علامتي تنصيص " "، واسم الدورية مكتوباً بالبنط الغامق، رقم المجلد والعدد والسنة، ورقم الصفحة، مثال: جرار، صلاح: "عناية السيوطي بالتراث الأندلسي– مدخل"، مجلة جامعة القاهرة للبحوث والدراسات، المجلد العاشر، العدد الثاني، سنة 1415هـ/ 1995م، ص179.

رابعا: الآيات القرآنية والاحاديث النبوية:– تكتب الآيات القرآنية بين قوسين مزهرين بالخط العثماني﴿ ﴾ مع الإشارة إلى السورة ورقم الآية. وتثبت الأحاديث النبوية بين قوسين مزدوجين « » بعد تخريجها من مظانها.

ملاحظة: لا توافق هيئة التحرير على تكرار الاسم نفسه (اسم الباحث) في عددين متتالين وذلك لفتح المجال أمام جميع أعضاء هيئة التدريس للنشر.

فهرس المحتويات

The Effectiveness of Teaching Grammar in Context: Teaching Conjunctions as an Example

Mohammed O. Ramadan

This study seeks to find out whether or not teaching conjunctions in the context can help improve these Libyan EFL learners' use of these devices. In so doing, a quasi-experimental design with pre- and post-intervention control group (CG henceforth) and treatment group (TG henceforth) was used to collect data. The results of pre-intervention results of both groups showed that the Libyan EFL learners experience different sorts of problems (namely misuse, underuse and overuse) in using conjunctions. An intervention course was then conducted where the TG was taught conjunctions in the context of their use in texts, while the CG was taught conjunctions in the traditional way (i.e. the way conjunctions are taught in the Libyan context). The post-intervention results for the CG showed little or no improvement in using conjunctions whereas the TG showed significant improvements in the use of conjunctions. This improvement was reflected in greater properties of correct use and fewer cases of misuse, underuse, and overuse. More diversity in using conjunctions was also evident, including in the TG participants' use of conjunctions which had not been used before. This suggests the need to move towards teaching grammar in context rather than in isolation, as currently is often the case in ELT in Libya.

Keywords: conjunctions, context, teaching, Libyan EFL leaners

1. Introduction:

Libyan students, as many EFL Learners, face many English language problems. One which is often noticed in the writing of Libyan Learners of English as a Foreign Language (LLsEFL henceforth) is a lack of cohesion and coherence (El-Aswad 2002; Aldabbus 2008). In his work contrasting the composition processes involved in Arabic and English, El-Aswad (ibid: 307) argued that, generally speaking, one of the most common features in the writing of Libyan third year university students was the lack of cohesive devices in general and conjunctions in particular. This often made the writing unclear and, therefore, harder to follow. No doubt many factors contribute to this problem, but surely the lack or improper use of conjunctions is a major problem which contributes to the lack of cohesion in LLsEFL writing. It has been widely reported in previous studies (e.g. Halliday and Hasan 1976; Witte and Faigley 1981; that the use of conjunctions as well as other cohesive devices contributes greatly to the cohesiveness and coherence of texts. Since conjunctions are one of the essential requirements for a cohesive text, one would assume that their improper use would cause problems in its flow. From my own experience as a student and then a teacher in Libya, I have often observed that the use of conjunctions is problematic for LLsEFL. Therefore, this study aims to look at this issue and explore the sorts of the problems that LEFLL have in using these devices and to try to test whether or not teaching conjunctions in context would help these learners improve their use of these devices.

2. Literature Review:

2.1 Definitions of English Conjunctions

Conjunctions are one type of rhetorical resources available in English for producing coherent discourse. They serve to both relate what has been said previously to what follows (as shown in examples 1a-1d above) so as to form a unified whole instead of a collection of irrelevant fragments, and specify the relationships among the discourse segments they unite (Greenbaum and Quirk 1990). Their explicit signalling of the connections between the segments renders them salient devices for shaping textual coherence. However, "conjunctive elements [i.e. conjunctions] are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:226). This statement reveals a couple of significant aspects of the meaning of an expression when it functions as a conjunction. One is that a conjunction does not raise new propositions in a single integrated text; the other is that every conjunction has a central meaning which is enriched by the context. They can occur in more than one form, include coordinating (e.g. 'but', 'and') and subordinating conjunctions (e.g. 'because', 'although'), adverbs (e.g. 'however', 'moreover') and prepositional phrases (e.g. 'in addition', 'on the contrary'). In addition to the above categories, Conjunctions can link "units of discourse of differing sizes" (Biber et al. 1999:725). These units can vary from clauses to sentences, to paragraphs and even to longer expanses of discourse (Quirk et al. 1985). In Halliday and Hasan's (1976:232) view, "cohesion is a relation between sentences, not a relation within the sentence". The sentence here means an independent clause which consists of a subject and a finite verb which can be used on its own. As a result, fundamental criterion is that the minimal units connected must be no less than clauses. If the connected constituents were words or phrases, then the expression could not be incorporated into the

realm of conjunctions. Moreover, as mentioned earlier, cohesion is an inter-sentential relation rather than an intra-sentential one. The relationship which conjunctions represent must extend beyond the sentence in which they occur. Moreover, conjunctions mark the semantic relationship between linguistic segments they link. In the process of forming a coherent discourse, what conjunctions actually combine are propositional rather than grammatical constituents (Nunan 1999:304). Any two linguistic segments with an independent proposition can be placed side by side in a multitude of ways. Their association can consequently be constructed in numerous ways as well. The employment of a conjunction clarifies the relationship between two segments by the strength of the specific meanings it has. In the same vein, in defining conjunctions, Nunan (ibid) stated that they "make explicit the functional relationships between different ideas in a text". Acting as landmarks, conjunctions signal how one idea relates to another (Leech and Svartvik 1994).

2.2 Importance of Conjunctions in Written Discourse

Although many people are in no doubt about the importance of this category of linguistic items, some may not see them as such. Those who believe that conjunctions are not an essential set of propositions, consequently, does not see that their underuse or misuse as causing serious breakdowns in communication, they probably look at conjunctions from the rather narrow perspective of grammar. In other words, conjunctions are seen in terms of their weight in grammar in comparison with other more important categories such as the tenses and passive voice. However, if one looks at conjunctions and their functions in a broader perspective, in terms of how they operate and function within longer stretches

of language (i.e. discourse) one would soon come to realise the significant and necessary role they play alongside other categories of grammar in signifying meaning. The importance of conjunctions in the production of good quality texts is strongly correlated with the functions they perform in written communication. Owing to "physical distance and temporal distance" (Brown 2001:304) between the writer and the reader, writing lacks the paralinguistic and kinetic channels such as facial expression, head or eye movement, gesture and tone of voice, available in spoken interaction. Lexicalization and syntactic structures become the principal media through which the writer can encode meaning (Tannen 1982, cited in Brown 2001). Writing, however, does involve numerous linguistic features carrying similar capabilities to those of paralinguistic to add support or emphasis and to convey the interlocutors' attitudes in spoken discourse. Conjunctions are one of such linguistic features. And the appropriate use of conjunctions is an essential element for students to acquire as they learn to write, as asserted by researchers on discourse and writing pedagogy (e.g. McCarthy 1991). This necessity mainly derives from their signalling function. Conjunctions not only signal the logical flow of a text to the reader but also signal the writer's line of thought toward the shape of his/her argument. That is, by using a conjunction, the writer is guiding readers in the direction of his/her argument by showing them the relationship between propositions such as in using a contrast, additive, and exemplification. In other words, the use of conjunctions, as Blakemore (1987:77) explains, help to minimises the effort needed by the reader to process the intended meaning by directing him/her towards the intended interpretation of our utterances. To fulfil the signalling function, conjunctions,

make discourse structures obvious, and notify the reader of the progression of discourse content. Communication in English tends to be sender-centred compared with Semitic (including Arabic) and East-Asian languages. For example, punctuation marks, which are considered to be essential in writing, did not exist in Arabic until recently (Othman 2004). In fact, even in modern written Arabic texts, punctuation marks are still not treated as important and, therefore, it is still not uncommon to read a written text with very few or no punctuation marks. Unlike in English for example, Arabic tends to leave the task of defining the boundaries of sentences and propositions in the text to the reader who is expected to work out these features from the co-text and context. In other words, there is more onus in Arabic on the reader to establish the intended meaning. In English, it is the writer's responsibility to make the focus and direction of a text lucid and thus it becomes more relatively important how the writer joins her/his ideas together. This then has a great deal to do with how successful the communication is. The employment of conjunctions can assist in easing the reconstructive role of the reader and accomplishing the goal of written communication more economically, since "connections reflect the writer's positioning of one point in relation to another in creating a text" (Basturkmen 2002:51).

As for reading comprehension, although research findings on whether or not conjunctions play a role in facilitating reading have been contradictory, many believe that they do contribute to reading comprehension. Geva (1992, cited in Innajih 2007), for instance, found that the better university level EFLLs handled the logical implications of conjunctions in reading tasks, the better

they could integrate and understand textual information. Moreover, conjunctions convey the writer's attitudes and emphases on the arrangement of discourse proposition. In contrast with other constituents of clauses, conjunctions have a "relatively detached role" (Quirk et al. 1985:631). They are not an indispensible part of the prepositional content of the sentences which they join. However, their absence does remove a powerful clue about the writer's perception of the connections between antecedent and subsequent ideas. Conjunctions allow the writer to mark the development of their arguments and reflect the decision to highlight certain relationships in the text to accommodate the reader's understanding. Through this mechanism, the writer obtains the power to manoeuvre information flow in order to constrain what can be recovered from the discourse, and guides the reader towards the writer's preferred interpretations so that his/her intentions can be accurately inferred (Biber et al. 1999). Conjunctions, hence, play a critical role in facilitating the progress of written communication, and EFLLs should be trained in their use so as to lower the possibility of misinterpretation in their writing. However, mastering the use of conjunctions is a challenging undertaking for EFLLs who are not always capable of taking advantage of conjunctions and difficulties are often encountered.

2.3 *Sources of Difficulty Among EFLLs in Learning Conjunctions*

The difficulty that encounters many EFL learners in learning can be largely attributed to two sources: the linguistic nature of conjunctions (Tanko 2004) and the other concerns the teaching of conjunctions (Crewe 1999; Milton and Tsang 2003). The

linguistic factors which make learning conjunctions difficult are their semantic, syntactic and discourse-functional characteristics. The first difficulty stems from the abstract and ambiguous meanings of conjunctions. To master the use of a conjunction, EFLLs need to know the meaning of the word (Steffani and Nippold 1997). However, the meaning of conjunctions is often elusive, which makes it hard for learners to appreciate their essence. ''Although it seems likely that the commoner, more comprehensible ones [conjunctions] can provide a clue to the logical structure of text, many others are too abstract or too opaque to offer much help'' (Wright and Leung 1985:61). The cause of such elusiveness can be explained in accordance with Blakemore's idea of procedural meaning. Blakemore (1992) proposed that conjunctions do not have a conceptual meaning, which specifies a definite set of semantic features, in the same way of lexical items such as 'boy' and 'girl' do, but they only have a procedural meaning which contains instruction on how to manipulate the representation of conceptual meaning in a text. Another source of difficulty also related to the meaning of conjunctions is their hidden nuances. Parrott (2000) pointed out that clear differences in meaning between conjunctions are often exceedingly subtle. For instance, how to distinguish the use of the conjunction 'besides' from 'moreover' can be confusing. Although these two conjunctions perform similar functions to signifying an additional point in an argument, the difference is that 'besides' is considered to be more proper under certain circumstances. The other source of difficulty for EFLLs originates in the various kinds of syntactic categories conjunctions can occupy. Conjunctions are composed of three types of origins: coordinating and subordinating conjunctions, adverbs, and

prepositional phrases. Examples of these three types are: 'but' as in 'we went to the park, but we did not have time for the museum'; 'although' as in 'they went running, although it was very hot'; and 'however' as in 'the new measures taken by the government seem to be effective. However, there are still many challenges ahead', and 'in spite of' as in 'in spite of the bad weather, many people managed to go out'. Moreover, the multiple functions of conjunctions can be a further source of difficulty. The main role conjunctions play in written discourse is to serve to specify the semantic relations between linguistic units. For example, the role of 'but', in 'They tried but did not succeed' is to explicitly show the contrastive relationship that exists between these two clauses. However, McCarthy (1991) indicated that the relationship between conjunctions and their semantic functions cannot always be established on a one-to-one basis. Many conjunctions in English can signal more than one semantic function. For instance, in Quirk et al.'s (1985) model of classification the conjunction 'in other words' is located in the appositive category and in the inferential category as well as in the reformulatory group in the contrastive category. The final source of difficulty in learning conjunction is the methods of teaching them (Milton and Tsang 2003; Tanko 2004). While introducing these devices, writing textbooks normally provide learners with lists of conjunctions categorised according to their semantic functions, such as adversative or causal relations, without further explanation of the semantic, syntactic and stylistic restrictions of individual conjunctions. Zamel (1983:24) argued that "because these lists do not demonstrate how cohesive devices establish the logical relationship between the ideas presented, they are ineffective as an aid in teaching these links". For lack of context,

such lists are neither able to assist students in identifying the types of linguistic elements conjunctions usually occurs with, nor are they able to assist students in comprehending the scope of the linguistic units that conjunctions can span. The way conjunctions are presented may also lead students to conclude that words under the same functional category are equivalent and interchangeable. In fact, even though conjunctions under the same category do share similar semantic functions, there are many subtle nuances of their meanings. In addition, conjunctions belonging to the same category could relate to dissimilar parts of speech and carry different grammatical weight. EFLLs who follow the advice and alternate conjunctions with one another can jeopardise the readability of their compositions because the apparent alternatives may represent different logical or illogical progressions in an argument.

2.4 Presentation of Conjunctions in Libyan EFL Textbooks

In the textbooks that I reviewed, the textual cohesion was in most cases non-existent. In some cases where cohesive devices were introduced; they are done so inconsistently and in a potentially misleading way. Conjunctions, as with many other grammatical elements, are still very much considered at the level of the sentence in most Libyan EFL text-books. The following is an example of how conjunctions are presented in some Libya EFL text-books:

Table 1: An example of how conjunctions presented in one of the Libyan EFL text-books

Additive words	Also, and, as well as, besides, equally important, further, furthermore, in addition, likewise, moreover, too, not only….but also.
Amplifications words	As, for example, for instance, in fact, such as, that is, to illustrate.
Contrast words	But, conversely, despite, even though, however, in contrast, on the one hand/on the other hand, although, whereas, yet, nevertheless, on the contrary, in spite of this.
Cause and affect words.	Accordingly, as a result, because, consequently, for this reason, since, as, so, then, therefore, thus.
Summary words	Finally, in conclusion, in short, to sum up, to conclude.

Although teachers may provide one or two examples to illustrate the function of each conjunction, and, in some cases translate these conjunctions into Arabic in order to help the learners understand their meanings, presenting conjunctions in such a list does not help learners to understand their meanings and functions. This is simply because conjunctions are introduced out-of-context and without considering their functions in discourse. As Borkin (1978, cited in Zamel 1983:24) argued, presenting conjunctions in a list is absurd since it gives learners the wrong impression that they express similar logical relationships. These conjunctions cannot be understood without taking into consideration the discourse contexts in which they appear. Dubin and Olshtian

(1980:356) also pointed out that teaching conjunctions in lists can be misleading because it fails to recognise that "the most important characteristic of cohesion is the fact that it does not constitute a class of items but rather a set of relations". Widdowson (1978:15) made the same type of criticism of materials and teaching strategies that focus on the conjuncts to be learned rather than on how these links make contextually related ideas clear and logical. Many other problems are created for EFLLs when they are given such lists. Some conjunctions may have more than one function in English. For example, 'since' can be used to signal time, as in 'since I arrived here, the weather has been awful' or it can signal cause, as in 'since they did not study hard, they failed the exam' (Zamel 1983:25). Another problem with teaching conjunctions in lists is that it classifies conjunctions according to their functions, and thus ignores their semantic and syntactic restrictions, giving the student the wrong idea that they can be used interchangeably (ibid: 22). For example, 'however' and 'but' cannot replace 'on the contrary', despite the fact that they are, according to the list given above, classified in the same category. What makes things worse is not only the way conjunctions are introduced, but also the exercises designed as a follow up. These exercises are designed on the sentence-level and do not really lead learners to appreciate how conjunctions function in a broader context, as further demonstrated in the following exercises:

6.1 Re-write the following sentences using 'although' as in the example below:

Example: *She has a car. She comes to work by train.*

Although she has a car, she comes to work by train.

1-   It was raining. She went out.

2-   She was hungry. She did not eat well.

3-   Ahmed is smart. He didn't do well in the test.

6.2 Re-write the following sentences filling in the blanks with 'unless' or 'therefore':

1-   He cannot go_____ she comes.

2-   _____ you speak to her she won't eat her food.

3-   She is smart_____ , she will pass her exams.

2.5 Previous Studies

As discussed earlier, conjunctions are relatively difficult linguistic items for EFLLs to learn due to their complexity and ambiguity. Moreover, this difficulty is compounded by inappropriate teaching techniques and materials. The combination of these two factors seems to have contributed to their problematic nature for EFLLs. Numerous research studies (e.g. Field and Yip 1992; Granger and Tyson 1996; Altenberg and Tapper 1998; Milton and Tsang 2003; Bolton et al. 2003; Tanko 2004; Jalilifar 2009, among others) have been conducted in the last two decades on the use of conjunctions in EFLLs' written discourse, Crewe (1999:317) has even claimed that the misuse of conjunctions is "a universal" feature of EFLL writing. Although no clear evidence was cited to support this claim, the immense interest to investigate the use of these devices by EFLLs from different L1 backgrounds (e.g. Chinese, French,

Swedish, Hungarian, Iranians, Turkish, Lithuanian, Taiwanese, Hong Kong, Japanese, Spanish, and German) may to some extent justify his claim. Whether or not the misuse of conjunctions is universal is an open question. However, what seems to be agreed on in the literature is that their use is often problematic for EFLLs. Moreover, most of these studies (e.g. Field and Yip 1992; Granger and Tyson 1996; Crewe 1999; Zamel 1999; Altenberg and Tapper 1998; Milton and Tsang 2003; Bolton et al. 2003; Tanko 2004; Jalilifar 2009) categorically agree that the main source of all sorts of problems EFL leaners encounter in using these devices is mainly due to the methods of teaching conjunctions. However, despite this widely shared view, no study, to the best of the present researcher's knowledge, has yet empirically tried any technique or method in order to help to overcome those difficulties. This study, therefore, hopes to contribute to the existing and relevant literature by empirically testing whether or not teaching conjunctions in context could help in improving EFL leaners use of these devices.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Question

The study is designed to answer the following research question:

- To what extent does the teaching of conjunctions in the context of reading lead to improvement in the use of these devices by Libyan students understudy?

3.2 Research Method

To achieve the present study stated aim and question, a quasi-experimental was chosen as a method for gathring the needed

data. In educational research, it is well known that one of the researchers' tasks is to find weaknesses in particular educational phenomena in order to suggest possible remedies. As Bouma and Atkinson (1995:126) reported, "while the other research designs provide useful information, experimental design can provide the most rigorous test of a hypothesis which specifies that X causes Y". Experimentation is defined by Campbell and Stanley (1972:1) as "research in which variables are manipulated and their effects upon other variables observed". In the present study, every effort was made to control all variables that could potentially affect the results. By adopting an experimental approach many issues in education such as comparing one method of teaching or material with another can be considered. However, experimentation has its limitations because, as Campbell and Stanley (1972:4) stressed, "it is a refining process superimposed upon the probably valuable accumulations of wise practice". It is well known that the manipulation and control of all variables can only be applied in a laboratory with inanimate objects. In education, where participants are humans, ethical and legal constrains have also to be considered. Thus, for the reasons mentioned above, the type of experiment taken into consideration the participants' circumstances and the regulations applied by the educational authority in Libya. This ensured that the study was conducted in an atmosphere which students would normally experience in their regular classes, thus preventing affects which could be claimed to have impacted on the study participants' performance in the experiment.

3.4   Study Participants

Participants chosen for this study were fourth year English major students at the University of Sirte, Libya. Fourth year students were selected based on the assumption that they were in their final year at university and, at this level, they should have higher proficiency in English and therefore they would be expected to make fewer mistakes. Table 3.1 below summarizes information about the study's participants.

Table 1: Some background information on the study's participants

No	Nationality	L1	Age	Sex		Type of school	Years of Learning English	English Proficiency
				F	M			
20	Libyans	Arabic	21-24	18	2	Public	10 years (7 years pre- university, 3 years at university)	Fourth year undergraduate /upper-intermediate

As illustrated in Table 3.1, the majority of the participants were female and ages ranged between 21 and 24. All participants were NNSs of English, shared Arabic as their L1 and had studied in state-run public schools. They had all been studying EFL for at least 10 years. Moreover, none of them studied in an English-speaking country and their level of English, according to proficiency standards in the department, was considered to be an upper-intermediate. 20 students took part in this study and they were randomly divided into a CG and TG each consisted of 10 students, as further explained in the next subsection.

3.5 Allocation to the CG & TG

An announcement was made on the department's notice board for fourth year students who might be interested in voluntarily taking part in the study. Initially 33 students came forward and agreed to take part in the study. However, at a later stage, some of the students, for various reasons, asked to be excused from the study. All in all 20 students were happy to stay and take part in the study. The next step was then to divide participants into a CG and a TG. In order to ensure random allocation to the two groups, I assigned a number to each participant, and then used a computer program available online to randomly assign the participants to the CG and TG.

3.6   Intervention Course

3.6.1   Treatment Group

Table 3.2 below provides some information regarding the intervention course including its location, number of participants and their ages and English proficiency levels. The number and the length of sessions in the intervention are also included.

Table **خطأ! لا يوجد نص من النمط المعين في المستند.**2: Summary of the intervention course

Location	Department	English Language and Literature
	University	University of Sirt
	City/ Country	Sirt/Libya
Participants	No	10 Libyan Fourth Year EFL undergraduates
	Gender	9 females/1 male
	Ages	21-24
	English Proficiency	Upper intermediate

Duration of the Intervention	8 weeks	
Number and length of sessions	No of sessions	12 sessions
	Length of session	70-90 minutes
Teacher	The present researcher	

3.6.1.1 Materials & Instructional Activities

Twelve texts were selected to be used in teaching conjunctions to the TG. These texts were carefully selected in consultation with the reading tutor in the department to suit the level of the students. The texts were of different types and represented different genres (e.g. book introductions/ and newspaper articles, see appendix B for samples of these texts)) and were of suitable length for the duration of the class and other activities. For a detailed account for the instructional activities for the TG and TG please refer to appendix C)

3.6   Measuring Instrument

3.6.1   Pre- and Post- Intervention Tests

The pre- and post-intervention test compositions written by the present study's participants were used to measure the learners' use of conjunctions. The pre-intervention compositions were used first to measure the participants' prior knowledge of the use of conjunctions. Following the intervention, both groups were then post-tested in order to measure any improvements in their use of conjunctions compared to the pre-intervention test. When administering the pre-intervention test, neither group was told of the purpose of the exercise. Participants were merely told that it was a data gathering exercise but they should do their

best. At this stage, it was important that participants were not aware of the focus of the exercise as their writing should be as uncontrived as possible. In the post-intervention test, participants were informed that the exercise was similar to the initial exercise (the pre-intervention) and since they had just finished the course on conjunctions, it would be a measure of their ability in using them.

3.6.1.2 Content and Format of Pre- and Post-intervention Tests

Argumentation was chosen to be the mode of the compositions. There were two reasons for choosing this mode. Firstly, there were greater opportunities to elicit a maximum possible number of conjunctions using this mode. Field and Yip (1992:18) contended that conjunctions "are likely to feature much more prominently in argumentative writing than in a description of a holiday outing". The CG and TG were required to write an essay of 350/400 words on one of the following topics:

- In recent years, the education system has witnessed some changes such as the introduction of the new Curriculum which is known as the "Cooperative learning Curriculum".
- Women's lives in the Libyan society have seen dramatic changes over the last twenty years. Some people believe that these have given women a greater role in society and therefore women are now more active and effective in society where others people argue that women's lives have, in fact, become worse due to these changes.
- Many people around the world believe that war in Yemen is totally unjustified. Others, however, argue that there were good reasons for it.

3.7 Selection of Conjunctions; The selection of conjunctions in this study was based on Halliday and Hasan's (1976) taxonomy of conjunctions (See Appendix A).

3.8 Extraction of Conjunctions, Each instance of a conjunction was highlighted and recorded manually in the present study as shown in the following excerpt:

...For example, the students in primary stage need an easy course at subjects and the content of those subjects should be clear. Moreover, I also think that the number of subjects is important because at this stage the learners can't not be able to get many much information at this stage and age... (ESSAY: PTTG46).

To be marked as a conjunction, the expression must be in Halliday and Hasan's list (see appendix A). Moreover, they must satisfy the conditions of the definition of conjunctions discussed above. In terms of grammatical status, conjunctions must belong to one syntactic category which constitute conjunctions; that is, coordinating (e.g. 'and', 'but'), and subordinating conjunctions (e.g. 'because'), adverbs (e.g. 'however', 'nevertheless'), or prepositional phases (e.g. 'in addition', 'in other words'). Secondly, conjunctions must connect linguistic units within and/or above the sentence level.

3.9 Definitions of Misuse, Underuse and Overuse

For the purpose of carrying out the error-analysis of students' compositions, three major problems were identified and they are defined operationally as shown in Table 3.4:

Table خطأ! لا يوجد نص من النمط المعين في المستند.3: Definitions and examples of misuse, underuse and overuse of conjunctions

Categories	Definitions	Examples
Misuse	1-The conjunction used is not consistent with the relationship that exists between the sentences it connects.	I think the old generations of people know better tha[...] young people don't have wise decisions because the[...] from this life as our grandmother and grandfather. **M**[...] young generation have advantages because they have[...] like mobiles, TV, and electronic games and others go[...] didn't have in the past days. (ESSAY: PRCG35, Appendi[...]
	2-The conjunction used is often associated with a different register such as spoken/informal.	1-....After what happening in USA in September the[...] crazy and they say they wanted to kill all terrorism in[...] Iraq was occupied because of its religion because [...] country... **By the way**, may be they will come next t[...] Arabic or Muslim countries saying they wanted to [...]

		PRCG15, Appendix 4)
Underuse	1- A conjunction is not used where it is needed.	The education ministry always try for changes and changes in the education system to improve it better. Six years ago they introduced the postgraduate studies students now able to now do masters and in other PhD. **[However]** The postgraduate system is still no needing many of improvements. **[Thus/Therefore]** students like to go to other countries and complete th (ESSAY: PRCG14, Appendix 4)
Overuse	1-The use of a particular conjunction that has appeared repetitively in an essay when it is not necessary.	...I know other things in the world better than the w **and** we can spend the world money **and** resources fo **And** we can spend the money to help the poor people any foods **and** waters in some areas in the world. **A** spending the money **and** resources **and** in how we the planet what called the climate change in the w should concerned in how to make the energy res futures. **And t**he money for the war of Iraq can be sp drugs and diseases such AIDS **and** is killing millio countries and in parts...(ESSAY: PRCG13, Appendix 4)

3.9 Data Analysis Method

The data was analysed quantitatively using manual and statistical analysis and qualitatively using text analysis. The manual analysis was conducted by manually counting all cases of correct use, misuse, underuse, and overuse in each essay and the total use of each category was then counted in all essays and the sum was multiplied by 100 and divided by the total sum of all conjunctions used in each group's individual essays to obtain the percentage of use in each category. For instance, in order to obtain the percentage of correct use in the CG, the number of correct uses (70) was multiplied by 100 (=700) which was then divided by the total usage of this category (285) which gives us the percentage of the correct use of 24.56%. As for the statistical analysis

(using SPSS, version 2007), a paired-sampled t-test was conducted to see if any statistical significant improvement has occurred after the intervention.

4. Results & Discussion

4.2 Pre-Intervention Results

4.2.1 Overall Frequency of Conjunctions

Table 4.1 below presents the total number of words and the total conjunction tokens in the pre-intervention data. The frequency of conjunctions based on 1,000 words is also given to facilitate a comparison with the overall figures. This is because there seems to be a marginal difference in the length of essays written by the two groups. Information about the number of conjunction types used by the two groups is shown last.   Table.4: Summary of total number and types of conjunctions per words

Groups	CG	TG
Total number of words in the essays	6883	6939
Number of conjunctions	285	303
Conjs. per 1000 words	41.15	43.66
Types of conjunctions	18	21

As can be seen in the above table, out of a total of 6883 words used in the CG essays, 285 conjunctions were identified whereas in the TG 303 conjunctions were employed out of a total of 6939 words used in all their essays. This suggests that the groups are very similar in the frequency of using conjunctions.

4.2.2   Pre- intervention Results in the CG & TG

4.2.2.1 Results of Misuse, Underuse and Overuse

As revealed in the table below, misuse is the most common feature in the pre-intervention data. Table 4.2 also reveals that in the CG conjunctions were misused 101 times out of 285 times. The situation is similar in the TG where conjunctions were misused 118 times out of 330 times the essays. As for the underuse, both experimental groups were similar in their levels of underuse, indicating that participants did not use a conjunction in about 30% of the occasions where they could (or should) have done so. However, although these figures are useful in giving us a general picture overall underuse, another look at underuse in each semantic category was needed in order to find out whether or not specific semantic categories tended to be underused. Finally, the overuse is the third most common feature in our data. Although the overall total of overuse, according to Table 4.4, is slightly higher in the TG than in the CG, their percentages are almost identical. This slight difference of overuse between the two groups is probably due to the fact that, TG participants used more conjunctions in general than those in the CG.

Table.5: Use of conjunctions in CG and TG pre-intervention

Groups		Correct Use	Misuse	Underuse	Overuse	Total
CG	Number	70	101	85	29	285
	Percentage	24.56%	35.45%	29.82%	10.17%	100%
TG	Number	77	118	100	35	330
	Percentage	23.4%	35.7%	30.3%	10.6%	100%

4.3   Post-intervention Results

4.3.1   CG Post-intervention Results

As can be seen from below (Table 4.8), there has been almost no improvement in the CG's use of conjunctions. In fact, the results suggest that in the categories of misuse and overuse, performance seems to have deteriorated in the post-intervention test. Although it is not clear why this happened, it might be merely because participants used more

conjunctions in the post-intervention test. This might be because, even though participants were not told about the focus of the intervention, in the fear that this might affect the outcome of the study, focusing specifically on conjunctions could have led to the production of more of them. Another reason could be that participants might have been told by someone in the department about the aim of the study (i.e. to investigate the use of conjunctions), which could have given them the impression that they should use more conjunctions in their writing. What is important to note here, however, is that despite the increase in the quantity of conjunctions used in the post-intervention test, the quality of their use did not improve. According to Table 4.8, the only category which seems to have improved in the post-intervention is underuse. Again, this is not surprising taking into account, as just mentioned, that the number of conjunctions used is higher than in the pre-intervention test.

Table.6: Summary of use of conjunctions in CG pre and post-intervention

Test-type		Correct Use	Misuse	Underuse	Overuse	Total
Pre-intervention	Number	70	101	85	29	285
	Percentage	24.56%	35.45%	29.82%	10.17%	100%
Post-intervention	Number	77	146	71	45	339
	Percentage	22.6%	43.5%	20.7%	13.2%	100%

Even though the results so far reveal no clear improvement between the CG pre- and post-intervention results, a further t-test was conducted to ensure that there was no statistically significant improvement. The mean and the standard deviations of the scores are shown in Table 4.9 below.

Table.7: Mean and standard deviation of CG pre- and post-intervention results

Category	Test	Mean	SD
Correct use	Pre-intervention	2.19	1.030
	Post intervention	2.41	0.946
Misuse	Pre- intervention	3.75	1.391
	Post- intervention	4.25	1.270
Overuse	Pre- intervention	1.13	0.942
	Post- intervention	1.41	0.946
Underuse	Pre- intervention	2.69	1.281
	Post- intervention	2.22	1.408

A paired-samples t-test was selected for this comparison of the results for the same group. The null hypothesis here states that 'there was no significant difference between the means of the CG's pre- and post-intervention results. The level of significance was chosen to be 0.05, as commonly used in the social sciences. The t-test was conducted on all categories of use (i.e. correct use, misuse, underuse and overuse) and the results are shown in table 4.10:

Table.8: CG pre- and post-intervention t-test results

Category	Test	Mean	SD	P-value
Correct use	Pre-intervention	2.19	1.030	.344
	Post intervention	2.41	0.946	
Misuse	Pre- intervention	3.75	1.391	.084
	Post- intervention	4.25	1.270	
Overuse	Pre- intervention	1.13	0.942	.174
	Post- intervention	1.41	0.946	
Underuse	Pre- intervention	2.69	1.281	.150
	Post- intervention	2.22	1.408	

As shown in the Table 4.10, all probability values are greater than the threshold value of 0.05. This means that there were no statistically

730

significant differences between the means of the CG pre- and post-intervention results. This suggests that the traditional teaching programme has had little or no effect on the CG use of conjunctions.

4.3.2   TG Post-intervention Results

The results presented in table 4.11 below indicate that although the number of conjunctions used in the pre- and post-intervention tests are very similar (330 and 340 respectively), there have been clear improvements in every category in the post-intervention test. For example, in the pre-intervention, participants used conjunctions correctly 23.4% of the time whereas in the post-intervention they were used properly 60.58%, an increase of 37.18%. This improvement is attributed to the effect of the intervention where participants were shown how conjunctions function in texts and how NSs use them in real life communication. This way of teaching grammar rules meaningfully facilitates the learning of structure of the target language. Krashen (1981) stated that grammatical structures can be internalized if learners are situated in a particular context in which they use the structures for authentic communication.

Table.9: Use of conjunctions in TG pre-intervention results

Groups		Correct Use	Misuse	Underuse	Overuse	Total
Pre-intervention	Number	77	118	100	35	330
	Percentage	23.4%	35.7%	30.3%	10.6%	100%
Post-intervention	Number	206	58	46	30	340
	Percentage	60.58%	17.5%	13.52%	8.85%	100%

Having looked at the quantitative results which suggest a substantial improvement in the TG, the qualitative results are presented and discussed next to see how the improvement suggested by the quantitative results is reflected in the participants' actual use of conjunctions.

i.   Correct use

As pointed out above, correct use increased significantly in the post-intervention test. This is further supported by the qualitative analysis which shows that participants had begun to use conjunctions more appropriately in the post-intervention, as illustrated in the following examples:

Example (1a/pre-intervention)

...(1) I think the old generations of people know better than now. Today young people don't have wise decisions because they don't learn from this life as our grandmother and grandfather. (2) Moreover, the young generation have advantages because they have technologies like mobiles, TV, and electronic games and others good things that didn't have in the past days... (ESSAY: PRCG35).

Example (1b/post-intervention) *...The system of education changed as a result of society changes. Moreover, the system of education changes also reflect changes of people changes and the society in general...The changes like these are very important to improve the system and improve it better for the students and the teachers. However, I see only on problem for me with the changes which that no one tested the changes before they apply we try it in our education. ..... Finally, changes can lead to good and better things but we need carefulness in doing them and try to test gradually and no overnight. (ESSAY: PTTG5,).*

These two extracts were written by the same participant. This student writer used one conjunction in the pre- intervention test but it was used inappropriately since it did not indicate the relationship that existed between sentences 1 and 2. In the post-intervention test, however, the

student writer used four conjunctions and they were all used appropriately. The student writer in example 1b seems to have been aware of the relationship between his/her sentences, which helped him/her to choose the appropriate conjunctions. This improvement in the participants' understanding of the relationship between sentences and paragraphs is, I believe, probably due to the intervention where great attention was paid to how ideas and arguments develop in a text and how conjunctions and other linguistic devices are used to signal these developments. One of the activities included in the intervention, for example, aimed to raise the learners' awareness of patterns in the texts. This involved presenting learners with examples of texts that show coherence and cohesion. The students read through the text individually, then I led the class in discussing the patterns which existed in it and how one part is related to another. For example, when using the sample text about polar bears, I asked students what the conventional thinking about animals adopting offspring (sentence 2) and what the new idea is (sentence 3). I then highlighted the sequence of sentences 2 and 3 as a 'hypothetical-real' reason, and asked about other relationships between sentence 1 and sentences 2, 3 and 4 as a 'preview-detail' pattern, and the relationship between sentences 3 and 4 as a 'consequence-cause' pattern. Following this, I asked students to suggest devices that could be used to overtly signal these relationships among ideas present in the text. The aim of such activity was twofold: to draw the learners' attention to typical patterns in English texts, and emphasizes the need for writers to consider how their ideas are related, and how to sequence ideas to reflect the nature of the relationships which, I believe, are needed in deciding whether or not to use a conjunction and which one to use. These activities seemed to be very helpful in guiding the participants to choose the appropriate conjunctions in linking their sentences, as demonstrated by the post-intervention results.

ii. Underuse, Underuse is the second most improved category after misuse. This suggests that the TG participants had started to realize that the presence of

conjunctions can, to a large extent, reduce the effort needed for readers to process a text by explicitly marking the relationship between sentences. The following example illustrates how TG participants seemed to have become aware of the need for conjunctions to mark the relationships between sentences:

Example (2a/pre-intervention) *In the past times the education was very a bit boring because the teachers was control of the classroom and he make big part of teaching. Teachers controlling and everything and all the teaching depending so much on teachers. (1)[However]With the changes happening now I think can help make good improvements in classrooms. One good thing in changes is we have semesters system not like before for one year studying. Semester system the students can have breaks and its short than a years system. (2) [Moreover/In addition, etc] Changing the system of exams I think good and useful than before because now there styles of questions and more interesting than in past exams papers. (3)[Finally/To sum up, etc]I think I like little bit of changes happening and we need more and more different things like teachers needing aids and tools not only blackboards. Any good* system of education can't be worked by itself we need to help and improve all the sides in education like teachers, classroom, equipments etc... (ESSAY: PRTG12).

Example (2b/post-intervention) *There is four of the stages in Libyan system of education. Firstly primary school, it is consisting of six years. At this stage the students enters...Secondly, preparatory schools which includes three years.... For example, in the primary school, students studying the basic of subjects such as maths, Arabic and religion. However, in the last three recent years the students studying the three basic of subjects and the three other general subjects. ...Thirdly, the secondary schools which are different in Libya from the other countries and we call... Finally, after students completed from the secondary school they enter... (ESSAY: PTTG21).*

What can be seen from these two examples written by the same participant is that in the post-intervention he/she started to use conjunctions to link the text. Although it can be argued that even without the presence of conjunctions example 2a is still comprehendible, there is no doubt that the presence of conjunctions in example 2b makes it much easier for the reader to follow the ideas and the arguments. Moreover, even though conjunctions are often seen as optional, since

they do not contribute to the propositional content of a message, their presence could tell us about the competence of the writer. As Schiffrin (1987:67) put it "discourse markers [i.e. Conjunctions] tell us not only about the linguistic properties (e.g. semantic and pragmatic meanings, source, functions) of a set of frequently used expressions, and the organization of social interaction and situations in which they are used, but also about the cognitive, expressive, social and textual competence of those who use them". Moreover, conjunctions signal not only the logical flow of a text to the reader but also the writer's line of thought towards the shape of his/her argument. That is, by using a conjunction, the writer is guiding the readers in the direction of his/her argument by showing them the relationship between propositions such as in contrast, addition, and exemplification. This helps to minimise the effort needed by the reader to process the intended meaning by directing him/her towards the intended interpretation of the utterances (Blakemore 1987). The improvement in the participants' clear lines of thinking and their awareness and understanding of how their texts developed is probably a result of the intervention, where great emphasis was placed on how writers develop their ideas and arguments and how conjunctions as well as other devices are used to show such transitions explicitly. Of course, one could claim that there are other linguistic devices which could be used to help readers understand the text, and that the presence of conjunctions is not always crucial. However, as discussed earlier, conjunctions not only serve syntactic and cohesive functions, but rhetorical ones too. Conjunctions provide the writer with a means of regulating the way in which readers will interpret the text (Mauranen 1992). In this sense, their importance is not limited to making the text hang together or reducing the readers' choices in the process of reception and making sense but also in constituting a potentially effective mean means of persuading readers to see things as the writer does, or as the writer wants them to see things (ibid). Having that said, the use of conjunctions should not be overemphasised at the expense of other cohesive devices. Over-emphasizing the need for using

conjunctions might lead to overuse which in turn would have a negative effect on the writing quality. Tanko (2004: 44) further argued that overuse "can have a disastrous effect on the clarity of a writer's message and produce an adverse effect on the reader". This adverse effect has been also observed although not frequently, in some of our participants post-intervention essays. Crewe (1999:324) also argued that using more conjunctions than are actually needed makes the text less comprehensible. In his words: "overuse [of conjunctions] at best clutters the text unnecessarily, and at worst causes the thread of the argument to zigzag". Even though the main focus of this study is on improving the current participants' use of conjunctions, the main emphasis of the intervention was not only to encourage learners to use more conjunctions but rather to show them how ideas develop in texts and how writers use certain devices (including conjunctions) in order to explicitly signal those relationships. For example, in the text about the 'polar bears' mentioned earlier, I pointed out to the learners that the text uses only one conjunction but we, as readers, are able to infer how the ideas are related. Students were told that writers also make their writing cohesive by using lexical ties, such as the use of word repetition, synonyms and antonyms, and superordinates. However, the fact that the participants used 340 conjunctions in the post-intervention test suggests that more practice is needed to help these learners make use of other types of cohesive ties.

iii.   *Overuse* >The slight decrease found in overuse was surprising since the results indicated that the use of 'and', which was responsible for almost all of the overuse in the data, had substantially decreased in the post-intervention test. For this reason, the participants' post-intervention essays were examined closely in searching for the possible cause of this continuing overuse. It was found that, although participants reduced their use of 'and', they tended to overuse other conjunctions such as 'moreover'. This probably explained the only slight improvement in overuse in the post-intervention test in the TG, as further demonstrated in the following examples:

Example (3a) (pre-intervention)*...And we can spend the money to help the poor people living without any foods and waters in some areas in the world. And we can be spending the money and resources and in how we can to protect the planet what called the climate change in the world. And we should concerned in how to make the energy resources in for futures. And the money for the war of Iraq can be spended for the drugs and diseases such AIDS and is killing millions in African countries and in parts... (ESSAY: PRCG13).*

Example (3b) (post-intervention)*...Nowadays, you can say that every one has education because education is for all people in Libya. But in the past people couldn't get education in particular for women. Moreover, our grandmothers did not educated because the situation was very hard and the society did n't given chance to learn... Moreover, women have rights now and women work in every job like the men. Moreover, women in Libya take very much care of the families... (ESSAY: PTTG18).*

Although two different subjects are discussed in these examples due to the choices of topics available, they were written by the same participant. In the pre-intervention essay (example 3a) 'and' was used very frequently and exclusively to link the text, whereas in the post-intervention essay (example 3b) it was used only occasionally and 'moreover' was overused instead. The fact that participants reduced their use of 'and' while starting to overuse other conjunctions such as 'moreover' is probably because it was assumed that the intention of the intervention course was to have them use less of 'and' and more of other conjunctions. Of course, this is true to some extent, but the intention was not merely to have them replace 'and' with other conjunctions. Rather it was to make them aware of conjunctions which could serve similar functions by explaining to them the difference between the usage of this word in English and Arabic and encouraging them to think of other possible choices before they used it. The explanation of the differences and similarities between the L1 and L2, especially in the use of 'and', was often conducted in Arabic. The use of L1 has been advocated by some researchers as a useful technique in FL teaching, especially when dealing with difficult grammatical concepts (Mohammed 1998; de la

Campa and Nassaji 2009).   A recent study by de la Campa and Nassaji (2009, cited in Nassaji and Fotos 2011) of the amount, purpose, and reason for L1 use in FL classrooms concluded that teachers tended to use it most frequently for instructional purposes, for example in explaining difficult grammatical concepts, translating lexical meanings, and providing instructions for communicative tasks and activities. One of the most widely recommended uses of the learners' mother-tongue is the presentation of contrastive comparisons between two languages so as to make learners aware of their differences and similarities (ibid). This technique is believed to help learners understand when to transfer from their native language and when not to. In this study, the use of L1 was aimed, and only limited, to explaining the similarities and differences in the uses and functions of conjunctions when this was likely to be influenced by the L1 such as 'and'. The post-intervention results presented so far suggest that, despite some less encouraging results, the TG seemed to have shown improvement in the use of conjunctions compared with the pre-intervention test. However, in order to be sure that these results are statistically significant and could not have occurred merely by chance, a t-test analysis examined the post-intervention improvement. The means and the standard deviations of the data are shown in Table 4.12.

Table.10: Mean and standard deviation of TG pre- and post-intervention results

Category	Test	Mean	SD
Correct use	Pre-intervention	2.44	1.366
	Post intervention	6.56	1.625
Misuse	Pre- intervention	3.66	2.522
	Post- intervention	1.81	1.091
Overuse	Pre- intervention	1.09	1.532
	Post- intervention	0.69	.535
	Pre- intervention	3.13	1.809

738

Underuse	Post- intervention	1.44	0.840

The null hypothesis of the t-test in this case states that 'there was no statistically significant difference between the performance of the TG in relation to the correct use, misuse, overuse and underuse of conjunctions before and after the intervention. The t-test results are summarized in Table 4.13:

Table.11: TG pre- and post-intervention t-test results

Category	Test	Mean	SD	P-value
Correct use	Pre-intervention	2.44	1.366	.001
	Post intervention	6.56	1.625	
Misuse	Pre- intervention	3.66	2.522	.001
	Post- intervention	1.81	1.091	
Overuse	Pre- intervention	1.09	1.532	.030
	Post- intervention	0.69	0.535	
Underuse	Pre- intervention	3.13	1.809	.001
	Post- intervention	1.44	0.840	

According to this Table, all the t-statistics probability values are lower than the threshold value of 0.05. This shows that there are statistically significant differences between the means of the pre- and post-intervention scores. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected in all cases. This improvement is claimed to be a result of the intervention, which aimed at making learners aware of other conjunctions and how they are used in text. In other words, because learners had been shown how conjunctions are employed in texts and the function that they serve, they became more confident in using other terms which express the intended relationship. For example, one of the common misuses found in the pre-intervention data was that learners use 'moreover' to mark a contrastive relationship or to use 'however' to mark an additive relation. When

students were shown how ideas and propositions are developed in the text and how conjunctions and other devices to express relationships between sentences, the learners seemed to have become more aware that conjunctions are not used randomly but rather express specific relationships implied by the global and local discourse preceding and following them. To sum up, it is apparent from the TG's post-intervention results that it gained good improvements in the use of conjunctions. These results provide an answer to the research question, namely: 'Does teaching conjunctions in the context of reading lead to improvement in the use of these devices by LLsEFL?' However, it is worth noting at this point that improvements in the participants' ability to use conjunctions differed between categories of use. One reason for this is probably the relatively short duration of the intervention of 8 weeks, which may not have been long enough for all of the participants to fully understand how each conjunction functions in a text. Secondly, although all participants shared a very similar educational background and every care was taken to ensure that they had similar levels of language proficiency, there were inevitably individual differences among learners which could have impacted on overall improvements. Language learning is a highly complex process involving many factors such as learners' readiness to acquire a particular form, motivation, and teaching quality amongst others (Nassaji and Fotos 2011:136).

5. Conclusion:

The aim of this study has been to find out whether or not teaching conjunctions in the context would help to improve the LLsEFL use of conjunctions. The results have shown that there was a significant improvement in the use of conjunctions when they were taught in context. However, despite this improvement in the use of conjunctions, the results also show that this improvement was not always substantial. For example, overuse decreased only slightly in the post-intervention TG, despite the decrease in the use of 'and'. This was attributed to the

fact that the learners tended to use 'and' less but instead overused other conjunctions such as 'moreover'. With that said, the overall results show a very good overall improvement in the use of conjunctions in the TG. These findings suggest that the intervention was, to a large extent, successful in improving the TG participants' use of these devices, and that teaching conjunctions in context can be very useful in improving the employment of problematic grammar items which in turn would help them to make use of these items in their own output.

5.2   Pedagogical   Implications   (Towards   Teaching   Grammar   in Context)

There is an on-going debate on whether or not to teach grammar as such (see, for example, Nassaji and Fotos 2004; 2011). Some argue that we should, while others argue we should not. I am not going to go into this debate here, but the most likely answer in such a debate in the Libyan context is a categorical 'yes' in favour of teaching grammar. This is because most LLsEFL and teachers still hold deep-seated beliefs about grammar teaching, believing that language cannot be learned without specifically teaching its grammar. This is not the problem since, as mentioned earlier; many SLA researchers also share this view and believe that grammar instruction is needed in language learning. What Libyan EFL teachers and curriculum designers need to think about, however, is the way grammar is taught. Grammar in the Libyan context is, as shown in the case of conjunctions, still being taught in isolation of other subjects and the language skills. In the light of the current study's findings as well as those of previous research (e.g. Weaver 1996; Hinkel 2002b; 2002c), there is a need to integrate the language skills and sub-skills in EFL teaching in the Libyan context. Integrating the language skills with sub-skills provide learners with ample opportunities for input and output which will help improve their mastery of language. This is particularly important in situations where there is lack of exposure and opportunity to practise outside of the classroom. Relying on a few hours

of formal classroom instructions cannot be sufficient for language learning. From my experience in the Libyan context, LLsEFL make hardly any effort outside the classroom to learn the language, such as by watching or listening to English television or radio programmes or reading English newspapers. This lack of self-motivation could be compensated for by the integration of language skills. This can, for example, be achieved through relating what the students have learned in their previous grammar lessons to their reading class. For example, if previous grammar instruction has been about the passive voice, the reading class teacher could point out instances of the passive voice encountered in texts and ask students to think about the functions that these forms serve there. Moreover, s/he could also point out why the passive voice and not the active was used, for example. This is similar to what was done in this study and corresponds to Spada's and Lightbown (2008, cited in Nassaji and Fotos 2011:131) notion of integrative grammar instruction where attention to form occurs while learners' primary focus is on meaning. In the Libyan context, it is not only grammar that is still being taught separately, but also other language skills. It is high time to move towards the integration of the teaching of different language skills, which could be very effective in enhancing students' communicative abilities. Combining reading and writing, for example, could help improve our EFLLs' writing by making them aware of how writers develop and organise their ideas in English, which would in turn help them apply it in their own writing. Reading classes should not only be about content, reading a text silently and aloud and answering a few comprehension questions, as is currently practised in the Libyan EFL context, but should also, in my opinion, include a focus on form by raising the learners' awareness of the grammatical structures that they have already learned in their grammar classes and guiding them to look critically and analytically at the text in hand. Such practices could also assist our learners to avoid the influence of Arabic rhetorical styles which is often noticed in their writing. In the current study, for example, one of the causes of overuse of additives in general and 'and'

in particular was the apparent influence of Arabic style where for rhetorical and syntactic purposes, many additives represented mainly by 'and' are used. Although these kinds of problems may not always hinder communication they can, combined with other grammatical errors, negatively affect writing quality.

References

Aldabbus, S., 2008. An investigation into the impact of language games on classroom interaction and pupil learning in Libyan EFL primary school. Thesis (PhD). University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK.

Altenberg, B., & Tapper, M., 1998. The use of adverbials connectors in advanced Swedish learner's written English. In J.M., Sinclair.. How to use corpora in second langue teaching. eds. Philadelphia, PA, USA: Johan Benjamin Publishing Company.

Basturkmen, H., 2002. Clause relations and macro patterns: cohesion and coherence and the writing of advanced ESOL students. English Teaching Forum, 40(1), 50-56.

Bolton, K., Nelson G., & Hung, J., 2003. A corpus-based study of connectors in student writing. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics, 7(12), 165-182.

Biber, D., Johansson S., Leech G., Conoard S., & Finegan, E., 1999. The Longman grammar of spoken and written English. London: Longman.

Blakemore, D., 1987. Semantic constraints on relevance. Oxford: Blackwell.

Celce-Murcia, M., 2002. Why it makes sense to teach grammar in context and through discourse. In E. Hinkel and S. Fotos New perspectives on grammar teaching in second language classrooms. eds. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Crewe, W.J., 1999. The illogic of logical connectives. ELT Journal, 44/4: 316-325.

El-Aswad, A., 2002. A study of the L1 and L2 writing processes strategies of Arab learners with special reference to third-year Libyan university students. Thesis (PhD). Newcastle Upon Tyne University, UK.

Ellis, R., 1994. The study of second language acquisition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Field, Y., & Yip L.M.O., 1992. A comparison of internal conjunctive cohesion in the English essay writing of Cantonese speakers and native speakers of English. RELC Journal, 23/1:15-28.

Fraser, B., 1999. What are discourse markers? Journal of Pragmatics, 31,925-931.

Granger, S., & Tyson S., 1996. Connectors' usage in the English essay writing of native and non-native EFL speakers of English. World Englishes, 15(1), 17-27.

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

Hinkel, E., 2002a. Why English passive is difficult to teach (and learn). In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos, New perspectives on grammar teaching and learning. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hinkel, E., 2002b. Grammar teaching in writing classes: tense and cohesion. In E. Hinkel & S. Fotos, New perspectives on grammar teaching and learning. eds. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Innajih, A.A., 2007. The impact of textual cohesive conjunctions on the reading comprehension of 4th year English major students in Libyan universities. Thesis (PhD). University of Newcastle Upon Tyne, UK.

Jalilifar, A., 2009. Discourse markers in composition writings: the case of Iranian learners of English as a foreign language. English Language Teaching, 1 (2), 114-122. http://ccsenet.org/journal/index.php/elt/article/view/460/472.[acce ssed on July 2009].

McCarthy, M., 1991. Discourse analysis for language teachers. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Mauranen, A., 1992. Cultural differences in academic rhetoric: a linguistic study. Thesis (PhD). University of Birmingham, UK.

Nassaji, H., & Fotos, S., 2011. Teaching grammar in second language classrooms: integrating form focussed instruction in communicative context. London: Routledge.

Tanko, G., 2004. The use of adverbial connectors in Hungarian university students' argumentative essays. In J.M., Sinclair. How

to use corpora in second langue teaching. ed. Philadelphia, PA: Johan Benjamin Publishing Company.

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

Schiffrin, D., 1987. Discourse markers. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Weaver, C., 1996. Teaching grammar in context. Portsmouth. NH: Heinemann.

Widdowson, H.G., 1978. Teaching language as communication. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix (A) Summary Table of conjunctive relations (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 242-43)

Summary Table of Conjunctive Relations

	External/internal	Internal (unless otherwise specified)			
Additive	Additive, simple: Additive *and, and also* Negative *nor, and ... not* Alternative *or, or else*	Complex, emphatic: Additive *furthermore, in addition, besides* Alternative *alternatively* Complex, de-emphatic: After-thought *incidentally, by the way*	Apposition: Expository *that is, I mean, in other words* Exemplificatory *for instance, thus*	Comparison: Similar *likewise, similarly, in the same way* Dissimilar *on the other hand, by contrast*	
Adversative	Adversative 'proper': Simple *yet, though, only* Containing 'and' Emphatic *however, nevertheless, despite this*	Contrastive: Avowal *in fact, actually, as a mater of fact* Contrastive (external): Simple *but, and* Emphatic *however, on the other hand, at the same time*	Correction: Of meaning *instead, rather, on the contrary* Of wording *at least, rather, I mean*	Dismissal: Closed *in any case, in either case, whichever way it is* Open-ended *in any case, anyhow, at any rate, however it is*	

	External/internal	Internal (unless otherwise specified)			
Causal	Causal, general: Simple *so, then, hence, therefore* Emphatic *consequently, because of this* Causal, specific: Reason *for this reason, on account of this* Result *as a result, in consequence* Purpose *for this purpose, with this in mind*	Reversed causal: Simple *for, because* Causal, specific: Reason *it follows, on this basis* Result *arising out of this* Purpose *to this end*	Conditional (also external): Simple *then* Emphatic *in that case, in such an event, that being so* Generalized *under the circumstances* Reversed polarity *otherwise, under other circumstances*	Respective: Direct *in this respect, in this regard, with reference to this* Reversed polarity *otherwise, in other respects, aside from this*	
Temporal	Temporal, simple (external only): Sequential *then, next, after that* Simultaneous *just then, at the same time* Preceding *previously, before that* Conclusive: Simple *finally, at last* Correlative forms: Sequential *first ... then* Conclusive *at first ... in the end*	Complex (external only): Immediate *at once, thereupon* Interrupted *soon, after a time* Repetitive *next time, on another occasion* Specific *next day, an hour later* Durative *meanwhile* Terminal *until then* Punctiliar *at this moment*	Internal temporal: Sequential *then, next, secondly* Conclusive *finally, in conclusion* Correlative forms: Sequential *first ... next* Conclusive *... finally*	'Here and now': Past *up to now, hitherto* Present *at this point, here* Future *from now on, henceforward* Summary: Summarizing *to sum up, in short, briefly* Resumptive *to resume, to return to the point*	

Appendix B: Sample of the Teaching Materials used in the Intervention course (*Adopted from Hyland, 2003*)

Series Editor's Preface

Learning how to write in a second language is one of the most challenging aspects of second language learning. Perhaps this is not surprising in view of the fact that even for those who speak English as a first language, the ability to write effectively is something that requires extensive and specialized instruction and which has consequently spawned a vast freshman composition industry in American colleges and universities. Within the field of second and foreign language teaching, the teaching of writing has come t

Appendix B: Polar Bears text (From New Scientist, March 11, 2007:21,

Adopted from Bustrkmen 2002)

Polar Bears

Polar bear mothers may accidentally adopt other cubs because they are not very good at recognising their own. Evolutionary theory suggests that animals should adopt offspring they are related to, such as nephews or nieces. But a genetic study of polar bears by Nick Lunn of the Canadian Wildlife Service in Edmonton, Alberta, and his colleagues revealed that cubs recently adopted in the wild were completely unrelated to their adoptive mothers. Polar bears are usually solitary and their ability to identify their cubs might not be very well recognised, the researchers suggest.

Appendix B: Some suggested combinations by TG's participants.

> ➢ Sentences 3 and 4 form a consequence–cause pattern
> James Dwyer from the University of Southern California suggests avoiding very high doses of vitamins. A study of 573 middle-aged men and women found that those taking 500 milligrams of vitamin C supplement per day, the equivalent of 10 oranges, had 2.5 times as much thickening of their arteries as people who took no supplements.

> ➢ Sentences 2 and 5 form a preview– detail pattern
> There is bad news for the countless health fanatics who take vitamin C. In high doses Vitamin C may clog up arteries, the American Heart Association meeting in San Diego heard last week.

> ➢ Sentences 4 and 1 form a contrast
> A study of 573 middle-aged men and women found that those taking 500 milligrams of vitamin C supplement per day, the equivalent of 10 oranges, had 2.5 times as much thickening of their arteries as people who took no supplements. Among smokers thickening rises fivefold.

Appendix B: *Vitamin C Warning* (From *New Scientist*, May 20, 2007: 13, Adopted from Bustrkmen, 2002)

Appendix C: Instructional Activities for CG and TG

Control Group Instructional Activities

Session No	Aim of the Session	Procedures and Instructions
1st Session	Introduce students to the additive category	➢ Students were introduced to a list additive conjunctions (e.g. also, and, as well as, besides, equally important, further, furthermore, in addition, likewise, moreover) ➢ Meaning and functions of each conjunction were explained with examples for illustration. ➢ Students were then asked to write some examples using each conjunction. ➢ Some gap filling exercises were also given to students where they were asked to fill the gaps with the appropriate conjunction.
2nd Session	Introduce students to the adversative category	➢ Students were introduced to a list additive conjunctions (e.g. but, despite, even though, however, in contrast, notwithstanding, on the one hand/on the other hand, although, whereas, yet, nevertheless, on the contrary). ➢ Meaning and functions of each conjunction were explained with examples for illustration. ➢ Students were then asked to write some examples using each conjunction. ➢ Some gap filling exercises were also given to students where they were asked to fill the gaps with the appropriate conjunction.
3rd Session	Introduce students to the causal category	➢ Students were introduced to a list additive conjunctions (e.g. accordingly, as a result, because, consequently, for this reason, since, as, so, therefore, thus). ➢ Meaning and functions of each conjunction were explained with examples for illustration. ➢ Students were then asked to write some examples using each conjunction. ➢ Some gap filling exercises were also given to students where they were asked to fill the gaps with the appropriate conjunction.

4th Session	Introduce students to the temporal category	- Students were introduced to a list additive conjunctions (e.g. before, while, meanwhile first/second, next, finally, then) - Meaning and functions of each conjunction were explained with examples for illustration. - Students were then asked to write some examples using each conjunction. - Some gap filling exercises were also given to students where they were asked to fill the gaps with the appropriate conjunction.

Treatment Group Instructional Activities

i. Skimming: As a first step, participants were presented with a text and asked to skim it and then scan it and were encouraged to try and guess any new word or expression from the context. However, if the participants were having any difficulty with the text, my role, as a teacher-researcher, was to explain and clarify anything which might hinder their understanding of the text. In most cases participants expressed no great difficulty in understanding the texts presented to them throughout the course which had been carefully chosen to suit their level. Participants were then asked to work in pairs and answer some direct and inferential questions for comprehension. Afterwards, participants were asked to work in pairs and identify the type of text (for example, argumentative or expository, etc), and genre (for example, book introduction or newspaper article) and the register (formal or informal). The purpose of such activities were to make sure that participants were aware of these features which are important in understanding how conjunctions in particular are used differently to serve different functions, as discussed earlier.

ii. Highlighting Conjunctions: This activity involved participants working in pairs and underlining any conjunction found in the text . What was intended was rather to encourage participants to notice the presence of these devices in the text which would pave the way for illustration of how conjunctions function in relation to their context, as demonstrated in the next three steps (i.e. iii iv, vi).

iii. Raising Participants' Awareness of Patterns in Texts: This activity required examples to be given of texts that showed coherence and cohesion. Participants read through the text individually, and then I led the class in discussion of the

patterns in the text and how one part was related to another, as further illustrated using the sample text below:

(1) Learning how to write in a second language is one of the most challenging aspects of second language learning. (2) Perhaps this is not surprising in view of the fact that even for those who speak English as a first language, the ability to write effectively is something that requires extensive and specialized instruction and which has consequently spawned a vast freshman composition industry in American colleges and universities. (3) Within the field of second and foreign language teaching, the teaching of writing has come to assume a much central position that it occupied twenty or thirty years ago.(4) This is perhaps the result of two factors.

(5) On the one hand, command.... (6) A further strengthening of the status of writing.....(Hyland 2003: iv; for the full text, see Appendix B)

Using a sample text, participants were shown how the writer begins by giving a general statement in sentence 1. Then, in sentence 2, he goes on to elaborate on his first statement, explaining how writing is considered to be challenging even for NSs and the fact that this difficulty has '... spawned a vast freshman composition industry in American colleges and universities'. As for sentence 4, participants were shown how this sentence has a double function; a) concluding the paragraph, b) introducing the next one. In this sentence, the demonstrative pronoun 'this' functions as a reference to all previous points and elaborations (i.e. 'writing is difficult for both native and non-natives' + 'teaching of writing has gained more interest recently') made in the preceding paragraph. Thus, all of these issues are a result of two factors which he is then going to mention later in the next paragraph. The function of sentence 4 is therefore to conclude the paragraph and at the same time gives hints to the reader about what is going be mentioned in the next one (i.e. to discuss the two factors that, according to the writer, have contributed to the increasing interest to the teaching in writing). The second paragraph begins in sentence 5 by discussing these two factors which the writer alluded to in the previous sentence 4. He starts by saying 'on the one hand' and goes on to discuss and explain the first factor which the writer believes has contributed to the teaching of writing gaining more interest. After that, he goes on to talk about the second factor in sentence 6. By doing this type of activity, I tried to make participants aware of how writers develop

their ideas logically and how each sentence functions in relation to what has preceded and will follow.

When using sample text about polar bears (see Appendix B), I asked participants what was the conventional thinking about animals adopting offspring (sentence 2) and what the new idea is (sentence 3). Then I highlighted the sequence of sentences 2 and 3 which is 'a hypothetical–real pattern', and asked about other relationships among the sentences in the text. For instance, the relationship between sentence 1 and sentences 2, 3 and 4 is a 'preview–detail pattern', and the relationship between sentences 3 and 4 is a 'consequence–cause pattern'. After that, I asked the participants to suggest devices that could be used to signal the relationship between ideas. This step paved the way for the subsequent step, which involved showing participants how writers use conjunctions and other devices in the text so as to make the relationship between their prepositions and ideas more clear and explicit.

iv. Functions of Conjunctions: At this stage, I would go through the text and show participants how each individual conjunction was used and the function it served in the local context (i.e. at the level of a clause and/or sentence) and the global context (i.e. at the level of paragraph and/or text level). Participants were also shown how conjunctions are used to explicitly show propositional relations such as contrastive or additive that already exist between the two units of discourse that they connect. For example, when coming across the word 'thus' in a text, participants were shown why the writer used this word instead of, say, 'moreover'. It was explained to participants that the reason why the writer used the former because the relationship expressed by the propositions linked by 'thus' is cause-effect and not additive which requires a conjunction belonging to the causal category. The reason for showing participants such a seemingly obvious semantic distinction as causal versus additive was that it was observed that some participants in this study sometimes seemed unaware of such distinctions, which led them to erroneously choose a conjunction which was not compatible with the relationship implied between the sentences.

Thus, the previous step showed participants that the choice of which semantic category of conjunction such as additive and adversative to use is determined by the relationship that exists between the units of discourse (or, more accurately in the writer's mind). In addition to the semantic function of

conjunctions, their stylistic functions were also pointed out. Participants were made aware of how the use of conjunctions is often determined by features such as text-type, genre and register. For example, when encountering the word 'thus' in a text, participants were made aware of other options within the causal category such as 'so' which the writer did not use in that text (perhaps due to its greater informality) and the fact that the word 'so' tends to be associated with the spoken register. Conversely the word 'thus' is often used within more formal and written discourse. This was done in order to raise participants' sensitivity to differences in register in using conjunctions. In addition to the semantic and stylistic functions of conjunctions, their discoursal functions were also pointed out, where conjunctions link two units of discourse by relating the unit they introduce to the one that precedes or follows it. The grammatical function (e.g. coordinators, subordinators, adverbs or prepositional phrases) of each conjunction encountered in the text was also pointed out and the differences between them were explained. For example, participants were shown how coordinators such as 'and' and 'but' are often used to link two dependent clauses/sentences, and adverbs like 'however' and 'moreover' are frequently used to connect two independent clauses/sentences. On some occasions, I used Arabic in order to explain, especially in the case of the differences and similarities in the use of the word 'and' in English and Arabic. This is because, as shown later in, LLsEFL tend to use this word quite frequently in their writing, probably as a sign of transfer from the L1 where 'and', 'wa', is very frequently used in Arabic texts.

vi. Reformulating: In this type of activity, I took sentences from a text and separated them, often rearranging the order. Participants were then asked to combine ideas by joining two or more sentences together and to articulate the nature of the relationship between them (For some combinations suggested by participants, see Appendix B).

Example: Vitamin C Warning

• Among smokers thickening rises fivefold.

• There is bad news for the countless health fanatics who take vitamin C.

• James Dwyer from the University of Southern California suggests avoiding very high doses of vitamins.

• A study of 573 middle-aged men and women found that those taking 500 milligrams of vitamin C supplement per day, the equivalent of 10 oranges, had 2.5 times as much thickening of their arteries as people who took no supplements.

• In high doses Vitamin C may clog up arteries, the American Heart Association meeting in San Diego heard last week.

Following this reformulating and combining activity, participants were shown the original text to see how ideas were organised and any overt signalling used (For the original text, see Appendix B).

vii. Composing: In the second half of the course, this type of text analysis, which was shown in previous steps, was followed by a short composition session in which participants were asked to write a short summary of the text they had been presented with. This was done in order to give participants an opportunity to practice what they had learned in the use of conjunctions before they were post-tested.

viii. Editing: In this activity, participants reviewed their writing with particular emphasis on the sequencing of ideas and the signalling of relationships between them. When they had completed an initial draft of a piece of writing, for example a mini-summary of texts they had read, I asked them to review it to locate where they had used conjunctions. They then reread their draft and checked a) whether or not conjunctions they had used were necessary and b) whether or not conjunctions they had used reflected the relationships implied by their clauses, sentences and units. If they found it difficult to understand the nature of the relationship, I advised them to consider again one or more of the following solutions:

- include more information or remove the idea(s)
- change the sequence of ideas
- use a signalling device (conjunction)

- remove the signalling device because it is misleading or change it to a more accurate one

xi. Homework: After a few sessions, it was felt that participants were familiar with these steps, they were given a text (or were sometimes left to choose their own) and were asked to follow the same steps described above. Participants were asked to read for meaning and at the same time looking at how conjunctions (as well as other grammatical items) were used and functioned in the text. The purpose of this activity was to encourage learners a) get used to the habit of reading outside the classroom and b) provide them with ample exposure to how conjunctions are used in a meaningful contexts which could help them to internalize their use which would thus become part of their intake.