

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

Taeko Fujisaku

This is a preliminary study that investigates the correlation between the use of conjunctions and the evaluation of writing by examining density and frequency of conjunctions used in student essay writing. Essays written by first-year university students are examined as the end product of high school English teaching in Japan. The results with the current data indicate that the quality of the written texts does not relate to mere density of the use of conjunctions or the use of complex conjunctions, but present some implications for further study. In addition, the students' essays reveal special features of ESL/EFL learners' writing with regard to the use of conjunctions, especially *because*.

**Key terms: *conjunctions, *cohesion,
*text-forming devices, *evaluation**

1. Introduction

Research began with the following basic questions: What are the elements which make better compositions? What distinguishes between a mere succession of sentences and an integrated passage? Are there any unique characteristics which make a meaningful text in English?

The answer does not seem to be in sentence-level grammar. A passage does not necessarily make sense merely because each sentence in it is grammatically correct. Nunan (1993: 2) states:

... the sentences that make up a text need to be grammatical, but grammatical sentences alone will not ensure that the text itself makes sense. In addition to the structure and meaning of the individual sentences, we need to know how the sentences relate to each other.

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

Writers try to create a linkage between the words and sentences to make the text more integrated. The linguistic elements which give unity to texts are called *text-forming devices*. Halliday and Hasan (1976) describe text-forming devices comprehensively and call those linguistic means *cohesion*. They explain that unity of texts is realized through four types of cohesion: *reference*, *substitution*, *ellipsis* and *conjunction*. This study focuses on conjunctions as a tool which makes linkage between sentences in a text.

Halliday and Hasan's cohesion system has been influential and has been applied to analyzing various texts. Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983) employed the taxonomy of conjunctions devised by Halliday and Hasan in their study. Significantly, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman claim that the way of using logical connectors, which is their term for conjunctions, can be one of the measures of language proficiency. They say, "an English speaker or writer's ability to use logical connectors to subordinate one clause to another is a fair measure of the learner's overall syntactic maturity (1983: 334)" and add that understanding logical connectors helps learners in developing other skills as well.

Goldman and Murray (1992: 518) state that ESL students need more knowledge of and training in logical connectors in order to grasp the relationships between sentences and to understand information accurately. They add that such knowledge would eventually lead to improving overall ESL proficiency.

Schleppegrell (1996: 282) claims that the role of conjunctions should be paid more attention to in ESL writing instruction. She explains through her research that ESL writers often use conjunctions in their essays in a way which is more appropriate for spoken texts. She adds that more studies are needed to improve our understanding of the role of conjunctions and to improve instructions for producing spoken and written texts which are appropriate for different genres.

Walelign (1996) claims that the use of conjunctions affects writing quality. Examining essays written by Amharic-speaking ESL students, he found that the raters had a tendency to give low ratings to the essays with a lot of simply-coordinated clauses and to give high ratings to the essays with elaborate subordinated clauses. Thus, some research has shown the importance of the use of conjunctions in the ESL field.

In English language teaching in Japan, however, devices which create linkage be-

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

tween sentences have not been paid much attention. High school English courses aim for students to be able to organize and express their ideas in writing passages of a certain length, according to the Ministry of Education's *Course of Study for Upper Secondary School* (1989).¹ Nevertheless, most of the actual activities in "English Composition" classes are sentence-level translations from Japanese into English rather than composition writing. Students might memorize individual conjunctions, but they do not have much opportunity to use them as text-forming devices in composition writing.

Moreover, a clear and comprehensive evaluation system for English composition writing for Japanese learners has not been established yet. Kurihara (1994: 23) is doubtful whether Japanese teachers of English evaluate their students' essays based on explicit, definite criteria. Their evaluations are, rather, likely to be quite subjective. He adds that enough empirical data for setting up criteria has not been provided yet.

For these reasons, it is important to consider concrete indexes for assessing the quality of writing. The current study is being conducted to see how the usage of cohesive devices affects essay evaluation. In particular, one of the cohesive devices, the use of conjunctions, is focused on in this study. Are essays evaluated by readers as being better ones if the writer uses more conjunctions? Are essays evaluated by readers as being better if the writer uses more complicated conjunctions between sentences rather than simple conjunctions?

In order to consider the above questions, two research hypotheses are presented and composition data are analyzed in the following sections. Then some conclusions resulting from the study are presented, and some implications for teaching composition in Japanese high schools and implications for further study are considered.

2. Data Analysis

Research Hypotheses. To investigate the effect of the use of conjunctions on writing, the following two research hypotheses were formed.

Hypothesis 1. Students who use more conjunctions will get higher scores.

Are essays better evaluated if more conjunctions are used in a passage? Hypothesis 1

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

examines this question. Previous research (Abadiano 1995; Schleppegrell 1996; Maeda 1996) suggests mere quantity does not correlate with highly evaluated essays.

Hypothesis 2. Students who use more complex conjunctions will get higher scores.

English-native-speaker children are likely to rely on simple conjunctions such as *and*, *but* and *so* (Perera 1984; Abadiano 1995). These three conjunctions are also quite familiar to Japanese EFL learners. Moreover, Abadiano (1995: 319) suggests that the evaluation of written texts might be related to appropriate use of various cohesive devices. Are compositions written by Japanese EFL learners also better evaluated if they contain a variety of conjunctions, not only simple ones? Hypothesis 2 is formed to investigate this question.

Research Design. The two research hypotheses listed above were tested by analyzing the conjunctions used in argumentative essays. An argumentative essay requires a clear statement of the writer's opinion and reasoning, so it is likely to include much explicit use of conjunctions in order to show the development of the writer's ideas. Therefore, the data appear to be highly suitable for discussing the current research questions.

Data Collection. The essays examined came from the composition section of the Kanda English Proficiency Test (KEPT)² of Kanda University of International Studies held in April 1997. The writers of the compositions were freshmen, and they wrote the essays soon after their enrollment. Therefore, it is reasonable to assume that their English proficiency showed the result of their high school English learning.

The KEPT consists of five sections: Reading, Grammar, Listening, Written Composition and Oral Communication. All the sections are interdependent and concern the same subject matter.

In the writing section, students were asked to write an argumentative essay on a question within 30 minutes. Examinees were asked to express their opinions and state the reasons why they supported a position. The question was based on the

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

narrative which was presented in the other three sections of the examination, so examinees were expected to use information from these sources in their arguments.

The essays were read and given a grade ranging from twenty (the highest) to zero (the lowest) by two experienced raters using the KEPT Writing Descriptor Bands.³ Each rater evaluated the essays independently, and the sum of two ratings was divided by two.

The number of essays analyzed was 381. The scores were distributed in the range from zero to ten, which was the lower half of the possible range of scores. Presumably the scores were relatively low because the analyzed essays were written by incoming freshmen.

The essays were divided into three groups: the top-five-percent group (22 essays), the middle group (340 essays), and the bottom-five-percent group (19 essays). This division is used in testing the research hypotheses.

Analytical Procedure. In order to test the two research hypotheses, the essays were analyzed in the following way. Conjunctions used in the essays were identified and counted. The conjunctions dealt with in this study were limited to intersentential conjunctions and ones which made compound and complex sentences. Use of conjunctions between phrases (e.g. I like beans and rice.) was excluded.

After the total number of words used in each essay was counted, the ratio of conjunctions per total words was calculated. Then a one-factor ANOVA was conducted to compare the average percentages of the top, middle, and bottom groups to test Hypothesis 1.⁴

Then all the conjunctions were categorized along two dimensions: linguistic categories (i.e. simple conjunctions, coordinating conjunctions, and subordinating conjunctions) and functional categories (i.e. additive, adversative, causal, and sequential). These categories of conjunctions will be discussed in the next section.

The percentage of coordinating plus subordinating conjunction was divided by the total number of conjunctions in an essay. This percentage indicates the ratio of conjunctions other than simple conjunctions in the total number of conjunctions. The average percentages of the top, middle, and bottom groups were compared by conducting a one-factor ANOVA to test Hypothesis 2.

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

Categorization of Conjunctions. Three linguistic categories were used to classify the types of conjunctions: *simple conjunctions*, *coordinating conjunctions*, and *subordinating conjunctions*. These categories are slight modifications of the terminology used by Azar (1989). The simple conjunctions are *and*, *but*, *so*, *or* and *nor*. Coordinating conjunctions refer to transitions, such as *therefore* and *moreover*. Subordinating conjunctions refer to conjunctions which are used to make adverbial clauses, such as *because* and *if*.

Four functional categories were used: *additive*, *adversative*, *causal*, and *sequential*. These categories are based on Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238) and Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983: 324).

As mentioned in the previous section, the conjunctions were categorized along two dimensions. For instance, in the sentence “I myself do like resort, *but* I wouldn’t want to go to this resort place” (student sentence), the conjunction *but* was categorized as linguistically simple and functionally adversative. Other examples are shown below in Table 1.

	Simple	Coordinating	Subordinating
Additive	and, or, nor	in addition, etc.	
Adversative	but	however, etc.	though, etc.
Causal	so	therefore, etc.	because, etc.
Sequential	(and)	firstly, etc.	before, etc.

Table 1. Examples of Conjunctions

Word and Conjunction Counting. The numbers of words and conjunctions were counted consistently according to the following criteria.

Word counting followed the orthography which appeared in the essays. A group of letters or a letter between spaces was regarded as one word.

In general, when a conjunction played a role in connecting ideas in sentences, it was counted as one conjunction. Some coordinating conjunctions were accompanied by *and* (e.g. *and also*, *and then*). In these cases, only the coordinating conjunctions

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

were counted. However, if the use of conjunctions contained linguistic or functional errors, those were counted as 0.5 conjunctions. For example, in the ‘sentence’ “*Because* now environmental problem is serious topic in all country’ (student sentence), *because* was not used properly as a subordinating conjunction. In this case, *because* was counted as 0.5 conjunction. Local errors such as spelling mistakes were ignored.

3. Results

Frequency of Conjunctions Identified in the Essays. The research results are analyzed in this section. The total number of conjunctions used in the 381 essays was 2078, and the average number of conjunctions used in an essay was 5.45. The 33 examples of conjunctions used four or more times—collectively amounting to 95.3 percent of the total conjunction usage—are listed in Table 2. Conjunctions *and* (15.1%), *but* (20.5%), *so* (13.2%), *if* (18.0%) and *because* (13.0%) were used much more frequently than any other conjunctions.

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

	Simple	Tokens	Coordinating	Tokens	Subordinating	Tokens
Additive	and	314 9	for example also moreover of course	40 13 9 15	as	6
Adversative	but	427	however on the other hand anyway	36 7 4	although	4
Causal	so	274	then therefore as a result	17 6 6	if because once when even if now that	374 269 21 16 10 4
Sequential			first second then first of all anyway third finally	13 13 11 8 5 4 4	when before while after	26 5 4 4

Table 2. Examples of Conjunctions Identified in Composition Data

The relative percentage of conjunctions in each linguistic category is shown in Table 3.

	Frequency	% of Total Conjunctions
Simple Conjunctions	1024	49.3 %
Coordinating Conjunctions	278	13.4 %
Subordinating Conjunctions	776	37.3 %
Total in Essays	2078	100.0 %

Table 3. The Relative Percentage of Conjunctions by Linguistic Category

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

The percentage of simple conjunctions was 49.3 percent, almost half of the total conjunctions used in the essays. The percentage of subordinating conjunctions was 37.3 percent. The percentage of transitions (coordinating conjunctions) was 13.4 percent. Simple conjunctions appeared the most frequently in the essays, and subordinating conjunctions followed.

The relative frequency of conjunction by functional categories is shown in Table 4.

	Frequency	% of Total Conjunctions
Additive Conjunctions	424	20.4 %
Adversative Conjunctions	522	25.1 %
Causal Conjunctions	1020	49.1 %
Sequential Conjunctions	112	5.4 %
Total in Essays	2078	100.0 %

Table 4. The Relative Frequency of Conjunctions by Functional Category

The ratio of causal conjunctions amounts to almost half of the total conjunctions used in the essays (49.1%). Adversative conjunctions follow (25.1%). Additive conjunctions, including the simple conjunction *and*, seemed to be very familiar to the examinees, but overall the additive category was the third out of the four categories (20.4 %). Sequential conjunctions are used much less than other types (5.4%).

The Results of the Tests for Research Hypotheses. The results of the tests for the two research hypotheses are presented in the section. The first hypothesis was:

Hypothesis 1. Students who use more conjunctions will get higher scores.

Table 5 shows the means and standard deviations of the densities of conjunctions in three groups.

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

Group	Count	Mean	Std. Dev.	Std. Error
Top	22	4.929	1.231	.262
Middle	340	5.034	1.738	.094
Bottom	14	5.204	1.876	.501

Table 5. Means and Standard Deviations of the Densities of Conjunctions

The mean percentage of top group was 4.929%, middle group 5.034%, bottom Group 5.204%. The result of the one-factor ANOVA is shown in Table 6.

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F-test
Between Groups	2	.645	.322	.109
Within Groups	373	1101.038	2.952	p=.8966
Total	375	1101.683		

Model II estimate of between component variance = -1.315

Table 6. The Result of the One-way ANOVA for Hypothesis 1

There was no significant relationship found between the writing level and density of conjunctions in the result of the analysis, $F=0.109$, $p=0.8966$. The comparison between two groups (top and middle, top and bottom, middle and bottom) is also presented in Table 7.

Comparison	Mean Diff.	Scheffe F-test
Top vs. Middle	-.105	.039
Top vs. Bottom	-.274	.109
Middle vs. Bottom	-.17	.065

Table 7. The Result of the Scheffe F-test for Hypothesis 1

The Scheffe F-test shows no significance in three pairs (top group vs. middle group - $F=0.039$, top vs. bottom - $F=0.109$, middle vs. bottom - $F=0.065$). Thus, Hypothesis 1 was rejected.

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

Hypothesis 2. Students who use more complex conjunctions will get higher scores.

The average percentages of the complex conjunctions in total conjunctions in an essay were compared among the three levels by conducting a one-way ANOVA. Table 8 shows the means and the standard deviations. The mean percentage of top group was 55.182%, middle group 51.374%, bottom group 30.875%.

Group	Count	Mean	Std.Dev.	Std. Error
Top	22	55.182	16.681	3.556
Middle	340	51.374	23.738	1.287
Bottom	16	30.875	34.25	8.562

Table 8. Means and Standard Deviations of the Percentages of Complex Conjunctions

The results of the one-factor ANOVA showed no significance as presented in Table 9, $F=6.019$, $p=0.0027$.

Source	DF	Sum Squares	Mean Squares	F-test
Between Groups	2	6884.349	3442.175	6.019
Within Groups	375	214462.584	571.9	$p=.0027$
Total	377	221346.934		

Model II estimate of between component variance = 1435.137

Table 9. The Result of the One-way ANOVA for Hypothesis 2

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

The comparisons between the two groups are shown in Table 10.

Comparison	Mean Diff.	Scheffe F-test
Top vs. Middle	3.808	.262
Top vs. Bottom	24.307	4.785*
Middle vs. Bottom	20.499	5.614*

* Significant at 95%

Table 10. The Result of the Scheffe F-test for Hypothesis 2

The Scheffe F-test showed significance in the comparison in the two pairs; top group vs. bottom group ($F=4.785$, $p<0.05$), middle vs. bottom ($F=5.614$, $p<0.05$), but not in the pair of top vs. middle ($F=0.262$). Thus, Hypothesis 2 was rejected.

4. Discussion

In this section, some possible reasons for the results of this study are discussed.

Hypothesis 1. Students who use more conjunctions will get higher scores. There was no significant relationship found between the ratio of conjunctions in essays and the writing scores from the current data by the statistical analysis. This result indicates that the sheer density of conjunctions does not affect the quality of writing. This was expected and is in accord with the previous research (Abadiano 1995; Maeda 1996; Schleppegrell 1996; Oi 1986).

Hypothesis 2. Students who use more complex conjunctions will get higher scores. There was no significant difference among the three levels in the essays studied here. Using various transitions and subordinating conjunctions did not have a clear relationship in the essays examined in this study. The results did not follow the previous research that suggested that there is a relationship between the appropriate use of complex conjunctions and the quality of writing (Abadiano 1995; Walelign 1996).

There seems to be several possible reasons for the results. Firstly, it is possible that there was no real significant relationship between the use of more complex conjunctions and the quality of essays. In that case, it is possible to consider some other

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

elements of good essays. As for content, having clear message seems to be very important. The writers were supposed to take a clear position and present supporting reasons because the required essay was an argumentative one. As for organization, arrangement of information seems to affect readers' understanding. Proper use of vocabulary and grammar seem also important.

On the other hand, it is possible that some elements of research design influenced the results. One possible factor is the whole range of the essays studied. It should be noted that the data studied came from students within a limited range of abilities. The essays considered as the top-group in the data analysis (seven to ten points) could reasonably be called the lower middle scores in the total range of zero to twenty points. If we had investigated a wider spread of writing abilities, clearer differences might have been observed in the examination of the relationship between the use of conjunctions and the evaluation of writing.

Other factors of the current study should also be considered. For instance, the length of the essays studied was rather short and the number of words in them was limited (about 107 words on average). The examinees were required to write an argumentative essay. Longer essays and other kinds of writing might provide a different result. It should be emphasized that the clear relationship between the use of conjunctions and the quality of essays was not found within the current data. Further studies should be conducted in order to generalize on the relationship between the use of conjunctions and the evaluation of writing.

The Notable Use of Causal Conjunctions. The current study reveals some remarkable features of ESL writing in the use of conjunctions.⁵ One notable fact is that the percentages of causal conjunctions among the total number of conjunctions used in essays were high at every level. In 381 essays, *because* was used 269 times, *if* 374 times, and *so* 274 times. The total of these three conjunctions amounts to 44 percent of all the conjunctions in all the essays.

The type of writing required for the examinees might have led to this high frequency. The writing required in the KEPT was argumentative. In this kind of writing, the writers should express their opinions and add reasons to support this position. It is, thus, reasonable to expect that the frequency of conjunctions which introduce rea-

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

sons will likely be higher than in many other writing tasks (e.g. narration). In addition, the writers often explain their ideas by using hypothesized situations. Therefore, we can see great use of the conjunction *if*.

The frequent use of *because* might also be one of the features of EFL learners' writing. Schleppegrell (1996) explains that "university ESL writers use twice the number of *because* clauses as non-ESL students responding to the same essay prompt." In the current study, *because* was used as often as the simple conjunction *so* was (*because* 269 times, *so* 274 times). These conjunctions are taught in junior high school years,⁶ therefore the examinees are likely to have been accustomed to using them. *Because* especially seems to be common in answers to the questions which begin with *why*.

Some subordinating conjunctions were used in "sentences" without a main clause. From the perspective of formal grammar, the causal conjunction *because* is used at the beginning of the sentence to make subordinating clauses. However, 83 percent of all uses of *because* (224 out of 269 examples in 381 essays) in the current composition data occurred at the beginning of adverbial clauses which did not accompany main clauses. (e.g. "*Because* I don't want them to destroy any environment"; student sentence). Thus these "sentences" were incomplete. Kamimura and Oi (1992: 79) call this type of incomplete "sentence" *sentence fragments* and explain that ESL learners often create sentence fragments.

As for independent *because* clauses, Schleppegrell (1996: 278) writes:

Such use of "independent" *because* clauses is also a feature of ESL writing. The punctuation suggests that the writer is drawing on a spoken model. ... ESL writers are inappropriately transferring conjunction strategies from speech to academic writing rather than simply making punctuation errors. (1996: 278)

The essay database which Schleppegrell used was more academic than that examined in the current study. However, Schleppegrell's observation still might account for the frequent use of *because* in incomplete sentences in the current study. The examinees might have been accustomed to using *because* in spoken discourse and have transferred this high use into their writing.

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

5. Conclusion

The purpose of this study has been to consider whether the explicit use of cohesive devices, specifically conjunctions affect the evaluation of written texts. In order to investigate this topic, the two following research hypotheses were examined by analyzing the essays written by first year Japanese university students.

1. Students who use more conjunctions will get higher scores.
2. Students who use more complex conjunctions will get higher scores.

The current data showed no significant relationship either between the density of conjunctions and evaluation or between the use of complex conjunctions and evaluation.

However, the results have some implications for further study. Further study should be made to consider the use of conjunctions and writing evaluation. For instance, it might be productive to focus on the difference of difficulty in using four functions; additive, adversative, causal and sequential.⁷ Further studies should take other discourse markers into consideration as well as conjunctions. Some phrases and sentences play the role of signaling the development of ideas and stories in passages. The use of such expressions might distinguish the writers' proficiency.

The examinees seemed largely to rely on conjunctions such as *and*, *but*, *so*, *because*, and *if*. They did not seem to be accustomed to using more formal transitions such as *therefore*, *nevertheless*, *similarly*, and so on. This situation appears to be almost the same as English-native-speaker children examined in other studies (Perera 1984; Abadiano 1995). Understanding and using conjunctions seem to be very important in developing academic skills of comprehending information and expressing their ideas. More conscious training should be given to these matters in English classes in Japanese schools.

At the same time, relying on the use of conjunctions such as *because*, *if*, *firstly*, and *secondly* is not the immediate solution to create more communicative and coherent texts for the readers. There are other important elements for producing meaningful texts. It goes without saying that the passages should contain a clear message. As for organization, teachers should be ready to point out a variety of devices which can be

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

used to make meaningful texts. They include, for instance, repeated lexical items and phrases and clauses which signal discourse structure. The arrangement of information is also important.

The Kanda students' essays showed some features of ESL/EFL learners' writing in the use of the conjunction *because*. The frequent use of *because* in composition writing shows the students are in the developmental stage (Schleppegrell 1996). In addition, they use *because* in sentence fragments, meaning as subordinating clause apparently without a main clause. The students might have become accustomed to using *because* in answers for questions with "why" but might not have had much opportunity to develop an understanding of its proper use in formal writing.

The use of conjunctions might contain more than appears on the surface. Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983: 323) state the following:

Producing logical connectors is often more challenging than might at first be apparent. In addition to the usual semantic and syntactic knowledge students must possess in order to use logical connectors appropriately, they must also have a sensitivity to register. (1983: 323)

Teachers should be careful to deal with conjunctions considering their linguistic and functional roles and the preferable register.

This study has considered the correlation between the use of conjunctions and the evaluation of writing by examining density and frequency of conjunctions used in the composition writing from the applied linguistics' perspective. Those compositions written by university entering students have been examined as the end product of high school English teaching. In order to generalize the relationship between the use of conjunctions and the quality of writing, future research should deal with a wider range of data. In addition, in order to examine the effect of teaching cohesive devices for making meaningful texts, it would be appropriate to conduct a longitudinal study comparing the change in the quality of writing before and after the instruction as the students progress through the university. The qualitative research of the learners' use of conjunctions would also present many implications for composition teaching.

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

Acknowledgements

This study is based on my MA thesis submitted to Kanda University of International Studies in 1998. I am most grateful to Prof. Bruce Horton and Prof. Shigeru Matsumoto for their suggestions on this paper. I wish to express my special thanks to Mr. Bill Bonk of the English Language Institute at Kanda University of International Studies for his help performing the statistical analysis. I also wish to express my appreciation to the two Bulletin reviewers for their very helpful comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

Notes

- ¹ For example, according to *The Course of Study for Upper Secondary School* (Mombusho, 1989), the objectives of the subject Writing is “to further develop students’ abilities to write their own ideas etc., appropriately, and to foster a positive attitude toward writing in English.” *The Course of Study* suggests that “emphasis should be placed on writing passages of a reasonable length in plain English.” (Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, *HANDBOOK FOR TEAM-TEACHING*, 108-115)
- ² KEPT (the Kanda English Proficiency Test) aims to reliably measure change in a student's global communicative proficiency over four years of undergraduate program. In ideal circumstances, students take this test when they enter this university and also at the end of each academic year in their four years of study.
- ³ KEPT Writing Descriptor Bands describes the criteria used for rating essays, dividing scores in twenty levels. The guide explains the characteristics of compositions at each level, regarding matters such as content, organization, grammar, vocabulary, sentence connection, and so on.
- ⁴ Some extreme percentages such as 0% and 100% were excluded from computation.
- ⁵ For more details, see Fujisaku (1998).
- ⁶ For example, in *Total English*, a series of English textbooks for junior high school students, *so* appears in the seventh grade and *because* appears in the eighth grade.
- ⁷ This suggestion is based on Goldman and Murray (1992). They showed that there was relative difference of difficulty in using logical connectors consistently for native speakers and ESL students.

言語科学研究第5号(1999年)

References

- Abadiano, H.R. 1995. Cohesion Strategies and Genre in Expository Prose: An Analysis of the Writing of Children of Ethnolinguistic Cultural Groups. *Pragmatics*, 5/3. 299-324.
- Azar, B. S. 1989. *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. 2nd Edition. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall Regents.
- Celce-Murcia, M. and D. Larsen-Freeman. 1983. *The Grammar Book: An ESL/EFL Teacher's Course*. Rowly: Newbury House.
- Fujisaku, Taeko. 1998. *A Study of Cohesion and Coherence in English Composition Writing: the Concepts and Some Implications for Teaching English in Japanese High Schools*. MA Thesis presented to Kanda University of International Studies.
- Goldman, S. and J. D. Murray. 1992. Knowledge of Connectors as Cohesive Devices in Text: A Comparative Study of Native-English and English-as-a-second-language Speakers. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 84/4. 504-519.
- Halliday, M. A. K. 1985. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. 1976. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Horiguchi, S. et al. 1997. *Total English I*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Horiguchi, S. et al. 1997. *Total English II*. Tokyo: Shubun Shuppan.
- Kurihara, M. 1994. Eisakubun wo Donoyouni Hyoka Suruka. *Gendai Eigo Kyoiku*. 8. 23-27.
- Maeda, J. 1996. *Analyzing Intermediate Level Learner Writing with Respect to Coherence and Cohesion*. Paper presented at the 26th CAJ Convention (Communication Association of Japan).
- Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, 1994. *HANDBOOK FOR TEAM-TEACHING*, Tokyo: Gyosei Corporation.
- Mombusho. 1989. *The Course of Study for Upper Secondary School*.
- Nunan, D. 1986. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin.
- Oi, K. 1986. Cross-cultural Differences in Rhetorical Patterning: A Study of Japanese and English. *JACET Bulletin*. 17. 23-48.

A Preliminary Study of the Use of Conjunctions and the Quality of Writing

Perera, K. 1984. *Children's Writing and Reading: Analysing Classroom Language*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Schleppegrell, M. J. 1996. Conjunction in Spoken English and ESL Writing. *Applied Linguistics*. 17/3. 271-285.

Trabasso, T. and L. L. Sperry. 1985. Causal Relatedness and Importance of Story Events. *Journal of Memory and Language*. 24. 595-611.

Walelign, A. 1996. *Aspects of Local and Global Coherence in the English Essays of Amharic-speaking Basic Writers: A Test-based Exploratory Study*. PhD. Dissertation. Indiana University of Pennsylvania.