

Investigating English Foreign Language Learners' Performance In Connectives at The University Level

Ass.prof. Amra Ibrahim Sultan (Ph.d)
Inst. Waad Maray Hasan Farhan
(M.A.)

Abstract

Connectives as grammatical cohesive devices are used to link words, phrases, and sentences to each other, and to make coherent text. The main purposes of this study are to investigate the students' performance in the College of Education (henceforth, CE), and College of Education for Women (henceforth, CEW) at Tikrit University in the area of connectives, classify the students' errors in connectives at both recognition and production levels in the CE and CEW to get a clear survey of students' performance, and find out whether there are significant differences between students' performance in the CE and CEW at both recognition and production levels. To achieve purposes, and hypotheses of this study, a diagnostic test has been constructed. A sample of 106 students has been chosen from fourth year students in CE and CEW. A sample of 24 students has been chosen to apply the pilot study, and 82 for final administration of the test. Fourth year college students' responses have been analysed, tabulated, and discussed. The results of this study reveal that EFL learners make errors of different sources at the recognition as well as production level. It is also clear that EFL learners encounter more complex and problematic errors at the production level than at the recognition level.

1.Introduction

Connectivity is used in grammatical classification of words to indicate that a group of expressions from various syntactic categories which are usually used to join sentence elements and clauses with each other. While Biber et al (2000: 875) state that connectives elicit the speaker's or writer's awareness of the relationship between two units of discourse. James (1998: 160) ensures that students may have some knowledge about the usage of these connectives, but they are unable to perform all semantic functions of the connectives or sometimes overuse and underuse certain connectives.

Parrott (2000: 307-313) highlights that EFL learners especially at the university level face a range of problems in understanding and using these forms and expressions. The learners of foreign language sometimes use them in ways which are misleading or stylistically awkward. Also, misplacement occurs when students omit them in places where they should be used, sometimes misselection occurs when they think that some connectives are alternative to each other, and sometimes use them wrongly. Learners of English are inefficient and make errors of different sources in comprehending and producing connectives.

Shaw(1986:363-364)explains that well-written paragraph depends on the ease and smoothness with which thought transits from sentence to sentence. Theoretically, the present study will provide beneficial and clear theoretical background in performing logical connectives, and their semantic roles in a coherent way. Practically, this study is useful for students, teachers, textbook writers of English language to be able to overcome the difficulties in using connectives. This study aims at:

1. Investigating the students' performance in the College of Education (henceforth, CE) and College of Education for Women (henceforth, CEW) at Tikrit University in the area of connectives.
2. Classifying students' errors in connectives at both recognition and production levels in the CE and CEW at Tikrit University to get a clear survey of students' performance.
3. Finding out whether there are significant differences between students' performance in the CE and CEW at both recognition and production levels.

It is hypothesized that:

1. Students' errors of CE and CEW at the production level are higher than that at recognition level.
2. There are no significant differences between students' performance of the CE and CEW in various areas of the connectives.

This study is limited to :

1. One type of grammatical cohesive devices viz 'Connectives'.
2. Fourth year College students in CE and CEW at the University of Tikrit during the academic year (2008-2009).

The following basic terms will be used frequently and operationally in this study:

1. Connectives: Gramley and Patzold (1992: 139) state that connective is operationally served to join sentence elements with each other. This relation can be achieved by conjunctions.
2. Error Analysis: Ellis (1997:17)remarks that error analysis (henceforth, EA) is alteration or deviation in producing logical connectives which arise from a lack of learners' knowledge. The operational definition of error analysis is an act, assertion that incidentally deviates from what is correct or appropriate, and sometimes errors refer to the condition of having false knowledge(The Free Dictionary, 2009: 1).

3. Performance: It takes into account the interaction between competence (knowledge, ability for use), it depends on the negotiation of meaning between two or more persons. It is a context specific, in addition to grammar rules, the knowledge of how language is used to achieve particular communicative goals, and the recognition of language use as a dynamic process(Bachman, 1990: 83).

2. Principles of Teaching Grammar

Celce-Murcia (2001: 275) states that there are useful sets of research-based general principles which can guide the teaching of grammar in second/foreign language classrooms:

1. Teaching Grammar should be planned and systematic .
2. Teaching Grammar should nevertheless be "rough tuned", presenting learners at slightly different stages a range of opportunities to supply increments to their grammar comprehension.
3. Teaching Grammar may contain agreement of classroom code switching and mother tongue use, at least with beginners.
4. Teaching Grammar should be "little and often" with much redundancy and revising of issues;
5. Text-based, problem-solving grammar activities are required to advance of learners' active, articulated knowledge about grammar;
6. Active corrective feedback and elicitation promote learners' active control of grammar.
7. Teaching Grammar requires to be reinforced and included in meaning-oriented activities and tasks, which present immediate opportunities for practice and use.

2.1 Notion of Performance in Learning Process

Cruse (2006: 28) points out that the term 'performance' was introduced by the famous linguist Chomsky to refer in the first place to the processes included in the production of actual utterances, rather than the produced utterances themselves. See the following Table(1)

	Phonology	Lexicon	Morphology and Syntax	Integrated Language Performance
Speed of response	Articulation ability (speed accuracy of speech sound production).	Naming facility (speed of responding with the names of things when presented in rapid succession.	Expressional fluency (ability to compose rapidly sentences fitting given grammatical requirements.)	Oral speaking fluency
Diversity of response	'word fluency' (ability to recall words with given phonetic-orthographic characteristics.)	Ideational fluency (ability to call up names or ideas fitting given semantic characteristics)		Listening comprehension
Complexity of information processing	Auditory memory for speech sounds or sequences of sounds	Abstract reasoning ability (ability to process complex linguistically coded information)		Reading comprehension (and speed)
Awareness linguistic competence	No pertinent evidence	Awareness of the structure of the lexicon; facility in giving opportunities, super- ordinate, etc.	Grammatical sensitivity (ability to find analogous grammatical elements in sentences)	Writing ability

Table (1)
Carroll's Chart of Linguistic performance abilities
(Stern,1983: 351)

2.2 Notion of Error Analysis

Crystal (1997: 139) states that error analysis (henceforth, EA) is a technique which L2 learners use for identifying, classifying, and systematically interpreting the unacceptable forms.

2.2.1 Sources of Errors

Brown (1987: 177-187) classifies the sources of errors into interlingual transfer, intralingual transfer, context of learning, and communication strategies as illustrated below:

2.2.2 Interlingual Transfer

Corder (1973: 132) , Ellis (1997: 51) and Lado (1961: 86) discuss that 'Interlingual transfer' means the process by which the L1 learners exerts over the acquisition of the L2. It often refers to the type of errors which is due to the L1 effect on the performance of L2 learner. When the two tasks are different and EFL learner performs only what s/he knows in the second task. This is sometimes called 'negative' or 'interference'.

2.2.3 Intralingual Transfer

Brown (1987: 178) points out that EFL learners have begun to produce structure of the new rule more and more intralingual transfer-generalization within the target language, i.e. the previous experience and their existing knowledge begin to contain forms within the L2 itself. Intralingual Transfer which is represented by 'negative intralingual transfer', or 'overgeneralization'

2.2.4 Context of Learning

Ibid (1987: 179), and Sarosdy et al (2006: 124) agree that 'context of learning' can be coincided with the concept 'teaching-induced errors', and sometimes with 'false concepts' which result

from various aspects of teaching procedure itself that EFL learners are exposed to: the classroom situation, the used material, and teaching method.

2.2.5 Communication Strategy

Ellis (2003: 340) affirm that communication strategies (CS) mean conscious employment of verbal or nonverbal mechanisms which EFL learners utilize to prevent a communication problem produced a lack of/or inadequacy of L2 knowledge. One strategy is called paraphrase another is avoidance.

2.3. Concept of Connectives

Quirk and Greenbaum(1973: 126)clarify that Connectives are some words and phrases which are used to indicate a specific connection between different parts of a text. They refer to the term 'conjunct' which shows a semantic connection between what is being said and what was said before. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 226)refer to connectives as 'conjunctions '.Burton-Roberts' (1997: 116)defines connectives as' conjunct adverbials'. Leech and Svartvik (1994: 177)describe connectives as 'linking signals'. While Biber et al (2000: 875) call connectives as 'linking adverbials' while Yule (2006: 208-209) labels them as 'connectors' and also 'linking words'.

2.3.1 Function and Usage of Connectives

Van Dijk (1977: 52) explains that the main function and usage of connectives is to make relation between propositions or facts which can be expressed by a set of cohesive expressions from different syntactic categories. These items represent binary operators because they cannot appear in an individual sentence or non-composite sentence and represent sentential adverbs such as *consequently, nevertheless, ...etc.* While Leech and Svartvik (1994: 177) mention their opinions that connectives are words and phrases which have the connecting function, like 'sign posts' on a journey.

Werner et al (1996: 220) state that connectives may also be used when a comma normally follows the connectives. Azar (1999: 389) agrees that a comma (,) is used if the adverb clause comes first, and also comma is usually used if the prepositional phrase comes first of the subject and the verb of the independent clauses and sometimes a semicolon (;) may be used instead of a period(.)between two independent clauses. Thus, commas are usually used to set the connective off from the rest of the sentence. For examples:

1. Because the weather was cold, John stayed at home.
2. Because of the cold weather, John stayed at home.
3. There has been an increase in population and a shortage of housing. As a result, rents have gone up and fewer students can afford to live within walking distance of college.
(Yule, 2006: 214)

2.3.2 Semantic Classification of Connectives

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 238-270) classify conjunctives into additive, adversative, causal, temporal, and other conjunctions(continuatives) as discussed below:

2.3.2.1 Additive

Quirk et al (1972: 665) define that additive connective is a set of cohesive devices which describe that part of sentence gives a supplement and additional information to what has been previously mentioned or denoted. For example:

4. You should stop smoking. Furthermore, you should do it at once!

2.3.2.2 Adversative

Ibid(1972: 674),and Biber et al (2000: 878)discuss that adversative relation can be paralleled with 'concessive' relation and signals the unexpected, surprising nature of what is being said in view of what was said before. Crystal (1997:11)defines adversative

as a certain form or construction which is used in semantic and grammar to indicate antithetical circumstances. For instance:

5. We agree that the weather is bad and not suitable for working in the open. However, we have the seeds, and they must be planted now.

(Leech et al, 2001: 269)

2.3.2.3 Causal

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 256) explain that the concept of 'causal' can be coincided with specific ones of 'result', 'reason', and 'purpose'. This relation introduces a sentence expressing consequence or result of what was said before. Leech and Svartvik (1994:106) claim that cause and reason are overlapping notions (both answering the question why? and what?). As a matter of fact, there are differences between cause and reason where the cause is related to the events themselves, whereas reason concerns the way a learner understands the events, and acts upon this interpretation. Look at following Examples:

6. She had a headache. Consequently, she stayed at home

7. I got there very late, so I missed the bus.

8. Because there was very little support, the strike was not successful.

(Alexander, 1988: 26)

2.3.2.4 Temporal

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 261) define temporal connectives as a sequence in time. In other words, the one is subsequence to other. For instance:

9. You should visit your uncle next day.

Table (2) shows in detail expressions of this type.

Table(2)
Table of Conjunctive Relations

	External/internal	Internal (unless otherwise specified)		
	Additive Additive	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. Exemplificator y: 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: but, and Emphatic: however, nevertheless, despite this	Contrastive: Avowal: in fact, actually, as a matter 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, 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
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	Reserved 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: otherwise, Polarity: under other circumstances	Respective: Directive: 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 the first ... in the end	Complex temporal (external only): Immediate: at once, thereupon Interrupted: soon, after a time Repetitive: next time, on other occasion Specific: next day, an hour later Durative: meanwhile Terminal: until then, 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 sun up, in short, briefly Presumptive: to resume, to return to the point
----------	---	---	--	--

Halliday and Hasan (1976:242-243)

2.3.2.5 Other Conjunctive Items (Continuative)

'Continuative' is an uninflected function word that serves to conjoin words, phrases, clauses, and sentences. Sometimes the term 'continuative' seems to be synonymous with connective, Conjunctive, and conjunction (Audio English.net Dictionary ,2006:2).These devises are:

1. Well

Leech et al (2001: 568) describe the word '*well*' as a linking adverb which is used when we cannot give the answer the other

person wants or expects, and occasionally served to begin an answer when you need time to think. Look at the following example:

10. I think Scotland is beautiful! Well, yes, but the weather can be terrible! (ibid)

2. Now

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 268) explain that '*now*' has continuative role and it often indicates the opening of new stage in the communication and a new point in argument. For instance:

11. Now when will you email your colleague, John?

3. Of course

Swan (2005: 367) clarifies that '*of course*' is a continuative expression which serves "as everybody knows" or "as is obvious". For example:

12. Of course Shakespeare had written many dramatic works.

4. Anyway

Parrott (2000: 309) describes it as a discourse marker which shows that we are getting back to the main topic after a digression. For example:

13. They changed over to a most peculiar kind of train which you don't see now. I've forgotten what it was called. Was it called a 'steam coach'? I can't remember. Anyway it was just one coach but it ran by stream and it made a funny noise. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 270)

5. Surely

Swan (2005: 563) states that '*surely*' is a type of continuative expression which is used mostly to ask for learners' acceptance: to convince them that something must be true, or that there are good reasons for believing it. For example:

14. Surely, the TV channel is accused of dramatizing the condition.

6. After all

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 270-271) describe 'after all' as a conjunctive item which has continuative function, and its meaning is "what I have just said is reasonable, when everything is taken into account".

Other classification of the connectives is given by Quirk et al (1972: 520-521) as follows:

1. **Listing** (enumerative & additive) such as *first, second ...etc.*
2. **Transitional** such as *incidentally, now, by the way ...etc.*
3. **Summative** such as *altogether, overall, in conclusion ... etc.*
4. **Apposition** such as *namely, in other words, for example ...etc.*
5. **Result**, such as *accordingly, consequently, now, ... etc.*
6. **Inferential** such as *else, otherwise, ...etc.*
7. **Contrastive** (reformulating, antithetic, concessive, and replative) such as *on the contrary, instead ...etc.*
8. **Temporal transition** such as *meantime, meanwhile, etc.*

2.3.3. Position of Connectives

Pooley (1957: 98) states that it is needful to state the employment of *and*, *but...* and other coordinating conjunctions at the opening of sentences because they produce heavy emphasis when presenting a new sentence.

15. He heaved the rock aside with all his strength. And there in the recesses of a deep hollow lay a glittering heap of treasure. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 235)

Roberts (1962: 110) mentions that sentence connectives may exist between the patterns or it may occur within or at the end of the second pattern. Coordinating conjunctions always come between the words or clauses that they join, and subordinating conjunctions must be placed at the beginning of clause. Sometimes connectives may be placed at the beginning, in the middle or at the end of a clause.

Quirk et al (1972: 526) find that the normal position for most connectives is initial (I). These connectives are limited to (I) position as follows: *again, also, altogether, besides, better,, equally, hence, likewise, more, only, overall, similarly, so, still, then (antithetic), too, yet*. Quirk et al (1985: 643) also state that middle position is quite normal for several of the connectives which could not be misunderstood in this position: *however, nevertheless, in other words, on the contrary ... etc*. At the end position, (E), we often find *in other words, the informal anyway, anyhow, and (especially) though*. For example:

16. Moreover, I wanted to speak to him before he left.

17. I wanted moreover to speak to him before he left.

18. I wanted to speak to him moreover before he left.

19. I wanted to speak to him before he left moreover.

20. I moreover wanted to speak to him before he left. (Parrott, 2000: 311)

2.3.4. Basic Forms of the Connectives

Biber et al (2000: 884) believe that connectives can be realized by all of basic forms and syntactic structures as follows:

1. Single adverb: which includes *anyway, however, nevertheless, so, though, therefore, similarly, now, also, yet, again, and then*.
2. Adverb phrases: which include *first and foremost, and more precisely*.
3. Prepositional phrases: which include, *for example, in addition, in conclusion, on other hand, in fact, as a result, and of course*.
4. Finite clauses: which include *that is, and that is to say, what is more*.

5. None-finite Clauses: which include *to conclude*, *added to that*, *to cap it all*.

2.3.5. Importance of Connectives

Cruse (2006: 26-27) and Tanskanen (2006: 7-21) show that there are kinds of connectedness which distinguish text from random collections of words. It is important to state that there is an interplay between cohesion and coherence in that the presence of cohesive devices in a text facilitate the task of recognizing its coherence. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) classify cohesion into grammatical and lexical cohesion.

2.3.5.1 Grammatical Cohesion

Brown and Yule (1983: 24), Gramley and Patzold (1992: 184), and Gee (1999: 159) state that 'Cohesion' refers to cohesive ties exist between elements in connected sentences of a text in such a way that one word or phrase is joined to other words or phrases. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 4) affirm that Grammatical cohesion includes those devices such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. (Cited in Tanskanen, 2006: 15).

1. Reference

Trask (1993: 232) states that reference is "the phenomenon by which noun phrase in particular utterance or sentence is associated with some entity in the real or conceptual world."

2. Substitution

Aarts (2001: 205) states that substitution as "a particular string of words must be constituent if it can be replaced by something else: by a single word, by another string of words."

3. Ellipsis

Burton-Roberts (1997: 111-112) describes that ellipsis is often the omission or the deletion from the sentences of demanded constructions but they can be comprehended in the context of their use.

4. Conjunctions

The final type of grammatical cohesion is called 'conjunction'. Aarts (2001: 46) mentions that conjunctions are closed class of words which have a linking function. Greenbaum and Nelson (2002: 111) show that there are two classes of conjunctions:

1. Coordination conjunctions, or coordinators. These forms include *for, and, but, or, yet* which are used to connect units of equal ranks.

Sometimes, coordination conjunction may be strengthened by a correlative form such as *both ... and, either or, not only ... but also*. For example:

26. Not only is television boring, but it (also) wastes a lot of time.

(Leech et al, 2001: 134)

2. Subordinating conjunctions, or subordinators. Show (1986: 127) adds that subordinating conjunction introduces an adverb clause which links dependant adverb clause to the rest of the sentence and can be grouped as follows: *because, before, since, until, how, so that, as, although, in order that, if, though, when, after, unless, and while*. For example:

27. There were delays because the weather was bad. (Yule, 2006: 197)

2.3.5.2 Lexical Cohesion

Jefferies (2006: 187) affirms that there is another type of cohesion which is called 'lexical cohesion', where the choice of the lexical items will affect the learner to make relations between sentences in a text. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 340-355) classify lexical cohesive devices into two main categories 'Reiteration' and 'Collocation' as follows:

1. Reiteration: includes repetition, synonyms, superordinate, the use of general word, hyponymy and so on (Tanskenan, 2006: 31-32).

2. Collocation: Gramley and Patzold (1992:61) state that collocation refers to different combinations of word forms.

3. Procedures

The population of this study is the fourth year learners, Department of English, in both CE and CEW at Tikrit University during the academic year 2008-2009. The total number of the original population is 106 where 58 students are chosen from CE and 24 students are chosen from CEW. The total number of the sample is 82 students drawn from both colleges which constitute 77.35% of its original society. See Table(3).

Table (3)
The Population and the Sample of the Study

College	Population	Sample	Percentage %
CE	82	58	70
CEW	24	24	100
Total	106	82	77.35

An achievement test is used as an instrument or medium of measuring students' performance at both CE and CEW in grammatical area. Performance test in which the test-takers' performance is expected to replicate their language performance in non-test situations (Jones 1985 a) and (Bachman, 1990: 77). The researcher constructs performance test which becomes significant not simply to know the degree of skill which test-taker can bring to the performance of a certain global task, but also to discover accurately which of the communicative skills and domains of the language he has mastered. Brumfit and Johnson (1979:151-152) add that Performance-based test is useful as an achievement test, i.e. to show the degree of success in assimilating the content of a language

learning programme which is based on a communicative (notional) syllabus. The performance of global communicative task may show for any task the enabling skills which have to be mobilized to complete it. The performance of global communicative task may show for any task the enabling skills which have to be mobilized to complete it. Procedure to work is as follows:

1. Global Task

e.g. Search text for specific information

2. Enabling Skills

e.g.- Distinguish main point from supporting details.

- understand text relations through grammatical cohesion devices.

- understand relations within sentences.

- understand conceptual meaning.

- deduce meaning of unfamiliar lexis.

In this study, a written achievement test is designed to assess students' performance in connectives. Coloured items as well as two modified passages have been taken from distinct books. The validity of the test has been ascertained. Brown (2004: 22) indicates that if a test accurately represents the subject matter about which results are to be reflected, and if it constrains the test-takers to perform the behaviours that are being assessed, it can intimate 'content-related evidence of validity', more commonly known as 'content validity'. Yu (2008: www) defines face validity as making common sense, being persuasive and acceptable. Face validity also means the validity at face value. A jury of ten specialists in linguistics and methodology of teaching EFL certify the face validity of the diagnostic test.

The validity of the test has been ascertained. McNamara (2000: 135) clarifies that pilot administration means a version of a test written during the test development process which is to be

administered. At the outset, the pilot administration is conducted on twenty four students assigned randomly from the original population of CE. Bachman (1990: 24) characterizes that reliability is a quality or an aspect of test scores, i.e. reliability represents the consistency of measures or stability of the results across different times, test forms, raters, and other characteristics of measurement context. Thus, in this study Pearson correlation coefficient formula is used to find out the reliability of the test and it has been found (0.73) which is considered as good, while Spearman Browns' correlation coefficient is (0.84).

$$R = \frac{N \sum(XY) - (\sum X)(\sum Y)}{\sqrt{[N \sum X^2 - (\sum X)^2] [N \sum Y^2 - (\sum Y)^2]}}$$

Where:

R= the number of students in the sample

$\sum XY$ = the summation of the product X and Y scores.

$\sum X$ = the summation of scores on one variable

$\sum Y$ = the summation on the other variable

$\sum X^2$ = the summation of the squared scores on the X variable

$\sum Y^2$ = the summation of the squared scores on the Y variable.

(Spiegel, 1972: 189)

Item analysis is also found. Item analysis is used to determine test homogeneity: the more similar to one another (not being identical) test items are doing something effective (validity) and consistency (reliability) (Davies, 1990:6).The Difficulty Level* of this study is also calculated. Richards and Schmidt (2002: 276-277)explain that Item Difficulty (ID) means a degree of ease of a test item, it denotes the proportion of test-takers who answered the

item correctly. Mousavi (1999: 193) and Brown(2004:58-59)clarify that it means a measure of how easy or difficult an item is on the basis of particular group of test-takers getting the test item. The total scores of twenty-four students have been arranged from highest scores to the lowest one, then they are classified into two groups.The whole scores of students who answer the test items correctly at both the higher and lower groups are divided by the total number of students, and then multiplied by (100). If the items difficulty level falls somewhere between about (0.20) to (0.80), they would be good and preferred (Bloom et al, 1981: 95). Hence, the current (ID) of the fourth year students fluctuates between (0.33) and (0.58). See Table (4).

Table (4)**Number of the items, Discrimination Power, and Difficulty****Level of test Items**

Number of the items	Disc. Power	Number of the items	Diff. Level
1	0.63	1	0.58
18	0.63	6	0.58
29	0.63	14	0.58
32	0.63	18	0.58
8	0.54	23	0.58
21	0.54	25	0.58
23	0.54	32	0.58
35	0.54	37	0.58
41	0.54	44	0.58
46	0.54	50	0.58
50	0.54	9	0.54
4	0.50	10	0.54
9	0.50	17	0.54

Number of the items	Disc. Power	Number of the items	Diff. Level
28	0.50	35	0.54
44	0.50	43	0.54
5	0.46	47	0.54
17	0.46	3	0.50
24	0.46	4	0.50
34	0.46	8	0.50
39	0.46	11	0.50
42	0.46	16	0.50
15	0.42	20	0.50
38	0.42	21	0.50
2	0.38	26	0.50
7	0.38	28	0.50
19	0.38	31	0.50
20	0.38	33	0.50
26	0.38	34	0.50
30	0.38	41	0.50
40	0.38	42	0.50
43	0.38	46	0.50
10	0.33	10	0.45
11	0.33	36	0.45
25	0.33	2	0.41
36	0.33	13	0.41
47	0.33	19	0.41
3	0.29	24	0.41
6	0.29	29	0.41
12	0.29	38	0.41

Number of the items	Disc. Power	Number of the items	Diff. Level
33	0.29	40	0.41
37	0.29	48	0.41
13	0.25	7	0.37
14	0.25	5	0.33
16	0.25	12	0.33
16	0.25	22	0.33
22	0.25	27	0.33
27	0.25	30	0.33
31	0.25	39	0.33
48	0.25	45	0.33
49	0.25	49	0.33

Discrimination Power (DP) is found. Mousavi (1999: 191-192) and Brown (2004: 59) point out that it means how well a test item differentiates (discriminates) between high- and low-ability test-takers, i.e. Item discrimination is the degree to which an item distinguishes between weak and strong test-taker in the test as a whole.

*The following formula constructs as follows:

$$DL = \frac{H+L}{N} \times 100$$

H= number of correct answers in the high group .

L= number of correct answers in the low group .

N= the total number of students in both groups

Items which indicate discrimination power* of (0.30) or more are mostly regarded acceptable and satisfactory (Eble ,1972: 399). Correspondingly, the present discrimination power (DP) fluctuates between (0.25) and (0.63). See Table (4) The whole test contains 5 questions which consist 50 items. They are scored out of 100 marks. The scores of the present test are divided equally between recognition and production levels. Two marks are specified to the correct items whereas zero for incorrect production as well as neglected items. The final version of the test is given to eighty-two fourth year students in the Department of English, University of Tikrit on the 20th of April 2009. The time is limited to two hours.

4. Analysis of the Data

The analysis of data will also justify the assumed hypotheses as well as systemize, and categorize the achieved results of learners' responses.

4.1. Learners' Performance in Recognizing the Functions of Connectives

The first question assesses students' performance to recognize and choose the correct connective that best completes the given sentences among various types of the connectives items. See Table(5)

*The following formula has been used to estimate the discrimination power of the items:

$$\text{Discrimination Power} = \frac{RL - RU}{1/2 T}$$

RL = the number of students in the lower group who get the items right.

RU = the number of students in the upper group who get the items right.

T = the total number of the two groups

Table(5)

The Number of Learners' Correct, Incorrect Answers and Percentages of CE and CEW in Recognizing the Correct Function of the Connective

The Syntactic Area	No of Items	CE				CEW			
		No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %
To recognize the correct function of connective among different items	1	38	65%	20	34%	15	62%	9	37%
	2	44	75%	14	24%	17	70%	7	29%
	3	39	67%	19	32%	15	62%	9	37%
	4	20	34%	38	65%	7	29%	17	70%
	5	28	48%	30	51%	13	54%	11	45%
	6	35	60%	23	39%	12	50%	12	50%
	7	27	46%	31	53%	8	33%	16	66%
	8	25	43%	33	56%	13	54%	11	45%
	9	31	53%	27	46%	15	62%	9	37%
	10	18	31%	40	68%	18	75%	6	25%
Total		305	52%	275	47%	133	55%	107	44%

Brumfit and Johnson (1979: 154) find that there are various levels of performance by matching the learners' performance with operational specifications. These specifications are related to both receptive and productive performance. These parameters are:

- Size, complexity, range of text which can be handled /e.g. enabling skills, structures, functions which can be handled.
- Speed at which language can be processed.
- Flexibility shown in dealing with changes / e.g. topic

- Accuracy with which/ e.g. enabling skills, structures,
- Appropriacy functions can be handled.
- Independence from reference sources and interlocutor
- Repetition / hesitation in processing text.

The attainable consequences ensure that students of CE and CEW do not perform well in this area of the test. Strictly speaking, students of CE and CEW cannot ascertain and determine the correct connective because most of them misselect the right choices. Table (5) indicates the total number of incorrect answers for students of CE is 305 which constitutes 52%, and the total number of correct answers is 275 which forms 47% ,while the total number of incorrect answers for students of CEW is 133 which constitutes 55%, and the total number of correct answers is 107 which constitutes 44%. This clarifies that both students of CE and CEW show equal ratio, and marginal performance of connectives according to Carroll's (1980: 134) scale of students' performance. Students of CE are competent in item 10 which represents adversative connective, while students of CEW are good performers in item 4 which represents continuative connective. This is due to the positive effect of item 10, students of CE and CEW are introduced to such items in pre-university or university stage, and the items are easy for them. While students of CE are very poor performers in item 2 which represents additive connectives and students of CEW are also very poor in item 10. This is due to the fact both students of CE and CEW are confused in selecting the correct choice, sometimes they ignore an item, the difficulty of the interpretation of the function of the connectives, the lack of mastery to use such connectives, inaccurate and sporadic understanding of such an item.

4.2 Learners' Performance in Using Connective for Coherence

The second question is assigned to evaluate properly the learners' ability to show the role and the function of correct connective to close the given passage. See Table (6).

Table (6)

The Number of Students' Correct, Incorrect Answers and Percentages of CE and CEW in using connectives for Coherence

The Syntactic Area	No of Items	CE				CEW			
		No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %
Using Connective for Coherence	1	12	20%	46	79%	6	25%	18	75%
	2	13	22%	45	77%	2	8%	22	91%
	3	15	25%	43	74%	10	41%	14	58%
	4	11	18%	47	81%	11	45%	13	54%
	5	21	36%	37	63%	10	41%	14	58%
Total		72	24%	218	75%	39	32%	81	67%

It is clear that students of CE have good performance while students of CEW are competent in arranging the text by using given cohesive devices but they are slightly confused in the choice of the correct connectives. Table (6) shows that the total number of incorrect answers for students of CE is 72 which forms 24%; while their correct answers are 218 which constitutes 75%. As for students of CEW, their incorrect answers is 39 which constitutes 32% whereas their correct answers is 81 which forms 67%. Very good performance is made by students of CE in item 4 which represents causal connectives. Excellent performance is achieved by students

of CEW in item 2 which represents additive connectives. These result from simplicity of this area, the effect of personal characteristics, and the students have good mastery of these connectives that means there is influence of the previous extensive exposure to this area. While item 5 registers the lowest the percentage of correct answers for students of CE and CEW. Students of CE are competent, while students of CEW are modest in this item. This is due to the difficulty, ignorance of such an item, and they sometimes confuse relationships among connectives.

4.3 Learner's Performance in Recognizing the Connective and Identifying the Adverbial Clause

The third question in this test is formulated to test students' ability to encircle the connective in the given sentences, to point out the relationships they express, and to underline the adverbial clause. Table (7) shows that.

Table (7)

The Number of Learners' Correct, Incorrect Answers, and Percentages of CE and CEW in Recognizing the Connective, Type of Relationship and Adverbial Clause

The Syntactic Area	No of Items	CE				CEW			
		No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %
To recognize the connective,	1	35	60%	23	39%	5	20%	19	79%
	2	24	41%	34	58%	4	16%	20	83%
	3	33	56%	25	43%	8	33%	16	66%
	4	32	55%	26	44%	4	16%	20	83%

The Syntactic Area	No of Items	CE				CEW			
		No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %
adverbial, clauses, and type of the relationship or the connective	5	34	58%	24	41%	5	20%	19	79%
	6	36	62%	22	37%	8	33%	16	66%
	7	39	67%	19	32%	10	41%	14	58%
	8	31	53%	27	46%	7	29%	17	70%
	9	31	53%	27	46%	7	29%	17	70%
	10	29	50%	29	50%	11	45%	13	54%
Total		324	55%	256	44%	69	28%	171	71%

Table (7) indicates that the total number of CE students' incorrect answers is 324, which constitutes 55%, and the total number of correct answers is 256, which forms 44% .While the total number of incorrect answers for students of CEW is 69 which constitutes 28%, and the total number of correct answers is 171 which forms 71%. It is clear that students of CEW have better performance than students of CE .Item 2 as causal connective students of CEW register very good result. While students of CE have a moderate performance in item 2. Both students of CE and CEW have a good mastery of such items, interference between the first and second language, and the item is easy. Students of CE have extremely poor performance on item 7 while moderate performance for students of CEW is registered on item 7. This is due to the failure of recognizing the adversative connective and confusing them with other relationships (additive, causal, continuative), and sometimes they cannot distinguish this connective from other parts of speech, faulty grammatical control,

insufficient training, ignorance of such item, inaccurate understanding in such areas, negligence of the grammatical knowledge, and difficulties of different classification of these connectives.

4.4. Learners' Performance in Using Logical Connectives in the Cloze passage

The aim of this question is that students are required to yield and fill in blanks with the appropriate connectives. Students' results are represented in Table (8):

Table (8)

The Number of the Learners' Correct, Incorrect Answers, and Percentages of CE and CEW in Using Logical Connectives to Close Passage

The Syntactic Area	No of Items	CE				CEW			
		No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of Correct answers	Percentage %
To use logical connectives in cloze passage	1	26	44%	32	55%	17	70%	7	29%
	2	42	72%	16	27%	13	54%	11	45%
	3	30	51%	28	48%	9	37%	15	62%
	4	26	44%	32	55%	6	25%	18	75%
	5	36	62%	22	37%	22	91%	2	8%
	6	34	58%	24	41%	7	29%	17	70%
	7	36	62%	22	37%	17	70%	7	29%
	8	31	53%	27	46%	13	54%	11	45%
	9	30	51%	28	48%	10	41%	14	58%
	10	7	12%	51	87%	11	45%	13	54%
Total		298	51%	282	48%	125	52%	115	47%

The results of this area indicate that the total number of incorrect responses for students of CE is 298 which forms 51%, while the total number of incorrect responses for students of CEW is 125 which constitutes 52%, and the total number of the correct answers is 115 which forms 47%. It is clear that students of CE and CEW record equal results which indicate a significant knowledge. They have marginal performance in this area. Very good performance of CE students is registered on item 10 while CEW students show good performance on item 4. This is resulted from good mastery of such connectives, educational background and good training on these items, whereas very little performance of students of CE is obviously on item 2 and non-performance of CEW students is of item 5 which represents additive connective. This means that students of CE and CEW are frequently confounded relationships among ideas, and sometimes relationships between utterances are not adequately marked in the given text. Negative interference occurs in item 5, also most of them face difficulties in such item, poor training in pre-university stage. EFL learners lack of awareness and the knowledge to fill the given blanks with suitable connectives.

4.5 Learner's performance Level in Linking Sentences with Logical Connectives

The specific objective of question 5 is to evaluate the students' performance at the production level, and to check whether the students of CE and CEW have the ability to supply a suitable connective to link the introduced pairs of sentences correctly without using the same connective twice add or omit words to improve the new sentences and pay attention to punctuation marks.

Table (9)

The Number of Learners' Correct, Incorrect Answers, and Percentages of CE and CEW in Supplying Logical Connectives to Link Sentences

The Syntactic Area	No of Items	CE				CEW			
		No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of Correct answers	Percentage %
To supply logical connectives to link sentences	1	17	29%	41	70%	6	25%	18	75%
	2	13	22%	45	77%	3	12%	21	87%
	3	26	44%	32	55%	13	54%	11	45%
	4	46	79%	12	20%	14	58%	10	41%
	5	34	58%	24	41%	11	45%	13	54%
	6	36	62%	22	37%	15	62%	9	37%
	7	27	46%	31	53%	7	29%	17	70%
	8	36	62%	22	37%	12	5%	12	50%
	9	34	58%	24	41%	14	58%	10	41%
	10	32	55%	26	44%	4	16%	20	83%
	11	38	65%	20	34%	17	70%	7	29%
	12	36	62%	22	37%	8	33%	16	66%
	13	32	55%	26	44%	8	33%	16	66%
	14	32	55%	26	44%	9	37%	15	62%
	15	40	68%	18	31%	12	5%	12	50%
Total		479	55%	391	44%	153	42%	207	57%

Table (9) clarifies that students of CEW record better performance than students of CE where the total number of incorrect answers for CE students is 479 which constitutes 55%, and

the total number of correct answers is 391 which forms 44%. While the total number of incorrect answers of CEW students is 153 which constitutes 42% and the total number of correct answers 207 which forms 57%. Students of CE register a good performance in item 2 which represents causal connective, while students of CEW have a very good performance on item 2 too. This is due to the fact that students of CE and CEW are exposed to such an item in pre-university or university stage, the positive effects of the mother tongue so the item seems to be easy for them. While students of CE have a very poor performance in item 4 which represents additive connective, and students of CEW are also very weak in performance on item 11 which represents continuative connective. Disjoining such items results from the difficulty of these items, misinterpreting and confusing the logical relationships, poor training in these items, carelessness of such items, and faulty grammatical control on these areas.

4.6. Learners' Performance in the Whole Test

In order to give a comprehensible illustration of students' responses in CE and CEW, Table (10) displays that students of CE show slightly moderate results at the recognition level where the total number of incorrect answers is 701 which forms 48% and the total number of correct answers is 749 which constitutes 51%. By contrast, Table (10) shows that the total number of incorrect answers at the production level is 777 which forms 53%, and the correct answers are 673 which constitutes 46%. This indicates that students of CE perform slightly better in the recognition level than the production level, i.e. learners' performance in the recognition level is acceptable (pass mark) but the researcher seeks for a higher level. This indicates that students of CE show better performance at the recognition level than at the production level. This is due to

inefficient knowledge at the production level. Students of CE face more serious problems at the production level, faulty grammatical control in producing the logical connectives, lack of awareness, and mechanic of writing or speech. Concerning students of CEW, the total number of incorrect answers in the recognition level is 241 which forms 40%, and the total number of correct answers is 359 which constitutes 59%, while the total number of incorrect answers in the production level is 278 which forms 46%, and the total number of the correct answers 322 which forms 53% as shown in Table(10). It is clear that students of CEW show acceptable performance in the recognition and production level. This is due to personal characteristics, educational background and they are exposed extensively to this area in pre-university or university stage. There is an assumption which indicates that female students are better in acquiring the foreign language than male students, this is due to the type of language acquisition device of female which helps them to acquire language faster than male.

4.7 Overall Assessment of Learners' Performance

According to Carroll's (1980:134) Scale of students' performance, it is found that learners' performance ranges between 3.6% as intermittent users and 1.2% as very good users. (See Appendix VI) The results also indicate that:

1. There is only 1 very good learner which constitutes 1.2% out of total of 82 students.
2. There are 22 good learners which forms 26.8% out of a whole of 82 students.
3. There are only 4 competent learners which constitutes 4.8% out of a total of 82 students.
4. There are 4 modest learners which forms 4.8% out of a whole of 82 students.

5. There are just 29 marginal learners which constitutes 35.3% out of a total 82 students.
6. There are 18 extremely limited users which forms 21.9% out of a whole of 82 students.
7. There are only 3 intermittent users which constitutes 3.6 % out of a total of 82 students. It is found that there are only 31 students perform successfully on the test which forms 37.80%. While the mean of the total scores is 51.29 which indicates that they have inaccurate understanding.

Table (10)
Correct, Incorrect Answers, and Percentages of CE and CEW Learners' Performance at the Recognition and Production Levels

CEW											
Recognition						Production					
No. of questions	No. of items	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	No. of questions	No. of items	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of Correct answers	Percentage %	No. of questions
1	10	133	55%	107	44%	4	10	125	52%	115	47%
2	5	39	32%	81	67%	5	15	153	42%	207	57%
3	10	69	28%	171	71%						2
Total	25	241	40%	359	59%	25	278	46%	322	53%	Total
CE											
Recognition						Production					
No. of questions	No. of items	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %	No. of questions	No. of items	No. of incorrect answers	Percentage %	No. of correct answers	Percentage %
1	10	305	52%	275	47%	4	10	298	51%	282	48%
2	5	72	24%	218	75%	5	15	479	55%	391	44%
3	10	324	55%	256	44%						
Total	25	701	48%	749	51%	25	777	53%	673	46%	

Table (11)
Assessment Scale of Students' Performance

Band	Learner's Performance
90-100	Expert user. Accurately understands English Styles
80-89	Very good user. often approaches bilingual competence
70-79	Good user. Would cope in most situations in English
60-69	Competent user. Can cope well with most situations but will have occasional misunderstandings.
50-59	Modest user. Manages in general to communicate but often has inaccurate understandings
40-49	Marginal user. Is not easy to communicate with
30-39	Extremely limited user. Receptive skills do not allow continuous communication
20-29	Intermittent user. Understanding occurs only sporadically
0-19	Non-user. Uncertain recognition of which type of language being used.

Carroll's (1980: 134) scale of Students' Performance

4.8 Comparison of Students' Performance between the CE and CEW

Table (12)
The Mean Score, Standard Deviation and T-Calculated Value
and T-Tabulated Value, Degree of Freedom and Level of
Significance

College	Mean Score	SD	t. Value		DF	Level of Significance
			Calculated	Tabulated		
CE	49	16.26	1.78	1.98	80	0.05
CEW	56	13.45				

T-test formula* has been used to find out whether there are significant differences between the students' performance in the CE and the CEW students. The mean of CE in the diagnostic test is 49 while CEW is 56. Consequently, t-test is 1.78. It is certainly less than the tabulated t-value which is 1.98 at 80 degree of freedom, at 0.05 level of significance as shown in Table (12).

* T-Test formula is:

(Glass and Stanely, 1970: 295)

$$\frac{\bar{X}_1 - \bar{X}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{(n_1 - 1)S_1^2 + (n_2 - 1)S_2^2}{n_1 + n_2 - 2}}}$$

4.9 Assessment of CE Students' Performance

The test particular score for each correct answer is 2 marks and the total marks for each test-taker is 100. Appendix(IV) displays that there are only 37 CE students out of a whole of 58 EFL learners were unsuccessful to get at least pass mark of 50. It indicates that just 53.44% of CE students successfully performed the diagnostic test. In addition, it investigates students' performance according to Carroll's scales (1980: 134). Students results are:

-
-
1. None of CE students are expert users.
 2. Only 1 student is a very good user which represents 1.72% of a whole of 58 CE students.
 3. Just 16 are good users which constitutes 27.58 of a whole of 58 CE students.
 4. Just 4 are modest users which forms 6.89% out of a whole of 58 CE students.
 5. 17 are marginal users which constitutes 29.31% out of a whole of 58 CE students.
 6. Only 17 are absolutely limited users which forms 29.31% out of a whole of 58 CE students.
 7. 3 are intermittent users which forms 5.17% out of a whole of 58 CE students. What is more, the mean of the whole scores is 49% which indicates unacceptable results, so researcher seeks for higher level. (See Appendix IV).

4.10. Assessment of CEW Students' Performance

As far as CEW students' performance, Appendix (V) presents that there are at least 13 CEW students out of a whole of 24 students failed to get the test pass mark of 50. It is clear that there are only 11 CEW students which forms 45.83% succeeded in the diagnostic test. Thus, it also examines CEW students' performance on the basis of Carroll's scales (1980: 134) as follows:

1. There are no expert CEW users.
2. There are no very good CEW users.
3. There are only 6 good CEW users which forms 25% out of a whole of 24 CEW students.
4. There are 5 competent CEW users which constitutes 20% out of a whole of 24 CEW students.
5. There are 12 marginal CEW users which forms 50% out of a total of 24 CEW students.

6. There is absolutely 1 CEW limited user which constitutes 4.16% out of a whole of 24 CEW students. Besides, the mean of the whole CEW students' score is 56% which is considered inadequate results.

4.11. Discussion of Results

Table (13) clarifies that the majority of students in CE and CEW encounter different kinds of difficulties in manipulating the logical connective expressions. Moreover, students are misapprehended and deficient in using logical connectives. It is clear that the total number of incorrect answers of CE students is 1478 which constitutes 51% . While the total number of incorrect answers of CEW students is 519 which forms %43. In this respect, the additive connectives occupy the first rank scheme where incorrect answers are 358 which constitutes 56%. Other conjunctive items (continuatives) are the second in rank where the total number of incorrect answers is 345 which constitutes 54%. The third rank is occupied by adversative connectives where the incorrect answers are 455 which forms 49%. Causal Connectives hold the last rank because the incorrect answers are 320 which form 46 %.

Table (13)

The Areas of Test, No. of Incorrect Answers for CE and CEW Students, their Percentage and Rank

The Areas of Test	CE			CEW		
	No. of Incorrect Answers	Percentage %	Rank	No. of Incorrect Answers	Percentage %	Rank
Additive	358	56%	1	124	46%	1
Continuative	345	54%	2	119	45%	2
Adversative	455	49%	3	167	43%	3
Causal	320	46%	4	109	37%	4
Total	1478	51%		519	43%	

Table (13) also displays that students of CEW show better performance than students of CE. As for students of CEW, the first rank is also occupied by additive connectives where the total number of incorrect answers is 124 which forms 46%. Other conjunctive items (Continuative) take the second rank order where the total number of incorrect answers is 119 which constitutes 45%. The third rank is occupied by adversative connectives where the total number of incorrect answers is 167 which constitutes 43%, and this ensures that they face serious problems. Causal connectives take the last rank where the total number of incorrect answers is 109 which forms 37%.

Table (13) shows that students of CE and CEW face serious problems and are incompetent in using the logical connectives. They are also unfamiliar with actual use of those connectives. This results from the lack of the knowledge to master such areas of connectives. This is also due to the linguistic nature of connectives. The lack of practice in these areas, ignorance of using connectives, improper training in such areas, and the interference between the first language and the second language. Besides, the difficulty of

these connectives which needs semantic, logical, syntactic, and phonological knowledge make the students avoid long sentences.

It is clear that the Arabic language has dominant effect and strong impact on the English language. Interlingual transfer which is represented by 'Positive Transfer' occurs when the learners' L1 facilitates the L2 acquisition. That is to say, first language transfer means the process by which the L1 learner exerts over the acquisition of L2 (Ellis, 1997: 51). It can be observed that certain items have the same semantic function between the L1 and the L2 as positive transfer as shown in Question (1) items (3) and (10), which facilitate the selection of the correct answer.

Q1/ 3. It would be wise to save some of the money. d) for there may be unexpected expenses later.

من الحكمة أن توفر بعض النقود لأن يمكن أن يكون هناك أنفاق غير متوقع فيما بعد.

The connective 'for' seems to be the same function in the Arabic language 'لأن' to state a reason. It facilitates the selection of the right choice.

(10) These plants usually flower in spring d) but won't if there is frost.

هذه النباتات تزهر عادة في فصل الربيع لكن لن تزهر لو كان هناك صقيع.

Also, the item 'but' has equivalent function in mother tongue which facilitates to choice the correct answer.

Negative transfer also can be found in Question (4) items (3) and (5):

Q4/ 3. In fact, it is not just the summer temperature but the general average temperature of the whole world that has been steadily moving up.

This item has been answered as follows:

3.*Therefore , it is not just the summer temperature. Thus, the general average temperature of the whole world that has been steadily moved up.

لذلك لا ترفع درجات حرارة الصيف فقط ، فان الارتفاع كان متوسط درجات حرارة العالم بانتظام.

Most of the students interpret the relationship between these sentences as 'causal' relation while they are 'adversative relation.

Q4/ 5. There are small signs for example Butterflies in north America have moved about 60 miles.

This item has been answered as:

5.* There are small signs. As (if), Butterflies in north America have moved about 60 miles.

هناك إشارات صغيرة كالفرشات في شمال أميركا قد انتقلت ٦٠ ميلاً.

The connective 'for example' is interpreted by the students 'as if ' which refers to similarity. This is due to negative transfer or Arabic style.

Other negative transfer can be indicated in Question (5) item (8).

Q5/8.The police were sure Griffiths was lying. They had found his fingerprints everywhere. Furthermore, they knew for a fact that they had not been at his mother's at the time of the crime.

8.* The police were sure Griffiths was lying. So they had found his fingerprints everywhere. They knew for a fact that they had not been at his mother's at the time of the crime.

الشرطة كانت متأكدة انه كذاب لأنهم وجدوا بصمة أصابعه في كل مكان فقد عرفوا الحقيقة كان في منزل أمه وقت الجريمة.

Most of the students have used 'so...' instead of 'furthermore' which expresses 'additive', this is due to negative transfer of the students' native language. 'Interlingual Transfer' means errors which result from the target language itself. In other words, errors of this type occur when EFL learners produce or use new forms within the target language itself(Brown,1987: 178).Intralingual transfer includes different types of errors such as overgeneralization(errors caused by the extension of the L2 forms), simplification(errors

result from using simple linguistic rules within the target language), and errors of overproduction (expressions being used too repeatedly or over and over) (Richard and Schmidt, 2002: 185). In the current test, learners experience confusing within English language itself. Thus, Intralingual transfer can be observed in Question (1) items (1), (3), (8) and (5), where incorrect choice of logical connective has been occurred among various choices:

1. I enjoyed reading the story. It was rather sad c) though

1*. I enjoyed reading the story. It was rather sad b) but

The students have chosen the connective 'but' because they use and experience the item 'but' more frequently than other connectives. Such error also comes from misplacement when the connective 'though' is placed within sentence and sentence final position while 'but' is placed sentence initial position.

Induced errors is found in Question (1) items (2) :

Q1/ 2. He told me he wanted to join the army b) that is (to say) he wanted to wear a uniform and carry a gun.

2*. He told me he wanted to join the army c) therefore, he wanted to wear a uniform and carry a gun.

Most of students do not have the ability to distinguish between different items because of insufficient practice and the classroom situation makes them choose false concept or false item. Context of learning errors is noticed in Question (2) item (4).

Q2/ 4. Consequently, he is looking forward to his trip around the world.

4*. Besides, he is looking forward to his trip around the world.

Students of CE and CEW understand that the connective 'consequently' has the same function to the connective 'besides'. This results from defective understanding of the functions of connectives and classroom situation to show the differences among different types of connectives. Induced errors are found in Question

(3) item (4), (5) and (6) because students of CE and CEW cannot recognize and encircle the connective from other elements of each sentence or from other parts of speech. In addition, they fail to identify the type of those connectives, i.e. they confuse to recognize the relationship expresses (additive, adversative, causal, and continuative).

Q3/4. The peasants are desperately short of food. Furthermore, they urgently need doctors and medical supplies.

The expression 'furthermore' is additive connective.

5. You know that new house? Well, you'll never guess who bought it. The item 'well' is continuative connectives. Students of CE and CEW sometimes encircle noun, verb, adverb, and pronoun in those sentences. In addition, most of them cannot identify the relationship it expresses. They comprehend that 'furthermore' is to express adversative relationship and 'well' is to express additive connective.

6. You will not help me. Hence, I must do it myself.

The connective 'Hence' expresses causal relationship. The students' answer is that the connective 'Hence' expresses additive relationship. This results from faulty presentation of the differences among various relationships of the connectives. As far as dependent and independent clauses, most of students fail to differentiate and underline the dependent clauses especially in Question(3)items (1):

In item 1. Although economic alliances can help countries, certain parts of the population may suffer.

The dependent clause is 'economic alliance can help countries'. Most of students underline the independent clause 'certain parts' of the population may suffer" as dependent clause. Sometimes Students of CE and CEW do not have the ability to distinguish what the connective expresses. They comprehend 'although' as causal connective.

While items (8), Students of CE and CEW are unable to recognize what relationship the connectives express:

Q3/ 8. Now, I'd like to say something about the exam.

The expression 'now' is to express continuative connective. They have interpreted it as additive connective.

Faerch and Kasper (1983: 36) say that communication strategy is "potentially conscious plans for solving what to an individual presents itself as a problem in reaching a particular communicative goal." (Cited in Brown, 1987: 180). In this study, communication strategy is seen in Question (5) item (2). It is clear that students of CE and CEW avoid using the connective 'because of', 'on account of', 'in spite of', because they lack the knowledge to use such connectives, and sometimes do not know how to change the simple sentence into noun phrase. Thus, most of their answers depending on because, and so in these items.

Q5/2. The rice crop failed on account of bad weather.

2. The rice crop failed because of bad weather.

2. The rice crop failed because /so it was bad weather .

other errors can be found in items (3), (4), (5).

Q5/ 3. What did you think of her new laptop? Well, I was a bit surprised.

3*. What did you think of her new laptop? Yes, and alright at the moment, I was a bit surprised.

5. I am not sure what time I'll arrive, may be seven or eight, anyway I'll certainly be there before.

5*. In way, I am not sure what time I'll arrive may be seven or eight. So, I'll certainly be there before.

5. Conclusions

1. Connectives represent crucial aspect of the English language which have a significant role to organize and to connect learners' ideas logically in written and spoken texts. It is clear that coherent texts do not only depend on conjunctives but also on other cohesive devices.
2. EFL learners make errors of different sources at the recognition as well as production level. It is also clear that EFL learners encounter more complex and problematic errors at the production level than at the recognition levels. This is due to the mechanism of speech.
3. Unsatisfactory performance also results from the lack of the mastery and the knowledge to recognize and to employ different types of connectives. Misuse of English Connectives sometimes comes from learners' first language interference.
5. Inappropriate performance results from ineffective techniques, improper mechanical exercises in their textbook, and misleading presentation of connectives. Connectives as highly teachable teachers of English language may not effectively train their students on actual usage of connectives. Thus, the concentration in teaching should be on the function of connectives .i.e. Teaching use and usage.

References

- Aarts, B. (2001). *English Syntax and Argumentation*. 2nd. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Alexander, L. G. (1988). *Longman English Grammar*. London: Longman
- Audioenglish.net. dictionary (2006).<http://www.audioenglish.net>
- Azar, B. S. (1999). *Understanding and Using English Grammar*. 3rd. ed. USA: Longman.

- Bachman, L. F. (1990). ***Fundamental Considerations in Language Testing***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Biber, D. S. Johnsson, G. Leech, Conrad; and E. Finegan (2000). ***Longman Grammar of Spoken English and Written English***. 3rd ed. London: Longman. Pearson Education.
- Bloom, B.S; Madaus, G. F. and Hasting T. J. (1981). ***Evaluation to Improve Learning*** . New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Brown, D. (1987). ***Principles of language Learning and Teaching***. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- ,(2004). ***Language Assessment Principles and Classroom Practices***. USA.White Education Plains Pearson: Longman.
- Brumfit, C. J. and Johnson, K. (1979). ***The Communicative Approach to Language Teaching***. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bulter, Christopher,(1985).***Statistics in Linguistics***. Great Britain: Billing Ltd.
- Burton-Roberts, S. N. (1997). ***Analyzing Sentence***. 2nd ed. New York: Addison Wesley; Longman Ltd.
- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). ***Discourse Analysis***. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Carroll, B. J. (1980). ***Testing Communicative Performance***. Oxford: Pergamson Institute of English.
- Celce-Muricia, M. (2001). ***Teaching English as a Second or Foreign Language***. USA: Heinle & Heinle.
- Corder, S.P. (1973). ***Introducing Applied Linguistics***. London: Harmondsworth Penguin Books Ltd.
- Cruse, Alan (2006). ***A Glossary of Semantic and Pragmatics***. Edinburgh; Edinburgh University Press Ltd.

-
-
- Crystal, D. (1997). *A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Davies, A. (1990). *Principles of Language Testing*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell Ltd.
- Eble, R. L. (1972). *Essentials of Educational Measurement*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey; Prentice-Hall.
- Ellis, R. (1997). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Finch, G. (2005). *Key Concepts in Language and Linguistics*. 2nd . London: Palgrave Macmillan
- Gee, James, P. (1999). *An Introduction to Discourse Analysis: Theory and Method*. London: Routledge.
- Genesee, F. and Upshur, J. A. (1996). *Classroom-based Evaluation in Second Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gramley, and M. Patzold (1992). *A Survey of Modern English*. London: Routledge
- Greenbaum, S. and Nelson, G. (2002). *An Introduction to English Grammar*. 2nd ed. London: Pearson Education Ltd.
- Glass, G. V. and J.C. Stanley (1970). *Statistical Methods in Education and Psychology*. USA: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hughes, A. (1989). *Testing for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- James, Carl (1980). *Contrastive Analysis*. England: Longman Group Ltd.
- Jeffries, L. (2006). *Discovering Language: The Structure of Modern English*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

- Lado, Robert (1961). *Language Testing: The Construction and Use Foreign Language Test*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (1994). *A Communicative Grammar of English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- McNamara, T. (2000). *Language Testing*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mousavi, Seyyed, A. (1999). *A Dictionary of Language Testing*. 2nd ed. Tahrán: Rahman Publications.
- Parrott, M. (2000). *Grammar for English Language Teachers*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Pooley, R.C. (1957). *Teaching English Grammar*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc.
- Quirk, R. ; S. Greenbaum; S. and Svartvik, J. (1972). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of English Language*. London: Longman Group Ltd.
- (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. Hong Kong: Longman Group (FE) Ltd.
- Richards, J and Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*. London: Pearson Education Limited.
- Sarosdy, J. , Bencze, T. F. Poor Z., and Vadnay, M. (2006). *Applied Linguistics for BA Students in English*. Bolcsesz Konzorcium
- Stern, H. (1983). *Fundamental Concepts of Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Swan, M. (2005). *Practical English Usage*. 3rd. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spiegel, Murray R. (1972). *Statistics*. London: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

-
-
- Van Dijk, T.A. (1977). *Text and Context: Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. New York: Longman Group Ltd.
- Werner, P.K., Church, M. and Baker, L.R. (1996). *A Communicative Grammar*. McGraw-Hill book Company, Inc.
- Wikipedia, the Free Encyclopedia (2009). "Interlanguage." <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/interlanguage>.
- Yu, Chong, Ho. (2008). "Reliability and Validity". <http://www.creative-wisedo.com>
- Yule, G. (2006). *Oxford Practice Grammar Advanced*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Appendix (I)

A letter to the jury members

Ministry of Higher Education

And Scientific Research

College of Education

Department of English

Dear sir, Dr, ...

The researcher intends to conduct a study entitled "**Investigating English Foreign Language Learners' Performance in connectives at the University Level**". The main aims of this study are:

4. Investigating the students' performance in the College of Education (henceforth, CE) and College of Education for Women (henceforth, CEW) at Tikrit University in the area of connectives .
5. Classifying students' errors in connectives at both recognition and production levels in the CE and CEW at Tikrit University to get a clear survey of students' performance.

6. Finding out whether there are significant differences between students' performance in the CE and CEW at both recognition and production levels.

The researcher is thankful and content if you, as specialist and expert in the domain of linguistics and methods of teaching English as a foreign language, comment on and give the validity and invalidity of the test items. Certainly, the researcher would appreciate, respect, and take into consideration all your suggestions, modifications, and advices.

Thank you in advance for your cooperation.

Yours

Dr.Amra Ibrahim

Mr.Waad Maray

2009

Appendix (II)

The Initial version of the Diagnostic Test

A. Recognition Level

Q1/ Choose the Word or phrase that best completes those sentences. (20 marks).

1. I enjoyed reading the story. It was rather sad,....
a) also b) but c) though d) so
2. He told me he wanted to join the army He wanted to wear a uniform and carry a gun.
a) in fact b) that is (to say) c) therefore d) yet
3. It would be wise to save some the money there may be unexpected expenses later.
a) but b) alternatively or c) subsequently d) for

-
-
4. What is your opinion? I do not really know.
a) well b) thus c) at least d) after all
 5. Tickets are required for admission, those who do not have a ticket won't get in.
a) rather b) similarly c) consequently d) subsequently
 6. We are sending food and water they will need things like tents and blankets.
a) because b) on the contrary c) in additions
d)therefore
 7. the greenhouse effect, we now experiencing a phenomenon known as 'global warming' which is a more general term for increased world temperatures.
a) similarly b) as a result of c) nevertheless d) also
 8. the rain, we went to out without an umbrella.
a) despite b) also c) likewise d) now
 9. We 'll leave at eight o'clock. Ganny won't be coming
a) consequently and b) of course c) well d) furthermore
 10. The plants usually flower in spring, won't if there is frost.
a) Nevertheless, so b) alternatively or c) consequently and d) but

Q2/ Indicate the meaning behind using the following connectives: (and, surely, but, consequently, besides. Well). (10 marks).

Professor Baker is fond of his students 1.....he has spent much time with them lately. He has been teaching for such a long time that he is a little tired of classrooms 2.....laboraries of office.3 His doctor told him to take it easy.4 he is looking forward to

his trip around the world 5..... Mr. Baker is making all the arrangements for the trip so that there won't be any problems about the research.

Q3/ Underline the dependent (adverbial) clause and circle the connective in each of the sentences here. Then tell what relationship or the connectives express: (additive, adversative, causal, continuative): (20 marks).

1. Although economic alliances can help countries. Certain parts of the population may suffer.
2. The European Union will be difficult to achieve because some members do not want to lose certain rights.
3. It was an interesting offer, though I couldn't accept it.
4. The peasants are desperately short of food. Furthermore, they urgently need doctors and medical supplies.
5. You know that new house? Well, you'll never guess who bought it.
6. You will not help me. Hence, I must do it myself.
7. The princess is very intelligent. Nevertheless, she has a lot to learn.
8. Now, I'd like to say something about the exam.
9. Canada produces many mineral; likewise, some parts of the United States are rich in mineral resources.
10. South-central Canada has wide, flat, fertile plains; as a result, many farmers moved to this area to grow wheat.

Appendix (III)

B. Production Level

Q4/ Fill in the following blanks with appropriate connectives

(20 Marks).

All those people who say that the weather has not been normal recently are right 1..... there is really no such thing as normal weather, they probably mean something else. If they mean that average summer temperatures have been getting warmer 2..... they are certainly correct 3..... it is not just the summer temperature 4..... The general average temperature of the whole world that has been steadily moving up. The signs are everywhere. There are small signs. 5.... Butterflies in north America have moved about 60 miles north of where used to live. There are 6..... very large signs. Huge masses of ice in mountain glaciers 7..... the Arctic are melting. The famous snow cap on Africa's Mount Kilimanjaro has almost disappeared . 8..... ice or snow does not really disappear, it turns into water flows into the ocean and causes sea levels to rise. Why is this happening? One answer is that it could simply be part of natural process. 9....., there have been long periods of warmth in the past. So we could just be experiencing another warming trend. This kind of answer had more supporters a few years ago. What scientists now believe is that human activity is the cause. For more than two hundred years, humans have been gradually changing the atmosphere, mainly 10..... industrial pollution.

Q5/ Supply a suitable connective to link the following pairs of sentences without using the same connective twice, add or omit words to improve your new sentences, and pay attention to punctuation marks:

(30 marks)

1. OPEC want prices to rise. Its members disagree about how to

rise prices.

2. The rice crop failed. It was bad weather.
3. What did you think of the new laptop? I was a bit surprised.
4. The roads are usually very crowded at the beginning of holiday seasons. There are often serious traffic jams at the end of the holidays.
5. I am not sure what time I'll arrive ,may be seven or eight .I'll certainly be there before.
6. It is possible to make a continual approach towards impartiality. By knowing things somewhat remote in time or space .by giving to such things their due to weight in our feelings.
7. Banerjee is still suffering from a knee injury. He was chosen to ran in the marathon,
8. The police were sure Griffiths was lying. They had found his fingerprints everywhere. They knew for a fact that he hadn't been at his mother's at the time of crime.
9. Let's finish the cake. Somebody got to eat it.
10. The negotiations succeeded. Both sides bargained in good faith.
11. You find these properties expensive? Prices have increased lately, you know.
12. Nobody imagines that he'll ever repay the loan.
13. We were moving some things out of the house when it started pouring with rain. Everything got wet.
14. It is a great mistake to conceive this historical revolt as an appeal to reason. It was a return to the contemplation to brute fact.
15. A) Have we met before?
B) Yes, you remember me? We went to school together.

Appendix (IV)**Scores of CE Students' Performance in the Diagnostic Test.**

No.	Scores	No.	Scores	No.	Scores	No.	Scores	No.	Scores	No.	Scores
1.	84	11.	70	21.	50	31.	42	41.	38	51.	34
2.	76	12.	70	22.	48	32.	42	42.	38	52.	32
3.	74	13.	70	23.	48	33.	42	43.	36	53.	32
4.	74	14.	70	24.	48	34.	42	44.	36	54.	30
5.	74	15.	70	25.	46	35.	40	45.	36	55.	30
6.	72	16.	70	26.	46	36.	40	46.	34	56.	28
7.	72	17.	70	27.	46	37.	40	47.	34	57.	28
8.	72	18.	52	28.	44	38.	40	47.	34	58.	26
9.	70	19.	52	29.	44	39.	38	48.	34		
10.	70	20.	50	30.	44	40.	38	49.	34		

Appendix (V)**Scores of CEW Students' Performance in the Diagnostic Test.**

No.	Scores	No.	Scores
1.	74	13.	48
2.	72	14.	48
3.	72	15.	48
4.	72	16.	48
5.	72	17.	46
6.	70	18.	46
7.	68	19.	46
8.	68	20.	44
9.	68	21.	44
10.	68	22.	44

No.	Scores	No.	Scores
11.	68	23.	42
12.	48	24.	38

Appendix (VI)

Students' Total Scores in the Diagnostic Test according to the Rank order

No.	Scores	No.	Scores	No.	Scores	No.	Scores
1.	84	25.	68	49.	44	74.	34
2.	76	26.	68	50.	44	75.	34
3.	74	27.	68	51.	44	76.	32
4.	74	28.	52	52.	42	77.	32
5.	74	29.	52	53.	42	78.	30
6.	74	30.	50	54.	42	79.	30
7.	72	31.	50	56.	42	80.	28
8.	72	32.	48	57.	42	81.	28
9.	72	33.	48	58.	40	82.	26
10.	72	34.	48	59.	40		
11.	72	35.	48	60.	40		
12.	72	36.	48	61.	40		
13.	72	37.	48	62.	38		
14.	70	38.	48	63.	38		
15.	70	39.	48	64.	38		
16.	70	40.	46	65.	38		
17.	70	41.	46	66.	38		
18.	70	42.	46	67.	36		
19.	70	43.	46	68.	36		
20.	70	44.	46	69.	36		
21.	70	45.	46	70.	34		
22.	70	46.	44	71.	34		
23.	70	47.	44	72.	34		
24.	68	48.	44	73.	34		