



ISSN: 1817-6798 (Print)

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

available online at: www.jtuh.org/**Najwa Yaseen Ismail**

College of Education for Humanities, University of Tikrit

Abdulsalam Ali Hasan

graduate student

* Corresponding author: E-mail :

aa2300080ped@st.tu.edu.iq

07713604595

Keywords:

Listen Read Discuss Strategy,

Conjunctions,

Preparatory School,

Use

ARTICLE INFO**Article history:**

Received 3 Feb 2026

Received in revised form 25 Mar 2026

Accepted 27 Mar 2026

Final Proofreading 31 July 2026

Available online 31 July 2026

E-mail t-jtuh@tu.edu.iq©THIS IS AN OPEN ACCESS ARTICLE UNDER
THE CC BY LICENSE<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities

The Impact of Listen Read Discuss Strategy on EFL Preparatory School Students' Use of Conjunctions

A B S T R A C T

Listen Read Discuss strategy helps students in achieving meaningful understanding during the discussion stage. The current study aims at finding out the impact of using Listen Read Discuss strategy on EFL preparatory school students' use of conjunctions. The population of the current study consists of 924 which represent 17% students from fifth preparatory schools in Al-shirqat City, with a sample of 60 randomly selected from Ashoor preparatory school for boys during the academic year 2025-2026. The participants are divided into two groups: the experimental group, includes 30 students while the control group comprises 30 students. To ensure comparability, both groups have been equalized in their age, the parents' academic attainment and their scores in the post test. The data collected are analyzed statistically. The findings show that Listen Read Discuss strategy positively influences the experimental group's English learning outcomes in using conjunctions compared to the control group.

DOI: <http://doi.org/10.25130/jtuh.33.7.1.2026.19>

اثر استراتيجية استمع اقرأ ناقش على استخدام ادوات الربط لدى طلبة المدارس الاعدادية دارسي اللغة الانجليزية لغة اجنبية

عبدالسلام علي حسن/طالب دراسات عليا

نجوى ياسين أسماعيل/ كلية التربية للعلوم الانسانية, جامعة تكريت

الخلاصة:

تساعد استراتيجية استمع اقرأ ناقش الطلاب على بناء معارفهم في مرحلة الاستماع و في مرحلة القراءة و

في مرحلة المناقشة. تهدف استراتيجية استمع إلى التعرف على أثر استخدام الاستراتيجية الحالية على طلبة الصف الخامس الإعدادي من متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية لغةً أجنبية لأدوات الربط، وذلك من خلال التعرف على أثر استخدام استراتيجية استمع-اقرأ-ناقش في استخدام طلاب الصف الخامس الإعدادي من متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية لغةً أجنبية لأدوات الربط. يتكوّن مجتمع الدراسة الحالية من ٩٢٤ طالبًا، وهو ما يمثل ١٤% من طلاب الصف الخامس الإعدادي في مدارس مدينة الشرقاط، وقد اختيرت عينة مكونة من ٦٠ طالبًا عشوائيًا من مدرسة آشور الإعدادية للبنين خلال العام الدراسي ٢٠٢٥-٢٠٢٦. وقُسم المشاركون إلى مجموعتين: المجموعة التجريبية وتضم ٣٠ طالبًا والمجموعة الضابطة وتضم ٣٠ طالبًا. ولضمان التكافؤ، جرى موازنة المجموعتين في العمر والتحصيل الدراسي للوالدين ودرجاتهم في الاختبار البعدي. حُلّلت البيانات المجمّعة إحصائيًا. وأظهرت النتائج أن استراتيجية استمع-اقرأ-ناقش تؤثر إيجابيًا في نواتج تعلّم اللغة الإنجليزية لدى أفراد المجموعة التجريبية في استخدام أدوات الربط مقارنة بالمجموعة الضابطة. واختُتمت الدراسة بعدد من الاستنتاجات والتوصيات والمقترحات لدراسات مستقبلية. كلمات مفتاحية: استراتيجية استمع اقرأ ناقش، أدوات الربط، المدارس الإعدادية، استخدام.

Section One: Introduction

1.1 Statement of The Problem

As a starting point, a conjunction is a word whose function is to link, or put together, other words. Conjunctions can link words, phrases, and clauses. In fact, understanding the proper uses of conjunctions can be of great value in writing clear, well-formed sentences (Chalker, 1989; Quirk et al., 1985).

Conjunctions also show the relationships between the words and word groups that they connect. In English, conjunctions are divided into three kinds: coordinating, subordinating, and correlative conjunctions (henceforth CCs) (Chalker, 1989; Quirk et al., 1985).

For Waldhorn and Zeiger (1967), coordinating conjunctions may join single words, or they may join groups of words, but they must join similar elements: subject + subject, verb phrase + verb phrase, clause + clause, and so on. This principle of syntactic parallelism is also emphasized by Quirk et al. (1985).

Subordinating conjunctions are those that connect a subordinate clause to a main clause (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002). As the name implies, correlative conjunctions are pairs of words that are used to link words or groups of words (Chalker, 1989). The most important point when using them is that the words, phrases, or clauses that are put together must be of the same grammatical type. This means that nouns must be linked with nouns, verbs with verbs, adjectives with adjectives, and so on (Quirk et al., 1985; Biber et al., 1999).

It is expected that most Iraqi English as a Foreign Language (henceforth EFL) preparatory school students may often face difficulties in using these conjunctions. They may encounter difficulties in constructing correlative conjoining structures and may fail to join similar elements to form grammatically acceptable sentences. Previous studies on EFL learners' grammatical performance indicate that coordinating and correlative structures are frequent sources of error due to issues of parallelism, agreement, and inversion (Biber et al., 1999; Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999).

Moreover, students may fail to construct sentences in which certain correlative conjunctions require subject–operator inversion (e.g., not only ... but also) or subject–verb concord, or they may use one part of the correlative pair while omitting the other (Huddleston & Pullum, 2002).

Thus, many students may avoid using these conjunctions in their writing, despite the fact that such structures are important for organizing ideas and linking sentences, clauses, or elements within the sentence effectively (Halliday & Hasan, 1976).

1.2 Aims of the Study

This study aims at finding out:

1. The impact of Listen Read Discuss strategy on EFL Preparatory school students' use of conjunctions between the experimental group that has been taught using the strategy and the control group that has been taught using the conventional method in the post-test.
2. Finding out whether there is any significant difference between the experimental group's achievement at recognition and production levels in the post-test.

3. Finding out whether there is any statistically significant difference among the students of the experimental group in using subordinating conjunctions (Time, Reason/Cause, Condition, Contrast/Concession, Purpose, Place, Result/Consequence).

1.3 Hypotheses of the study

The aims of the study are supposed to be achieved through verifying the following hypothesis:

1. There are no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of the experimental group who was taught by using Listen Read Discuss strategy and that of the control group who was taught by conventional method in their use of conjunctions in the Post-test.

2. There are no statistically significant differences in the mean scores of the experimental group's achievement at recognition and production levels in the post-test.

3. There are no statistically significant differences among the mean scores of the experimental group in their use of Subordinating conjunctions—including (Time, Reason/Cause, Condition, Contrast/Concession, Purpose, Place, Result/Consequence,) in the post-test.

1.4 Limits of the study

This study is limited to:

1. The use of Listen Read Discuss strategy on students' use of conjunctions.

2. The study is limited to the use of the following types of subordinating conjunctions –including (Time, Reason /Cause, Condition, Contrast/Concession, Purpose, Place, Result/Consequence).

3. The first four units from the prescribed student textbook 'English for Iraq' for fifth class.

4. Iraqi EFL preparatory school students in Ashoor preparatory School for Boys.

5. This study will be last for only eight weeks during the first course of the academic year 2025-2026.

Section Two: Theoretical Background

2.1 Concept of Listen Read Discuss Strategy

According to Manzo et al. (2005), the learning strategy known as Listen Read Discuss (henceforth LRD) helps students build their knowledge by using graphic organizers during the Listen (listen) stage, assisting them in understanding the text during the Read (read) stage, and assisting them in achieving meaningful understanding during the Discussion (discuss) stage. During the 1980s and 1990s, the strategy gained recognition in literacy education as part of broader movements toward interactive and student-centered reading instruction. Researchers highlighted that combining auditory input with guided reading and collaborative discussion could scaffold comprehension for learners with diverse abilities, including struggling readers and second-language learners. This perspective aligned with emerging theories of metacognitive strategy use and cooperative learning, which underscored the role of dialogue and reflection in deep processing of textual information (Pressley & Afflerbach, 1995). Entering the twenty-first century, LRD continued to be examined within English as a Foreign Language (EFL) and English as a Second Language (ESL) contexts, where multimodal input and structured interaction are considered essential for language development. Contemporary scholarship connects LRD to strategy-based instruction and communicative language teaching, suggesting that the discussion phase in particular facilitates language production, discourse organization, and functional grammar use (Klingner, Vaughn, & Boardman, 2015; Richards & Rodgers, 2014). McKenna (2002:94) defines Listen Read Discuss as a strategy especially designed struggling readers. Its stages represent the before, during, and after stages of all reading lesson formats. It means that there are three stages to this strategy. First, the students listen to the teacher's explanation of the material from the teacher. Second, the teacher asks the students to read the text to gauge their comprehension. Finally, the teacher guides the students to discuss their comprehension of the text. In this strategy, the teacher makes efforts to ensure that the students comprehend about the text by giving explanations in earlier sections. It simulates student's minds in section discussion.

2.1.1 Advantages of Listen Read Discuss strategy

Listen Read Discuss strategy is characterized by the following:

1. It helps enhance prior knowledge before reading the text.
2. It is considered an effective tool for improving comprehension and learning the instructional content for both new and struggling readers.
3. It provides students with an opportunity to ask questions actively, and this activity offers them a chance to obtain assistance in understanding the material (Manzo & Casale, 1985, p. 377).
4. When the topic is discussed in depth, this helps students learn more effectively.
5. Classroom discussions have great importance in developing and fostering students' metacognitive thinking (Manzo, 1995, p. 378).
6. Listen Read Discuss strategy is characterized by an exploratory nature that promotes effective self-discovery in teaching by teachers and among students.
7. It represents a new starting point and hope for students because they exert effort while learning from the text.
8. It contains numerous periods of silent reading and constructive discussion that enrich thinking.
9. It redistributes class time for teachers who rely on traditional lecture- and assignment-based instruction (Manzo et al., 2009, p. 48).

2.2 Definition of Conjunctions

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

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

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

2- John loves Mary, but is loved by Jane. (ibid)

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

3- I will phone you if the train is late. (Swan and Walter, 2001, p.218)

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

4- The books are on the table or in the cupboard. (Aarts , 2001,p.46)

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

5- My cats and dogs are great friends. (ibid, p.262)

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

2.2.1 Coordinating Conjunctions

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

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

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

2.2.2 Subordinating Conjunctions

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

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

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

2.2.3 Correlative Conjunctions

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

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

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

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

- a- Correlative Coordinators
- b- Correlative Subordinators

2.2.3.1 Correlative Coordinators

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

36- Not John but Bill is here.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

40-The book is neither interesting nor accurate (Azar, 1989).

2.2.3.2 Correlative Subordinators

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

- She knew the answer as quick as a flash. (McCarthy and O'Dell, 1995)

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

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

Similarly, Shaw (1986) shows that sometimes a few subordinating conjunctions are linked to certain markers to form what are known as CSs. 111- The performance had hardly began when the light went on. (Thomason and Martinet, 1986)

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

- If I had studied, (then) I would have passed the exam. (Coe , 1980)

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

- Whether you want to finish your work or not is not my concern. (Strumpf , 1998)

It is important to mention that there are many CSs in English (see Quirk et al., 1985).

Section Three: Methodology

The details of the methodological procedures employed to achieve the research aims and test the hypothesis have been presented. It outlines the research design, the targeted population, the recruited sample, the procedures for establishing sample equivalence, the pretest and posttest instruments, and the statistical means for data analysis.

3.1 Experimental Design of the Study

Experimental design serves as a structured framework that enables the study to test its hypotheses and uncover meaningful insights into the relationship between independent and dependent variables (Best & Khan, 2006). The research process is guided by this design, which provides a set of principles to ensure consistency and

direction. Essentially, the research design functions as the conceptual framework that organizes the entire study. It establishes the foundation of the investigation, making the tasks more systematic and manageable (Lillykuty & Samson, 2018).

In this study, two groups of fifth-year preparatory school students were selected randomly: the experimental group (In short, EG) and the control group (In short, CG). The independent variable, Listen Read Discuss strategy, is administered only to the EG, whereas the CG receives the conventional method. A post-test was administered to both independent groups within the experimental design, as presented in Table (1).

Table (1) *The Experimental Design of the Study*

Groups	Pretest	Independent Variable (Treatment)	Posttest
Experimental	Students' Achievement in the pretest	Listen Read Discuss strategy	Students' Achievement in the posttest
Control	Students' Achievement in the pretest	Conventional method	Students' Achievement in the posttest

3.2 Population and Sampling

In the present study, the population comprises Iraqi preparatory school students in the fifth grade, including both male and female students in Al-Shirqat City, Salah-Aldin Government. The total population of fifth-grade students' amounts to 924, distributed across six schools in Al-Shirqat, as detailed in Table (2).

The sample of the current study is taken from Ashoor preparatory school for boys in Salah Aldin Province during the academic year 2025- 2026. The whole number of those students is eighty. They are divided into two classes (D) and (H) equally, which means that each class has forty students were selected at random from the two groups to take the test in the pilot administration. Thus, thirty students make up the final experimental group, and thirty students make up the control group., as shown in the table (2).

Table (2) The Population and Sample of the Student

Groups	No. of Population	No. of Pilot Study	No. of Sample
D	40	10	30
H	40	10	30
Total	80	20	60

3.3 The Two Groups Equalization

Two variables are presented for making equalization between experimental and control groups which are students' ages in months and students' scores in the pre-test.

3.3.1 Students' Ages in Months

The students' age in months for the two groups are counted till the first of December 2024 to find out whether there is any difference between their ages, as shown in appendix (A). By applying the t-test- formula for two independent groups, it is found that the mean score of experimental groups is 213.03 with standard deviation is 7.64 and that of the control group is 214.53 with standard deviation is 9.33. The calculated t-value is 0.484 which is found to be lower than the tabulated value which is 2.00 at the degree of freedom 58 and the level of significance 0.05. This means that the students of the two groups are equal in their age, as shown in table (3).

Table (3) The Mean, Standard Deviation, T-Value of Students' Age

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
EG.	30	213.03	7.64	Calculated	Tabulated	58	0.05
CG.	30	214.53	9.33	0.681	2.00		

3.3.2 Students' Scores in the Pretest

The pretest is administered to both the experimental and control groups for the purpose of equalization (see appendix C). The mean score of the pretest is 67.96 for the experimental group and 66.36 for the control group, with standard deviations of 11.52 and 12.09, respectively. The calculated t-value is 0.524, which is less than the tabulated t-value of 2.00 at a significance level of 0.05 and 58 degrees of freedom.

This result indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the pretest scores of the experimental and control groups, confirming that the groups are equivalent prior to the intervention, as indicated in the table (4).

Table (4) Mean scores, standard deviations, and t-value for the Students in the Pretest

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
EG.	30	67.96	11.52	Calculated	Tabulated	58	0.05
CG.	30	66.36	12.09	0.524	2.00		

3.4 Instructional Material and Student Instruction

Only the subordinating conjunctions found in the first four units from the Students' Book "English for Iraq"—that is, instruction at the preparatory stage—have been covered. The fifth preparatory English Text Book has been followed in the specification of these modules. During October, November and December of the academic year (2025–2026), the instruction was conducted. While the experimental group was instructed to use the listen read discuss strategy, the control group received instruction using the conventional method.

3.5 The Achievement Posttest

In the current study, achievement posttest is the instrument which has been constructed and applied to achieve the aims of the study. The purpose of the test is to assess if the course goal has been accomplished at the end of the instructional time.

Therefore, the researcher has constructed an achievement posttest to assess if statistically meaningful variations occur between control and experimental groups. This test includes five questions; each question is composed of different items.

- Question number one is about “Read the passage then complete using the given conjunctions. The total items of this question are (10) items. The total scores of the first question is twenty scores, each item has two scores, the correct response gains two scores while the incorrect response gains zero.

- Question number two is True/False question. This question measures students' ability to determine whether the sentences are true or false. The total items of this question are (10) items. The total scores of the second question is ten scores, each item has one score, the correct answer gains one score while the incorrect answer gains zero.
- Question number three is to write fully sentences about the given types of conjunctions. The total items of this question are (5) items. The total scores of the third question is twenty scores, each item has four scores, a fully correct response gains four scores while no response get zero.
- Question number four-branch (A) is a multiple choice items. This question measures students' ability to complete the given sentences. The total items of this question are (10) items. The total scores of the fourth question is twenty scores, each item has two scores, the correct answer gains two scores while the incorrect answer gains zero.
- Question number four-branch (B) is a matching items. This question measures students' ability to match a conjunction from column A with its correct meaning or function from column B. The total items of this question are (10) items. The total scores of the fourth question, branch(B) is ten scores, each item has one score, the correct answer gains one score while the incorrect answer gains zero.
- Question number five is to write a process essay about 'A Special Day with Friends'. It consists of one item. The total scores of this question is twenty.

The assigned time to answering the test is one hour. Later on, the test papers have been collected to be scored, see Appendix (B) The students in both groups are post tested at the end of the experiment to the same time.

Section Four: Analysis of Data, Discussion of Results and Conclusion

According to the collected data of the current study, the results have been analyzed and discussed in the following:

4.1 The First Hypothesis

To determine whether there is a significant difference between the mean scores of the experimental group and the control group in the Achievement posttest, statistics show that the mean score of the experimental group is 74.43, while that of

the control group is 60.00. Using the t-test formula for two independent samples, the calculated t-value is 6.491, and the tabulated t-value is 2.00 at a degree of freedom of 58 and a significance level of 0.05. This indicates that there is a significant difference between the two groups, in favor of the experimental group as shown in Table(5).

Table (5) Means, Standard Deviation, and t-Values of the Two Groups in the Achievement Posttest

Groups	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
EG.	30	74.43	10.18	Calculated	Tabulated	58	0.05
CG.	30	60.00	6.67	6.491	2.00		

4.2 The Second Hypothesis

The mean scores of the students' performance at recognition and production levels in the posttest for the experimental group are calculated and compared to determine whether there is a significant difference between them. The results indicate that the mean score at the production level is 26.60, while the mean score at the recognition level is 47.83. The t-test formula for two paired samples is applied, revealing that the calculated t-value is 26.020, is higher than the tabulated t-value is 2.045 at 29 degrees of freedom and a 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there is a significant difference in performance between the two levels of students, favoring recognition level as shown in Table (6).

Table (6) Students' Mean Scores, Standard Deviation, and T-Value of the Experimental Group Performance at Recognition and Production Levels

Group	No. of students	Mean	SD.	T-Value		DF	Level of Significance
Production	30	26.60	4.48	Calculated	Tabulated	29	0.05
Recognition	30	47.83	6.46	26.020	2.045		

4.3 The Third Hypothesis

A one-way ANOVA is used to determine whether there are any significant differences between the mean scores of subordinating conjunctions as shown in the following Table (7):

Table (7) One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) Among the Subordinating Conjunctions

Variables	Sum of Squares	DF	Mean Square	F-value		Sig.
				Calculated	Tabulated	
Between Groups	3022.067	6	503.678	194.127	2.14	0.05
Within Groups	526.700	203	2.595			
Total	3548.767	209				

Table (7) shows that the calculated f-value value 194.127 is higher than the tabulated f-value 2.14 at the DF = 6, 203 and 0.05 level of significance. This indicates that there is a significant difference in the mean scores of the experimental group's in using subordinating conjunctions.

Table (8) Comparisons of Means (Scheffe^a)

Groups	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05					
		1	2	3	4	5	6
Result/Consequence	30	4.266					
Contrast/Concession	30		7.366				
Place	30			8.900			
Purpose	30				10.833		
Condition	30					12.666	
Reason/Cause	30						14.633
Time	30						15.766
Sig.		1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	0.288
Means for groups in homogeneous subsets are displayed.							
a. Uses Harmonic Mean Sample Size = 30.000.							

The comparison of means indicates that the mean scores for result/consequence, contrast/concession, place, purpose, condition, reason/cause, and time are 4.266, 7.366, 20.031, 8.900, 10.833, 12.666, 14.633, and 15.766, respectively, with a harmonic mean sample size of 30. The results show a significant difference in the mean scores across the student performance in subordinating conjunctions within

the experimental group and in the favour of reason/cause and time subordinate conjunctions as shown in table (8).

4.4 Conclusions

The following points illustrate a number of conclusions drawn from the study's findings and results:

1. LRD strategy helps to enhance students' ability to use, internalize and apply conjunctions in a better way.
2. The statistical results show that LRD strategy improves EFL preparatory school students' use of conjunctions which in its role encourage teachers to integrate LRD strategy in the instruction of their classes
3. The three steps used in LRD strategy present an improvement in students' command over conjunctions, as well as simplifying the usage of conjunctions.
4. The experimental group shows a significantly different performance among the adjective variables which reveal that LRD strategy helps students to differentiate and apply a various kinds of conjunctions.
5. The conjunction variables results show a significant difference in the posttest which proves that LRD strategy helps students in controlling the use of kinds of conjunctions.

5.2 Recommendations and Suggestions

First: for the Teachers:

1. Use real life situations to introduce conjunctions in an engaging way.
2. Using guided practice with immediate feedback to help students internalize the use of conjunctions.
3. Encourage students to write narrative and descriptive writings in which conjunctions play a crucial role.

Second: For the Students

- 1- When making a discussion, aim to understand the material thoroughly rather than just writing down easy questions. This will help improve your understanding and interpretation.
- 2- When engaging in the discussion, don't just focus on answering questions quickly-take time to discuss the answers with your peers, as this will enhance your understanding.

3- Use LRD not just for new material but also to review previously studied content, reinforcing vocabulary and concepts.

References

- Aarts, B. (2001) *English Syntax and Argumentation*. (2nded.).London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Aarts, F. and Jan Aarts (1988) *English Syntactic Structures. Functions and Categories in Sentence Analysis*.London:Prentice Hall, Europe .
- Aisyah, A. (2015). Evaluating Students' Achievement Test in Reading for Interpretation. *Academic Journal Perspective: Education, Language, and Literature*, 2(2), 269-274.
- Best, J. and Khan, J. (2006) .Research in Education. UK: Pearson Education Inc.
- Biber, D., Conrad, S., & Leech, G. (2002). Longman student grammar of spoken and written English. Longman.
- Brown, H. D. (2003) *Language Learning and Teaching*.(4th ed.).San Francisco State University:Addison Wesley Longman,Inc.
- Celce-Murcia, M., & Larsen-Freeman, D. (1999). The grammar book (2nd ed.). Heinle & Heinle publishers.
- Chalker, S. (1989) *Current English Grammar*.London and Basingstoke: London: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Coe, N. (1980) *A Learner's Grammar of English*. Hong Kong: Thomas Sons Ltd.
- Creswell, J. W. (2015). Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research. pearson.
- Crystal, D. (1992). An encyclopedic dictionary of language and languages. Blackwell.
- Ehrlich, E. and Daniel Murphy (1976) *English Grammar* . New Jersey: McGRAW-Hill Book Company.
- Eltaif, S,A. (2019) . Phonological Aspects in English and Arabic. Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities available online at:<http://www.jtuh.tu.edu.iq>.
- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. Longman. Heinemann: Educational Books Press.
- Huddleston, R., & Pullum, G. K. (2002). The Cambridge grammar of the English language. Cambridge University Press.
- Ismail, N. Yaseen.(2024). Enhancing Iraqi EFL Students' Discourse Competence by Using Explicit Instruction. Journal of Tikrit University for Humanities (2024) 31 (8) 77- .96

- Klingner, J. K., Vaughn, S., & Boardman, A. (2015). Teaching reading comprehension to students with learning difficulties (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Lillykuty, M., and Samson, R. (2018). —Insights from Kristen M Swanson's theory of caring”. Asian Journal of Nursing Education and Research, 8(1), (pp.173-177).London and New York: Routledge
- Manzo, A. V. (1995). Informal reading inventory. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt Brace.
- Manzo, A. V., & Casale, U. (1985). Teaching children to be literate: A reflective approach. Sea Harbor, WA: Literacy Leaders.
- Manzo, A. V., Manzo, U. C., & Thomas, M. M. (2005). Content area reading: Strategic teaching for strategic learning. John Wiley & Sons.
- McCarthy, M. and Felicity O'Dell (1995) *English Vocabulary inUse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pressley, M., & Afflerbach, P. (1995). Verbal protocols of reading: The nature of constructively responsive reading. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). A comprehensive grammar of the English language. Longman.
- Roberts, P. (1956) *Patterns of English* .New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc.
- Shaw , H. (1986) *Handbook of English*. (4th ed.).New York: McGraw- Hill Book Co.
- Strumpf, M. and Auriel Douglas (1999) *The Grammar Bible*. Los Angeles: Strumpf, M. and Auriel Douglas.
- Swan, M. and Catherine Walter (2001) *The Good Grammar Book*.
- Waldhron, A. and Arthur Zeiger (1967) *English Made Simple*. London:
- Yule, G. (1996) *The Study of Language*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.