



Article Title

The L2 Acquisition of the Coordinating Conjunction "and"
in Taiwanese Learners' Interlanguage at College Level

Author

Yi-hui Chiu

Bio Data

Miss Yi-hui Chiu received her M.A. in English from London University. She has been teaching English majors at technical colleges in Taiwan for ten years and has been particularly interested in the development of linguistic competence among college-level learners. Currently, she is doing her doctoral study at Graduate School of English, Tamkang University and teaching at Kuang Wu Institute of Technology.

Abstract

This study explores the acquisition of the most commonly used coordinating conjunction “and” in essays written by three groups of college students in high-, mid-, and low-proficiency levels in Taiwan and shows that a number of error patterns can be traced when analyzing the misuse of this coordinating conjunction. Ignorance or misuse of “and” will be discussed in relation to L1 transfer and the EFL reading and grammar materials these learners are exposed to in the EFL setting. This research not only offers empirical evidence of a particular grammar point in Taiwanese learners’ essays but also sheds light on grammar and reading pedagogy in the EFL context

Introduction

Conjunctions are composed of two categories: subordinating conjunctions and coordinating conjunctions. The function of conjunctions is to link ideas. Unlike

subordinating conjunctions, coordinating conjunctions have not received much attention in second language acquisition, because it is generally believed that coordinating conjunctions are easy to acquire due to simplistic notions of parallelism. Given the overall frequency with which the word AND occurs in spoken and written English, it should be assumed that its function is both pervasive and essential. Francis and Kucera (1982) reported AND as the fourth most frequent word in the Brown Corpus of Written English, after THE, BE, and OF, occurring 28,872 times in 1,014,000 words, or 28.5 times per 1000 words (cited in Lazaraton, 1992). The word AND is regarded as possessing few semantic functions and even less interesting syntactic properties. It is introduced in Book 1 of the English textbook used in junior high schools in Taiwan. Everybody recognizes the word but is not aware of its importance. Teachers often see that students omit or misuse AND in writing. It is considered as a local problem for EFL learners since misuse of the conjunction AND will not affect the communicative purpose. Nevertheless, at a more advanced level, this flawed conjunction acquisition means that learners will not understand reading materials without recognizing the whole sentence structure. Even more, when translating, the concept of “and” may help the understanding of a sentence but in a sense, students do not really know what to coordinate by means of “and.” Without the concept of coordination, the translation from Chinese to English will hamper acquisition and induce more errors.

The main motivation of this paper derives from the fact that sentences often involve multiple coordination's in EFL reading textbooks. EFL learners do not know how to parse chunks of elements, thereby leading to misunderstanding of sentences. The reason is ignorance of the function of conjunctions, especially coordinating conjunctions. The thesis

of this paper is that AND does have important functions in reading and written discourse and that it occurs so frequently that it deserves thorough examination. Also, the primary concern is that there is a gap between reading textbooks and grammar textbooks. That is why students do not acquire the conjunction AND well. The scope of this paper will be narrowed by analyzing students' essays to see if production, particularly error patterns, can help us understand students' acquisition of conjunctions with the sole focus on "and."

Related Literature

In *The Grammar Book*, Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman (1999, p. 461) defined conjunction, or coordination as "the process of combining two constituents of the same type to produce another, larger constituent of the same type." There are three major ways of using conjunctions in English. The first is to combine like constituents with a coordinating conjunction, such as *and*, *but*, or *or*, which is considered as simple coordination. The second is called ellipsis, in which redundancies in the VP are eliminated. The third option includes use of a pro-form, as in the following example:

Annie plays softball, and she plays soccer too.

In this sentence, the pronoun "she" substitutes "Annie" to eliminate the redundancy, and "too" means "also" (p. 461). Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman proceeded to argue that a conjunction aims to help speakers and writers avoid repeating identical constituents to avoid ambiguity through the uses of coordinating conjunctions, ellipsis and pro-forms (p. 485).

In terms of the meaning and use of coordinating conjunctions, AND may serve as a logical operator, a marker of many meanings, an inferential connective, and a marker of speaker continuation. Due to the truth-conditional properties of connective elements,

AND is considered as a logical operator, in which it is possible to reverse all clauses that are conjoined by AND without any loss of meaning. AND also includes richer meanings by the same sort of juxtaposition of sentences. Schiffrin (1987) examines the use of AND as a discourse marker—“a category that contains words like oh and well, expressions that cannot be well defined without reference to a speaker’s role in conversation at a given moment” (Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman, 1999, p. 474). However, AND as a discourse marker will not be examined in this paper.

Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech, & Svartvik (1985) make claims concerning clausal connection by AND. Coordinated clauses should be syntactically parallel. In addition, they can be interchangeably ordered without affecting semantic relationships. They offer a semantic framework for classifying the range of And-connected clauses found in these data. The framework is quoted below; examples from the data collected for this study and from the original discussions by Quirk et al. exemplify each relationship. The six categories are made with the illustrated definitions and examples for a better understanding of semantic meanings of AND, along with interchangeable meanings of adverbials.

Figure 1 Quirk, et al.’s semantic framework of AND

No	Category	Definitions/Examples	Adverbials
1	Reason/result	The event in the second clause is a consequence or result of the event in the first We didn’t have enough clothes and our hands and legs were frozen. (High)	So, consequently, because
2	Sequence	The event in the second clause is chronologically sequent to the event in the first.	So, then, next, now, after...then

We saw the natural lake and took a small train,
then had a cup of coffee in the cloudy mountain.
(High)

3	Contrast	The second clause introduces a contrast (BUT could also be used). Robert is secretive and (in contrast) David is candid. (from Quirk, et al.)	Although, even though
4	Concession	The second clause introduces an element of surprise in view of the content of the first. I was so happy and worried because that was my first flight. (Medium)	Yet
5	Addition	The second clause is “pure” addition to the first I lost all my certificates and papers in my bags and the keys were missing. (High)	Also
6	Comment	The second clause is a comment on the first. They disliked John— <i>and</i> that’s not surprising in view of his behavior. (from Quirk, et al.)	

From the examples above, AND can be regarded as having a small number of semantic relationships between the clauses it connects.

In addition to the above-mentioned prescriptive grammar books, few empirical studies on the coordinating conjunction AND have been conducted. Many of them were targeted at native speakers of English, with a comparison between speech and written production (Lazaraton, 1992). Lazaraton (1992) conducted a study on AND by analyzing spoken and written samples of native speakers from a comparison-contrast task and “near-death experience” narratives. The results showed that AND occurred with the highest frequency in the spoken narratives and occurred least frequently in the written comparison-contrast texts. Generally speaking, AND occurs much more frequently in speech production than in written production. In her pilot study, Lazaraton found that

advanced nonnative speakers showed almost the same frequency as native speakers in this study. To exclude the speech production, this paper aims to borrow her semantic framework to analyze the L2 acquisition of AND by analyzing a rhetorical mode—written narrative “The Unforgettable Experience.”

Chang (2003) investigated subordinators’ parts of speech in Taiwanese learners’ English writing. The study showed that there exist patterns among subordinator errors, and that subordinators’ similarities in parts of speech do not seem to highly correlate with identical error patterns though semantic similarity among subordinators did correlate with some similarities in their error patterns.

With the theoretical and empirical studies, this paper aims to examine the syntactic and semantic properties of a coordinating conjunction by examining the use of AND by L2 learners. With the above-mentioned rationale, the preliminary step to analyze the data of three proficiency levels is to bear the following research questions in mind:

1. What are the error patterns of using the coordinating conjunction “and” by high-, medium-, and low-level learners?
2. Is the hierarchy in learners’ errors different from the patterns in reading and grammar textbooks?

Method

Two classes of English majors in an in-service program participated in the study. They were reported to have received at least 6 years’ formal English education in an EFL setting. They all took a written version of the reading part of the GEPT (General English Proficiency Test), which is a nationally widely-used criterion of assessment, and the levels

of proficiency were determined based upon their scores of proficiency tests. All participants were required to write an essay of *An Unforgettable Experience* in class within two hours. All the papers were divided into three levels according to their written scores on GEPT, not based upon their original class. All the papers were entered into the computer by using Word applications to see how many sentences and how many tokens of “and” were found under what circumstances. The essays were marked according to their original scores of the GEPT exam into three groups: high, medium, and low with the essays examined: 18, 18, 17, respectively.

The reasons for such a categorization are two: first, the data were analyzed to see if the different proficiency levels produced various overall distributions. Second, the texts were collected to see if different proficiency levels of input (e.g. the textbooks) facilitate them to different levels. All the data were collected in class while they were writing the essays without any model essays but electronic dictionaries could be consulted where appropriate. Not all the learners consulted the dictionary, though.

Results and Discussion

In analyzing the data, error patterns due to the existence of AND were found. Apparently, it is not easy to commit errors of coordinating conjunctions, compared with those of subordinating conjunctions; rather, these error patterns seem to suggest some general grammar errors. To discuss these patterns in a more systematic way, the author will illustrate examples to explain the error patterns. The problems are presented in descending order of frequency as follows.

Table 1 Error Patterns in descending order

Rank	Error Patterns	H	Percentage	M	Percentage	L	Percentage	Total	Percentage
1	Do not use past tense:	15	59.4%	12	50%	9	50%	36	48.6%
2	Omission of “And”	4	12.5%	3	12.5%	2	11.1%	9	12.2%
3	Wrong past tense use	3	9.4%	2	8.3%	3	16.7%	8	10.8%
4	Wrong parts of speech	3	9.4%	2	8.3%	1	5.6%	6	8.1%
5	Omission of Copula Be	3	9.4%	1	4.2%	1	5.6%	5	6.8%
6	Misuse of Verbs (let)	1	3.1%	2	8.3%	1	5.6%	4	5.4%
7	Wrong use in passive voice	1	3.1%	1	4.2%	0	0	2	2.7%
8	Syntactically correct but semantically ambiguous	1	3.1%	1	4.2%	0	0	2	2.7%
9	NP redundancy	1	3.1%	0	0	1	5.6%	2	2.7%
	Total	32		24		18		74	

1. Problems in tense and aspect [36]¹ (average: 48.6%; H: 59.4%; M: 50%; L: 50%)

Due to the title of students' essays—*An Unforgettable Experience*, it is understandable that students would produce past events by using past tense. It is also easy to explain that they do not use past tense because Chinese is a tense less language. By problems in tense and aspect, I refer to the type of coordinator error as shown below.

- (1)* I just put on my shoes and snowboard and jump down the hill. (High)
 (2)*[On] the 3th [3rd] day we had a spa and play in pub. (Low)
 (3)* We try our first ski and get on the cable car that was so scary because we can't control ourself [ourselves] well. (Medium)

Sometimes it can be confusing to predict whether or not the learners do know how to use past tense when encountering the verbs with the same forms of participles, such as “put.” In (1), the learner does not produce the past tense of “jump” but it is not clear—if “put” used here represents a form of simple present tense or simple past tense. This point may require further elicitation tests.

For low proficiency users, it is possible for them to omit the past tense marking in the second verb phrase because of ellipsis, which is to omit the similar subject. In (2), the

¹ The number in the bracket represents the total number of such an error committed by the three proficiency

user produces a past tense marking “had” in the first phrase but only uses “play” instead of past tense marking in the second phrase. The major interlanguage grammatical rules might be caused by unfamiliarity with the concept of ellipsis or simply an error. The other possibility for lower achievers to master the rule might be that they tend to confuse the concept of coordinating conjunctions with other rules. For example, they are taught to use base form after auxiliary verbs; in the second verb phrase right after “and,” they should also use base form. Let’s take a look at the following example:

John won a coupon of NTD5000. He can (or could) buy a DVD player and have a wonderful meal with his family.

In this sentence, the second verb phrase omits “he can (or could)” so that the learners might think that a base form should fit in the second phrase. However, this is a tentative hypothesis; it requires further tests.

Sometimes learners may produce inconsistent errors of past tense marking as in (3). In the relative clause, the writer produced “was” but in the main clause, he/she only used present tense. The problem of “was” in the relative clause is not the focus of this paper but may require further investigation.

2. Omission of “And” [9] (average: 12.2%; H: 12.5%; M: 12.5%; L: 11.1%)

(4)*After few days waiting, I got my card then I started to have my crazy shopping again. (High)

Chinese does not emphasize the importance of conjunctions. One of the major linking word or phrase is 然後 (jan hou,; *then*), which is an equivalent term of “then” in English. However, to combine independent clauses or phrases, “and” is necessary to go

with “then” because “then” is an adverb, which cannot combine two clauses or phrases. In this case, “and” is often ignored by writers.

(5) *When I heard yelling “earthquake”, “earthquake” from outside, I was lying on the bed, just ignored the yelling, [] then it became stronger and stronger. (Medium)

(5) involves more than one error. When producing “then,” “and” is often missing in the sentence. As discussed earlier, “then” is often considered appropriate to connect phrases or clauses in interlanguage due to L1 transfer.

3. Problems in misuse of past tense [8] (average: 10.8%; H: 9.4%; M: 8.3%; L: 16.7%)

Some of the learners did employ past tense marking but produced wrong marking. For instance:

(6) * Until my second year at junior high school, teacher tached us volleyball and telled us that school will have volleyball game. (Low)

Improper use of past tense is often seen in beginners’ essays because low achievers have not mastered the irregular verbs. However, this learner is apparently aware of the existence of past tense.

4. Problems in wrong parts of speech [6] (average: 8.1%; H: 9.4%; M: 8.3%; L: 5.6%)

(7)*Thanks to their curiosity and naughty, they played fire unexpectedly at home. (High)

AND in (7) is to combine two nouns together. Due to the apparently similar word ending –ty, this learner may have mistakenly regarded “naughty” as a noun, which is the part of speech of “curiosity.” It is assumed that the learner may be aware of combining two nouns but is ignorant of differences of parts of speech between the two words. Even more, when consulting electronic dictionaries, the learner may not have known that he/she should be

looking for the word with the noun property. Often, the learners tend to have L1 transfer by looking up the word “頑皮” (wan pǐ; *naughty*) without considering the parts of speech in the whole sentence. Another possible explanation may be due to the fact that the learners may not have mastered the basic sentence structures when writing essays. Linguists attempt to analyze the errors and investigate the cognitive mechanisms of committing such errors; however, whether or not learners do master the basic sentence structures is one of major concerns in grammar pedagogy and research.

(8) *I was so happy and worry. (Medium)

The other example is (8), with the same problem of parts of speech. “Worry” may not sound like an adjective to native speakers of Chinese when transferring the L1 to L2. Nevertheless, the other possible explanation for such an error may be because “worry” is actually used as a verb here. It is simply because the learner forgot to add past tense marking or did not use the verb properly.

5. Omission of Copula Be [5] (average: 6.8%; H: 9.4%; M: 4.2%; L: 5.6%)

(9) *One day, when I finished the class and ready to go home, I went to bus stop, waiting for the bus, after a while, I got into the bus. (High)

The reason for omission of copula be coincides with Lin’s finding (2002) that more than half of errors of omission of copula be goes with adjectives due to L1 interference. In (9), “ready” is translated as 準備 (chun bei; *ready*) in Chinese. For native speakers of Chinese, 準備 may serve as the function of verbs. In order to gather informal data about the part of speech of 準備 in Chinese, all of the respondents, all native speakers of Chinese, even Chinese majors, were informally interviewed. They said that 準備 is a verb. This may underlie the reason why learners would omit copula be before the word “ready.”

(10) *It's a hot August day and my camera so hard to take the pictures. (High)

AND connects two independent clauses in the sentence and AND does not induce any errors concerning the acquisition of conjunctions. However, misunderstanding of parts of speech caused the learner to omit copula *be* in the sentence. (10) brings up another example of uncertainty of parts of speech in Chinese and English. In the Chinese sentence 照相機很重, (chao hsiang chi hen chung; *The camera is very heavy.*) “很重” (hen chung; *very heavy*) omits the main verb. Learners may rely heavily on Chinese sentence structures to produce English sentence patterns in such a way that they would ignore the existence of the verb. On the other hand, “重” (chung; *heavy*) is not easily identified as an adjective in Chinese. Due to such a feature, missing *be* is found under such circumstances.

6. Misuse of verbs (such as *let*) [4] (average: 5.4%; H: 3.1%; M: 8.3%; L: 5.6%)

Apparently, the misuse of verbs, such as *let*, may not be directly related to the acquisition of AND. However, the misconception of the linguistic properties of *let* will lead to the fact that learners do not coordinate phrases or lexical items by using AND properly. Therefore, a discussion will be needed in this respect.

(11) *All my friends like to listen to A-mei's CD and always moved by her voice. And all scream let my ears felt hurt! (High)

(12)* It's can let me to learn how to plan these activities and how to learn how to lead. (Low)

(13)* This game let me unforgettable and to cherish the memory of this game. (Low)

In (11), the second AND is treated as combining two independent clauses. The sentences are not syntactically well-constructed; however, an interesting area is worth discussing here. In learners' interlanguage, it seems that 讓 (jang; *let*) may play an important role

when writing essays. In (11), the learner adds past tense in “feel.” According to the SVO word order, it seems that the learner did not regard “let” as a verb so he/she used “felt” in the sentence, representing a past event. In (12), it’s hard to distinguish to what extent the learner understands the use of “let.” “It’s” may involve the copula be, but “can let” may make us wonder if he/she did know that “let” is a verb. However, there should be a verb in the base form, instead of the infinitive right after “let.” In grammar pedagogy, Taiwanese learners are more likely to have the concept that there is only one verb in a sentence. In (13), due to misunderstanding of the use of “let,” AND syntactically coordinates two elements, but does not produce a parallel pattern at all.

7. Misuse in passive voice [2] (average: 2.7%; H: 3.1%; M: 4.2%; L: 0%)

(11) *All my friends like to listen to A-mei’s CD and always moved by her voice.

To examine this sentence (11) in detail, let us write the full sentences for a better understanding:

(11a) All my friends like[d] to listen to A-mei’s CD.

(11b) All my friends were always moved by her voice.

In (b), the subject “all my friends” is the same. Due to ellipsis of the subject, the verb is easily omitted. The other possible reason is that the learner acquired the passive voice by producing the form “past participle + by+ noun”.

(14) *I was so happy and worry because that’s my first flight and travel by myself.
(Medium)

In (14), the second half of the clause is classified into the error of misuse of passive voice because “travel” is not a participle. However, upon a closer examination, it seems that the learner tried to use AND to coordinate “flight” and “travel.” “By myself” in this sense

would be ambiguous. In addition, if the learner tried to write “my first flight and (my first) travel,” “my first travel” would not sound colloquial. Although the meaning conveyed by the whole sentence is perfectly clear, the syntactic structure may makes one wonder if he/she treated “travel” as a verb.

8. Problems in semantics [2] (average: 2.7%; H: 3.1%; M: 4.2%; L: 0%)

(15)* Half a year past, I found that he is really stupid **and** funny, but still cute, what a weird cat and experience. (High)

I assume that the learner is actually writing two sentences. “What a weird cat and experience!” should be treated as an independent sentence. In this sentence, the syntactic structure is correct because AND coordinates two nouns. In terms of semantic properties, these two nouns do not have equivalent meanings. Even though the structure is fine, the sentence would be considered as a wrong usage of AND.

9. NP redundancy [2] (average: 2.7%; H: 3.1%; M: 0%; L: 5.6%)

NP redundancy is found sparsely in high and low achievers’ data. Such an error is not a result of the use of AND but an internal error in the second independent clause. This paper does not investigate this area.

(16)* There was almost 7-8 rooms in one house, every rooms were very small, **and** we 10 people lived in the attic under the roof.

EFL Reading and Grammar Textbooks

In analyzing the students’ essays and error patterns, it is better to investigate the students’ exposure, i.e., what kind of input they have. Is there any interrelationship between EFL learning materials and production? It is not easy to track down what input exactly influences the learners’ acquisition; however, it would shed light on grammar pedagogy and reading pedagogy.

The distribution of error patterns led this writer to find out what kind of input they had received. The hierarchy of sentence patterns in the reading textbooks coincides with the production patterns among three different proficiency levels. For example, low achievers tend to produce more lexical connection, i.e., more connection of discrete items. In the reading textbooks, low achievers receive simple coordination patterns, such as lexical connection, with fewer clausal connections. High achievers produce more clausal connection, which coincides with more occurrences of clausal connection in Book 3 in table 2.

Due to the small number of students' essays, it is not easy to generalize and compare these two hierarchies between the reading textbooks patterns and student production patterns. In the EFL reading classrooms, this writer, as a reading instructor, found that students in fact, have difficulty noticing what kinds of elements are coordinated. For instance, EFL learners do not know what AND tries to convey. For a further analysis, multiple coordinations should be investigated to determine whether or not the learners are able to parse larger chunks of elements.

Table 2 **Types of Connections of AND in Active Reading textbooks²**

	Book1		Book2		Book3		Total	
Clausal	41	15.4%	53	15.6%	90	17.7%	184	16.5%

² For a better understanding, Appendix B offers the overall distribution of AND among the three levels of reading series.

Phrasal	92	34.6%	123	36.2%	233	45.9%	448	40.2%
Lexical	132	49.6%	162	47.6%	183	36%	477	42.8%
Total	266		340		508		1114	

On the other hand, through a survey of current EFL grammar textbooks targeted at beginning up to intermediate EFL students, it is surprising to find that conjunctions, especially coordinating conjunctions, are largely neglected by materials writers. Obviously, the general assumption is that compared with other grammar points, coordinating conjunctions are much easier to acquire. However, grammar textbooks only deal with discrete linguistic items and the only information available concerning the most frequent occurrence of AND is shown in Table 3. A general picture presents what kind of connection AND offers: Azar 1³ (1996) presents lexical connections; Azar 2 & 3, lexical, phrasal and clausal connections. *Focus on Grammar* only introduces AND as a function of linking ideas, which can be considered as clausal connection. *Grammar in Use* does not cover any aspect of AND. The available descriptions of the coordinating conjunction AND are as follows:

Table 3 Descriptions of AND in the grammar textbooks

Azar 1	And can connect two or more nouns.
Azar 2	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When <i>and</i> connects only two words (or phrases) within a sentence, NO COMMAS are used; when <i>and</i> connects three or more items within a sentence, COMMAS are used. 2. When <i>and</i> connects two complete sentences (also called independent clauses), a comma is usually used. 3. Often a subject has two verbs that are connected by <i>and</i>. We say that the two verbs are parallel. 4. It is not necessary to repeat a helping verb (an auxiliary verb) when two verbs are connected by <i>and</i>.
Azar 3	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The function of coordinating conjunctions, like <i>and</i>, <i>but</i>, <i>or</i>, and

³ To make a convenient comparison, the three levels of Azar grammar series are called according to the proficiency levels instead of the real names.

nor is to link words or phrases.

2. Parallel patterns may involve more than two parts.
3. Coordinating conjunctions may connect two independent clauses. In informal writing, sometimes coordinating conjunctions may be positioned in the beginning.

FOG 1⁴ We use connectors to help the reader understand our ideas more easily. Use *and* and *but* to connect two sentences. *And* adds information to the idea in the first sentence.

Limitation of the study

From Tables 2 and 3, we can see that AND occurs often in EFL reading textbooks; however, in EFL grammar textbooks, AND is dealt with sparsely. The EFL learners are not able to grasp the exact meaning of coordinating conjunctions, AND in particular. To bridge the gap between the grammar points introduced and the complex sentence structures learners are exposed to, language teachers should have a good command of incorporating discrete points into the whole. This is what EFL learners lack in the classroom and what the EFL language teachers should overcome. Due to the over-emphasis of communicative language teaching, complex sentence structures are seldom analyzed in the classroom. Without a systematic introduction to coordinating conjunctions, it seems that the learners are not aware of the parallel patterns of sentences. In response to this question, an experiment of parsing elements of coordination can be designed with care to test this hypothesis for the benefit of advanced reading and translation pedagogy.

Due to the small sample of students' essays, it is difficult to make generalizations about what kind of error patterns EFL students have. So far we have a tentative hierarchy of what kind of patterns users of different proficiency levels will produce and the possible rationales in the learner's interlanguage grammar.

⁴ FOG 1 represents Focus on Grammar: A Basic Coursebook (1996). To abbreviate it in the table, the number 1 is added instead of using "basic" for a convenient categorization.

For further analysis of AND, we can analyze the role of AND in clausal coordination to see what type of semantic property AND has based upon Quirk et al's (1985) semantic framework. The use of AND seems to be treated as other than a coordinator; sometimes it is syntactically coordinate but semantically subordinate.

Conclusion

It has been shown in this paper that AND does occur with a high frequency in the written narrative texts examined here, with a density of approximately 66.3 tokens per 1000 words. Several areas for further investigation suggest themselves. One avenue of inquiry would be to compare these results of narrative genre, which were obtained from nonnative speakers, with data collected from other genres, such as compare-and-contrast. A more in-depth study of nonnative language uses of AND can make a valuable contribution to our understanding of communicative competence and the acquisition of that competence. And more data is called for upon a more in-depth examination.

This pilot study is only one step towards understanding the semantic, and syntactic functions of the conjunction AND in particular and the area of conjunction in general. The results of this research should offer a sufficient foundation on which to analyze a greater variety of texts. The hypothesis derived from such work can then be formed and such claims can be tested about idea connection in the English language.

References

Celce-Murcia & Larsen-Freeman. (1999). *The Grammar Book*. Boston, MA:

Heinle & Heinle.

Chang, Y. F. (2002) *An Investigation of parts of speech in interlanguage:*

subordinators in Taiwan learner's English Writing. Unpublished MA thesis,

Tamkang University, Taiwan.

Culicover, P. & Jackendoff, R. (1997). Semantic subordination despite syntactic coordination. *Linguistic Inquiry*, 28 (2).

Lazaraton, A. (1992). Linking ideas with AND in spoken and written discourse. *IRAL*, 30 (3).

Lin, H. L. (2002). *On the Omission of Be in Taiwan Learners' English Writing*. Unpublished MA thesis, Tamkang University, Taiwan.

Quirk, et al. (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Reading Textbooks Evaluated

Anderson, N. (2002). *Active Skills for Reading: Book 1*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Anderson, N. (2002). *Active Skills for Reading: Book 2*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Anderson, N. (2002). *Active Skills for Reading: Book 3*. Boston, MA: Heinle & Heinle.

Grammar Textbooks Evaluated

Azar, B. (1996). *Basic English Grammar (2nd ed.)*. New York: Longman.

Azar, B. (2003). *Fundamentals of English Grammar (3rd ed.)*. New York: Longman.

Azar, B. (1999). *Understanding and Using English Grammar(3rd ed.)*. New York: Longman.

Murphy, R. & Smalzer, W. R. (2000). *Grammar in Use (2nd ed.)*. Cambridge:

Cambridge University Press.

Schoenberg, I. (1996). *Focus on Grammar: A Basic Coursebook*. New York:

Longman.

Schoenberg, I. (1996). *Focus on Grammar: An Intermediate Coursebook*. New

York: Longman.

Schoenberg, I. (1996). *Focus on Grammar: A High-intermediate Coursebook*.

New York: Longman.