

THE USAGE OF ENGLISH CONJUNCTS BY STUDENTS IN SELECTED TERTIARY INSTITUTIONS IN SOUTHWESTERN NIGERIA

Folasade Ojetunde
Michael Otedola College of Primary Education

Bidemi Okanlawon
Obafemi Awolowo University

Abstract

This study examined the usage of conjuncts by students in selected tertiary institutions in Southwestern Nigeria. It discussed the problems associated with the usage of conjuncts among the selected students with a view to determining their level of mastery of conjuncts and the effect of this on their acquisition of English. The data for the study were drawn from an essay writing assignment given to 675 selected first year students across nine tertiary institutions in Southwestern Nigeria. The institutions were selected using stratified random sampling technique. Seventy-five (75) students were drawn from each institution using purposive random sampling procedure. The findings revealed that out of the nine semantic classes of conjuncts examined in this study, enumerative conjuncts 855 (41.93%) were mostly used by the students in their essay writing out of 2039 instances of conjuncts used by the students followed by appositive conjuncts 477 (23.39%), resultative conjuncts 236 (11.57%), summative conjuncts 210 (10.30%), contrastive conjuncts 160 (7.85%), inferential conjuncts 52 (2.55%), transitional conjuncts 49 (2.40%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used at all. Obviously, the usage of conjuncts generally was restricted to certain semantic classes that the students were familiar with. This accounted for a monotonous usage of the conjuncts. In spite of the high frequency and correct usage of the familiar conjuncts, there were redundant, monotonous and random usage of conjuncts, inappropriate choice of conjuncts and semantic errors which were least expected of advanced learners of English as the ones used in this study. The study therefore concluded that the students had poor mastery of conjuncts in terms of the monotony exhibited in their usage of conjuncts and the errors committed. The attention of teachers of English and curriculum planners of English courses for Nigerian institutions of learning was called to this problem.

Introduction

This study sought to investigate the usage of English conjuncts among selected tertiary institution students in Nigeria. We examined the usage of English conjuncts in relation to the semantic components that classify certain types of conjuncts according to their meanings. In English as a Second Language Environment (ESL) such as Nigeria, tertiary institution students need to acquire competence in English in order to make a success of their academic carriers. They need to understand the grammatical categories or word classes and their slots in structure, grammatical processes and the intra and inter-sentential functions of grammar so that they can control the cohesive devices of text and employ the grammatical process to indicate the value of utterances in discourse. Thus, this makes this study relevant to Halliday's (1985) textual meta-function which complements the ideational and interpersonal functions by creating what is commonly referred to as relevance (i.e. relevance to the environment), that is, the context of situation and to the preceding and the succeeding texts. This is essentially the major function of conjuncts.

Researchers have paid attention to cohesion in written, particularly students' writing especially in second language situations. Tanimowo (1991) investigated the inter-sentence connection in the English of legal documents. The study identified the devices used for inter-sentence connection in the English of legal documents to determine the relative frequency with which such devices were used in the documents, and to explain why some particular devices were preferred to others in the drafting of legal documents. The data used in the study were drawn from two main types of legal documents, namely, public documents and private documents. The data were drawn from the 1989 Constitution of the Federal Republic of Nigeria and from a house insurance document of the Royal Exchange Assurance Company. The study found that lexical devices were generally preferred to grammatical devices as inter-sentence connectives in legal documents. The findings showed that repetition, the most frequently used of all the devices, was so highly favored which, more than any other one, enabled the legal draftsman express himself with precision.

All other devices were used only to the extent that like repetition, they enabled the draftsman make his formulations precise. Devices which entailed a lot of imprecision were not used at all in the texts used e.g. ellipsis, structural parallelism, time/place relaters while logical connectives, antonymy, substitutions, hyponymy were sparingly used. Collocations, synonyms and discourse reference were however frequently used. The study concluded that the choice of inter-sentence connecting device in legal documents is determined, to a great extent, by the draftsman's need for precision and clarity.

Akande (2003) in his study of Lexical Semantics dwelt richly on lexical meanings of some lexical devices and their inter-lexical sense relations. To have an in-depth understanding of lexical devices, Akande (2003) appealed to some major theories of language namely; the traditional, the structural and the systematic theories.

Ayodabo (2005) worked on cohesion as an aspect of textuality in 'vacancy' advertisement in Nigerian newspapers. Only four vacancy adverts were selected from the Guardian Newspaper of September 9, 1997, The Punch of October 20, 1998 and Weekend Concord of November 14, 1998. The major objectives of the study were to identify the major structural part of a vacancy advert, discuss the cohesive ties used to achieve intra-part cohesion and also discuss the cohesive ties employed to achieve inter-part cohesion. The study revealed that vacancy adverts display a text-type that is highly condensed. To enhance textuality, all the vacancy adverts used in the study displayed foregrounding through graphological prominence, capital letters, reverse block caption, different bold and type faces in big fonts, especially, in titles, positions being advertised. The findings revealed that the texts used displayed much use of repetition, reiteration, substitution, ellipsis and lexical cohesion, with little or no uses of conjunction in relating the internal organization of the texts. The study thus concluded that since a text, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), derives its texture from the fact that it functions as a unit with respect to its environment, all the vacancy adverts analyzed in the study under review achieved their textuality through the use of cohesive ties mentioned above.

Olateju (2006) examined the extent to which ESL learners were able to achieve cohesion in their written texts by investigating the cohesive devices used by the students during their continuous writing sessions at school. The data used for the study were drawn from seventy final year students of Ooni High School in Osun State, Nigeria. The students were given two essay questions which would enable them demonstrate their knowledge of cohesive devices in English. The study revealed that though the students' work showed

evidence of the use of some of the cohesive devices identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976, 1985), some of the few used were wrongly used, which made the understanding of the texts difficult. The study revealed that despite the fact that all the texts lacked good linkers and had a lot of grammatical errors, the high percentage of the use of grammatical ties in Text C of the study helped in understanding the text. Also in Text D, the use of lexically repeated items helped in understanding the text. The study therefore concluded that in an ESL situation, lexical cohesion and cohesive devices should be specifically taught and students exposed to their uses, since students (second language learners) have limited exposure to the day to day use of “good” sentence structures of the English Language worsened by the influence of Pidgin English.

Jo-Ling Chen (2007) identified the misuse of cohesive devices as a common problem faced by English As a Foreign Language (EFL) writers despite the fact that cohesion is an essential textual component not only to create organized text, but also to render the content comprehensible to the reader. In light of this, Jo-Ling Chen investigated college students’ use of cohesive devices and the relationship between the number of cohesive features used and writing quality. His findings revealed that in the 46 essays collected from 23 EFL undergraduates, the students were able to use various cohesive devices in their writing. Lexical devices had the highest percentage of use, followed by reference devices and conjunctions. The study revealed that there is no significant relationship between the number of cohesive devices and writing quality. The study however highlighted some cohesive problems found in the students’ essays.

First, the researcher found that the participants had a tendency to use a simple word rather than a phrase as the conjunction device. For instance, they seldom employed phrases such as ‘in addition’, ‘on the other hand’, ‘on the contrary’, ‘as a result’ and ‘all in all’ in their writing. Instead of these, they preferred using ‘and’, ‘but’, ‘so’ and ‘because’. Another problem identified by the researcher was the overuse of cohesive devices. The author suggested that the students might have been encouraged by textbooks or teachers to use cohesive devices to make their writing cohesive and coherent. It should however be noted that overuse of cohesive devices or any grammatical structure at all can cause the writing to be redundant and difficult to comprehend. The study thus concluded that teachers could help students enlarge their choice of vocabulary. Through this, they could learn to describe the main points of their topic rather than repeating words. Also, students could acquire vocabulary, syntactic structures, or features of genres through the process of reading to write.

Akanbi (2009) examined the concept of cohesion as a tool of writing and understanding of text. He discussed the various elements that promote cohesion in a text (cohesive ties). He also took a look at the major categories of linguistic cohesion by highlighting the different types and their functions. However, the present work focuses on logical connectors (i.e. conjuncts) which belong to the class of grammatical devices used for sentence connection.

Theoretical Discussion of Conjuncts

Following Wallwork (1985:76), conjuncts are grammatical items which belong to the class of adverbials. Adverbials may be part of the structure of the clause, in which case, they are adjuncts and subjuncts. If they are outside, they may serve as a sort of comment on the clause, such adverbials are called disjuncts; or they may serve to connect clauses, these are called CONJUNCTS.

These adverbial classes are exemplified in the following constructions:

The President attended the ceremony *personally*.

The adverbial *personally* is an adjunct. It is part of the clause. In other contexts, *personally* could be a disjunct as in:

Personally, I think he is wrong.

or subjunct as in:

I *personally* did the work

However, conjuncts are essentially linking devices. For example:

- (1) The nurse did not administer the injections as directed by the doctor.
Moreover, she didn't advise the patient to take his drugs regularly.
- (2) He doesn't need any money from us. *On the contrary*, we should be going to him for loans.

The adverbials italicized in examples 1 & 2 above look different from our traditional definition of adverbials/adverbs as words that modify verbs, adjuncts and other adverbs (Quirk, Greenbaum and Leech 1973:125). They seem to have nothing to do with time, place, manner etc. They are used as connective devices. By treating these words or groups of words semantically, we can better appreciate the way they function as inter-sentential connective devices.

As the name implies, **conjuncts** serve to conjoin two utterances or part of an utterance, and they do so by expressing at the same time the semantic relationship (e.g. of time or contingency) obtaining between them (Greenbaum and Quirk 2005:190). For example:

The candidate is a fine teacher, a broadcaster of some experience, and a respected drama critic. *All the same*, there is a feeling on the committee that someone younger should be appointed.

The conjunct *all the same* here connects two separate sentences, indicating a concession relation between them: i.e. despite the candidate's high qualifications some members of the committee were not satisfied.

Conjuncts are like disjuncts in the sense that they are not integrated into the propositional content of the clause within which they occur as adjuncts do (Adejare & Adejare 1996:118). Like disjuncts, conjuncts are usually at the initial position, but their connective role is often achieved more smoothly when they are placed at the medial position.

The cinema has lost none of its attractions in Lagos and the film industry has *in consequence* continued to flourish.

Although some conjuncts (such as the informal *though*) commonly appear at the final position, this position can somewhat obscure the connective role. Conjuncts are usefully sub-classified according to what kind of meaning connection they indicate between their sentence

and some earlier or later sentence(s). They are therefore distinguishable from disjuncts by the fact that they perform the textual cohesive functions of linking different parts of a well formed text together (Quirk, Greenbaum & Leech 1973:246), Aremo (1997:242), Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik 1985). Significantly, conjuncts are invariably H-type adverbials without modifiers or qualifiers. The class of conjuncts is one of the inter-sentence connective devices in English. In Quirk, Greenbaum & Leech (1973), a chapter is devoted to sentence connection. The authors are concerned with both the semantic content (that is, the meaning relationships that are implied rather than evident between adjacent sentences) and syntactic devices. Their primary focus in the chapter is, however, the syntactic devices that are used to connect sentences in a discourse. Out of these devices, we see logical connectors which include the various classes of conjuncts and conjunctions. Halliday & Hasan (1976) can be considered an improvement on Quirk et al (1973) because their study is more detailed and more fully exemplified than Quirk et al's. However, both studies are concerned with accounting for cohesion in discourse.

It should be noted that while Quirk et al (1973) are mainly concerned with grammatical devices, Halliday & Hasan (1976) are concerned with the grammatical as well as the lexical devices. Thus, the primary focus of the present study is conjuncts which are a class of logical connectors. There are many varieties of conjuncts. Quirk et al (1973:247) recognize thirteen varieties but we shall adopt Aremo's (1997: 242-3) and Adejare & Adejare's (1996:231-235) categorizations of varieties in the treatment of conjuncts in this study because the studies are more recent and more explicit. Conjuncts as presented in the two studies are exemplified below:

Enumerative Conjuncts: Enumerative conjuncts can be used to enumerate ideas in a text and they consist of three sets with clearly defined membership.

Set I - First, second, third etc

Set II - One, two, three etc

Set III - First, next, then and finally or lastly

This set of conjuncts consists of enumerating, listing conjuncts which provide an alternative way of listing ideas but they convey the additional sense being dependent on the preceding sense.

Another set of enumerative is called additive conjuncts. They are used to add new information to what has already been stated in a previous or past clause of a text e.g. *moreover, again, furthermore, then, in addition, likewise, above all, correspondingly, equally, what is more*. In Quirk et al (1973:247), they are otherwise known as reinforcing conjuncts.

Discourse Transitional Conjuncts: Transition between one idea to another in a text is marked by some transitional conjunct adverbials e.g. *by the way, incidentally, now, as regards, regarding*. For example:

I should mention this point *now* before discussing the next major sub-component.

Summative Conjuncts: Some conjuncts are used to sum up the ideas discussed in a text especially in scholarly text e.g. *altogether, overall, then, in all, in conclusion, to sum up, in brief*, as we have in the sentence below:

Green House was first in the field event and White House was first in the track event but Blue House came first *over all*.

Appositive Conjunctions: Some conjunctions are used to introduce appositive structures within the clause e.g. *namely, in other words, for example, for instance (e.g.), that is (i.e.), or that is to say*; as used in the sentence below:

There are four syntactic classes of adverbials *namely* adjuncts, disjuncts, subjuncts and conjunctions.

Resultative Conjunctions: Resultative conjunctions indicate that the propositional content of the preceding part of the text gives rise to the propositional content of the clause in which the resultative conjunctions occur e.g. *as a result, consequently, hence, so, therefore, thus, eventually, accordingly*. As can be seen in this sentence:

He lifted the iron lid. *As a result*, the bees buzzed out in their thousands.

Inferential Conjunctions: Some conjunctions are used to express logical inferences e.g. *else, otherwise, then, in other words*, in that case:

You just have to attend your lectures *otherwise* you may be prevented from writing the examinations.

Contrastive Conjunctions: These are used to express contrast between alternative processes in adjacent clauses e.g. *alternatively, however, anyhow, else, instead, on the contrary, on the other hand, in contrast, by comparison, on the one hand...*

He is not a gentleman. *On the contrary*, he is a crook to the core.

Temporal Transition Conjunctions: Temporal transition is expressed by some conjunctions. Two prominent examples are *meanwhile, meantime, in the meantime* as exemplified below:

They were drinking and cracking jokes in the sitting-room. *Meanwhile*, the burglars were combing through the bedrooms.

Other conjunctions include:

Reformatory Conjunctions: e.g. *better, rather, in other words*, as in:

She was very tall. *Rather*, she was the tallest girl around.

Replacive Conjunctions: e.g. *alternatively, rather, on the other hand*, as in:

You could see your mother about it. *Alternatively*, you could see the doctor.

Concessive Conjunctions: e.g. *anyhow, anyway, besides, else, however, nevertheless, still, through, yet, in any case, at any rate, in spite of that, after all, all the same*. As in:

He was very lazy, *yet* all the teachers thought that he was one of the most diligent boys in the school.

Methodology

The participants for this study were drawn from higher institutions in Southwestern zone of Nigeria. Stratified random sampling technique was employed in selecting study participants. Thus, nine tertiary institutions in only three states (i.e. Lagos, Ogun and Oyo) were used for this study. The nine institutions were made up of three each from **Universities:** (Lagos State University, Ojo (LASU); Olabisi Onabanjo University, Ago-Iwoye (OOU) and University of Ibadan (UI), **Polytechnics:** (Lagos State Polytechnic, Ikorodu; (LAGOS POLY) Moshood Abiola Polytechnic, Abeokuta (MAPOLY) and The Polytechnic, Ibadan (IBADAN POLY) and **Colleges of Education:** (Michael Otedola College of Primary Education, Epe (MOCPED); Tai Solarin College of Education, Ijagun (TALSCE) and Emmanuel Alayande College of Education, Oyo (ALAYANDE COE).

Seventy five (75) five year General Studies (GNS) students in each of the nine institutions, making a total of 675 students were selected using purposive random sampling. This was to allow for adequate representation and useful responses from the students. The rationale for the choice of GNS students is that GNS as a course in tertiary institutions involves all first year students across disciplines and these students need to use conjuncts in their written tasks.

The data used were drawn from these students using an essay writing assignment and the following topic was given to the students:

“Discuss the importance of computer literacy for national development in Nigeria.”

It should be noted that in keeping with the focus of this work, 9 semantic classes of conjuncts: enumerative, summative, resultative, appositive, inferential, contrastive, transitional, replacive and reformatory conjuncts were examined. The data were analyzed using descriptive statistics of simple percentages.

Data Analyses and Discussion

Our first consideration is a general picture of conjuncts used by all the participants across all the institutions. Table 1 below provides the result.

Table 1: Overall Usage of Conjuncts by all Participants in Essay Writing Task

Type	Institution	Conjuncts	Total
Universities	LASU	239 (33.95%)	704 (34.53%)
	OOU	129 (18.32%)	
	U.I.	336 (47.73%)	
Polytechnics	LAGOS POLY	209 (29.19%)	716 (35.12%)
	MAPOLY	233 (32.63%)	
	IBADAN POLY	274 (38.38%)	
Colleges of Education	MOCPED	217 (35.06%)	619 (30.36%)
	TASCE	209 (33.76%)	
	ALAYANDE COE	193 (31.18%)	
		2039	

Looking at the analysis of the usage of conjuncts across the institutions as presented

in the table above, it is clear that 2,039 occurrences of conjuncts were recorded. The analysis revealed that U.I. had the highest frequency rate of occurrences i.e. 336 (47.73%) followed by IBADAN POLY, Ibadan 274 (38.38%); LASU 239 (33.95%); MAPOLY 233 (32.63%); MOCPED 217 (35.06%); TASCE 209 (33.76%); ALAYANDE COE 193 (31.18%) and lastly OOU 129 (18.32%). However, we need to state that of utmost importance is the effectiveness and appropriacy in the usage of conjuncts to bring out the desired result in terms of communicative effectiveness but not always the rate of occurrences.

Overall Usage of Conjuncts by Students Across the Nine (9) Selected Tertiary Institutions

Having presented an overview of the overall usage of conjuncts by all participants, we need to examine in closer details the overall usage across the nine institutions used in this study.

Table 2: Overall Usage of Conjuncts by the Selected University Students

Institution	Enumerative	Summative	Appositive	Resultative	Inferential	Contrastive	Transitional	Total No. of Occurrences
LASU	117 (48.95%)	22 (9.21%)	42 (17.57%)	28 (11.76%)	04 (1.66%)	23 (9.62%)	03 (1.25%)	239
OOU	31 (24.03%)	14 (10.85%)	42 (32.56%)	21 (16.28%)	05 (3.88%)	15 (11.63%)	01 (0.77%)	129
U.I.	119 (35.42%)	36 (10.71%)	95 (28.27%)	47 (13.99%)	03 (0.89%)	26 (7.74%)	10 (2.98%)	336
Total No. of Occurrences of Conjuncts Types Used	267 (37.9%)	72 (10.2%)	179 (25.4%)	96 (13.6%)	12 (1.7%)	64 (9.1%)	14 (1.98%)	704

From Table 2 above, it is shown that a total occurrence of 704 conjuncts were used by the students in the three selected universities i.e. Lagos State University, Olabisi Onabanjo University and University of Ibadan. Out of these conjuncts, enumeratives accounted for 267 (37.93%), summatives 72 (10.23%), appositives 179 (25.43%), resultatives 96 (13.64%), inferentials 12 (1.70%), contrastive 64 (9.09%), transitional 14 (1.98%) while replacive and reformatory were not used at all.

Analysis across the universities revealed that the selected students in LASU had 239 total occurrences of conjuncts; out of these, enumeratives accounted for 117 (48.95%), summatives 22 (9.21%), appositives 42 (17.57%), resultatives 28 (11.76%), inferentials 4 (1.66%), contrastive 23 (9.62%), transitional 3 (1.25%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used at all. The selected students of Olabisi Onabanjo University had a total occurrence of 129 conjuncts. Of these conjuncts, enumeratives amounted to 31 (24.03%), summatives 14 (10.85%), appositives 42 (32.56%), resultatives 21 (16.28%), inferentials 5 (3.88%), contrastives 15 (11.63%), transitional conjuncts 1 (0.77%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not present.

For the selected students in the University of Ibadan, we had 336 occurrences of

conjuncts. Out of these instances of conjuncts, enumerative had 119 (35.42%), summative had 36 (10.71%), appositives 95 (28.27%), resultatives 47 (13.99%), inferentials 3 (0.89%), contrastive 26 (7.74%) and transitional conjuncts 10 (2.98%). Replacive and reformatory conjuncts were still not used by these students.

We can see from Table 2 that enumerative conjuncts 267 (37.93%) were mostly used by the selected university students followed by appositives 179 (25.43%), resultatives 96 (13.64%), summatives 72 (10.23%), contrastive 64 (9.09%), transitional 14 (1.98%) and lastly inferential 12 (1.70%). The implication of this is that the students were more familiar with enumerative conjuncts than any of the other types of conjuncts.

Table 3: Overall Usage of Conjuncts by the Selected Polytechnic Students

Institution	Enumerative	Summative	Appositive	Resultative	Inferential	Contrastive	Transitional	Total No. of Occurrences
LAGOS POLY	85 (40.67%)	35 (16.75%)	38 (18.18%)	12 (5.74%)	01 (0.47%)	29 (13.88%)	09 (4.31%)	209
MAPOLY	93 (39.91%)	25 (10.73%)	56 (24.03%)	22 (9.44%)	14 (6.01%)	23 (9.87%)	-	233
Ibadan Poly	117 (42.70%)	34 (12.41%)	42 (15.33%)	38 (13.87%)	18 (6.57%)	17 (6.20%)	08 (2.92%)	274
Total No. of Occurrences of Conjuncts Types Used	295 (41.20%)	94 (13.13%)	136 (18.99%)	72 (10.06%)	33 (4.61%)	69 (9.64%)	17 (2.37%)	716

As it can be seen in Table 3, a total occurrences of 716 conjuncts were used by the selected polytechnic students. Out of these, enumerative conjuncts had the highest rate of occurrences 295 (41.20%), followed by appositives 136 (18.99%), summatives 94 (13.13%), resultatives 72 (10.06%), contrastives 69 (9.64%) and transitional conjuncts 17 (2.37%). Replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used at all by the students.

Analysis across the polytechnics revealed that the students from the Lagos State Polytechnic used 209 conjuncts. Of these, enumeratives accounted for 85 (40.67%), summatives 35 (16.75%), appositives 38 (18.18%), contrastives 29 (13.88%), transitional 09 (4.31%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used.

For the selected students of MAPOLY, we recorded 233 instances of conjuncts, out of these, enumeratives had the highest frequency rate i.e. 93 (39.91%), appositives 56 (24.03%), summatives 25 (10.73%), contrastive 23 (9.87%), resultatives 22 (9.44%), inferential 14 (6.01%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used. For the selected students of Ibadan Poly, a total occurrences of 274 conjuncts were recorded. Of these, enumeratives had 117 (42.70%), summatives 34 (12.41%), appositives 42 (15.33%), resultatives 38 (13.87%), inferentials 18 (6.57%), contrastives 17 (6.20%), transitional 8 (2.92%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not present.

Table 4: Overall Usage of Conjuncts by the Selected College of Education Students

Institution	Enumerative	Summative	Appositive	Resultative	Inferential	Contrastive	Transitional	Total No. of Occurrences
MOCPED	88 (40.55%)	15 (6.91%)	71 (32.72%)	26 (11.98%)	01 (0.46%)	08 (3.69%)	08 (3.69%)	217
TASCE	104 (49.76%)	22 (10.53%)	51 (24.42%)	15 (7.18%)	03 (1.44%)	13 (6.22%)	01 (0.48%)	209
ALAYANDE C.O.E.	101 (52.33%)	07 (3.63%)	40 (20.73%)	27 (13.99%)	03 (1.55%)	06 (3.11%)	09 (4.66%)	193
Total No. of Occurrences of Conjuncts Types Used	293 (47.33%)	44 (7.11%)	162 (26.17%)	68 (10.99%)	07 (1.13%)	27 (4.36%)	18 (2.91%)	619

Table 4 reveals that a total of 619 conjuncts were used by selected students of the three Colleges of Education used. Out of these, enumeratives had the highest frequency rate of occurrences 293 (47.33%) followed by appositives 162 (26.17%), resultatives 68 (10.99%), summatives 44 (7.11%), contrastives 27 (4.36%), transitional 18 (2.91%), inferential 7 (1.13%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not present.

The selected students in MOCPED had 217 instances of conjuncts. Out of these, enumeratives had 88 (40.55%), summatives 15 (6.91%), appositives 71 (32.72%), resultatives 26 (11.98%), inferential 1 (0.46%), contrastive 8 (3.69%), transitional 8 (3.69%) while replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used. For the selected students of TASCE, there were 209 instances of conjuncts. Out of these, enumeratives accounted for 104 (49.76%), summatives 22 (10.53%), appositives 51 (24.42%), resultatives 15 (7.18%), inferentials 3 (1.44%), contrastives 13 (6.22%), transitional 1 (0.48%) while replacive and reformatory were still not present. The selected students in Alayande College of Education had a total of 193 instances of conjuncts. Enumeratives accounted for 101 (52.33%), summatives 7 (3.63%), appositives 40 (20.73%), resultatives 27 (13.99%), inferential 3 (1.55%), contrastives 6 (3.11%) and transitional conjuncts 9 (4.66%). Replacive and reformatory conjuncts were not used by the students.

Problems with Usage of Conjuncts

It is important for advanced learners not only to employ conjunct in their essays but to use them appropriately for their communicative needs. We, however, observed errors in the participants' usage and the errors as presented in Table 5 reveal that out of a total 2039 occurrences of conjuncts, enumerative conjuncts had the highest rate of occurrences i.e. 855 (41.93%). Out of these 776 (90.76%) were correctly used while 79 (9.24%) were instances of errors; appositive conjuncts followed with 477 (23.39%) instances. Of these, 425 (89.10%) were correctly used while 52 (10.90%) were instances of errors; resultative conjuncts had 236 (11.57%) instances, out of these 216 (91.53%) were used correctly while 20 (8.47%) instances were errors. Summative conjuncts had 210 (10.30%) instances, of these 182 (86.67%) were rightly used while 28 (13.33%) instances were instances of errors. For contrastive conjuncts 160 (7.85%) instances were recorded. Of which 147 (91.88%) were correctly used while 13 (8.12%) were instances of errors. Inferential conjuncts had 52 instances (2.55%) of which 45 (86.54%) were correctly used while 7 (13.46%) were wrongly used. Lastly, transitional conjuncts accounted for 49 (2.40%), of these 43 (87.76%) instances were correctly used while 6 (12.24%) were instances of errors. It is obvious the failure of the

students to use replacive and reformatory conjuncts was probably due to the failure of the essay topic to motivate their usage or that they are not familiar with these conjuncts and some others that were sparingly used in their texts. Most of the errors recorded in the students' essays were semantic errors, redundant and random use of conjuncts, inappropriate choice of conjuncts and spelling errors.

Table 5: Distribution of Errors Across the Semantic Classes of Conjuncts

Enumeratives		Appositives		Resultative		Summative		Contrastive		Inferential		Transitional		Total No. of Occurrences
Correctly Used	Errors	Correctly Used	Errors	Correctly Used	Errors	Correctly Used	Errors	Correctly Used	Errors	Correctly Used	Errors	Correctly Used	Errors	
776 (90.76%)	79 (9.24%)	425 (89.10%)	52 (10.90%)	216 (91.53%)	20 (8.47%)	182 (86.67%)	28	147 (91.88%)	13 (8.12%)	45 (86.54%)	07 (13.46%)	43 (87.76%)	06 (12.24%)	2039
855 (41.93%)		477 (23.39%)		236 (11.57%)		210 (10.30%)		160 (7.85%)		52 (2.55%)		49 (2.40%)		

Some of the Deviant Usage of Conjuncts in the Texts

In view of the fact that the participants used in this study were advanced learners of English, one would expect that they ought to have acquired an appreciable level of competence in English. The findings however, revealed that in spite of their familiarity with some of the conjuncts, there were still instances of incorrect usage of the conjuncts. We need to state that the deviant structures identified are categorized under the headings highlighted below. The following examples extracted from students' essays display the erroneous use of English conjuncts:

1. Redundant use of summative conjuncts

- (i) *So therefore*, computer literacy is an act of being knowledgeable, informed, enlightened, exposed and educated on an aspect that deals with computer.

2. Misuse of contrastive conjuncts -

however, nevertheless

- (ii) Secondly, computer education has made learning easier and faster due to the application of some specific devices. *However*, it has created the awareness in every citizen both literate and illiterate.
- (iii) Taking for instance, no matter how intelligence or brilliant you are without being computer literate nobody will employ you. Also some courses of study base their workings on computer. *However*, accountancy is an example of such course of study.

In the extract above, no contrary opinion is expressed in the last sentence. So, the use of contrastive conjunct *however* does not give us the appropriate meaning of the latter

expression in which some other related thing has been stated.

3. Random use of *also* as an additive conjunct or focusing subjunct.

(iv) *Also* computer literacy can *also* transform the standard of living of Nigerians.

4. Redundant use of *though*, *nevertheless*, *above all*, *so* and *but* as in the following extracts:

(v) *Though* computer literacy has helped a lot of people and the growth of Nigeria as a nation, *nevertheless* it has contributed to some negative impact it has on the people of the nation.

(vi) *Also above all*, unemployment will be drastically reduced if not to the lowest level if computer literacy is put in nation's agenda for national development.

(vii) In addition *so*, government offices have been equipped with computer in order to make the work so easy and difficult problems can be solved.

(viii) *Though* they have improved the online banking, credit and ATM card *but* there can still be a better improvement which can make the nation improve.

(ix) *Although* the importance of computer cannot be under estimated because it serves humanity in many ways.

(x) *Although* the citizen believe they have gain independence since 1960 *but* I think it would have been preferable if the colonial masters never gives freedom to Nigeria in that year.

5. Semantic errors.

(xi) *Conclusively*, the importance of computer literacy in Nigeria's development cannot be overemphasized as it is the bedrock for the development...

(xii) *Conclusively*, this also helps in the aspect of creation of job opportunity for the people when such a person is computer literate.

The use of *conclusively* in the extract above has no semantic correlate with the root word 'conclude'. So *conclusively* does not denote "in conclusion".

6. Omission of functional words

(xiii) () a nation to be more effective and efficient *then* there is need for technological advancement.

The functional word omitted is *for*.

7. Redundant use of additive conjuncts

(xiv) There has *also* been other advantages *as well*...

With the presence of *also* in the above extract there is no need of using *as well*; since both perform the same function.

(xv) *And moreover*, it will help in the development of the country.

8. Redundant use of resultative conjuncts

(xvi) Computer has become a useful tool for all the organisation in other to ease them in their job. It helps both in the theoretical and practical parts of any job. *So*, it is *therefore* expedient for every individual especially the student to have little knowledge if not all about the use of the computer.

(xvii) *So therefore*, every nation which aspires to improve in its information production, distribution and storage employ this laudable technology.

9. Wrong use of preposition “with” in additive conjuncts

(xviii) *In addition with this*, computer, no matter how things can be well done by hand it cannot be fast and fine as what computer can do.

10. Spelling errors

(xix)	more so	instead of	moreso
	infact		in fact
	further more		furthermore
	for instant		for instance
	in order words		in other words

From the extract above, we can see that many Nigerian learners employ wrongly certain conjuncts which have no semantic correlation with their root words. We need to state that the deviant structures identified in the data used in this study are categorized under the headings highlighted above. These thus, serve as a pointer to the types of conjuncts that students find most difficult to use correctly.

Conclusion

We would have to admit that the study which was limited to tertiary institutions has a lot of implications for the Nigerian educational system. There is need for second language learners of English to be introduced to different semantic classes of conjuncts early enough in an English course, with the common ones (enumerative conjuncts) being introduced first before the less common ones are taught and their indispensability being emphasized. The study therefore concluded that the students had poor mastery of conjuncts in terms of the monotony exhibited in their usage of most of the conjuncts. Even in their monotonous usage of conjuncts, they committed errors which were least expected of them as advanced learners of English.

References

- Adejare, A. & Adejare, O. (1996). *Tertiary english grammar*. Lagos: Difamo Books.
- Adetugbo, A. (1969). Oral english in the primary school. *Journal of Nigeria English Studies Association*. 3(1), 59-64.
- Afolayan, A. (1968). *The linguistic problems of Yoruba learners and users of English*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.
- Akanbi, S.O. (2009). Linguistic cohesion: Types and functions. *OSPOLY: Journal of Language and Communication*. Vol. 2 No. 1, pp. 144-156.
- Akande, A.T. (2003). Lexical semantics: An introduction. In L. Oyeleye, & M. Olateju, (Eds.) *Readings in language and literature*. (pp. 75-85), Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Limited.
- Aremo, B. (1997). *An introduction to English sentences 2*. Ibadan: Caltop Publications (Nig.) Ltd.
- Ayodabo, A. (2005). Cohesion as an aspect of textuality in ‘vacancy’ advertisement in newspapers. In D. Ayorinde & A. Alade, (Eds.) *Issues in language, communication and education: A book of reading in honor of Caroline A. Okedara*. (pp 312 - 342) Ibadan: Counstellations Books.
- Greenbaum, S., & Quirk, R. (2005). *A student’s grammar of the English language*. Indiana: Pearson Education.
- Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.

- Jacobs, R. (1966). *English language teaching in Nigeria*. Lagos: The Ford Foundation.
- Jo-Ling, C. (2007). An investigation of EFL students' use of cohesive devices. nutnr.lib.nutn.edu.tw/bitstream/987654321/7773/1/07
- Ogunsiji, A. (2003). Developing EL2 learners' communicative competence through Literature-in-English. In L. Oyeleye & M. Olateju (Eds.) *Readings in language and literature*. pp 128-135, Ile-Ife: Obafemi Awolowo University Press Ltd.
- Olateju, M. (2006). Cohesion in ESL classroom written texts. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*, 15(3): 314-331.
- Ojetunde, C.F. & Unoroh, S.O. (2010). Grammatical devices for sentence connection in written English of selected students of polytechnics in Lagos and Ogun states. *OSPOLY Journal of Language and Communication*. Vol. 2 No. 1, 1 – 15.
- Olagoke, D.O. (1979a). The mother tongue and ELs in Nigerian education. In E. Ubahakwe, (Ed.). *The teaching of English studies*. Ibadan: Ibadan University Press. pp. 15-26.
- Olagoke, D.O. (1979b). The mobility of English adverbials. In E. Ubahakwe, (Ed.). *The teaching of English studies*. Ibadan : Ibadan University Press. pp. 63-74.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S. & Leech, G. (1973). *A university grammar of english*. UK: Longman Group Ltd.
- Tanimowo, O. (1991). *Inter-sentence connection in the english of legal documents*. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife.
- Tomori, S.H.D. (1967). *A study of the syntactic structures of the written english of British and Nigerian grammar school pupils*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of London.
- Wallwork, J. F. (1985). *Language and linguistics: An introduction to the study of language*. London: Heinemann.

OJETUNDE, Folasade (PhD)

E-mail: folasade.ojetunde@yahoo.com

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

MICHAEL OTEDOLA COLLEGE OF PRIMARY EDUCATION

NOFORIJA-EPE

*OKANLAWON, Bidemi (PhD)

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

OBAFEMI AWOLOWO UNIVERSITY, ILE-IFE

bolawon@yahoo.co.uk