An Inquiry into Connectives and Their Use in Written Discourse

Kamil Kurtul

kurtulkamil@kku.edu.tr

Abstract

Problem Statement: To know a language means to be able to produce coherent verbal and written texts to convey one's message to the addressee. Texture is a matter of meaning relations and this is what distinguishes a text from something that is not. The text should function as a unity with respect to its environment. An important aspect of discourse understanding and generation involves the recognition and processing of discourse relations and as such connective devices, also known as connectors, play a significant role in the formation and interpretation of the relations present in a text.

Method: In the present study connectives both in Turkish and English have been analyzed in terms of their structural properties through the written works of two groups of students studying at Hacettepe University in Ankara. The analysis is based on the same principles as

the Penn Discourse TreeBank, which lists connective devices into three categories as coordinating, subordinating conjunctions and sentence adverbials. So as to analyze the reasons behind the mistakes of the participants, a Grammaticality Judgement Test has been designed and implemented.

Conclusion: The results indicate that there occurs L1 effect on both groups' use of connectives in L2 regardless of their language backgrounds.

Keywords: textlinguistics, coherence, connectors, connectives, grammaticality judgement test

Introduction

Communication takes place in a certain context through texts created by language users by employing various linguistics structures. In this sense, the ultimate result of language act is text production and its comprehension. From a linguistic point of view, a text is a series of sentences that make up a meaningful whole, which is not coincidental; on the contrary, it is constructed by the language user according to systematic, linguistic structures (Kıran & Kıran, 2006, p. 291; Huber, 2008i pp. 224-271; Beaugrande & Dressler, 1988). The most significant feature of a text is that it is made up of interrelated propositions and sentences. If the said relation is not maintained, successively ordered propositions and sentences cannot be considered a text internally unified. The first condition of the phenomenon of connection is the relation between/among the elements of a sentence (Dijk, 1980). These relations enable the text to be internally connected and in turn make one understand the interrelations present in a text.

Example (1) My father went to his office; my mother to the shop.

A meaningful relation occurs in the text (Example 1) as the actions in the sentences are similar to each other in terms of the acts carried out by the agents. The said meaningful relation between the sentences forms coherence. Coherence relations in a text might be created, as Halliday and Hassan (1976) suggest, without using explicit connectives but the reverse is also true.

Example (2) Aslı took a shower and went to bed.

Example (3) After she took a shower, Aslı went to bed.

In the (2) example, temporal time relation between the sentences is highlighted with a conjunction, *and* while in the following (3) example, they are connected with another connective, *after*. As seen in the examples, connectives, which facilitate language items in the micro-structure of any text, indicate the articulation points between consecutive units of a sentence, thus make it easier for the listener/reader to comprehend the relation to occur as a result of the articulation process in the text better. These items, carrying out various structural and lexical functions, connect words, phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs or larger units of a text to each other grammatically and at the same time create meaning by highlighting coherence relations (Uzun-Subaşı, 2006, p. 700).

The present study deals with connectives, which have significant roles in creating or underlining text coherence.

Background

Text Structure

Text is defined as a unit of language produced by language users either orally or in written form in a context and from linguistic and theoretical point of views, it has a three-fold structure:

Microstructure. This term refers to relationships within sentences and between adjacent sentences or clauses, in other words, to the inter-sentential organization and dwells upon topics such as reiteration, reference, substitution, ellipsis, exophora, endophora, tense, aspect, cohesive devices and so on.

Macrostructure. Macrostructure refers to relationships between blocks of sentences (e.g. sections and paragraphs) and large text segments. After reading the propositions of the text, language users form a semantic and abstract structure, that is, the macrostructure in their mind. Understanding a text means reader's comprehension of the subject, main idea and result of it and that requires the text to form a unified whole. Comprehension of the text by the reader and moving up to the next level is a result of certain processes, called macro rules; the first being, *deletion*, the second *generalization* and the last *construction*. This structure is composed of multi layers. At the base level of the text, there are numerous propositions but as the reader proceeds to upper levels, the number of propositions decrease and at the top level there remains a single proposition. The term macrostructure refers to the holistic coherence of a text (Ülper, 2008, pp. 27-35).

Superstructure. By this term is meant the functions of segments within the text as a whole and its overall organization as a coherent text. This structure differs from macrostructures in that it is not semantic but is formalistic. By configuring the conceptual content of a text in an order, superstructure is made up of formal features that act as a road map for the reader to get the message. In other words, it is a schematic form that provides the meaning entirety of a text. These criteria that make a multilayer text a unified whole are created each time within the text itself and organized according to the type, function, creator, receiver and of course to the conditions they exist. In the process, first of all, sentences come together to form sections, which are, indeed, sentence groups known as paragraphs that create meaningful units within themselves. What follows are texts which are the result of the

articulation of paragraphs in a systematic order. And each text develops following a theme (Onursal, 2003, p. 11). Moreover, so that a text would not turn into a coincidental chain of sentences but rather be a text, it is essential that conflicting views should not co-occur that referents of the text should overlap with the realities of outer world and that the text should be in harmony with them and have a holistic meaning.

While trying to find out the aforementioned holistic meaning, priority is given to linguistic coherence and cohesion, in other words, to the microstructure of the text as language is a means of creating meaning and as such the meaning of any text is established by linguistic elements and structures that are present in the microstructure. In that sense words, clauses, sentences and microstructures that are formed by the connections amid sentences maintain local coherence in a text and might be explained directly.

Within the light of the discussion made so far, if text is interpreted as a unity wherein *inter* and *trans* sentential relations, structures and connections are displayed; and if the term text is understood indicating no differences between written and oral language, we can see that research into text has so far conducted on two axes. On the first axis, structural and semantic relations between and among sub-elements of macrostructures such as narration, article, news and so on (van Dijk, 1977, 1980; Beaugrande & Dressler, 1980) are studied. On the second one, micro-structural forms and semantic relations of texts are analyzed (Webber et al., 2003, Grosz et al., 1995, Polanyi, 1988; as cited in Zeyrek, 2008).

Micro-structural research on text structures state that coherence and cohesion are best displayed by connectives. In textlinguistics tradition, these two concepts are considered to be the basic criteria of textuality and might be maintained through lexical items like synonymy, antonym and homonymy; however, connectors show cohesive and coherence ties clearly and as such they play a significant role in most discourse theories.

Classification of Connectives

Kurtul (2011) classifies discourse connectives according to their syntactic and semantic features. The study aims at investigating into textual coherence in microstructural level and uses Penn Discourse Treebank –PTDB (Prasad et al., 2007) and METU-Turkish Corpus Annotation as key documents. As a result, discourse connectives are classified into three types: (1) Coordinating Conjunctions, (2) Subordinating Conjunctions, and (3) Discourse Adverbials. From a structural perspective, a discourse connective is a predicate that take two and only two arguments, which can conveniently be called ARG1 and ARG2. These arguments can be in the form of abstract objects -propositions, facts, events, descriptions, situations, and eventualities- (Zeyrek et al., 2008; Kurtul, 2011).

Coordinating conjunctions. These conjunctions combine two clauses of the same syntactic type, that is, two main clauses. They are typically sentence-medial and show an affinity with the second clause. A typical use of coordinating conjunction can be seen in the example (4) where the italic parts show Arg1 and highlighted parts show Arg2. The connector is both highlighted and underlined.

Example (4) Gentlemen, some members of the Grand National Assembly expressed their objection to the treaty I signed with this French Committee. **However, I was planning to achieve some objectives by accepting the ceasefire.**

Efendiler, bu Fransız heyetiyle yaptığım yirmi günlük ateşkese, Büyük Millet Meclisi'nde kimileri karşı çıktı. <u>**Oysa**</u>**, benim, bu ateşkesi kabul etmekle sağlamak istediğim hususlar vardı.** Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Nutuk

Subordinating conjunctions. The first part of the group is simplex subordinators. In Turkish when a subordinate clause is reduced, it loses its tense, aspect and mood properties. In this way, it becomes a nominal or adverbial clause associated with the matrix verb. The relationship of an adverbial clause with the abstract object expressed by the matrix verb and

its arguments are conveyed by a small set of suffixes corresponding to English 'while', 'when', 'by means of', 'as if', or temporal 'since', added to the non-finite verb of the reduced clause. This pair of non-finite verb and suffix is called a 'converb'. The normal order of the arguments of a converb is ARG2-ARG1, where the converb appears as the last element of ARG2 (Zeyrek et al., 2008).

Example (5) However, I let this man go, **by showing respect to what we had gone through during Erzurum Congress.**

Gene **de ben, bu kişiyi Erzurum Kongresi'ndeki ilişkilerin anısına saygı göster<u>erek</u>** *serbest bırakmıştım*. (Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Nutuk)

The second part of subordinators is formed by complex ones. These conjunctions are formed by the combination of a lexical item, usually a postposition, with a nomilazing suffix and/or with a case suffix, too. If the verb of the clause does not have a subject, it is nominalized with *–mAk* (the infinitive suffix). If it has a subject, it is nominalized with -DIK (past) or *–mA* (non-past) and carries the possessive marker agreeing with the subject of the verb. The order of the arguments of a complex converb is ARG2-ARG1, where the converb appears as the last element of ARG2. The nominalizer, the possessive and the case suffix appear attached to the non-finite verb of ARG2 in that order. The connector is the last element of ARG2 (Zeyrek et al., 2008).

Example (6) **Since the telegram written by the Prime Ministry did not have a title and was not signed,** *it was not accepted by the Association for Defence of the National Rights of Anatolia and Rumelia.*

Sadaret merkezinden yazılan telgraf, başlığı ve imzası olma<u>dığı için</u> *Anadolu ve Rumeli Mudafaai Hukuk Cemiyeti Temsilciler Kurulu tarafından kabul edilmedi*. (Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Nutuk)

Discourse adverbials. Discourse adverbials are connectives that are able to access, in contrast with clausal connectives like *usually*, *definitely* etc., (one of) their arguments as well as the previous inferences anaphronically. They can take an abstract object in an adjacent or non adjacent position.

Example (7) It is surely much better for those who lack this power in the deep of their heart not to attempt at anything. **Otherwise, they might both deceive themselves and the nation.** *Yüreklerinde bu kuvveti duymayanların hiçbir girişimde bulunmamaları elbette daha iyidir.* **<u>Aksi takdirde</u>, hem kendilerini ve hem de ulusu aldatmış olurlar**. (Mustafa Kemal Atatürk, Nutuk)

Kurtul (2011) also tries to find out what kind of connectives are used to show what type of coherence relations in argumentative compositions written both in Turkish and English by learners (i) whose first language is Turkish (L1) and second language is English (L2) and (ii) those whose L1 is Turkish, L2 is English and L3 is French. The study shows that learners use the above mentioned connectors fairly well. However, mistakes made in L2 compositions reveal that they are mainly related with coordinators (mean average 18 %) and subordinators (mean average 49 %). So as to understand better the underlying reasons why these connectors are used inaccurately, a grammatical judgment test is designed and employed.

Method

Participants

The first participant group is 40 learners from Hacettepe University, studying at Department of English Language Teaching while the second group is 40 learners from Hacettepe University, Department of French Language Teaching, who were attending an English class as their second language subject. The first participant group's L1 is Turkish and L2 is English and the average age is 19.2. Of the learners, 29 are female while 11 are male.

L1 of the second participant group is Turkish, L2 is English and L3 is French and the average age is 22.9. Of the learners, 36 are female while 4 are male.

Data Collection Instrument

A Grammaticality Judgement Test (from now on GJT), developed by the researcher, was employed to test participants' knowledge about coordinators and subordinators in L2. The rationale behind the GJT is the fact that phrases and clauses may be connected through juxtaposition in Turkish without any explicit connective, yet this is not a common practice in English and coordinators are used to connect phrases and clauses. Thus, participants' performance in the use of these language items is expected to be low as a result of L1 effect on L2, in other words, because of the transfer that might occur. The aim of the GJT was to determine whether participants could distinguish grammatically acceptable sentences from unacceptable ones.

Out of a total of 84 sentences, the first group was about coordinators whereas the second was on subordinators. The third group is filler sentences and they have no grammatical or semantic relation to the test but functions as distracters. They were randomly scattered among sentences so as the participants might not realize that they were being tested on a specific language point. In the process, expert opinion was asked for maintaining content validity of the test and upon receiving the comments, necessary changes were made accordingly.

Administration of the Test

Participants were given a thirty minute time slot and asked to decide whether the sentences in the test were True (T) or False (F).

Data Analysis

In the evaluation process each correct answer by the participant was given one point while incorrect answers received no points at all and then the percentages of correct and false answers were calculated. The whole data were then entered into SPSS program and seen that the *Cronbach Alpha* correlation coefficient was *0.98* between the first and second group of participants, which was considered to be a sign indicating high level of test reliability.

<p align="center">**Findings and Discussion**</p>

Distribution of the 84 sentences of the test is seen below. Sentences were grouped into three as those about (i) coordinating conjunctions, (ii) subordinating conjunctions and (iii) filler sentences. Half of 28 sentences in each group is grammatically acceptable –true- and the other half is unacceptable –false. Sentences are in a random order (see Appendix – A).

Sentences about coordinating conjunctions are divided into three groups as;

(a) [*Full S + Conj + Full S*]

(b) [*Full S+ Conj+ Partial S (pro-drop)*]

(c) [*NP+ Conj+ NP*]

Half of these 28 sentences are grammatical (*acceptable*) and the other half is ungrammatical (*unacceptable*). In the Tables (1-6) below success ratio of the participants' about these types of sentences are seen.

(a) [*Full S + Conj + Full S*];

Table 1

Success Ratio of Acceptable Sentences

Number of Question	1	35	39	49	83	Average
1. Participant Group	% 70	% 65	% 82	% 70	% 75	**% 72,40**
2. Participant Group	% 80	% 70	% 80	% 70	% 80	**% 76,00**

Table 2

Success Ratio of Unacceptable Sentences

Number of Question	23	40	54	60	67	Average
1. Participant Group	% 30	% 35	% 60	% 25	% 37	**% 37,00**
2. Participant Group	% 20	% 30	% 50	% 35	% 35	**% 34,00**

(b) [*Full S+ Conj+ Partial S (pro-drop)*];

Table 3

Success Ratio of Acceptable Sentences

Number of Question	15	17	22	56	68	Average
1. Participant Group	% 65	% 90	% 60	% 20	% 95	**% 66**
2. Participant Group	% 55	% 95	% 30	% 60	% 90	**% 66**

Table 4

Success Ratio of Unacceptable Sentences

Number of Question	30	34	71	78	81	Average
1. Participant Group	% 60	% 35	% 65	% 10	% 60	**% 46**
2. Participant Group	% 50	% 35	% 55	% 10	% 80	**% 46**

(c) [*NP+ Conj+ NP*];

Table 5

Success Ratio of Acceptable Sentences

Number of Question	18	26	63	76	Average
1. Participant Group	% 90	% 80	% 83	% 65	**% 79,50**
2. Participant Group	% 80	% 95	% 83	% 65	**% 80,75**

Table 6

Success Ratio of Unacceptable Sentences

Number of Question	24	45	51	73	Average
1. Participant Group	% 60	% 60	% 60	% 50	**% 57,50**
2. Participant Group	% 50	% 60	% 50	% 50	**% 52,50**

Results show that participants are much more successful in distinguishing acceptable sentences from unacceptable ones in all groups. Success ratios do not present any statistically significant difference between the two groups. When data regarding lower level of success are analyzed, it is seen that they are mainly about sentences without connectors (in the first group the success ratio is 37 percent and in the second 34 percent).

The reason for this seems to stem from a structural difference in terms of coordinating conjunctions between Turkish and English. Turkish allows phrases and clauses to connect without using any explicit connectives; on the contrary, in English use of connectors such as *and*, *or* etc. is explicitly required (Example 8, 9).

Example (8) Bana biraz *kağıt kalem* getirir misin?

Would you bring me some *paper [and] pen*?

Example (9) Öğleyin *peynir ekmek* yedim.

I had *bread [and] cheese* at lunch time.

It might be suggested that participants are of the opinion that they can juxtapose L2 (English) sentences as they do in L1 (Turkish) without using any connective, therefore, participants seem to have brought a characteristic of L1 into L2, which is called *interference* in the related literature.

Another inquiry of the test was the argument structure of subordinators. In English some connectives in this category take their argument as a tensed clause and some as noun/verb phrases but in Turkish they take their argument as noun/verb phrases only. And as such participants' performance in distinguishing sentences displaying this feature from those without it was tested.

Sentences about coordinating conjunctions are divided into two groups as;

(a) [*Full S+ Conj+Full S*]

(b) [*Full S+ Conj+VP/NP*]

Half of these 28 sentences are grammatical (*acceptable*) and the other half is ungrammatical (*unacceptable*).

In the Tables (7-10) below success ratio of the participants' about these types of sentences are seen.

(a) [*Full S + Conj + Full S*];

Table 7

Success Ratio of Acceptable Sentences

Number of Question	6	13	19	28	44	59	79	Average
1. Participant Group	% 90	% 75	% 80	% 95	% 75	% 75	%25	**% 73,57**
2. Participant Group	% 90	% 95	% 80	% 95	% 70	% 80	%30	**% 77,14**

Table 8

Success Ratio of Unacceptable Sentences

Number of Question	3	14	33	43	48	55	70	Average
1. Participant Group	% 80	% 80	% 85	% 90	% 70	% 70	%60	**% 76,42**
2. Participant Group	% 75	% 70	% 90	% 80	% 65	% 60	%65	**% 72,14**

(b) [*Full S+ Conj + VP/NP*];

Table 9

Success Ratio of Acceptable Sentences

Number of Question	2	7	32	37	52	64	75	Average
1. Participant Group	% 30	% 80	% 95	% 70	% 90	% 67	%90	**% 74,57**
2. Participant Group	% 40	% 80	% 80	% 80	% 75	% 75	%90	**% 74,28**

Table 10

Success Ratio of Unacceptable Sentences

Number of Question	8	17	21	27	38	65	80	Average
1. Participant Group	% 70	% 90	% 90	% 90	% 85	% 95	%95	**% 87,85**
2. Participant Group	% 60	% 85	% 80	% 80	% 90	% 80	%85	**% 80,00**

There exists no statistically significant difference between two groups in terms of success ratios regarding these types of sentences. Results reveal that participants achieved high scores both in acceptable and unacceptable sentences. Nevertheless, a close look on mistakes indicates that they are mainly related with syntactical features of the arguments of the connectors. The reason for that again seems to have resulted from structural differences between L1 and L2. Some subordinating connectors in L2 take their argument as a tensed clause (Example 10), some take non-finite noun/verb phrases as their arguments (Example 11). On the other hand, subordinating conjunctions take their arguments as non-finite noun/verb phrases (Yıldırım, 2010; Zeydan, 2007, Göksel & Karlaske, 2005; Zeyrek et al., 2008).

Example (10) **Due to the fact that** **there was a strong storm**, *all the flights were cancelled*.

Kuvvetli bir fırtınadan dolayı/fırtına olduğu için, bütün uçuşlar iptal edildi.

Example (11) **Due to** **a strong storm**, *all the flights were cancelled*.

Kuvvetli bir fırtınadan dolayı, *bütün uçuşlar iptal edildi*.

Within the light of the discussion made so far and examples given above, it can be stated that both groups of participants have been under the influence of L1 in their production in L2, in other words, they have transferred structural properties of Turkish into English in

their written works, thus making mistakes. Another striking point is that mistakes are common in those connectors (such as *while, as, since* etc.) indicating more than one semantic relation. This could be interpreted by saying linguistic context is not enough to clarify the semantic relations present in the text or learners are of the opinion that relations shown by the connectors are vague.

Conclusion

The present paper that aims at studying connectives, which facilitate language items in the microstructure of any text and indicate the articulation points between consecutive units of a sentence, thus make it easier for the listener/reader to comprehend the relation in the text better, from a textlinguistics perspective has significant implications and results for language teaching. The first implication is that learners tend to transfer structural properties of L1 into

L2 regardless of their language background. In the study, first of all connectives were classified structurally and then the use of connectives was analyzed through the written compositions (in L1 and L2) of language learners, who speak two and three languages and study at foreign language teaching departments. When mistakes regarding connectives were inspected, it was seen that learners' mistakes were mainly focused on coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. Upon which a GJT was designed and employed to find out the reasons behind this phenomenon. Results indicate that learners can use connectives fairly efficiently and that they are, statistically speaking, more successful in identifying grammatically acceptable sentences than unacceptable ones. That is, learners seem to have enough database about acceptable/true sentences but are lacking in adequate database about unacceptable/false ones.

The second implication is that the present study once more confirmed the claim that while language is a virtual system with choices, text is a real system where choices of a language are realized through certain patterns. Language use is the process in which this virtual system is implemented. As language use takes place through texts produced under certain conditions, it is a must for those who write books, design learning/teaching materials, work as teachers and carry out research in language teaching to make use of textuality in every effort they put in.

Although some theorists and practitioners accept sentence as the upper boundary of linguistic studies, it seems indispensable to resort to textlinguistics point of view, which deals with extrasentential structures, namely, texts. It is indispensable because learners who are unaware of the limits and possibilities of the language they study produce not only incoherent, unintelligible texts but also have difficulty in conveying their messages and expressing their opinions to others. On the contrary, it is a well-established fact that coherent and intelligible text production helps in coherent reasoning as well. In order to achieve this end, propositions in a text must be articulated with each other properly so that relations between them might be better understood, in other words, coherent texts must be produced. Therefore, it is of vital importance to prevent or minimize wrong and inefficient use of connectives as a connective device creates certain relations among the elements of micro and macro structures of a text, relates intra and inter linguistic units to each other and thus contribute significantly to the creation of coherent texts.

References

De Beaugrande A. & Dressler, W. (1988). *Introduction to text tinguistics.* London: Longman.

Göksel, A. & Karlaske, C. (2005). *Turkish: A comprehensive grammar*. London, New York: Routledge.

Grosz, B. J. & Sidner, C. L. (1986). Attention, intention, and the structure of discourse. *Computational Linguistics*, Vol.12, p.175-204.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English.* London, New York: Longman.

Huber, E. (2008). *Dilbilime giriş*. İstanbul: Multilingual Publications.

Kıran, Z. & A. Kıran. (2006). *Dilbilime giriş*. Ankara: Seçkin Publications.

Kurtul, K. (2011). *Türkçe ve İngilizce'deki bağlaçların yazılı metinlerde kullanımı*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. Ankara University.

Atatürk, M. K. (2006). *Nutuk. 14th Edition*. İstanbul: Alfa Publications.

Onursal, İ. (2003). Türkçe metinlerde bağdaşıklık ve tutarlılık. In A. Kıran, E. Korkut, S. Ağıldere (Eds.) *Contemporary linguistics,* (pp. 121-132). İstanbul: Multilingual Publications.

Prasad, R., Miltsakaki, E., Dinesh, N., Lee, A., & Joshi, A. (2007). *The Penn Discourse TreeBank annotation manual*. University of Pennsylvania.

Sarıçoban A. & Aktaş D. (2011). A new intercomprehension model: Reservoir model. *The Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 7* (2). 144-163.

Uzun-Subaşı L. (2006). Ögrencilerin yazılı anlatım sürecindeki metinlestirme sorunları. *II. National Children and Youth Literature Papers,* (pp. 693-701). Ankara University, Faculty of Educational Sciences.

Ülper, H. (2008). Bilişsel süreç modeline göre hazırlanan yazma ögretimi programının ögrenci basarısına etkisi. *Unpublished Ph.D Dissertation*. Ankara University.

Van Dijk, T. A. (1980). *Text and context, explorations in the semantics and pragmatics of discourse*. London: Longman.

Webber, B., Joshi, A., Stone, M. & Knott, A. (2003). Anaphora and discourse structure. *Computational Linguistics*, *29*.

Yıldırım, Ç. F. (2010). Türkçe'de belirteç tümcecikleri: Sözbilimsel yapı çözümlemesi çerçevesinde bir sınıflandırma önerisi. *Unpublished PhD*. Dissertation. Ankara University.

Zeydan, S. (2008). The analysis of contrastive discourse connectives in Turkish. *Unpublished Master's Thesis*. METU.

Zeyrek, D. Turan, Ü. D. & Demirsahin, I. (2008). Structural and presuppositional connectives in Turkish. In *The Constraint in Discourse III*. Potsdam, Germany.

Kamil Kurtul is an Assistant Professor of English Translation and Interpreting Department at Kırıkkale University. He holds a PhD in Linguistics from Ankara University and has a Certificate from Cambridge University in Teaching of English. Dr. Kurtul has worked at various universities and institutions in Turkey and abroad and so far translated numerous works of eminent scholars into Turkish.

Kamil Kurtul

Bağlaçlar ve Yazılı Metinlerle Kullanımları Üzerine Bir İnceleme

Özet

Bir dili bilmek o dilde bildirişim durumuna uygun anlaşılabilir ve iyi kurgulanmış metinler üretmek ya da üretilmiş metinleri anlayabilmek demektir. Metin tümcelerin rastgele bir şekilde dizilmesiyle oluşturulan bir yapı değil, tümcelerle gerçekleşen anlamlı bir bütündür. Metindilbilim dili tümce düzeyinin ötesinde metinsellik ölçütleri temelinde inceleyerek bilgi yapısını ortaya koymayı amaçlar. Bağlaçlar metinlerin anlaşılıp yorumlanmasında önemli işlevlere sahip dilsel unsurlardır. Mevcut çalışmada Hacettepe Üniversitesi'nde öğrenim gören İngiliz ve Fransız Dili ve Eğitimi bölümlerinden öğrencilerin kendi ana dilleri ve İngilizce'deki bağlaç kullanımları ve başarım düzeyleri Penn Discourse TreeBank çalışması modellenerek incelenmiş, farklı dilsel arkaplana sahip olmalarının dilsel etkileşime neden olup olmadığı araştırılmıştır. Yapılan hataların nedenlerini ortaya çıkarmak amacıyla bir dilbilgisel yargı testi geliştirilerek uygulanmıştır. Değerlendirme öğrencilerin bağlaçları orta ve iyi düzeyde kullandıklarına ve D1'in öğrenicilerin dilsel arkaplanlarından bağımsız olarak D2'deki bağlaç kullanımlarını etkilediğine işaret etmektedir.

Anahtar Sözcükler: metindilbilim, bağdaşıklık, bağlaçlar, bağlayıcılar, dilbilgisel yargı testi

Appendix

Sample of Grammaticallity Judgement Test

(i) Sentences on Coordinating Conjunctions

[*Full S + Conj + Full S*]

<u>No</u>   <u>Sentence Types</u>

<u>Acceptable Sentences</u>

1   The baby is so sweet, and she is very well-behaved, too!

35   I said I've forgotton to talk, and they laughed at me.

<u>Unacceptable Sentences</u>

23   I missed supper. I am starving!

40   It is an old car. It is very reliable.

[*Full S+ Conj+ Partial S (pro-drop)*]

2.1 <u>Acceptable Sentences</u>

15   You will come and understand the issue yourself.

17   The Prime Minister went to Izmir and met some businessmen.

2.2 <u>Unacceptable Sentences</u>

30   I guess they will not accept our offer, reject it.

71   She may have heard about the rumour, not realized the importance of it.

[*NP+ Conj+ NP*]

3.1 <u>Acceptable Sentences</u>

18   I had bread and cheese at lunch time.

26   He couldn't read and write because of his illness.

Unacceptable Sentences

24   She is watching the same black white movie all the time.

45   During the years of depression all they had was bread butter.

(ii) Sentences on Subortinating Conjunctions

[*Full S+ Conj+Full S*]

1.1 Acceptable Sentences

6   I was trying to recall him when the doorbell rang.

13   Ayse is left-handed whereas her daughter is right-handed.

1.2 Unacceptable Sentences

3   Despite the fact that you reminding me, I forgot the meeting.

14   I have to look for a job since I finish the course.

[*Full S+ Conj+VP/NP*]

2.1 Acceptable Sentences

2   Leyla hugged me and by rubbing her cheek against mine, she wished me a good trip.

7   I always have a shower after taking exercise.

2.2 Unacceptable Sentences

8   While showing any conclusive evidence, most people thought he was guilty.

17   The minister is retiring due to he is ill.

(iii) Filler Sentences

4   The peace talks is likely to last several weeks.

5   Round the corner came a most exciting figure.