# The Role of Conjunctions in EFL Learners' Narrative Development

Author's Names:

**1.  Leila Sayah**

**Affiliation**:  Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, International Branch. Department of English and Literature, Mashhad, Iran.

**Email Address**: Sayah2015@gmail.com

**2.  Azar Hosseini Fatemi**

**Affiliation**: Associate Professor, Department of English and Literature, Faculty of letters and Humanities, Ferdowsi University of Mashhad_ Iran.

**Email Address**: hfatemi@ferdowsi.um.ac.ir

**Abstract**

Narrative as one the social practice to negotiate and renegotiate meaning in the process of socialization has regained a specific attention in the recent years. The growing literature has provided a rich documentation on children's oral and written skills. Current research on different narrative strategies across cultures have contributed little to the use of conjunctive adverbs in narrating or re narrating of the stories among school level children. To this end, this study investigated the application of conjunctions in narrative organization using the story telling and story retelling as the medium of instruction among sixty intermediate and advanced level EFL learners. The findings revealed that the four types of additive, temporal, casual, and adversative conjunctions emerged differently among learners with two levels of language fluency based on the content and the type of the medium instructed. The findings also manifested positive transfer of mother tongue on the application of specific conjunctive elements. The findings further suggested that influential trainings are required in EFL classrooms to promote the application of conjunctions in narratives, since they are consequential tools to improve the learners' linguistic, cognitive and communicative skills.

**Key words**: Narratives, conjunctions, additive, adversative, temporal, EFL Learners

## 1.Introduction

The process of negotiating and renegotiating meanings via narration has been called "one of the crowning achievements of human development" (Bruner, 1990, p. 67) and where the process of socialization is developed in the mutual "co- creation of persons and cultures"

(Miller et al, 2007). It enhances interpersonal relationships and it is an index of classic and modern socio cultural principles and practices where past could be revived in the present and the present could be transferred to the future while "establishing new identities of longing (directed toward the past) and belonging (directed toward the future)" ( Schaffer and Smith, 2004)

Narrative organization was mostly extended in storytelling and story retelling as two mediums of instruction. The mediums that need special ability "to create a cohesive text through the use of explicit linguistic markers, to convey ideas without extra linguistic support, to understand cause-effect relationships, and to structure the narration along the lines of culture-specific story schemata" ( Paul et al, 1996, p. 1295).

Though the main focus of narration is not on specific vocabulary, sentence, text or application of accurate grammatical structures as the unit of analysis, the various ideas should be arranged in a logical sequence with coherent expressions. The additional meaning in narration in fact could be achieved through adjacent sentences connected within a larger discourse structure. Cohesion made in this process could be analyzed in terms of conjunctive adverbs- the simplest words to connect sentences to the next_ so that the audience could follow all the themes and the plots of the narrators more easily and they can understand the semantic relation between sentences through using different conjunctive elements.

Since Children begin to use cohesion in the narratives from 2 to 3 years old (Peterson & Dodsworth, 1991), and at age 6, use of cohesion is stable (Liles, 1985), Thus, it is supposed that Iranian Intermediate and advanced level students also are competent to practice different kinds of conjunctions using storytelling and story retelling as mediums of instruction. Unfortunately, these medium of instruction are barely used in Iranian both public schools and private institutions for allegations as not having sufficient time and content, no motivation either from teachers or students, and the policy makers' main focus on structural accuracy and fluency. Another gap could be observed in underestimating conjunctive adverbs in content, instruction and assessment of Iranian learners in EFL classrooms, the gap that has led to little application or inappropriate use of conjunctions in both written and oral skills of learners.

Therefore, considering the growing consensus that narrative skills are related to academic achievement in the domains of reading and written expression, and also "narratives affects students' cognitive development and critical thinking" (Pishghadam and Motakef, 2012), the purpose of this study is to first identify the conjunctive adverbs used by intermediate and advanced level students and second to explore any possible significant differences between these students' production of different kinds of conjunctions that consequently leads to significant improvement in the their linguistic and communicative skills.

## 2.  Review of literature
Coherence and cohesion are two essential dimensions of narrative texts.  Cohesion is a textual quality attained through the application of cohesive devices that establish relationships of meaning, i.e. 'ties', between elements in the text by linking a presupposing with a presupposed element (Halliday & Hasan 1976, 4).  They also attested cohesion as "the set of possibilities that exist in the language for making text hang together" (p.18). Coherence, on the other hand refers to the content structure of a text based on narrative schemata. When practicing narrative coherence, one in fact represents specific cognitive abilities.

Halliday and Hasan (1976; 1994) proposed five main types of cohesive devices: References, lexical cohesion, substitution, ellipsis, and connectives. References are "identity of the particular thing or class of things that is being referred to" (Halliday & Hasan 1976, 31) including subcategories like personal, demonstrative and comparative references. Substitution and ellipsis describe a relationship between linguistic items and reference describes a relationship between meanings. Substitution refers to a presupposed element (a word or a group of words) by replacing it with a substitute item. Ellipsis, on the other hand, can be defined as a substitution by zero or grammatical omission.

Lexical cohesion "the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" (Halliday & Hasan 1976, 274), i.e. ties created through the lexical (rather than textual) relations between nouns, adjectives, lexical verbs and, to a lesser extent, also adverbs Two large subcategories of lexical cohesion can be distinguished: 'Reiteration' and 'collocation' (Halliday & Hasan 1976, 274). Reiteration refers to ties developed by repetition and collocations are lexical items tied by opposition.

Connectives shape semantic relationship between clauses or sentences and it can be achieved through conjunctions. Halliday and Hasan (1985, p. 76), regard conjunction as "the semantic relation in its cohesive function" and proposed four types of conjunction: (1) Additive conjunction acts to structurally coordinate or link by adding to the presupposed item and are signaled through "*and, also, too, furthermore, additionally*", etc. Additive conjunction may also act to negate the presupposed item and is signaled by "nor, and...not, either ,neither ",etc.( Crane, 2005, p.135). (2) Adversatives are coordinated conjunctions used to express comparison or contrast between sentences and they include "but", "on the other hand", "however", etc; (3) causal conjunctions express the cause or reason of what is being stated including: because, so, for this reason, etc; (4) temporal conjunctions represent sequence relationships between clauses including "next", "formerly", "in the end", etc (Salkie, R. 1997.pp.75. 76). Halliday (1985) further classified conjunction into three more abstract types: elaboration, extension and enhancement. Elaboration includes apposition like "in other words" and clarification like "or rather". Extension includes addition and variation like "alternatively". Enhancement includes spatial-temporal like "there", "previously" and causal-conditional like "consequently" and "in that case".

Generally speaking, children's narrative development begins first at home via storytelling and storytelling. Their storytelling abilities are progressed from script-like personal picture narrations (age 3) to event sequences (from age 3 on) and to globally organized narratives (from age 5 on) (Miller et al, 2007). While the structure of scripts, i.e. general event representations, personal narratives could be acquired by around age 8, and finally telling structured stories is developed in late adolescence.

Narration in story telling is one of narratives' social practices reflected by individuals' cognitive and communicative abilities, for example, sequencing episodes, conveying ideas, and also shaping forms of being and moral agency, affective identity development, and constructing cohesive text by linguistic markers, (Paul & Smith, 1993). Cohesion could be best represented in narratives through deduction, organization of thought, and contemplation. Cohesive relationships in narration could be indicated by explicit markers like *"and, but, so, and then* (Brown and Yule, 1989).

Though production of conjunctions is the key factor in developing coherent stories, and it is both publically practiced and privately utilized (Vygotsky, 1978; Berk, 2001), little research has been conducted to highlight its significance in individuals' communicative

development (Shapiro and Hudson, 1991; Liles, 1993; Merritt and Liles, 1989; Persson and Nyberg, 2000; Cain, 2003; Xin-hong, 2007; Pishghadam, Hosseini, and Javdan Mehr, 2011).

Shapiro and Hudson (1991) analyzed cohesion in children picture – elicited narratives and found that 6-year-olds produced structurally more complex stories containing goals and plots and used more complex language, past tense, and temporal connectives than preschoolers and they may have a more elaborate story concept. They suggested that when children focus on actions of the story, they use simple connectives, and when pictures portrayed typical events, they use less sophisticated pronoun strategy.

Medium-story retelling and storytelling-, media, input, response output and elicitation procedure also affect the narrative performance (Liles, 1993). Merritt and Liles (1989) found that story re-telling had clinical advantages than story telling in assessing narrative performance. Story re-telling provided a story model, which contributed to more complete episodes, longer language samples that were representative of children's language ability.

Persson and Nyberg (2000) used a conjunction analysis and investigated the overlap between encoding and retrieval processes by analyzing data from a positron emission tomography (PET) of different kinds of event information: item, temporal, and spatial. They found that both encoding and retrieval of spatial information activated posterior parietal areas bilaterally. They further suggested that when specific episodic information is retrieved from memory, there would be an engagement of the same regions encoding the same retrieval information.

Manhardt and Rescorla (2002) investigated oral narrative skills of 31 school-aged children diagnosed as late talkers focusing on characters' emotions, character speech, and causal explanations of events. They found weaknesses in story grammar skills independent of their weaker general language skills in addition to their continuing weakness in syntactic and lexical abilities.

Cain (2003) investigated the relationship between children's reading comprehension skill and their ability to make coherent storytelling and found that those weak at reading did not necessarily lack coherent story retelling ability but tell less structurally coherent stories than both same-age skilled peers and younger children of the same reading comprehension level. They also suggested that informative verbal and pictorial prompts could enhance children's narrative strategies.

Xin-hong (2007) investigated the English cohesion theory proposed by Halliday and Hasan among non-English-major graduate students in China. He found that the most effective areas were "conjunction" in the grammatical cohesion and the "reiteration in lexical cohesion. The frequency use of "personal reference" even had a great drop. After the appropriate time of instruction, he found that the frequency of "lexical reiteration" was markedly raised.

Jalilifar (2008) investigated discourse markers of 90 Iranian students qualitatively and quantitatively. Findings showed that elaborative markers were most frequently used followed by inferential, contrastive, causative, and topic relating markers. Results also revealed that students employed discourse markers with different degrees of occurrence.

Heilmann et al (2010) investigated different methods of children's narrative organization and found that Narrative Scoring Scheme (NSS) was the most developmentally sensitive measure for a group of 129 five to seven years children who completed a narrative retell. They also identified higher level narrative concepts and incorporation of examiner judgment across multiple narrative features.

Möller (2010) studied picture-elicited stories among 66 elementary school children in Germany. She found that the majority of first graders produced six or more components and

used a minimum of two cohesive ties per clause.  Both the narrative coherence and cohesion of participants' stories increased significantly from first to fourth grade in terms of ellipses and lexical cohesion. She also found the general order for the cohesive devices as being lexical cohesion followed by references, connectives and ellipses.

Pishghadam, Hosseini, and Javdan Mehr (2011) investigated Iranian language learners' accuracy, complexity and creativity in their written narrative tasks among 222 EFL learners and found that learners with lower lexical complexity were more creative than learners with higher lexical complexity. They also found that fluent learners with more grammatical complexity were more creative than their counterparts.

Pisghghadam and Motakef (2012) analyzed five subcomponents of narrative intelligence among 110 Iranian high school female students and found positive relationship between narrative and memory tasks. Out of NI, namely, emplotment, characterization, narration, genre-ation, and thematization, only narration was the best predictor for academic achievement with 11% of the variances in English achievement, 9% in Farsi achievement, and 14% in Arabic achievement.

Among the little research that have been performed in analyzing conjunctions in different studies, none investigated the importance of employing different kinds of conjunctions among Iranian EFL school level children  and whether they have any differences or similarities  with little children narrative strategies. To this end, two means of story telling and story retelling were used to investigate the influence of conjunctive adverbs on narrations. Accordingly, two main questions of the present study are as follow:

1. Are there any significant differences between the production of conjunctions of storytelling and story retelling among Iranian intermediate and advanced EFL learners?
2. Are there any specific types of conjunctions frequently used by Iranian intermediate and advanced EFL students?

## 3. Method

### 3.1. Participants

In order to investigate the relationship between narratives and the students' production of conjunctions, sixty female students randomly were chosen from a group of 200 intermediate and advanced EFL students in two English institutes of Ahvaz (city in south west of Iran) with the age range of 13 to 18. All learners passed English lessons before and supposedly were able to produce conjunctions in storytelling and story retelling as two means of investigating their conjunction ability. The inclusion criteria were normal intelligence, hearing, speech and language ability and no particular disabilities were reported.

### 3.2. Material

Longman short stories were selected for storytelling. One wordless and colored picture and one story in half of A4 size were used to elicit the subjects' narrative production. Story A was used for story re-telling whereas Story B was used for story telling. The total number of conjunctions was the same in both stories. The two stories had similar sequential events, which ensured similar types and number of conjunctions could be elicited.

### 3.3. Procedures

First, the researchers provided the students with general instructions and tried to clarify the procedures. Then the students were given a copy of the stories to preview the story sequences while the researchers answered their different enquiries. The presentation of the two stories was counterbalanced 25 minutes were set for telling and another 25 minutes were set for re-telling the two stories.

The subjects' narrative productions were transcribed orthographically. Next, the conjunctions were classified into appropriate and inappropriate types by the definition of Halliday and Hasan (1976) and the logical sense variable as proposed by Hargood, Millard, and Weal (2010) to present the correct use of conjunctions. The appropriate use of conjunctions defined as the semantic meaning of conjunctions matched with that implied between clauses were further classified by their semantic function encoded into four types: additive, temporal, causal and adversative conjunctions.

Dysfluencies such as self- repairs, repeats and hesitations (Biber et al. 1999) occurred very frequently in the data. Students sometimes repeated the same sentences or the same conjunctive adverbs within the clauses and so the researchers had to exclude them from the analysis unless they provided new type of conjunctive adverbs in their self repairs. *Chi*-square was run to realize any possible differences between the students' applications of different types of conjunctions in storytelling and story retelling. The main focus of this study was to elicit the following conjunctive adverbs and their examples:

1. Additive: and, also, too, in addition, as well as, furthermore, additionally, moreover, besides.
2. Adversative: but, or, except, however, instead of, on the other hand, whereas, in contrast, nevertheless.
3. Casual: So, because, so that, so as, for, therefore, thus, yet, until, since, though, due to, for that reason, due to, although.
4. Temporal: after, before, when, whenever, at first, in the end, finally, formerly, next, then, now, as soon as.

## 4. Results

The purpose of the analysis was to investigate the main effect of medium of storytelling and story retelling in the production of conjunction by intermediate and advanced EFL learners at two English institutes. Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the mean value of each of the dependent variables. The frequency of different types of conjunctions (additive, temporal, causal and adversative) was measured.

The frequency of conjunction was higher in story telling than that of story retelling in most of intermediate and advanced EFL learners (as it is seen in Table 1 and 2 ). As for the frequency of temporal conjunction, there was a slight difference in both story retelling and story telling. Most intermediate and advanced EFL learners practiced additive conjunctions in both storytelling and story retelling but the significant differences were observed in overuse of additive conjunctions as compared to other types.

Table 1 The frequency of Different Types of Conjunctions in Story Telling

| Type | Intermediate: Advanced | | Expected | $x^2$ | Asymp. sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Observed** | | | | |
| Additive | 184 | 188 | 186 | .043 | .836 |
| Adversative | 107 | 120 | 113.5 | .744 | .388 |
| Casual | 128 | 143 | 135.5 | .830 | .362 |
| Temporal | 155 | 177 | 156 | .013 | .910 |

Regarding causal conjunction; the frequency was increased in both storytelling and story retelling. Based on the *Chi-* square result, little significant medium effect was found between story retelling and storytelling on the application of temporal conjunctions among intermediate and advanced EFL learners (see Tables 1 and 2).

Table 2 The frequency of Different Types of Conjunctions in Story ReTelling

| Type | Intermediate: Advanced | | Expected | $x^2$ | Asymp. sig |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | **Observed** | | | | |
| Additive | 157 | 181 | 169 | 1.704 | .192 |
| Adversative | 101 | 136 | 118.5 | 5.169 | .023 |
| Casual | 123 | 151 | 137 | 2.861 | .091 |
| Temporal | 153 | 186 | 169.5 | 3.212 | .073 |

The frequency of various types of conjunctions ranked in descending order was adversative > causal > temporal > additive in storytelling (see (see tables 1 and 2) and adversative > casual > additive > temporal in story retelling. The other significant observation was the frequency of adversative conjunction in story telling that had a great impact on the frequency and types of conjunctions used. Both intermediate and advanced EFL learners used *and*, *too*, and *also* as different types of additive conjunctions and the application of other types of additive conjunctions as *in addition*, or *furthermore* was very low.

Regarding adversative conjunctions, application of "*but*" was significant among most intermediate and advanced level students and conjunctive adverb "*however*" was just practiced by just two advanced level students. Among temporal conjunctive adverbs, the application of "*after that*" instead of "*then*" was significant among most students and adverbs as "*formerly, next, meanwhile, as soon as,* and *until*" were the least applied conjunctions among both

intermediate and advance EFL learners (See the performance of some EFL learners in appendixes 1 and 2). Considering casual adverbs, *because* was the most frequently used conjunctions. "*Although*, though, *since* and *for*" were barely observable (*since* and *for* were fossilized in their mind as the "present perfect tense" indicators). It is obvious that most students lack the ability to apply the variety of conjunctions in their narrative and re -narrative strategies either orally or in written form. The other significant observation was the frequency of temporal conjunction in story retelling among advanced EFL learners as compared to the intermediate learners.

### 5. **Discussion** and **Conclusion**

The present study investigated the medium of story telling and retelling in the production of conjunction and it was revealed that while conjunctions have significant effects in practicing different narrative strategies, the over applications of certain types of conjunctive adverbs while overlooking conjunctions as adversative and casual types could significantly affect the cognitive and communicative skills of language learners.

Age range and methodology of this study differed significantly with recent literature on the application of different narrative strategies. First, the students of this study were intermediate and advanced EFL learners with age range of 13 to 16, whereas the other studies focused on the performance of preschool children. The second difference was the methodology used. The stories used in this study had the same number of pictures, conjunctions and sequential events in story retelling and telling. However, the stories for retelling and telling from Ripich and Griffith (1988) had different level of difficulties and those from Merritt and Liles (1989) had different sequential events.

Additive "*and*" was the simplest and earliest acquired conjunction, having an additional pragmatic function in English, applied by most EFL learners and though it was estimated that by increasing age or level, more advanced types of additive adverbs were to be applied, the result revealed that only small number of advanced EFL learners tried to use the more sophisticated ones and others just focused on the simplest forms. Among temporal conjunction though "*then*" served both semantic and pragmatic functions in narration, almost all students affecting by their mother tongue, used "after that" instead. Iranians- both skilled and non skilled individuals- mostly apply it in their Persian narratives either in storytelling, conversation or formal reports and so it was one of the marked evidences revealing negative transfer of mother tongue in narrative organization.

When comparing the frequency and the type of medium used to elicit the proper use of conjunctions, our results were consistent with Sze's (2002) study, finding that story retelling did not provide extra knowledge on four types of conjunctions, though the students were not under the stress of using the same length or the same conjunctions of the stories and were able to narrate their own stories relevant to the pictures. Another significant result of this study was the L2 learners' frequent pragmatic error though conjunctions were the significant markers to decrease syntactic and semantic errors. This study revealed that the students' inappropriate use of syntactic form led to confusable pragmatic error between adjacent sentences. This error could be improved when learners are instructed different types of conjunctions in their reading comprehension tasks when attempting to summarize their texts orally or in a written form.

Like Cain (2003), the study revealed that the ability to produce structured coherent stories or to use sophisticated connectives does not simply arise from good reading comprehension experience since some skillful intermediate and advanced EFL learners were

unable to apply variety of temporal, adversative, and casual conjunctions. The findings of this study was in contrast with Sze (2002) in that age did not have any significant role in producing more sophisticated events or conjunctions since most EFL learners revealed the same overuse application of additive adverbs in their storytelling and story retelling with semi like use of sequential concepts and the applied conjunctive adverbs mostly derived from the content of the stories without any extra effort to apply their own conjunctions. The reason of this mismatch between the students' cognitive skill and age could be related to unfamiliarity with different types of conjunctions (though they were instructed several times in different occasions) or they had no or little practice on narrative strategies in their different courses. The scarce of using the variety of conjunctive adverbs in both storytelling and story retelling was clearly observable among most participants, the lack that would typically affect the EFL learners' future writing academic achievements.

The macro-structure and familiarity with the stories reflecting socio- cultural aspects of daily life would undoubtedly affect the production of conjunctions in narrative organization. When students are asked to expose their personal experiences while developing variety of connectors in their narrations, it would definitely reveal the hidden cognitive potentials of individuals who suffer from situational or dispositional shyness and as Miller et al (2007) asserted, it could be regarded "as a useful technique to break the ice" and to motivate them to retell the significant referential meaning of their own experiences in their narrations.

Narratives can provide new potential recognition of connection across cultures in spite of universal differences. They could bring access to personal beliefs, emotions, and attitudes of narrators as well as the global socio-cultural norms and principles they develop in their narrations. In this study, it was revealed that EFL learners continuously practice specific and simple types of conjunctions as additive and adversative adverbs in their narratives and no significant change was observed as age or level was progressed. Mastering cohesive devices in narrations would undoubtedly impact EFL learners' academic achievements in both reading and writing skills and so there ought to be a better training in EFL classrooms in terms of the production of different conjunctions in the content of the books, different post method strategies, and assessment since they are important tools to improve the learners' linguistic, cognitive and communicative skills and it calls for teachers, stake holders, professionals, and policy makers' overall collaborations.

## References

Biber, D., Conrad, S. & Leech, G., 2002. *Longman Student Grammar of Spoken and*

*Written English*. Harlow, UK: Pearson Longman.

Brown, G. & Yule, G. (1989). *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge Textbooks in linguistics.

   Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bruner, J. S. (1990). *Acts of Meaning*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cain, k. (2003). Text Comprehension and its Relation to Coherence and Cohesion in Children's Fictional Narratives. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*,          21, 335–351.

Crane, P. (2000). Texture in Text: A Discourse Analysis of a News Article Using Halliday and Hasan 's Model of Cohesion Retrieved April 12, 2013  from http/www. Newsweek International Edition.

Jalilifar, A.R. (2008). Discourse Markers in Composition Writing: The Case of Iranian Learners of English as a Foreign Language. *English Language Teaching*,          1(2), 114-122.

 Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman as cited In M.A.K Halliday,( 1994), *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. United Kingdom: St Edmundsbury Press Ltd.

Halliday, M.A.K.( 1994). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. United Kingdom: St Edmundsbury Press Ltd.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Hassan, R. (1984). Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social Semiotic Perspective. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hargood, C., & Millard,D. E., & Weal, M. J (2010). Measuring Narrative Cohesion: A Five Variables Approach. *Narrative and Hypertext Workshop*, Eindhoven, Netherlands.

Heilmann, J., & Miller, J. F., & Nockerts, A. (2010). Sensitivity of Narrative Organization Measures Using Narrative Retells Produced by Young School-age Children. *Language Testing*, 27(4) 603–626.

Liles, B. (1987). Episode Organization and Cohesive Conjunctions in Narratives of Children With and Without Language Disorder. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research.30,*185-196.

Manhardt, J., & Rescorla, L. (2002). Oral Narrative Skills of Late Talkers at Ages 8 and 9. Applied Psycholinguistics, *23***,** 1–21.

Merritt, D. D., & Liles, B. Z. (1987). Narrative Analysis: Clinical Application of Story Generation and Story Retelling. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research, 54*,          438 447.

Miller, P. J., & Fung, H., &  Koven, M. (2007) . Narrative Reverberations:   How Participation in Narrative Practices Co-Creates Persons and Cultures In S.

Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds). *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, (pp. 307-322).          New York: Guilford Press.

Möller, C. (2010). Coherence and Cohesion in Early Immersion Students' L2 Narratives Implications for Cognitive and Linguistic Development. Dissertation, Paderborn University, Germany.

Nyberg, L & Persson , J. (2000). Conjunction Analysis of Cortical Activations  Common to Encoding and Retrieval. Department of Psychology, Umeå University, Sweden Retrieved April 10,2009 from http/www. Microscopy Research and Technique .Com.

Paul, R. & Smith, R.L. (1993). Narrative Skills in 4-Year-olds with Normal, Impaired, and Late-developing Language, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research 36*,          592-598.

Paul, R., & Hernandez, R., & Taylor, L., & Johnson, K. (1996). Narrative Development in Late Talkers: Early School Age. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research,*          39, 1295-1303.

Peterson, C., & Dodsworth, P. (1991). A Longitudinal Analysis of Young Children's Cohesion and Noun Specification in Narratives. *Journal of Child Language, 18*,          397–415.

Pishghadam, R., & Motakef, R. (2011). Narrative Intelligence and Learning Languages.    International Journal of Language Teaching and Research, *1*(1), 13-20.

Pishghadam, R., & Hosseini, A., & Javdan Mehr, F. (2011). Learners' Creativity in Accuracy, Complexity, and Fluency in Written Narrative Tasks. Ferdowsi Review, *1*(4), 33-49.

Ripich, D. N., & Griffith, P. L. (1988). Narrative Abilities of Children with Learning Disabilities and Nondisabled Children: Story structure, Cohesion and Propositions. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 21(3),* 165-173.

Salkie, R. (1997). *Text and discourse Analysis*.  London: International Ltd, Padstow, Cornwall.

Schaffer, K., & Smith, S. (2004). Conjunctions: Life Narratives in the Field of Human Rights. Biography, *27*, (1), 1-24.

Shapiro, L. R., & Hudson, J. A. (1991). Tell Me a Make-believe Story: Coherence and Cohesion in Young Children's Picture-elicited Narratives. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 960–974.

Sze, C. (2002). Age and Medium Effects on the Production of Conjunctions in Narratives by Cantonese-speaking Children. Speech and Hearing Sciences. Com

Yang, J. (2006). Application of Conjunction in English Teaching. *Sino-US English Teaching*, *3*(7), 48-51.

Xin-hong, Z. (2007). Application of English Cohesion Theory in the Teachin of Writing to Chinese Graduate Students. *US-China Education Review*, *4*(7), 31-37.

**Appendix 1**
Intermediate level Learners in Story Telling

| additive | | | | | | | Adversative | | | | | Casual | | | | | | | | | | temporal | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and | In addition | also | too | As well as | furthermore | except | or | but | However | Instead of | On the other hand | so | Because | So that | So as | for | Therefore | Yet | until | though | Since | After | before | when | at first | Now | then | In the end | formerly |
| 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 3 |  | 2 | 1 |  | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 5 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 4 |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 2 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  | 2 | 3 |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  | 2 |  | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 3 |  | 3 | 2 |  |  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 3 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| 5 | 1 | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |  | 2 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 |  |  |  |  | 5 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 1 |
| 4 |  | 4 | 2 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 |  |  | 1 | 3 | 1 |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 2 | 2 |  |  | 1 |  |
| 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | 1 | 2 |  |  |  | 2 |  |  |  |  | 3 |  | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |  |

**Appendix 2**
Advanced level Learners' Performance in Story Telling

| additive | | | | | | adversative | | | | | casual | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| and | In addition | also | too | As well as | furthermor | except | or | but | However Instead of | On the other hand | so | Because So that So as | for | Therefore Yet until | though | Since | After before | when | | at first | Next | Now then |
| 2 |   | 1 | 1 |   |   |   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   | 1 | 1 |   |   | 2 | 1 |
| 4 |   | 2 | 1 |   |   | 1 | 1 | 2 |   |   | 2 | 2 |   | 2 |   |   | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |
| 4 |   | 1 | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |   | 1 | 2 |   | 1 |   |   | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1 |
| 2 |   | 2 | 2 |   |   |   | 2 | 3 |   |   | 2 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |
| 3 |   | 3 | 2 |   |   | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 |   | 1 |   | 1 | 3 | 2 |   | 1 |   | 1 |
| 4 | 1 | 2 | 1 |   |   | 1 | 1 | 3 | 1 |   | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   | 2 | 1 |   | 2 |   |   |
| 4 |   | 4 | 2 |   | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 1 |   | 1 | 3 | 1 | 2 |   |   | 3 | 2 |   | 2 |   |   |
| 3 |   | 1 | 1 |   |   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 2 |   | 2 |   |   | 3 | 1 |   | 1 |   | 1 |
| 2 | 1 | 2 |   | 1 |   |   |   | 2 |   |   | 1 | 2 |   | 1 |   |   | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |
| 4 |   | 1 | 1 |   |   | 1 |   | 1 | 1 |   | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |   |   | 2 | 1 |   | 1 |   |   |