A STUDY OF FAULTY SUBORDINATORS AND COORDINATORS IN THE COMPOSITION WRITING OF SS2 STUDENTS IN CONCORDIA COLLEGE, YOLA

Jude Valentine Badaki
Department of English,
Concordia College, Yola
Adamawa State, Nigeria

Keziah James
Department of General Studies
Federal Polytechnic Mubi,
Adamawa State, Nigeria.

Luka Barnabas Jauro, PhD
Department of Information Technology
School of Management and Information
Technology

Tomas Usman Adamu
Department of languages
Northwest University Kano,
Kano State, Nigeria.

ABSTRACT: *The aspects of mechanics and expression are language skills a secondary school student should master at the senior grade. However, difficulties in handling these aspects have been noted in periodic examiners' reports in English language. Since one of these language pitfalls consistently manifests in English language compositions of students, this study analyses faulty coordinators and subordinators in their essays. Coordinators and subordinators have been viewed from the perspectives of cohesion, discourse analysis, semantics, and syntax. For the purpose of this study a syntactic approach is adopted to answer for faulty coordinators and subordinators in thirty senior students' essays in Concordia College. This corpus based approach hinges on the theoretical frameworks of Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1972) and Murthy (2007). A modified schema for analysis of results proves the preponderance of faulty coordinators as against subordinators in essays of senior secondary school students. The study concludes that the faulty coordinators are based on positioning, redundancy and ordering of coordinators. Errors also occur in incomplete paired coordinators, wrong replacement of a coordinator with another coordinator or part of speech, faulty coordinator— subordinator link and faulty coordinators that result from unranked coordination. Errors that concern subordinators are less frequent in the essays of senior secondary students. They occur as a result of faulty subordinators in unranked subordination and fault due to wrong replacement of subordinator with another subordinator or part of speech. Further studies can look at the semantic roles of coordinators and subordinators in meaning-bound analysis, can look at the frequency and types of coordinators and subordinators in the writings of students of a particular age, and can explicate the preponderance of a class of coordinators or subordinators in students' essays.*

KEYWORDS: *subordinators, coordinators, expression, and syntactic approach*

INTRODUCTION

Writing essays or compositions is one of the crucial skills in language performance at the secondary school level in Nigeria. Hence, at the end of six years, students are expected to write one of the following essays: exposition, narration, argumentation (and debate), speech, recipe,

description and letter (formal, semi-formal and informal). These language learning skills demand a mastery of the rubrics of mechanics (which involves grammar, punctuation and spelling), expression (which covers elements of vocabulary and sentence structure), organisation (formal features, good paragraphing, appropriate emphasis and arrangement of ideas), and content (relevance of the ideas to the topic and its specified audience and purpose). This expectation is reflected in the syllabus for English language (WASSCE, 2009).

Expressions and mechanics concern punctuating and structuring of sentences that make up the essays. Also included are phrases and clauses that form sentences which are organised in paragraphs that meaningfully link ideas. In the same way, links within sentences (simple, compound, and complex) are achieved through the use of coordinators, subordinators and conjuncts. Besides, for the mastery of these aspects, secondary school textbooks are structured according to the guidelines of the curriculum to meet the demands of continuous writing (essay writing).But chief examiners' reports, of several years, reveal the challenges students face in linking units of sentences. The comment on the essay section (Section A) reads thus: ''the languages of the compositions were marred by wrong grammar and weak vocabulary. The only remedy for this weakness is a conscious study of the rudiments of the English language (WASSCE English, 2008).'' Inferred from the report is the fact that both learning exercises and language textbooks have not solved the problem entirely. Still more remains to be desired. To evaluate this challenge, knowledge of the types of mechanical and expression errors in students' scripts is relevant. Likewise, the extent to which students make these errors will be investigated copiously from their scripts to test how they handle coordinators and subordinators in their essays. This study is relevant to learning English as a second language and it is necessary in highlighting errors that further research can address.

This study, therefore, seeks to identify and to classify the faulty coordinators and subordinators that feature in the essays of secondary school students.

The terms coordinators and subordinators have been treated from the perspectives of cohesion, discourse analysis, semantics, and syntax. From insights in cohesion, coordinators are termed *coordinating conjunctions* that have coordinate (structural) and additive (cohesive) relations. The coordinate relation is linked within sentences while the additive aspect is a relation between sentences (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). They go further to treat compound adverbs and prepositional expressions that function as conjunctive expressions (conjunctive adjuncts) in cohesive texts. Categories like additive, adversative, casual and temporal relations constitute their treatment of conjunctive relations; i.e., subordinators are treated under the aforementioned categories in their discourse. Studies in Text linguistics (Discourse analysis) note that the structural roles of words to a coordinate or a subordinate clause at the sentential level is qualitatively different from their cohesive roles. These roles are to mark dependencies between propositions and to create texture. Hence, the discourse analysts argue that multiplicity is found not only in function—form relationship but in a form —function relationship; where a coordinator/subordinator (form) can convey more than one conjunctive relation (function).More importantly is the linking of sentences to each other that excludes paratactic and hypotactic linkers (coordinators and subordinators) within sentences (Halliday, 1976; Gutwinki,; Schiffrin, 1992; Martin, 1992).

Although most of the insights on coordinators and subordinators discuss the sense relations of the two, Huddleston attempts a semantic interpretation from a propositional approach. He treats the semantic roles (of conjunction and disjunction) to express logical relations of coordinators

and subordinators. What concerns his description is the propositional relevance of coordination with regards to the reducibility of one element, order of change, likeness of class and function, open-endedness, and range of occurrence (Huddleston, 1996).

The syntactic approach treats coordinators and subordinators as explicit connectors of words, phrases and clauses of either equal constituent units or two unequal constituent units (Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik, 1972; Murthy, 2007).In their voluminous description of conjunctions they classify coordinators and subordinators as the following: pure coordinators and partial coordinators respectively. They also classed subordinators into pure, compound, correlative and borderline subordinators. Identified by them are other indicators of subordination (this consists of wh-elements, relative pronoun ''that'', subject-operator inversion, absence of finite verb forms, nominal that-clauses and comment clauses).Murthy makes a simpler classification of conjunctions. He identifies four of them, namely: correlative, compound, coordinating and subordinating conjunctions.

It is relevant at this point to distinguish the term ''coordination'' and ''subordination'' from ''coordinators'' and ''subordinators.'' Coordination is the process by which equal syntactic statuses of elements are held together by a coordinator. In the sentence (1) ''the governor is in the lounge and his wife is fraternizing outside'' has two coordinate clauses (sentences). The coordinator in turn is a marker of coordination which can join units at all levels in the constituent hierarchy—notably clauses, phrases and words. There is no limit to the number of units that may be linked by a single coordinator. Likewise, the term ''subordination'' is the process that involves inequality; a relationship between a dependent [(the subordinate element) and a head (the superordinate one)]. A ''subordinator'', however, is a ''signal'' or marker contained in the subordinate rather than superordinate clause. Such a signal may be of a number of different kinds; it can be a subordinate conjunction; a wh-element; the item ''that''; inversion; or (negatively) the absence of a finite verb form (Quirk et al, 1972).

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

The schema for identifying and classifying faulty coordinators and subordinators is hinged on the models of Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik(1972) and Murthy (2007).These models provide gradients that allow the identification of faulty coordinators and subordinators in sentences. Quirk et al identify pure coordinators, partial coordinators, and correlative coordinators Murthy identifies both pure and partial coordinators as coordinating conjunctions. Murthy, equally, has a comprehensive checklist of both coordinating conjunctions, cumulative or copulative coordinators. Quirk et al also identify pure subordinators, compound subordinators, correlative subordinators and borderline subordinators. He also identifies seven classes of subordinators, those of: time, cause and reason, purpose, result or consequence, condition (if, unless, and provided), concession (although and however), and comparison (than and as). Based on this syntactic perspective, therefore, the study sets out to find what previous studies on faulty coordinators and subordinators have failed to identify in the essays of secondary school students in Concordia College,Yola.

The following are examples of coordinators and subordinators from Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik (1972) and Murthy (2007).

[1] Pure coordinators: *And, or, but*
[2]Partial coordinators: For, Nor, Neither…nor, either…or, both

[3] Correlative coordinators: both…and, either…or, and neither…or

[4] Cumulative or copulative coordinators: And, so, both…and, No less than, Not only—but also

[5] Illative conjunctions: for, so, since, therefore, consequently

[6] Pure subordinators: After, as, but that, however, once, since, that, till, unless, because, if, before, when, whereas, like, whereby, whereupon, while, whilst

[7] Compound subordinators: in that, so that, in order that, such that, except that, for all that, save that, so that, proving that, provided that, supposing that, considering that, given that, granting that, granted that, admitting that, assuming that, presuming that, seeing that, immediately that, directly that, as far as, as long as, as soon as, so long as, insofar as, as far as, inasmuch as, according as, so as, sooner than, rather than, as if, as though, in case

[8] Borderline subordinators: even if, just as, if only, judging from, speaking frankly

[9] Correlative subordinators: if…then, although…yet/ though…yet/ nevertheless, as…so, more/-er/less…then, as…as, so…as, so…that, such…that, no sooner…than, Whether…or, the…the

[10] Subordinators of time: before, after, till, since, when, and while

[11] Subordinators of cause and reason: because, since, and as

[12] Subordinators of purpose: that and lest

[13] Subordinators of result or consequence: so

[14] Subordinators of condition: if, unless, and provided

[15] Subordinators of concession: although and however

[16] Subordinators of comparison: then and as

METHODOLOGY

This study identifies and analyzes faulty coordinators and subordinators in the essays of students. A corpus approach combining elements of descriptive and quantitative design provides the needed data for the study. The simple random sampling was done across three streams of SS2in Concordia College, Yola [A, B, and C].Samples of marked scripts based on a 450-word informal letter formed the instruments used for retrieving data. It is also relevant to note that the curriculum expects students at this level to master the basic structures within sentence constituents and also expects the students to write a four hundred and fifty (450) word essay. In addition, the data consists of seven hundred and five (705) instances of the use of both coordinators and subordinators from thirty (30) scripts of senior secondary two (SS2) graders. Faulty coordinators and subordinators are identified and classified using Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech and Svartvik(1972) and Murthy (2007).The grammatical and pseudo-semantic aspects of coordinators and subordinators form the basis of selection. The coordinators and subordinators found in students' scripts are placed against the coordination and subordination gradients proposed by Quirk et al and Murthy. Lexical links, phrasal connections and clausal links that fail to meet the standards of the gradients (as listed in the theoretical framework) are considered faulty.

RESULTS/ DISCUSSION
Corpora from students' scripts
Extracts from the thirty scripts of students are displayed in table 1 to show the different types of faulty coordinators and subordinators found in students' scripts. Seventeen instances of these faults occur and are presented in Table 1. The abbreviations Script S.O., Script R.A., Script F.A.… stand for discreet representation of students' names.

Table 1: extracts from scripts.

1.So firstly ¹, let me tell you who a friend is. A friend is someone you know well and like, cherish, adore etc².   [Script S.O.]
2.I learnt that you got no friends in ur new skul till date and to advise or tell u the importance of friendship is a major   reason why I am writing this leta.[Script R.A.]
3.Problems were bound to happen and¹ in order to have something that is meant to be yours; you'll have to suffer a   bit.[Script F.A.]
4.Don't go and tell someone else your problem with your friend cause your friend might take it as a gossip.   [Script A.N.A]
5. Hah, and also a true friend is one in a million.[Script B.G.]
6. Please avoid all that kind of thing and if you have any problem with you(sic) friend just tell the person.   [Script A.N.A]
7. I will like to remind you of my poor performance in primary school, but what caused such a sudden change in me.   [Script A.A.¹]
8. The couples will bring up good and some morals. [Script A.A.²]
9. Don't give your friends complete submission but either keep your relationship for good. [Script B.S]
10. So be very wise when choosing a friend cause you know in friendship all we need is trust, love, care, always there   for each other.[Script H.U.]
11.I made a conclusion to call and talk to you but it failed cause I can't get your number.[Script S.A.]
12. My main purpose of writing this letter is to tell you about the importance of friendship cause I heard that you have   been having some problems.[Script M.K.]
13. I read a book called little friendship and I really want to share it with you cause it has impact a lot on me.[Script S.J.S.]
14.Don't go and tell someone else your problem with your friend cause your friend might take it as a gossip.[A.N.A]
15. A friend is someone you know well and like, cherish, adore etc.[Script S.O]

*Number 1 has two instances of faulty coordinators marked [¹] and [²]

Analysis of corpora

Tables 2 and 3 show types of faults identified from samples of corpora that are marked according to the following criteria from Quirk et al and Murthy: First, the tables contain faulty coordinators resulting from ellipsis or omission, faulty coordinator—subordinator link, faulty coordinator—conjunct link, replacement of coordinator with another part of speech or another

coordinator and faulty coordinator according to position/to redundancy. Next, the second set involves faulty subordinator from superordinate clause link, faulty subordinators resulting from ellipsis or omission, faulty link from faulty ordering of subordinator and conjunct, faulty subordinator –coordinator link, faulty subordinators from superordinate clause link, replacement of subordinator with another part of speech or another subordinator and faulty subordinators caused by positional fixing or redundancy. Furthermore, the theoretical schema that underpins the categorisation of coordinators and subordinators are stated alongside the first two criteria. These criteria are marked TYPE A[1,2], TYPE B[1,2], TYPE C [1,2], TYPE D[1,2],, TYPE E[1,2],, TYPE F[1,2],, and TYPE G[1,2], respectively. Samples of the corpora are numbered [1,2…] and script identifications carry students' initials. Thus, it provides a modified gradient structure with the plus[+] and minus[-] sign to show presence and absence of type in the scripts as found in Quirk et al. Finally, descriptive explications of faults found in the scripts are attempted.

The research objectives on the identification and classification of coordinators and subordinators, using grammatical and pseudo-semantic parameters by Quirk et al (1972) and Murthy (2007), present the result for faulty coordination and subordinations. Tables 2and 3 present the analyses of faulty coordinators and subordinators in essay extracts. The types indicate manifestation(s) of fault. Likewise, the plus and minus signs stand for the presence and absence of these faults while a frequency column will display coordinator or subordinator count.

TABLE 2: FAULTY COORDINATORS

The table displays the presentation and analyses of types of faulty coordinators (TFC), categories/kinds of coordinators (CKC), presence/absence of fault (P/AF) and frequency of fault (F/F).

T F C	C K C		P/AF	F/F
TYPE A[1]: Faulty coordinators that result from unranked coordination	Pure Coordinators (Quirk et al)	And Or But	+ [**TYPE A[1]**] : ''and'' [1]*The couples will bring up good and some morals.* [Script A.A.[2]] **Type**: Pure coordinator	1
	Illative conjunction (Murthy,2007)	For Nor	**Fault type:** faulty coordinator connecting unranked phrases **Rule:** The pure coordinator connects clauses that are equal in rank. **Revised:** *The couples will bring up good (children) and teach them (some) morals.*	
TYPE B[1]: Faulty coordinators resulting from ellipsis or omission	Partial coordinators (Quirk et al)	Neither…nor Either…or Both	--ABSENT	0
TYPE C[1]:	Cumulative or copulative coordinators (Murthy,2007)	And, so, Both…and No less than	+[**TYPE C[1]**]: ''and'' + in order (to) [2]*Problems were bound to happen and[1] in order to have something that*	1

Faulty coordinator—subordinator link	Coordinating conjunction (Murthy,2007) →	No only—but also Also	*is meant to be yours; you'll have to suffer a bit.* **Type**: pure coordinator (and) + compound subordinator(in order to) **Fault type**: faulty coordinator – subordinator link. **Rule**: instead of joining clauses of equal rank the coordinator in sentence [2] joins two clauses of unequal rank . **Revised***: In order to[2] have something that is meant to be yours, you'll have to suffer a bit. Problems were bound to happen.(here, and[1] is removed)*	
TYPE D[1]: Faulty coordinator—conjunct link			---ABSENT	0
TYPE E[1]. Faulty coordinator according to position or ordering/or redundancy			**+[TYPE E[1]] :** *and* **[3]***A friend is someone you know well <u>and</u> like, cherish, adore, etc.[Script S.O.]* **Type:** pure coordinator(and) **Fault type**: faulty compound coordinator resulting from ordering. . **Rule:** in syndetic relation the coordinator appears before the last item. **Revised***: A friend is someone you know well, like, cherish, <u>and</u> adore.* **+[TYPE E[1]] :** *and also* **[4]***Hah, <u>and also</u> a true friend is one in a million. [Script B.G.]* **Type:** pure coordinator(and) + coordinating conjunction(also) **Fault type**: faulty compound coordinator resulting from redundancy. **Rule:** compound coordinator combines two ideas of equal rank.	6

			Revised: *Hah, a true friend is one in a million.(and also is removed completely)*	
			+**[TYPE E¹] :** ''so''& ''firstly'' [5] *So firstly, let me tell you who a friend is.*[Script S.O.]	
			Type: conjunct (illative) + conjunct (enumerative) link (so firstly) **Fault type**: not identified in Quirk et al and Murthy **Rule:** redundancy—we can do without the Coordinator (so).The enumerative (firstly) can serve the purpose.	
			+**[TYPE E¹]:** ''or'' [6]*However or in a nutshell, my aim of writing you this letter is to tell you or inform you on the importance of friendship on a daily basis due to the fact or a book and some observation I have made, got and read on the importance of friendship.*[Y.M.]	
			Type: pure coordinator (or) **Fault type**: faulty coordinator according to position. **Rule:** the coordinator has joined two phrases but it causes ambiguity or sense confusion. It is better done without.	
			Revised: *However or in a nutshell, my aim of writing you this letter is to tell you or inform you on the importance of friendship on a daily basis from the facts of(or) a book and from some observations.*	
			+**[TYPE E¹]:** ''and''	
			[7]*Please avoid all that kind of thing and if you have any problem with your friend just tell the person. [Script A.N.A]*	
			Type: pure coordinator(and)	

			Fault type: faulty coordinator as a result of redundancy. **Rule:** The coordinator should join equal ranked clauses. A borderline subordinator will serve this purpose. **Revised**: *Please avoid all that kind of thin. Even if you have any problem with your friend just tell the person.[Script A.N.A](and is removed)* **+[TYPE E¹]:** ''and'' **[8]***I learnt that you got no friends in ur new skul till date <u>and</u> to advise or tell u the importance of friendship.*[Script R.A.] **Type:** pure coordinator(and) **Fault type:** faulty coordinator as a result of redundancy. **Rule: as in no** **Revised**: simply remove the ''and''	
TYPE F¹. Incomplete paired Coordinator			**+[TYPE F¹]:** ''but'' & ''either'' **[9].***Don't give your friends complete submission <u>but either</u> keep your relationship for good. [Script B.S]* **Type:** pure coordinator(but) + partial coordinator (either…or) **Fault type:** incomplete paired coordinator **Rule**: the partial coordinator come in pairs, e.g., either….or **Revised:** *Don't give your friends complete submission <u>but either</u> keep your relationship for good <u>or</u> break it.*	1
TYPE G¹. wrong replacement of coordinator with another part of speech/or another coordinator.			**+[TYPE G¹] :** ''but'' **[10]***I will like to remind you of my poor performance in primary school, <u>but</u> what caused such a sudden change in me. [Script A.A.¹]*	1

			Type: pure coordinator(but) **Fault type:** use of one coordinator for another **Rule:** '*'but''* *signals contrast, i.e. the ideas in the two clauses contrast. However, this is not so; the ideas of progression from one performance to another still share similar affinity.* **Revised:** *I will like to remind you of my poor performance in primary school, <u>and</u> what caused such a sudden change in me.(<u>and</u> replaces but)*	
			TOTAL	10

As Table 2 indicates, there are ten (10) instances of faulty coordinators in students' essays. Of these instances, one (1) is type A^1 error (faulty coordinators that result from unranked coordination).Also found are Zero (0) type B^1 faulty coordinators (faulty coordinators resulting from ellipsis or omission). Others are one (1) instance of type C coordinators (faulty coordinator—subordinator link), and zero (0) instance of type D^1 (Faulty coordinator—conjunct link).Type E^1 faulty coordinators (faulty coordinator according to position, ordering or redundancy) manifests seven (6) times in the students' scripts. The table also shows one (1) occurrence for type F^1 (Incomplete paired Coordinator).Likewise, one (1) instance of Type G^1 faulty coordinators is present (wrong replacement of coordinator with another or with a part of speech).

Table 3: FAULTY SUBORDINATORS
The table displays the presentation and analyses of types of faulty subordinators (TFS), categories of subordinators and kinds of subordinators (CKS), presence/absence of fault (P/AF) and frequency of fault (F/F).

T F S	**C K S**	**P/AF**		**F /F**
TYPE A^2:faulty subordinator from superordinate clause link/faulty subordinators that result from unranked subordination	Simple subordinators (Quirk et al, 1972)	After,as,butthat,however, once, since,that, till,unless, Because,if Before,when, whereas,like whereby,whereupon,while, whilst	**[1]***<u>I learnt that you got no friends in ur new skul till date <u>and to advise or tell u the importance of friendship</u> is a major reason why I am writing this leta.</u>* [Script R.A.] **Type**: implicit subordinator of cause and reason fragmented into pure coordinator	1

			construct [(since)…and]. **Fault type**: faulty subordinator from superordinate clause link and faulty coordinator according to position/to redundancy. **Rule**: a subordinator introduces the subordinate clause in a cause-reason relationship. **Revised**: _Since I learnt you have no friends in your new school, I am writing to advice or to tell you the importance of friendship._	
	Correlative subordinators (Quirk et al 1972)	If---then (Al)though—yet As….so/ Nevertheless		
TYPE B² Faulty subordinators resulting from ellipsis or omission.	Borderline subordinators (Quirk et al,1972)		-[ABSENT]	
		More/-er/less—than.as---as, so---as, so—that, such---as, such…(that), no sooner---than		
		Whether---or		
TYPE C² Faulty subordinator—subordinator link.	Borderline subordinators (Quirk et al)	Even if, just as, if only		
		Participial forms		
		Expression oftime (immediately, directly & at the moment	-[ABSENT]	
TYPE D² .Faulty subordinator—conjunct link.	Subordinating conjunction	Wh-elements, Relative pronoun ''that,'' subject-operator inversion, nominal that-clauses, introducer of conditional-concessive meaning.	-[ABSENT]	
TYPE E². Faulty subordinator according to position/ordering/redundancy.	Cumulative or copulative subordinators (Murthy, 2007)	Cause or reason Purpose, result, Comparison	-[ABSENT]	
TYPE F². Incomplete Paired subordinator		And, so both…and, no less than, not only	-[ABSENT]	

Type G². wrong replacement of subordinator with another subordinator or part of speech.	Compound subordinators (Quirk et al,1972)	subordinator+ that, subordinator + as, subordinator + than	[2]. *So be very wise when choosing a friend* _cause_ *you know in friendship all we need is trust, love, care, always there for each other.[Script H.U.]* **Type:** neither a coordinator nor a subordinator in Quirk et al or Murthy. **Fault type**: a wrongly spelt simple subordinator (''cause'' for ''because''). **Revised:** *So be very wise when choosing a friend* _because_ *you know in friendship all we need is trust, love, care, always there for each other.[Script H.U.]*	5
			[3].I made a conclusion to call and talk to you but it failed _cause_ I can't get your number.[Script S.A.] **Type:** neither a coordinator nor a subordinator in Quirk et al or Murthy. **Fault type**: a wrongly spelt simple subordinator (''cause'' for ''because''). **Revised:** *So be very wise when choosing a friend* _because_ *you know in friendship all we need is trust, love, care, always there for each other.[Script H.U.]*	
			[4]. *My main purpose of writing this letter is to tell you about the importance of friendship* _cause_ *I heard that you have*	

			been having some problems.[Script M.K.] **Type:** neither a coordinator nor a subordinator in Quirk et al or Murthy. **Fault type**: a wrongly spelt simple subordinator (''cause'' for ''because''). **Revised:** *My main purpose of writing this letter is to tell you about the importance of friendship* <u>*because*</u> *I heard that you have been having some problems.[Script M.K.]*
			[5]. *I read a book called little friendship and I really want to share it with you* <u>*cause*</u> *it has impact a lot on me.[Script S.J.S.]* **Type:** neither a coordinator nor a subordinator in Quirk et al or Murthy. **Fault type**: a wrongly spelt simple subordinator (''cause'' for ''because''). **Revised:** *I read a book called little friendship and I really want to share it with you* be<u>*cause*</u> *it has impact a lot on me.[Script S.J.S.]*
			[6] *Don't go and tell someone else your problem with your friend* <u>*cause*</u> *your friend might take it as a gossip.[A.N.A]* **Type:** neither a coordinator nor a subordinator in Quirk et al or Murthy.

			Fault type: a wrongly spelt simple subordinator (''cause'' for ''because''). **Revised:** *Don't go and tell someone else your problem with your friend because your friend might take it as a gossip.*	
			TOTAL	6

Table 2 presents occurrences and analyses of six (6) faulty subordinators found in students' scripts. Type A² (faulty subordinator from superordinate clause link and faulty subordinators that result from unranked subordination) had one (1) instance of occurrence. Equally, type B² (fault from ellipsis or omission), Type C² (subordinator—subordinator link), Type D² (Faulty subordinator—conjunct link.) Type E² (Faulty subordinator according to position/ordering/redundancy), and Type F² (incomplete paired subordinator) all have zero (0) occurrences. While Type G² (wrong replacement of subordinator with another subordinator or part of speech.) manifests five (5) times.

Faulty coordinator: of the eleven (10) instances of faulty coordinators in students' essays one (1) have to do with faulty coordinators that result from unranked coordination. Zero (0) instance of faulty coordinators resulting from ellipsis or omission was found. Faulty coordinator—subordinator link occurred one (1) times, while there was zero (0) instance of error according to coordinator—conjunct link. Faulty coordinator according to position or ordering or redundancy manifested seven (6) times in the students' scripts. However, the table shows one (1) occurrence of fault according to incomplete paired Coordinator. Wrong replacement of subordinator with another part of speech or another coordinator manifests one (1) time.

Faulty subordinator: Found in the scripts are six (6) instances of faulty subordinators. Occurrence of unranked subordination/faulty subordinator from superordinate clause link/ faulty is zero (0). Fault due to omission of subordinator occurred zero (0) time. There are also zero (0) occurrences of subordinators that result from ellipsis or omission, faulty subordinator—subordinator link, faulty subordinator according to position/ordering/redundancy, and incomplete paired subordinator. However, wrong replacement of subordinator with another subordinator or part of speech manifests five (5) times.

Both errors of coordinators and subordinators in students' essays vary. As evident in the results of the analyses, faulty coordinators according to position or ordering or redundancy were most common in the scripts. The other common coordination errors students make are faulty coordinator—subordinator link, faulty coordinator in unranked coordination, incomplete paired coordinators, and replacement with another coordinator or part of speech. The students assessed made a total of eleven coordinator errors. Of lesser frequency are errors that concern faulty subordinators. Seven errors in subordination found relate to unranked subordination / omission of subordinator and wrong replacement of subordinator with another subordinator or

part of speech. The most errors found are faulty coordinators while the lesser ones are faulty subordinators.

CONCLUSION

Syntactic study of coordinators and subordinators is relevant in the aspects of mechanics and expression in the English language curriculum of secondary schools. However, students grapple with these intra-sentence connectors. From the results of the study, secondary school students make more errors in using coordinators than subordinators. Another point is that most of the faults result from positioning, redundancy and ordering of coordinators. Similarly, errors occur in incomplete paired coordinator, wrong replacement of coordinator with another coordinator or part of speech, faulty coordinator—subordinator link and faulty coordinators that result from unranked coordination. Errors that concern subordinators are less frequent in the essays of senior secondary students. They occur as a result of faulty subordinators in unranked subordination. Fault due to wrong replacement of subordinator with another subordinator or part of speech also occur. As mentioned in the research scope, the semantics of coordinator and subordinators was left out. Further studies can look at the semantic roles of coordinators and subordinators in meaning-bound analysis; what is said but not intended by the use of the two markers. Other studies can look at the frequency and types of coordinators and subordinators in the writings of students of a particular age (psycholinguistics or cognitive linguistic approach). Further research can explicate the preponderance of a class of coordinators or subordinators in students' essays. Above all, students should be taught the proper use of coordinators and subordinators. A mastery of this aspect will ensure better cohesion and coherence of text. Teachers should avoid brushing through this essential part of syntax because of its relevance to the overall structure of sentence and clause formation.

REFERENCES

Halliday, M.A.K. and Hasan, R.(1976). *Cohesion in English*. Harlow Essex: Longman.

Huddleston,R. (1996).*English Grammar: An Outline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Martin, J.R. (2001). '' Cohesion and Texture'' in A Handbook of Discourse Analysis.Schriffin, Tannen, and Hamilton (Eds.). Cornwall: Blackwell.35-53.

Murthy, J.D.(2007).Contemporary English Grammar. Ben Lawrence (Ed.).Lagos: Books Master.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., and Svartvik, J. (1972). Grammar of Contemporary English. London: Longman.

Schiffrin, D.(2001).''Discourse Markers: Language, Meaning, and Context'' in A Handbook of Discourse Analysis. Schriffin, Tannen, and Hamilton (Eds.). Cornwall: Blackwell.35-53.

The West African Examinations Council: Regulations and Syllabus. (2004-2008).WAEC.