



CONJUNCTION AS COHESIVE DEVICE IN SCIENTIFIC TEXTS

Mohammed Ameen Kamil Jawad

University of Kufa, Kufa, Iraq

Cite This Article: Mohammed Ameen Kamil Jawad, "Conjunction as Cohesive Device in Scientific Texts", International Journal of Interdisciplinary Research in Arts and Humanities, Volume 7, Issue 2, Page Number 1-3, 2022.

Abstract:

This study is mainly concerned with Conjunction as Cohesive Device in Scientific Texts. Conjunctions according to (Dooley & Levisohn 2001) are the clearest signs to limit the interpretation of a semantic relation in order to be well perceived. One of the most important obvious markers of coherence is conjunctions. In this study, the researcher will survey the purpose of using conjunction items in scientific educational texts and how these features act in an academic text to provide cohesion may lead to new progresses for specific aims of educational purposes.

Key Words: Conjunction, Additive Conjunction, Adversative Conjunction, Causal Conjunction and Conjunction of Time

1. Introduction:

Conjunction is defined as a component of an utterance which linking words, sentences, clauses as well as phrases. Conjunctions have been known regarded as fixed grammar particle, and perhaps they halt among items they unit or not (Halliday, 1999: 349). Cohesion is considered as a semantic concept that refers to semantic definition that applies to and describes sense interactions that occur within the text as a language. Cohesive tools or 'cohesive relations' may be grammatical or lexical and consist of words, phrases or clauses that relate the objects of the discourse. More specifically, the cohesive relationships are made by the way in which two or more items are joined semantically in a text. Cohesion is the textual consistency (Halliday & Hasan 1976: 4, 239).

2. The concept of Cohesive:

Throughout the Longman Dictionary of contemporary English, the concept "Cohesive" is identified like an adjective, linked and otherwise associated in an appropriate way. Eminent scholars such as (Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R., 1976: 3) and (Van Dijk, A. T., 1992: 46) have been primarily concerned of links that fasten the text in and keep forcing a co-interpretation. Sometimes the concept of "cohesion" is misleading for "coherence," therefore; it is defined as a semantic feature, as it is very essential for the analysis of discourse. It has been formed through the "interpretation" of all of the entire text. Such definition allows the audience or user to deduce the basic meaning of the information that the individual speaker would like to express. Coherence are being classified into two groups: situational coherence where area, tenor as well as mode is being defined with a specific set for clauses. The final or the following form is "generic coherence" which means how the text belongs to a particular genre. Therefore, in the sense that something spoken or published should have a context in terms of everyday experiences, the reader or even the listener would have in consciousness the coherence may be taken (Widdowson, 2007: 45).

3. Conjunction as a Type of Cohesive:

One such type with cohesive relationship is unique for every individual of other cohesive ones; that is, reference, replacement as well as ellipsis. In this sense, (Halliday, M. A. K., Hasan, R., 1976: 226) stated how the conjunctive elements are coherent, both internally and externally, through morality through certain particular definitions; they are not the principal platform to reach out to the previous (or consequent) text, however they convey those definitions that simply assume the existence of certain components in the discourse. Crystal suggests how conjunctions that mostly apply to statements connecting linguistic minorities are concepts throughout the grammar designations of words or phrases. (Crystal, D., 1985:66). In fact, according to (Halliday, M., 1985:325), such components are meant to represent semantic ties, which have been made reference as conjunction, e.g. "but" in "he came but did not stay". Conjunction differs from the other cohesive relationship, on the one hand from both references, and on the other from replacement and ellipsis. In other terms, the relationship isn't purely anaphoric, but is directly responsible for the connective relationship.

(Wikipedia, 2006: 34)

"They have such a cohesion function and hence are text-forming agencies" (ibid.).

Quirk refers to such components with a grouping of adverbials used throughout actors when convey "his assessment of how he views the connection between two linguistic units" (Quirk et al, 1985: 632). These components play the part of the connections that have already been formed for one unit and the other in this context. Conjunction behaves like a "cohesive tie between clauses or sections of text in such a way as to demonstrate a meaningful pattern between them" (Bloor, T., and Bloor, M. (1995:98), though their indications represented by Halliday and Hasan, "Conjunctive relations are not tied to any particular sequence in the expression" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 227).

4. Types of Conjunction:

According to (Farrokhpey, M., 1999: 282) there are four conjunctive types: (Additive Conjunction, Adversative conjunction, Causal Conjunction, and Conjunction of time)

4.1 Additive Conjunction:

It is a part of the semantic structure that forms text. Therefore, the interaction is usually semantic. Halliday and Hasan assume "contrary to expectation" are the essential significance of its adversative relationship. Whether the content with how this is being stated is the origin of intention, or even the effective communication is the scenario for the presenter. The cohesion seems to be on the outer level when it is the former and the cohesion seems to be on the inner level, when it is on latter, the external adversative relationship can be explained through its basic form by the words 'yet,' as stated (Halliday & Hasan, 1976:50; "But," "however" as well as "although" are quite close to "yet" in English. "But" is distinct from "yet," in which "but" it includes the 'and' dimension with part in its components, while "yet" should not. Therefore, finding sentences starting with "and yet," and just never "and but," also isn't unusual. In addition, Halliday and Hasan break down the additive form into (Halliday & Hasan, 1976: 8):

- Easy like, and, nor, or... etc.
- Complicated like, in addition, alternatively ... etc.
- Complicated "de-emphatic" like, by the way, etc.
- Relative or comparative like, by contrast, etc.
- Exemplifying like, for example, and for instance.

4.2 Adversative Conjunction (Appositive):

That relationship does have the different effect to intention. Such an intention is based on what's being said as well as the relationship which could be conveyed through communication process. In this instance, "however, but ... etc."

4.3 Causal Conjunction:

In the terms "so", "thus", "therefore", "consequently" as well as more terms such like "as a result (of that)", "because of that", "in a consequence (of that)", the basic type of the causal interaction is represented in Halliday, Hasan. Both these terms and phrases are frequently paired to its primary "and". Halliday and Hasan give the basic findings, cause as well as purpose under it's framework with causal links. The words "so" meaning "as a result of this", "for this reason", and "for this purpose" are not defined in the easiest of forms of speech. On the other side, when presented as prepositional sentences, they appear to have been distinctive. In regards and views on causal relations, Halliday and Hasan realize that the difference among internally and externally forms of cohesion appears to become less evident than in the other contexts, since this concept with cause also includes a few extent of explanation by a presenter. Simplistic terms "thus", "hence", and "therefore" all arise frequently in an internal context, suggesting some sort of logic or inference from such a premise; in the same way, we use concepts such as "arising out of this", "following from this", "it follows that", "from this it appears that".

4.4 Conjunction of Time:

The links for both two subsequent sentences, according to Halliday and Hasan, can merely be one in a sequence of time; one follows another. The time relationship is reflected by terms like "then," "and then", "next", "afterwards", "sequentially" as well as a variety of others. Halliday and Hasan claim how that of the existence of an external aspect throughout the meaningful sense, and those of advancement in time could well render the temporal connection more precise. Thus, for instance, one seem to represent "then + immediately" (at once, at a time, thereon, on which); "then +after an interval" (shortly, forthwith, soon, presently, later, after a moment); "then + repetition" (next occasion, on other time); "then + a specific time interval" (next night, twenty four hours later) as well as many more.

5. Methodology of Research: Documentation & Evaluation:

Certain academic articles have been studied for such issue of the research. The articles have been evaluated. A clause was then chosen and subjected to conjunctive insights from a certain portion (introductory, body and maybe a discussion of the results) of the existing literature. The results were inserted into lists, displaying the multiple types of conjunctions that were used by authors. For identification purposes as well as cross-reference, the clauses have been labelled upon these lists. Several selections of the articles texts with their studies are as follows: The manuscripts are delivered unedited so; they contain many various types of defects.

6. Conjunctive Estimation Sampling Technique on Certain Academic Writing:

Text 1:

"Even in death, Maha could recognise his voice. When she is angry and cannot listen to anybody, she listens to Faulata because of the love she has for him. Even she blamed everyone for her dilemma and wicked every one. Faulata was always the one who stops her from getting out of control"

Table 1: Conjunction Textual Study

Text	Elaboration	Extension	Enhancement
1. "Even in death, Maha could recognize his voice"			Cons

3. "because of the love she has for him"			Cause
4. "Even when she blamed everyone for her dilemma"			Cons
5. "and wicked everyone"		Add	

Text 1 Discussion:

This article includes three statements, which are interconnected by cohesive concepts utilizing separate rules. It includes three samples of such conjunctive markers, which come close to matching the contexts semantically as well as support the authors point.

Text 2:

"Salim got an accident and have two fractures on his right leg, and one left arm and three broken ribs, but the worst is his eyes which become to hollow for that how he lost everything and his dream of becoming a medical doctor".

Table 2: Conjunction Textual study

Text	Elaboration	Extension	Enhancement
1. "And have two fractures on his right leg."		Ad	
2. "but the worst is his eyes which become to hollow"		Ad	
3. "forthat how he lost verything"			Cause
4. "and his dream of becoming a medical doctor"		Ad	

Text 2 Discussion:

Such article is shown to be misleading in clause 4; irrelevant is the complicated causative conjunction for this. Instead of that used in the clause, the writer may choose the elaborate appositive.

7. Conclusion:

The researcher concluded that the usage of such conjunctive markers is quite fitting. For this sense, the mode of expression is expository, that also demands that such authors justify as well as explain a perspective in a concise manner that used an expository approach for the production of text. This writing method (scientific text) seems to be highly organized. It is clearly seen that using conjunction as cohesive devices is to incorporate sentences, phrases, or clauses, which are already, considered conjuncts of such conjunctions. The word in this context speech symbol is used primarily in conjunctions that link statements as:

- to join nouns, phrases and clauses
- to operate within a sentence.
- to join words/ideas of equal status (co-ordinating conjunctions)
- to join words/ideas of unequal status (subordinating)

8. References:

1. Bloor, T.and Bloor, M. (1995). *The Functional Analysis of English*. London: Arnold.
2. Crystal, D. (1985). *Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. London: Longman.
3. Farrokhpey, M. (1999). *Fundamental Concepts in Linguistics*. Tehran: Sokhan.
4. Halliday M.A.K. Mathiessen, C.M.I.N. (1999). *Constructing Experience through Meaning Language-based approach to Cognition*. Casell: London.
5. Halliday, M. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
6. Halliday, M. A. K and Mathiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. Arnold: G.B.
7. Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English* Longman: London
8. Quirk, R. Greenbaum,S.,Leech, h, G., and Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
9. Van Dijk, A. T. (1992). *Text and Context Explorations in the Semantics and Pragmatics of Discourse*. London: Longman.
10. Widdowson, H. G. (2007). *Discourse Analysis*. Oxford: Oxford university press. Wikipedia. 2006. Linguistics .London
11. Wikipedia. 2006. Linguistics. <http://www.Slidesharenet/cupidlucid/cohesion>