

Exploring the Use of Cohesive Devices  
Among Second-year through Fourth-year Learners of Chinese

by

Jining Han

A Thesis Presented in Partial Fulfillment  
of the Requirements for the Degree  
Master of Arts

Approved April 2013 by the  
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

Madeline K. Spring, Chair  
Xiaoqiao Ling  
Young Oh

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2013

## ABSTRACT

Many researchers have pointed out that sentence complexity plays an important role in language maturity. Using cohesive devices is a critical method to composing complicated sentences. Several grammatical researchers give cohesive devices different definitions and categories in the perspective of pure linguistics, yet little is known about the Chinese learners' acquisition situations of cohesive devices in the field of Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language (TCFL). Combined with these definitions and pedagogical theories, the acquisition situations of four grammatical features of cohesive devices and eleven logical relations are discussed in this thesis. This thesis expects that through discovering different features of cohesive devices among different student levels, educators of Chinese will gain a more comprehensive understanding of the acquisition orders and features of conjunctive devices.

In this study, I examine the teaching orders of cohesive devices in selected textbooks from first-year Chinese through fourth-year Chinese. Three groups of students were required to complete two essays based on the same topics and prompts. Twenty-eight valid writing samples are examined in total, including ten writing samples from fourth-year students, another ten from third-year students, and eight from second-year students.

The results show that there are no obvious differences among the three levels of students in their use of certain grammatical features and logical relations of cohesive devices. Students in these three levels have difficulty understanding how to connect paragraphs together fluently and accurately in their compositions.

Pedagogical implications include some suggestions about designing instructional writing assignments in order to give more clearly pedagogical instructions for teaching

cohesive devices. In addition, comprehensible directions that explain which logical relations should be taught every academic year are proposed.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER	
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
2 LITERATURE REVIEW.....	3
The Pedagogical Definitions of Cohesive Devices.....	3
Previous Pedagogical Research on Cohesive Devices.....	7
Cohesive Devices in Selected Textbooks.....	10
3 RESEARCH METHODOLOGY.....	18
Research Questions.....	18
Research Procedures.....	19
Data Collection.....	21
4 DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULT.....	25
Comparison of Total Instances of Usage.....	25
Comparison of Cohesive Devices Based on Grammatical Function.....	26
Comparisons Cohesive Devices Used to Express Logical Relations.....	28
5 IMPLICATIONS.....	30
Designing Instructional Writing Assignments.....	30
Teaching Cohesive Devices in the Fourth-year Chinese.....	31
Gradually Teaching Logical Relations.....	35
Three Further Suggestions.....	37

CHAPTER	Page
6 LIMITATIONS.....	39
7 CONCLUSION.....	41
REFERENCES.....	42
APPENDIX	
A. COHESIVE DEVICES USED IN FOURTH-YEAR SAMPLES .....	46
B. COHESIVE DEVICES USED IN THIRD-YEAR SAMPLES .....	49
C. COHESIVE DEVICES USED IN THIRD-YEAR SAMPLES.....	51
D. HUMAN RESEARCH CURRICULUM COMPLETION REPORT.....	53
E. INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL.....	56

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 COHESIVE DEVICES IN FIRST-YEAR CHINESE TEXTBOOKS.....	11
2 COHESIVE DEVICES IN SECOND-YEAR CHINESE TEXTBOOKS.....	12
3 COHESIVE DEVICES IN THIRD-YEAR CHINESE TEXTBOOKS.....	14
4 COHESIVE DEVICES IN FOURTH-YEAR CHINESE TEXTBOOKS.....	16
5 COMPARISON OF TOTAL INSTANCES OF USAGE.....	21
6 COMPARISON OF THE NUMBERS OF DIFFERENT CONHESIVE DEVICES..	21
7 COMPARISON OF COHESIVE DEVICES BASED ON GRAMMATICAL FUNCTION.....	22
8 COMPARISON OF COHESIVE DEVICES USED TO EXPRESS LOGICAL RELATIONS.....	23
9 PINPOINT THE COHESIVE DEVICES IN THE VOCABULARY LIST.....	31
10 FIND COHESIVE DEVICES IN THE TEXT.....	32

## Chapter 1

### INSTRUCTIONS

Research on second language writing has shown that syntactic complexity and fluency play crucial roles in syntactic maturity (Hunt, 1967; Monroe, 1975). Depending on the perspective of syntax, many Chinese researchers find that the use of cohesive devices, topic chains, and zero pronouns largely decide syntactic complexity (Zheng, 2002; Qu, 2006; Jin, 2007; Xiao, 2010;). Lu (2009) points out two ways to make sentences complicated. The first method is to write a long compound sentence that contains several clauses. The procedure of formation of a compound sentence includes the following four methods: 1) a cohesive device is used in between two clauses; 2) every clause contains one cohesive device; 3) only one cohesive device is located in a clause; and 4) there is also a possibility to create a complex compound sentence without utilizing cohesive devices.

Previously, many researchers have focused on dividing different categories of cohesive devices (Chao, 1979; Li & Thompson, 1981; Chu, 1994; Liu, Pan, and Gu, 2000), but rarely have researchers of Chinese pedagogy noticed the acquisition situations of cohesive devices in the field of TCFL. For example, these researchers do not address the issues of how to teach cohesive devices and of how students acquire them. This study expects that through discovering different features of cohesive devices among students of different levels, educators of Chinese will gain a more comprehensive understanding of the acquisition orders and features of cohesive devices. Some acquisition situations of grammatical features and logical relations on cohesive devices are examined through comparing learners' writing samples among students in second-year Chinese through

fourth-year Chinese. Their proficiency levels are between novice high and advanced low in terms of the ACTFL proficiency guidelines.

The experiment results highlight weaknesses that frequently appear when teaching cohesive devices to students in these three levels. Furthermore, the results provide opportunities to determine suggestions on designing instructional writing assignments and giving clear pedagogical instruction for teaching cohesive devices.



## Chapter 2

### LITERATURE REVIEW

#### THE PEDAGOGICAL DEFINITIONS OF COHESIVE DEVICES

The use of cohesive devices in a sentence is one of the crucial linguistic issues for learners of Chinese language, as Chinese adverbs are not morphologically distinct from their adjectival counterparts. Because conjunctive adverbs are particularly ambiguous, learners grasp the use of such a complicated part of speech through contextualization. In addition, Chinese allows zero subjects and objects, which may not be found in many other languages (Chu, 1998). Educators of Chinese highlight the absence of systematical explanations and specific training of the usage of compound sentences, conjunctive devices, and the presentations of many logical relations in the advanced levels' Chinese courses and textbooks (Cui, 2003).

While conjunctions do play an important part in linking words, phrases, sentences, and paragraphs, there are other important components as well (Lu, 1942; Wang, 1943; Zhao, 1957; Chu, 1998). Cohesive devices are a clear example of these “other important components.” What are cohesive devices? Wang (1943) does not discuss conjunctions, yet he addresses the term *lianjieci* 联接词 (cohesive words), indicating that cohesive devices can be used to link words to other words, and sentences to other sentences as well. Occasionally when function words are located in the middle of a phrase or sentence, they can be used to link semantic ideas together. Chu (2010) indicates that conjunctions are seldom seen in Chinese.

Conjunctions that connect nouns are mainly prepositions, whereas conjunctions

connecting clauses are usually adverbs. From the perspective of functional grammar, monosyllabic adverbs can only be placed between the subject and the verb (except *ke* 可), but polysyllabic adverbs can be seen at the beginning of a sentence or between the subject and the verb.

(1) 如果你今年夏天去四川。

*“If you this year summer go Sichuan.”*

(2) 如果今年夏天去四川。

*“You if this year summer go Sichuan.”*

(3) \*也我想去四川。

*“Also I want go Sichuan.”*

(4) 我也想去四川。

*“I want go Sichuan.”*

(5) \*我想去四川也。

*“I want go Sichuan also.”*

Pan and Gu (2001) not only distinguish adverbs from conjunctions, but also suggest the main feature that separates conjunctions from adverbs: conjunctions can be used at the beginning of a sentence and after the subject, but adverbs can only appear after the subject. Chu (2006) emphasizes that polysyllabic adverbs may become conjunctions, but monosyllabic adverbs cannot. Although these adverbs serve the function of connecting words and phrases, they are still characterized as adverbs. From the perspective of

functional grammar, both adverbs and conjunctives are used to connect words, phrases, and sentences.

In Lu's and Chu's research, cohesive devices are expanded from word levels to phrase and sentence levels. Lu (1980) expands the fields of cohesive devices in *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici* 现代汉语八百词. He mentions that, in addition to conjunctions, some adverbs and phrases have the functions of conjunctions. In other words, Lu views conjunctions, phrases, and adverbs that have conjunctive functions as cohesive devices. In addition, Chu (1998) also emphasizes the concepts of *lianjieju* 联接句 (cohesive clause sentences) and *lianjie duanyu* 联接短语 (cohesive phrases), both of which are to connect sentences and phrases, respectively.

(6) 北京有很多古代建筑，比如说，故宫。

*“Beijing has lots of ancient architecture, **for example**, The Forbidden City.”*

(7) 李明在北京，与此同时，他的妻子在去北京的路上。

*“Li Ming is in Beijing, **at the same time**, his wife is on the way to Beijing.”*

(8) 飞机晚点了，怎么处理这件事情？我们需要找航空公司。

*“The flight has been delayed, **how will we handle this situation?** We need to talk with the airline.”*

Cui (2003) points out the importance of linking sentences between paragraphs in Chinese language writing. In her definition, sentences that link paragraphs also could be a part of cohesive devices.

(9) 通过前面几段所说的，我们得出以下结论。

*“Through the discussions of above paragraphs, we receive the following*

*conclusions.*”

(10) 这个问题被分成以下几个部分。

*“The problem is divided into following several parts.”*

Cohesive devices can be divided into the following three categories: 1) conjunctions, 2) conjunctive adverbs, and 3) cohesive devices that have the function to connect sentences or paragraphs.

The logical relations of cohesive devices also play an essential role. These logical relations differ significantly from their English counterparts in the aspects of grammatical usages and functions. Distinguishing these logical relations will help learners of Chinese better understand the constructions of Chinese sentences and further understand the logical thinking methods in Chinese.

Chu (2010) divides cohesive devices into four categories: conditional, adversative, coordinative, and cause-and-effect. Chao's categories are more explicit "concession, cause or reason, condition or supposition, time, place, and correlative." (Chao, 1948, p115-22) Liu, Pan, and Gu (2001) suggest 11 categories as follows: *yinguo* 因果 (cause-and-effect), *tiaojian* 条件 (conditional), *jiashu* 假设 (suppositional), *rangbu* 让步 (concessional), *zhuanzhe* 转折 (adversative), *qushu* 取舍 (trade-off), *mudi* 目的 (purpose), *binglie* 并列 (coordinative), *xuanze* 选择 (alternative), *chengjie* 承接 (connective), and *dijin* 递进 (progressive).

Liu, Pan, and Gu's eleven categories are developed from Zhao's research, and combine the various pedagogical theories in the area of TCFL. The study mainly applies these 11 categories to define the logical relations of cohesive devices. Two categories

have been removed in this particular study, since the logical relations of *qushe* 取舍 (trade-off) and *mudi* 目的 (purpose) are rarely used among Chinese native speakers. Liu, Pan, and Gu mainly focus on clarifying the categories of words but ignore the connectors that link sentences and paragraphs. However, this thesis includes these cohesive devices.

To summarize, this thesis focuses on different features of cohesive devices of Chinese writing among three academic-year students. The analysis includes three aspects: comparison of the total number of instances of usage, comparison of cohesive devices based on grammatical function (e.g., conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs), and comparison of eleven logical relations of cohesive devices.

#### PREVIOUS RESEARCH ON COHESIVE DEVICES

Ke (2005) examines the 19 Chinese grammatical categories in line with Chao's research. In the part of conjunctions, his research shows a linear, progressive pattern suggesting that the mastery of certain linguistic features correlates with the improvement of the learner's proficiency. He points out his research mainly focuses on the level of sentences instead of paragraphs. Also, his experimental samples are from an eight-week study abroad program.

Lin (2012) examines the acquisition conditions of conjunctions for learners in advanced levels. She mainly researches the logical relations for conjunctions, and points out the major problems of learners in studying conjunctions: a) both cause-and-effect and adversative relations are mostly seen in the writing samples; b) students place the conjunctions incorrectly in sentences; c) there are no logical relations, but students still use conjunctions; d) students misuse and incorrectly expand the functions of conjunctions.

Gao (2008) suggests that students often misuse the conjunctions that have similar

functions in writing. Based on previous research, she concludes that some difficulties in teaching cohesive devices in writing. In other areas of TCFL, cohesive devices are also noticed. Zhou, Zhang, and Gan (2008) indicate that cohesive devices could be *biaozhici* 标志词 (marks) in Chinese reading. Through these marks, students may be able to understand the logical relations in expanded discourses. They provide five features that distinguish these marks: “repeat and complement,” “order and classify,” “reason and origin,” “adversative and contrast,” “conclusion and summary”.

The use of cohesive devices in the writing works of Chinese native speakers also attracts considerable attention from numerous Chinese researchers. For example, Wang (1997) addresses the importance of conjunctions from the perspective of logical relations, and further mentions that using the logical relations within the coordinative, connective, progressive, alternative, cause-and-effect, adversative, suppositional, conditional, and purpose categories could enhance fluency and variety within the composition. Learning the appropriate usage of cohesive devices, for Chinese native speakers, also manifests itself in a variety of ways. Zhang (2013) examines the scope of 265 conjunctions, and divides the process of studying conjunctions into three levels: complex sentence level, discourse level, and context level. In his research, Yu (2007) points out that the relations of suppositional and conditional are mainly used in complex sentences, and are seldom seen in simple sentences. Consequently, these two relations are primarily utilized in advanced-level writings, and learners of Chinese often make errors in such logical relations. Wu (1996) highlights that in Chinese, more than ten separate conjunctions can be organized into one logical relation category, and this ambiguity presents particular challenges for learners of Chinese. Additionally, Kosaka Junichi (1997) discovers that the

suppositional relation is widely seen in fiction from the Song dynasty. Modern Chinese usage of conjunctions thereby largely borrows from these pre-modern works. These provide difficulties for learners of Chinese to acquire cohesive devices and logical relations.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) illustrate that cohesive devices primarily serve the textual function in order to organize all the relevant information which binds a text as a unified whole. Yang & Sun (2012) points out “the more skillful and frequent use of cohesive devices, the more coherent and understandable the text becomes.” (P32) Using cohesive devices makes textual cohesion “a critical aspect of successful language processing and comprehension and is premised on building connections between ideas in text.” (Crossley & McNamara, 2009, p.120)

Many researchers have initiated a number of empirical research projects about English cohesive device features in compositions produced by native speakers or English learners among different proficiency levels. The results are contradictory. Spiegel and Fitzgerald (1990) find a negative relationship between the use of cohesive devices and learners’ proficiency levels. McCutchen and Perfetti (1983), conversely, find that the number of cohesive used are largely influenced by the learners’ proficiency levels. Yang and Sun (2012) claim that “the writing competence of most higher proficiency learners may have developed into a relatively stable state, which enables them to systematically put cohesive devices to use, thus maintaining the coherence of their compositions and attaining excellent marks.” (P46)

The research mentioned above is inclusive and insufficient in Chinese cohesive devices acquisition studies. It seems necessary to explore the use of Chinese cohesive

devices among Chinese learners in order to help educators understand the acquisition features of cohesive devices in their writings. Thereby, demanding more relevant research to discover the learners' acquisition features of using cohesive devices among different levels is imperative. A large number of Chinese learners fail to employ cohesive devices appropriately and effectively, and researchers should use this research as a foundation in the acquisition features of cohesive devices, in order to further provide teaching suggestions to help learners overcome these difficulties.

### COHESIVE DEVICES IN TEXTBOOKS

The acquisition order of cohesive devices in current textbooks could strongly influence how these cohesive devices are taught in the classroom, and furthermore, the students' individual understanding of the devices. I examine the teaching orders of cohesive devices in textbooks among first-year Chinese and fourth-year Chinese. The textbooks are being used in the Chinese language program in a large public university in the southwestern part of the U.S and other textbooks that are often used in college levels are also examined below.

First-year Chinese textbooks: *Chinese Link (level 1) & Encounters*

*Chinese Link* (level 1) and *Encounters* are examined in the first-year Chinese textbooks (see Table 1). The teaching orders of cohesive devices are similar in both of the textbooks. The conjunctions *he* 和, *gen* 跟, *huozhe* 或者, conjunctive adverbs *ye* 也, *jiu* 就, *hai* 还, *you* 又, and phrases and sentences linking *yimian...yimian* 一面...一面..., *yinwei...suoyi* 因为...所以..., and *biru* 比如... are introduced in lessons 1 through 10. From the perspective of logical relations, authors of these textbooks pay more attention to introducing coordinative relations than they did to the other classifications of relations.



Only one cohesive devices *yinwei...suoyi* 因为...所以... that expresses the cause-and-effect relations are introduced. *Chinese Link* also introduces *xian...zai...ranhou* 先...再...然后...that expresses progressive relations. In the cohesive devices that are listed below, we may notice that the coordinative relation is the most important logical relation that authors stress teaching in the first-year textbooks.

Table 1

*Cohesive Devices in Chinese Link (level 1) & Encounters*

	<i>Chinese Link (level 1)</i>	<i>Encounters</i>
Numbers	9	8
Coordinative	6 <i>ye</i> 也, <i>he</i> 和, <i>gen</i> 跟, <i>hai</i> , <i>huozhe</i> 或者, <i>yimian...yimian...</i> 一面...一面...	5 <i>ye</i> 和, <i>haiyou</i> 还有, <i>you...you</i> 又...又, <i>gen</i> 跟, <i>he</i> 和
Connectional	2 <i>xian...zai...ranhou</i> 先...再...然后, <i>jiu</i> 就	2 <i>jiu</i> 就, <i>ranhou</i> 然后
Cause and effect	1 <i>yinwei...suoyi</i> 因为...所以	1 <i>yinwei...suoyi</i> 因为...所以
Conjunctive adverbs	3	3

Second-year Chinese textbooks: *Integrated Chinese (level 2) & Chinese Link (level 2)*

When examining the second-year Chinese textbooks *Chinese Link (level 2)* and *Integrated Chinese (level 2)*, the logical relations of cause-and-effect, concessional, conditional, suppositional, adversative, alternative, connectional, and progressive are introduced (see Table 2). The authors utilize a cumulative approach to learning logical relations of cohesive devices, so they are able to help students grasp all of the introduced relations. The authors also introduced the cohesive devices that could connect phrases and phrases, and sentences and sentences. For instance, *ke bushi ma?* 可不是吗? and

*dui...laishuo* 对...来说, are able to connect phrases. However, the authors fail to mention the cohesive devices that could link paragraphs. As in the first-year Chinese textbooks, authors do not divide different grammatical types of cohesive devices. In other words, conjunctions and conjunctive adverbs are not divided into different categories to teach in these levels.

Table 2

*Cohesive Devices in Integrated Chinese (level 2) & Chinese Link (level 2)*

	<i>Integrated Chinese (level 2)</i>	<i>Chinese Link (level 2)</i>
Numbers	37	41
Cause-and-effect	3 <i>weile</i> 为了, <i>yinwei</i> 因为, <i>youyu</i> 由于	6 <i>yinwei...suoyi</i> 因为...所以, <i>youyu...yinci</i> 由于...因此, <i>youyu...suoyi</i> 由于...所以, <i>shiyouyu</i> 是由于, <i>weile</i> 为了, <i>zhihao</i> 只好
Conditional	4 <i>wulun...dou</i> 无论...都, <i>zhiyao...jiu</i> 只要...就, <i>fouze</i> 否则, <i>yaobushi</i> 要不是	5 <i>yaoshi...jiu</i> 要是...就, <i>zhiyou...cai</i> 只有...才, <i>zhiyao...jiu</i> 只要...就, <i>fouze</i> 否则, <i>meiyou...jiumeiyou</i> 没有...就没有
Suppositional	3 <i>kongpa</i> 恐怕, <i>nandao</i> 难道, <i>yaoburan</i> 要不然	5 <i>buran</i> 不然, <i>ruguo</i> 如果, <i>jiashi</i> 假使, <i>jiaru</i> 假如, <i>jiaruo</i> 假若
Concessional	1 <i>jishi</i> 即使	2 <i>guran</i> 固然, <i>suiran...danshi</i> 虽然...但是
Adversative	4 <i>keshi</i> 可是, <i>danshi</i> 但是, <i>er</i> 而, <i>buguo</i> 不过	6 <i>er</i> 而, <i>keshi</i> 可是, <i>buguo</i> 不过, <i>raner</i> 然而, <i>que</i> 却, <i>budan...faner</i> 不但...反而
Coordinative	5 <i>you...you</i> 又...又, <i>you</i> 又, <i>hai</i> 还, <i>bing</i> 并, <i>yu</i> 与	5 <i>ji...you</i> 既...又, <i>he</i> 和, <i>gen</i> 跟, <i>yu</i> 与, <i>yiji</i> 以及
Alternative	3 <i>yaome...yaome</i> 要么...要么,	4 <i>huozhe</i> 或者, <i>haishi</i> 还是,

	<i>huozhe</i> 或者, <i>bushi...jiushi</i> 不是...就是	<i>yaome...yaome</i> 要么...要么, <i>bushi...jiushi</i> 不是...就是
Connectional	4 <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外, <i>zaishuo</i> 再说, <i>lingwai</i> 另外, <i>yushi</i> 于是	1 <i>ciwai</i> 此外
Progressive	3 <i>bushi...ershi</i> 不是...而是, <i>yue...yue</i> 越...越, <i>xian...zai</i> 先...再	6 <i>lian...dou/ye</i> 连...都/也, <i>yao...haiyao</i> 要...还要, <i>yuelaiyue</i> 越来越, <i>conger</i> 从而, <i>budan...erqie</i> 不但...而且, <i>bingqie</i> 并且
Cohesive devices that link sentences	7 <i>birushuo</i> 比如说, <i>tebieshi</i> 特别 是, <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说, <i>zai...fangmian</i> 在...方面, <i>na...laishuo</i> 拿...来说, <i>kebushima?</i> 可不是吗? <i>nishuone?</i> 你说呢?	
Cohesive devices that link paragraphs	0	1 <i>zongzhi</i> 总之, <i>zongeryanzhi</i> 总而 言之
Conjunctive adverbs	7	9

Third-year Chinese textbooks: Connections: *A Cognitive Approach to Intermediate Chinese, Reading into a New China, and Boya Intermediate Level*

After examining the second-year textbooks, I choose three third-year textbooks: *Connection, Boya intermediate level, and Reading into a New China*. These textbooks introduce a larger variety of cohesive devices, and the logical relations of these new cohesive devices are similar to the relations taught in the second-year textbooks (see Table 3). The authors pay more attention to linking sentences to sentences, and using words or phrases such as *jiezh* 接着, *zaishuo* 再说, *dang...shihou* 当...的时候. Linking

between paragraphs is also introduced in this level, for instance, *yilai...erlai* 一来,二来, *diyi...dier*, 第一, 第二, 第三, and *zongzhi* 总之. Following the student activities for linking words and phrases in second year, these textbooks instead mainly focus on the linking of sentences and paragraphs levels.

Table 3

*Cohesive Devices in A Cognitive Approach to Intermediate Chinese, Reading into a New China, and Boya Intermediate Level*

	<i>Connections: A Cognitive Approach to Intermediate Chinese</i>	<i>Reading Into a New China</i>	<i>Boya Intermediate Level</i>
Numbers	37	29	38
Cause and effect	1 <i>weile</i> 为了	5 <i>youyu</i> 由于, <i>yinci</i> 因此, <i>yin...er</i> 因...而, <i>wei...er</i> 为...而, <i>suoyi</i> 所以	2 <i>yinwei...er</i> 因为...而, <i>zhisuoyi...shiyinwei</i> 之所以...是因为
Conditional	11 <i>yaobushi</i> 要不是, <i>buguan...dou</i> 不管...都, <i>wulun...dou</i> 无论...都, <i>zhiyao...jiu</i> 只要...就, <i>zaiburanjiu</i> 再不然就, <i>chufei</i> 除非, <i>fouze</i> 否则, <i>yaobu</i> 要不, <i>buran...jiu</i> 不然...就, <i>fei...buke</i> 非...不可, <i>nanguan</i> 难怪	1 <i>zhiyou...caineng</i> 只有...才能 adv.	8 <i>jiushi...ye</i> 就是...也, <i>buguan</i> 不管, <i>wulun/buguan...dou/ye</i> 无论/不管...都/也, <i>chufei</i> 除非, <i>fouze</i> 否则, <i>fanshi</i> 凡是, <i>bufang</i> 不妨
Suppositional	1 <i>haozai...yaoburan</i> 好在...要不然	0	1 <i>jiaruo</i> 假若

Concessional	4 <i>suiran...danshi</i> 虽然...但是, <i>suiran...keshi</i> 虽然...可是, <i>jishi</i> 即使, <i>jiusuan</i> 就算	1 <i>jishi...ye</i> 即使...也	4 <i>jishi...ye</i> 即使...也, <i>suiranmeiyoun...que/ye</i> 虽然没有...却/也
Adversative	2 <i>que</i> 却, <i>budanmei/bu...faner</i> 不但没/不...反而	4 <i>raner</i> 然而, <i>er</i> 而, <i>faner</i> 反而, <i>daoshi</i> 倒是	3 <i>faner</i> 反而, <i>xiangfan</i> 相反, <i>fandao</i> 反倒
Coordinative	3 <i>ji...ye...ye</i> 既...也, <i>ji...ye...ye</i> 既...又, <i>ye</i> 也	0	1 <i>qie...qie</i> 且...且
Alternative	1 <i>bushi...jiushi</i> 不是...就是	1 <i>yuqi...buru</i> 与其...不如	2 <i>bushi...jiushi</i> 不是...就是, <i>ningke</i> 宁可
Connectional	2 <i>jiu</i> 就, <i>yilai...erlai...sanlai</i> 一来...二来...三来	7 <i>ciwai</i> 此外, <i>congci</i> 从此, <i>jiezhe</i> 接着, <i>yifangmian...yifangmian</i> 一方面, 另一方面, <i>yishi...ershi</i> 一是...二是, <i>yushi</i> 于是, <i>congci</i> 从此	6 <i>ze</i> 则, <i>conger</i> 从而, <i>yibian</i> 以便, <i>jiu</i> 就, <i>lingwai</i> 另外, <i>erhou</i> 尔后
Progressive	6 <i>shenzhihaiyou</i> 甚至还有, <i>haiyao</i> 还要, <i>benlai...xianzai</i> 本来...现在, <i>yuanlai...houlai</i> 原来...后来, <i>budan...lian</i> 不但...连, <i>zaishuo</i> 再说	4 <i>shenzhi</i> 甚至, <i>bushi...ershi</i> 不是...而是, <i>meiyoun...yeyoun</i> 没有...也有, <i>geng</i> 更	2 <i>bushi...ershi</i> 不是...而是, <i>zaishuo</i> 再说
Cohesive devices that link sentences	5 <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说, <i>bingbu/bingmeiyoun</i> 并不/并没有,	5 <i>ru...ban(di)</i> 如...般(地), <i>suizhe</i> 随着, <i>yu...xiangbi</i> 与...相比, <i>bushi...ma?</i> 不	6 <i>zai...kanlai</i> 在...看来, <i>bifangshuo</i> 比方说, <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说, <i>na...laishuo</i> 拿...来说,

	<i>dang...deshihou</i> 当...的时候, <i>zai...kanlai</i> 在...看来, <i>zai...fangmian</i> 在...方面	是...吗? , <i>yucitongshi</i> 与此同时	<i>cong...laikan</i> 从...来看, <i>duiyu...eryan</i> 对于...而言
Cohesive devices that link paragraphs	1 <i>zongzhi</i> 总之	1 <i>youcierlai</i> 由此而来	3 <i>zongzhi</i> 总之, <i>zonggui</i> 总归, <i>zuizhong</i> 最终
Conjunctive adverbs	12	3	8

Fourth-year Chinese textbooks: *The Rutledge Advanced Chinese Multimedia Course: Crossing Cultural Boundaries, Comprehensive Chinese Advanced Writing, and Boya Advanced Level*

The fourth-year Chinese textbooks do not introduce any new logical relations or cohesive devices. Authors mainly rely on increasing the number of cohesive devices to make the sentences more complex (see Table 4).

Table 4

*Cohesive Devices in The Rutledge Advanced Chinese Multimedia Course: Crossing Cultural Boundaries, Comprehensive Chinese Advanced Writing, and Boya Advanced Level.*

<i>The Rutledge Advanced Chinese Multimedia Course: Crossing Cultural Boundaries</i>
<i>suizhe...fazhan</i> 随着...发展, <i>yinci</i> 因此, <i>huo...huo</i> 或...或, <i>dang...shi</i> 当...时, <i>yinwei...er</i> 因为...而, <i>fanzheng</i> 反正, <i>jinguan...raner</i> 尽管...然而, <i>fanshi...dou</i> 凡是...都, ... <i>buwaihu</i> 不外乎, <i>zhiyu</i> 至于, <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说, ... <i>zhisuoyi</i> 之所以, <i>yidan</i> 一旦, <i>guran...danshi</i> 固然...但是, <i>ji...ye/you</i> 既...也/又, <i>weile...er</i> 为了...而, <i>jinjin...eryi</i> 仅仅...而已, <i>jishi...ye</i> 即使...也, <i>you...er</i> 由...而, <i>ruguo...dehua</i> 如果...的话, <i>youyu...yizhiyu</i> 由于...以至于, <i>ji...you</i> 既...又, <i>er</i> 而, <i>zhisuoyi...dezuidadeyuanzaiyu</i> 之所以...的最大的原因在于, <i>buguanshi...shenzhi...ye</i> 不管是...甚至...也, <i>tongguo...detujin</i> 通过...的途径, <i>wei</i> 为, <i>ze</i> 则, <i>zhiyao...jiu</i> 只要...就, <i>hai...shenzhi</i> 还...甚至, <i>weimian</i> 未免
<i>Comprehensive Chinese Advanced Writing</i>

yiner 因而, dang...zhishi 当...之时, congershi 从而使, shiyuanyu 是缘于, buguo...eryi 不过...而已, eryou 而又, ze 则, er 而, jishi 即使, guran 固然, youqi 尤其, jiucierlun 就此而论, fei...ji 非...即, bingfei...yifei 并非...亦非, duiyu...eryan 对于...而言, zhisuoyi...shiyinwei 之所以...是因为, sui...er 虽...而, zongshi...ye 纵使...也, er 而, raner 然而, ji 即, suowei 所谓, fanzhiyiran 反之亦然, fanguolaiyishiruci 反过来亦是如此, yidan 一旦, jike 既可, youke 又可, tangruo 倘若, suiran 虽然, raner 然而, shangqie/hai 尚且/还, rushangsuoshuo 如上所说, ji 及, er 而

*Boya Advanced Level*

fanshi 凡是, guqie 姑且, jiaru 假如, wufei 无非, wulunruhe 无论如何, yidan 一旦, yi 亦, zuizhong 最终, fandao 反倒, yihuo 抑或, jiusuan...ye 就算...也, suizheerqi 随着而起, zhiyu 至于, hekuang 何况, budanshi 不单是, erqie/hai 而且/还

## Chapter 3

### RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

#### RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The study aims to explore the different features of using cohesive devices among the learners in second-year Chinese through fourth-year Chinese classes in a large public university in the southwestern part of the U.S. In particular, the categories of cohesive devices used by students and the acquisition orders are examined in the participants' writing samples. The specific research questions addressed are:

1. Among the learners of second-year Chinese through fourth-year Chinese, what are the different features of employing cohesive devices in their writing samples?

1.1 Which kinds of cohesive devices are most difficult to acquire for learners of Chinese?

1.2 Which logical categories of cohesive devices are most difficult to acquire for learners of Chinese?

2. In first year Chinese, only one logical relation is mainly introduced. However, in the second year, eight new logical relations are introduced in the textbook.

2.1 Compare to the introduced cohesive devices in textbooks, what are the actual acquisition features of learners in these levels?

2.2 Which kinds of cohesive devices do not develop at the same pace as the students' Chinese proficiency levels?

By designing an experiment for answering such questions, I am able to understand not only the diverse acquisition orders of cohesive devices in the process of learning



Chinese, but also the different features of acquiring cohesive devices among the three levels. Based on the results, I hope to know which devices require more instructional time in future teaching works. Educators of Chinese may be aware of how to organize teaching orders of cohesive devices in developing curriculum designs or textbooks.

In order to answer the second question, I plan to research whether there are certain cohesive devices that cannot be effectively acquired at the same pace as the development of their Chinese level. For instance, second-year Chinese students through fourth-year Chinese students who participated in previous studies are all seem unable to handle certain cohesive devices and collectively make the same errors. By answering this question, I may realize which errors are commonplace for students of Chinese, and discover the weaknesses and possible improvements of teaching cohesive devices in textbooks. Once acquisition drawbacks are found, educators of Chinese pedagogy may complete further research to discuss how to solve these problems and innovate this field of study in order to efficiently teach students.

## RESEARCH PROCEDURES

The research applies the method of utilizing case studies (Nunan & Bailey, 2010). The participants are divided into three groups. The first group includes students who were enrolled in Chinese 201 (second-year, first semester) classes in 2010 and who completed two final writing projects: these projects focused on the advantages and disadvantages of living in dorms, and their experiences of using computers in Chinese. The other two groups include students from third and fourth-year Chinese, respectively.

The prompts of two final writing projects:

请根据以下要求完成两篇作文，每篇文章不少于 200 字。

*“Complete two prompts from below, write two essays. Each essay with at least 200 Chinese characters.”*

1) 写出你认为住在学校或者住在校外的好处和坏处。

*“Please discuss the advantages and disadvantages of living in dorms.”*

2) 请你谈一谈你使用电脑的经历，其中包括：你每天使用多长时间的电脑。

你用电脑上网做什么？为什么？电脑给你带来好处和坏处分别是什么？请描述一件你在网上做的事情，这件事情影响到了你。为什么这件事情对你的生活很重要？

*“About your experiences in using the computer, including: how much time/how long do you use the computer. Why? What do you do online & why? What are the positives and negatives computers have brought to you. Explain one thing you do online and the impact it has on you. Why it’s essential to your daily life.”*

The data source is collected from the 30 students' writing samples of three different levels, in which 28 writing samples are valid. The second-year students were novice-mid to novice-high learners; the third-year students were intermediate-low to intermediate-mid learners; the fourth-year students, intermediate-high to advanced-low. The proficiency levels are based on the ACTFL proficiency guidelines. Second-year and third-year students take Chinese courses for around five hours per week, and fourth-year students spend about three hours per week in class.

I analyze the cohesive devices from the samples and divide them into two comparison categories (grammatical features and logical relations) used by different levels of students in order to find the acquisition order of conjunctions and cohesive devices among these three student levels.

## DATA COLLECTION

The experiment data is divided into three categories. The Table 5 below is the comparison of instance of usage of cohesive devices that students used. In order to pursue the improvement in accuracy and efficiency of using cohesive devices by students, the following Table 6 may be considered. In Table 6 all of the duplicated cohesive devices have been removed. Table 7 is the comparison of cohesive devices based on grammatical function, and Table 8 is the comparison of cohesive devices used to express logical relations. We may discuss the experiment's data in the following sections.

Table 5

### *Comparison of Total Instance of Usage*

4th-year Chinese	Numbers of Cohesive Devices	3rd-year Chinese	Numbers of Cohesive Devices	2nd-year Chinese	Numbers of Cohesive Devices
401-1	19	301-1	23	201-1	18
401-2	38	301-2	27	201-2	14
401-3	31	301-3	15	201-3	21
401-4	28	301-4	18	201-4	27
401-5	29	301-5	5	201-5	15
401-6	34	301-6	17	201-6	16
401-7	19	301-7	25	201-7	12
401-8	17	301-8	22	201-8	24
401-9	37	301-9	30		
401-10	23	301-10	14		
Mean	27.5		19.6		18.375

Table 6

### *Comparisons of the Numbers of Different Cohesive Devices*

4th-year	The Numbers of Using Different Cohesive Devices	3rd-year	The Numbers of Using Different Cohesive Devices	2nd-year	The Numbers of Using Different Cohesive Devices

401-1	14	301-1	12	201-1	12
401-2	16	301-2	18	201-2	9
401-3	19	301-3	6	201-3	15
401-4	17	301-4	13	201-4	9
401-5	11	301-5	4	201-5	12
401-6	22	301-6	11	201-6	13
401-7	12	301-7	13	201-7	9
401-8	11	301-8	9	201-8	13
401-9	20	301-9	15		
401-10	19	301-10	10		
Mean	16.1		11.1		11.5

Table 7

*Comparison of Cohesive Devices Based on Grammatical Function*

2 <sup>nd</sup> -year	201-1	201-2	201-3	201-4	201-5	201-6	201-7	201-8	Mean
Conjunctions	7	10	11	13	9	13	7	14	10.5
Conjunctive adverbs	2	2	3	7	2	0	0	6	2.75
Cohesive devices that link sentences	4	2	4	1	4	1	3	2	2.625
Cohesive devices that link paragraphs	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1

3 <sup>rd</sup> - year	301-1	301-2	301-3	301-4	301-5	301-6	301-7	301-8	301-9	301-10	Mean
Conjunctions	9	21	8	10	3	5	18	14	20	8	11.6
Conjunctive adverbs	5	3	1	3	0	8	2	2	8	0	3.2
Cohesive devices that link sentences	2	2	0	4	2	1	3	1	1	3	1.9
Cohesive devices that link paragraphs	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0.1

4 <sup>th</sup> -year	401-1	401-2	401-3	401-4	401-5	401-6	401-7	401-8	401-9	401-10	Mean

Conjunctions	11	24	21	11	16	19	10	11	17	10	15
Conjunctive adverbs	0	2	5	4	5	2	2	0	10	1	3.1
Cohesive devices that link sentences	4	3	0	8	2	11	3	1	5	6	4.3
Cohesive devices that link paragraphs	2	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	3	0.9

Table 8

*Comparison of Cohesive Devices Used to Express Logical Relations*

2 <sup>nd</sup> -year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Mean
Coordinative	4	0	4	7	4	2	0	11	4.0
Alternative	2	2	0	0	0	2	1	1	1.0
Connectional	2	2	2	0	1	1	0	0	1.0
Progressive	2	2	1	0	2	4	3	2	2.0
Cause-and-effect	2	0	5	5	0	1	3	1	2.125
Suppositional	0	0	2	1	1	2	0	0	0.75
Conditional	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0.5
Concessional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Adversative	7	0	4	8	5	4	4	7	4.875

3 <sup>rd</sup> -year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean
Coordinative	7	8	11	4	0	9	9	14	17	5	8.4
Alternative	3	1	0	1	0	2	3	1	2	1	1.4
Connectional	2	1	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	2	1.0
Progressive	0	4	0	3	0	1	0	0	2	0	1.0
Cause-and-effect	4	4	1	0	2	2	5	2	2	1	2.3
Suppositional	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	0.4
Conditional	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.1
Concessional	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.1
Adversative	3	8	2	5	1	1	1	4	7	1	3.3

4 <sup>th</sup> -year	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	Mean
Coordinative	4	16	3	11	9	8	6	4	17	10	8.8
Alternative	0	3	2	0	0	1	0	2	0	1	0.9
Connectional	4	4	10	3	2	6	3	0	6	0	3.8

Progressive	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	1	3	0	0.8
Cause-and-effect	3	3	11	4	10	8	2	3	2	4	5.0
Suppositional	2	1	1	1	1	0	3	0	1	1	1.1
Conditional	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0.5
Concessional	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0.3
Adversative	0	4	1	3	6	3	2	7	5	3	3.4

## Chapter 4

### DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION OF RESULT

Reviewing the ACTFL Proficiency Guidelines Writing section, we may notice that students in novice levels are required to write in words and phrases. In intermediate-mid to intermediate-high levels, students' writing narrations and descriptions are often of paragraph length. When students achieve advanced levels, "writers produce connected discourse of paragraph length and structure." (P12) In order to ascertain if the students achieve the standards of ACTFL proficiency guidelines, and explore the relations between proficiency levels and acquisition features of cohesive devices, the data analysis includes discussions of the total instances of usage, grammatical features, and logical relations.

Concerning the general comparison of cohesive devices among these groups, from the quantity of cohesive devices used by the students, the mean number of devices from the second-year students' is 18.375, which is slightly lower than that of the third-year students', 19.6. The mean number of the fourth-year students' is significantly higher, 27.5. From this data, we see that the number of cohesive devices is increasing concurrently with the Chinese learners' levels. This may indicate that the fourth-year students are consciously trying to write complicated, complex sentences rather than strings of short sentences, and that students are aware of using cohesive devices to generate clauses in order to represent certain logical relations. Although the frequency and mean number of using cohesive devices appears high, the effectiveness and repetition also requires further examination. In the fourth-year group, the mean number of using different cohesive devices is 16.1, third-year is 11.1, and second-year is 11.5. The comparison data shows

that up to 41.45% of cohesive devices are repeated in the fourth-year writing samples. In other words, the fourth-year students are more aware of the significance of using cohesive devices to create complicated sentences and to connect discourses; however, they lack sufficient vocabulary words, phrases, or sentences as cohesive devices, so they inevitably repeat using a few of the same devices.

The data of grammatical comparisons of cohesive devices shows that the conjunctions category constitutes a large percentage in the students' usage of cohesive devices as a whole. Students are able to handle such cohesive devices effectively, and the students' advancing language proficiency levels have a direct correlation to the increasing number of conjunctions they use. The mean numbers of three levels are 15 (fourth-year), 11.6 (third-year), and 10.5 (second-year). It can be seen that this category is easy to grasp and one of the first to acquire in the order of acquisition.

The research data proves that the number of conjunctive adverbs used by students is much less than the number of conjunctions. The mean numbers are 3.1, 3.2, and 2.75 among the three student groups. It can be interpreted that there are no distinct differences among these three levels. Accordingly, the acquisition of conjunctive adverbs is separate from the students' level improvement. Furthermore, students did not realize that Chinese monosyllabic conjunctive adverbs could only be located between the subject and the verb(s), and could not be at the beginning of a sentence. The absence of systematical explanations and specific training of the use of adverbs as cohesive devices in advanced levels' Chinese courses and textbooks is a perceptible issue.

According to the textbooks, the authors begin teaching conjunctive adverbs at the earliest level. However, the acquisition features from these samples show that students



still lack the ability to use such cohesive devices. It may be inferred that students prefer to use conjunctions instead, which are considerably easier to use.

In Chinese writing, many researchers have described different requirements in different levels. Cui (2003) points out the importance of linking sentences between paragraphs, which is essential for advanced-level Chinese writing. He also suggests that first-year students should have the ability to connect words and phrases to sentences; second-year students should link sentences to paragraphs; and third-year students should connect paragraphs to discourses. My research shows that the fourth-year students have the proficiency level to connect sentences and topics through certain cohesive devices with the mean number of 4.3. However, the mean number of third-year is 1.9, and second-year is 2.625. The third-year students, on that account, have not yet achieved the proficiency level and awareness to see a paragraph as a whole, as their paragraphs mostly consist of single, and disconnected sentences. In contrast, the fourth-year students grasp how to make a paragraph cohesive and fluent, but lack the understanding of how to connect separate paragraphs. The mean numbers of using cohesive devices to link paragraphs are 0.9, 0.1, and 0.1 among these three groups. The students from these three levels do not develop the awareness and proficiency levels to connect paragraphs and see different paragraphs as a whole. These mean numbers do not show any progression among the three levels. Further attention should be placed on courses and writing instruction, in order to help the students effectively develop a thorough grasp of these cohesive devices.

When examining the comparisons of logical relations, from the cohesive devices listed in Table 8, it may be understood that the coordinative relation is the most important

logical relation that these authors emphasize in their first-year textbooks. However, in second-year Chinese textbooks, the authors introduce all of the logical relations of the cohesive devices. In addition, the textbooks also introduce the cohesive devices that connect phrases and sentences. The textbooks of third-year and fourth-year Chinese show no new logical relations of cohesive devices. The authors mainly increase the varieties of cohesive devices to make the sentences more complex. As for the second year and third year writing samples, the three most frequently used logical relations are coordinative, cause-and-effect, and adversative, and the other logical relations are seldom used. In fourth-year, the connection relation shows obvious improvements in terms of the amount of times it is used correctly.

When we look back to Table 1 to Table 4, educators of Chinese introduce nine separate cohesive devices in the category of conditional relations, eight in suppositional relations, and nine in progressive relations in the second-year textbooks. Moreover, in the third-year textbooks, there are twenty in conditional relations, nine in concessional relations, and twelve in progressive relations. Nonetheless, noticing the actual acquisition situations, the numbers of relations of progressive, conditional, concessional, and suppositional usage do not show large differences among the three student levels, which indicates students do not acquire these aspects in their writing. However, these relations are critical in Chinese reading comprehension and advanced writing. Based on Liu's (2001) logical relations list, there are many cohesive devices with the function to express these four relations. Additionally, textbooks introduce several cohesive devices in these categories in the second-year level. With more attention focused on teaching these types of relations, there can be a clear distinction among levels by acquiring these complicated

concepts in their writing gradually.

## Chapter 5

### IMPLICATIONS

Based on the established arrangements of teaching cohesive devices in textbooks, data shows that students are unable to acquire these cohesive devices effectively. Teachers of Chinese as a second language should re-evaluate their instructions to make them more comprehensible and teaching arrangements in order to help students gradually acquire grammatical features and the eleven logical relations. I will give suggestions for teaching grammatical features of cohesive devices and logical relations.

### DESIGNING INSTRUCTIONAL WRITING ASSIGNMENTS

When exploring training the abilities of linking sentences to paragraphs and linking paragraphs to discourses, based on the experimental data, it is noted that teachers provide several suggested cohesive devices in the writing prompt that would help students to increase their awareness of sentence/paragraph linking. Second-year students are required to complete the same writing assignment as third-year and fourth-year students. In this case, teachers provide some cohesive devices to link sentences and paragraphs in the prompts, because it is assumed that second-year students lacked the ability to write essays on a paragraph level. My research shows that the fourth-year students have adequate ability to connect sentences and topics through certain cohesive devices with the mean number of 4.3. However, third-year is 1.9, and second-year is 2.625. This data also reveals that teachers' instruction for the second-year students still plays an important role in connecting sentences in writing. The second-year students who are directed responded with a positive attitude and awareness in using cohesive devices to link sentences and topics. In the fourth-year Chinese class of the Chinese program in the larger public

university in the southwestern part of the U.S, teachers focus on providing instructional hints to help student practice cohesive devices to connect sentences and paragraphs in writings, and at the end the semester, students have shown marked improvements in using cohesive devices to make the paragraphs as a whole.

#### APPLYING THE METHOD OF PEER RESPONSES TO TEACHING COHESIVE DEVICES IN THE FOURTH-YEAR CHINESE CLASS

Teachers focus on developing the understanding of the appropriate usage of cohesive devices in the fourth-year Chinese class in the Chinese program in the large public university in the southwestern part of the U.S. In the syllabus, teachers emphasize devoting time to improving students' proficiency in writing. Students are able to present and write most types of research, argumentative, and opinion papers about general topics using more complex sentences and statements, with relatively advanced, comprehensive syntax. In summary, cohesive devices are a crucial method to produce complex sentences and are widely practiced and introduced throughout the fourth-year curriculum.

In the classes, teachers mainly apply peer responses to design in-class writing activities. These activities not only include cohesive device practices, but also have other grammar and writing strategy exercises. Many researchers have pointed out the importance of peer responses in developing students' writing skills and strategies. Zhu (2001) finds that "peer response holds considerable promise as a viable tool in writing instruction at multiple levels. Its potential to help students develop audience awareness and improve writing through negotiating peer feedback is particularly appealing." Peer responses could spur students' engagement and interaction in the class activities. (Stanley, 1992; Zhu, 1995). Teachers may integrate this teaching method into curriculum designs

to instruct cohesive devices.

Taking ASU's fourth-year Chinese curriculum design as an example, when students study vocabulary from a new unit, they are first required to pinpoint the cohesive devices in the vocabulary list before reading the main text. In the next class, they share which cohesive devices they found, while teachers help students find the important cohesive devices they missed. In this way, teachers are able to further assist in introducing these cohesive devices. (see Table 9)

Table 9

*Pinpoint the Cohesive Devices in the Vocabulary List*

30. 膳食		shànshí	n (书)	meals, food
31. 有益		yǒuyì	sv	beneficial
32. 且不说	且不說	qiěbùshuō	conj	leaving aside, to say nothing of (moreover-not-say)
33. 料		liào	n	material, stuff, ingredients
34. 极其	極其	jíqí	adv	extremely, exceedingly
35. 白萝卜	白蘿蔔	báiluóbo	n	turnip (white-radish)
44. 嗅觉	嗅覺	xiùjué	n	[sense of] smell
45. 道		dào	m/n	courses [of a meal], rivers, topics, etc.
46. 不光		bùguāng	adv	not only
47. 典故		diǎngù	n	allusion, literary quotation
50. 否则	否則	fǒuzé	conj	otherwise, or else, if not
51. 吓了一跳	嚇一跳	xià yí tiào	vo	shocked, jump a mile
52. 狮子	獅子	shīzi	n	lion
53. 餐桌		cānzhuō	n	dining table

Students are required to find these cohesive devices in the text so that they may understand the meanings and functions of these cohesive devices by their context. Once located, teachers will explicitly introduce the grammatical features and logical relations of these cohesive devices. (see Table 10)

Table 10

Find Cohesive Devices in the Text

152 Lesson 7 ■ Chinese food culture 中国的饮食文化

正文

### 中国的饮食文化

中国人讲究吃的传统，经过数千年的发扬光大，已经形成了内容丰富、颇具特色的“饮食文化”。要谈中国的饮食，不能不说到中国南北的差异和各地的风味。从人文历史角度划分的南北方多以长江为界。长江以南是中国的南方，长江以北则是中国的北方。总的来说，在主食方面，南方人大多爱吃米食，北方人爱吃面食。在菜肴口味方面，有“南甜北咸，东辣西酸”这样的说法。因为各地风味不同，逐渐形成了“川鲁淮粤”四大菜系。川菜的特点是辣，火锅很有特色<sup>2</sup>；鲁菜常用葱和酱。著名的北京烤鸭就源自于鲁菜；淮扬菜的海鲜和鱼类很有名，通常菜里喜欢加一点儿糖；粤菜较清淡，汤类很讲究，点心也很精致。[1-24]

中国饮食的讲究还表现在很多的烹调细节上。比方说，材料和味道讲究随季节而变。一般来说，冬季的味道比较浓重，夏季的味道比较清淡。同时，也讲究营养膳食，饭菜吃下去要对健康有益。且不说用料和制作极其讲究的宫廷菜，就是老百姓的家常菜里也大有学问，例如白萝卜炖羊肉。大家都知道，羊肉能够强身健体，而白萝卜可以帮助消化，并具有美容养颜的功能，这两样材料放在一起炖，对身体虚弱的人特别适合，冬天吃尤其好。此外，评价菜肴的标准也很高。一般来说，必须色、香、味俱全，满足了食客视觉、嗅觉和味觉三方面的要求，才称得上是一道好菜。[25-45]

饭菜不光要做得好，给一道菜起名字也得有水平。有些菜名还包含了很有趣的历史典故，例如“东坡肉”是因宋朝著名文学家苏东坡而得名的。当然，有的名字不能从字面上去理解，否则会让人吓了一跳，例如“红烧狮子头”里面可没有狮子的头。[46-52]

吃饭的时候，餐桌上的礼仪也马虎不得。例如谁坐上座、怎么劝菜劝酒、谁付账等等都很有讲究。[53-57]

以上所说的都是中国饮食文化中好的一面，可惜的是不好的一面也有。广东流行一句话，“四条腿儿的，除了凳子，什么都吃”。很多稀有动物成了中国人餐桌上的山珍海味。尽管人们已经逐渐意识到保护野生动物的重要性，但是杜绝不文明的饮食习惯仍然有待努力。[58-70]

HP Deskjet F

When the class completes these practices, the ten most important cohesive devices of the lesson are selected in groups. Students are then required to choose a topic or set a writing context, such as writing about the advantages and disadvantages of using community websites. The homework assignment is to use these ten cohesive devices to then produce sentences in term of their chosen topics.

During the following classes, students share their chosen topics and interpretations of the ten cohesive devices in this context. Other students are responsible for repeating the correct sentences or correcting the errors in the sentences. Students often proactively discuss the errors afterwards. Spring (2009) expresses that students are not given enough opportunities to employ complex language in class; they often are required answer questions with one or two words. She further suggests “explicit attention to classroom interactions that provide multiple opportunities for students to show mastery of language forms, and functions in their oral and written communication is important for teachers.” (P201) The process of the in-class activity includes interpretations, repetition, corrections, discussions, and negotiations, which provide multiple ways to show mastery of cohesive devices with employing complex language, and students are able to simultaneously engage in the class discussions and analyze the functions of these cohesive devices.

Errors one student might make could also be the result of language transmission. In order to avoid other students repeating these errors, teachers assist in collecting the errors and discussing them with students at the end of class. By providing instantaneous feedback, students may better understand the appropriate use of cohesive devices.

After the students complete their practices in groups and correct their mistakes in the first draft, they are required to revise each sentence with teachers during their individual language tutorial sections. After students amend their sentences, they are required to connect the ten sentences and redo the essay as the final project of the unit. In this way, teachers are able to advance improvement of the students’ ability to connect sentences and make paragraphs as a whole by using proper cohesive devices. Likewise, students are able to try to use unfamiliar cohesive devices at the beginning of the practice session, as



they have the opportunity to repeat these cohesive devices at different times and practice them further in order to master even the complex, unfamiliar ones.

After a year of practice under such methods, at the end of the academic year, students participate an online writing project to examine the writing skills. Students are required to complete a self-introduction that includes introducing their hometown and habits. The results show that the diversities of using cohesive devices are considerably increased as well as the abilities to connect sentences and paragraphs (Han, 2012).

### GRADUALLY TEACHING LOGICAL RELATIONS

In researching the uses of logical relations, data shows that students prefer to use cohesive devices with which they are most familiar. Xu (2001) provides a concept of *Jianhua Celue* 简化策略 “simplified strategy”, which signifies learners of Chinese prefer to use their most familiar ways to express themselves in the process of learning Chinese because of their limitations in the previously-acquired ways of expressions. Therefore, it is understandable that they often repeat the logical relations that they have learned at the beginning levels. Gu (2009) points out teachers should teach different cohesive devices in different proficiency levels. He mentions that the cohesive devices, such as, *yinwei...suoyi* 因为...所以 or *A bi* 比 B, are frequently used by native speakers. These commonly-used cohesive devices should be taught in the first-year or second-year Chinese courses. For some less frequently-used cohesive devices, such as *SV+jiu+SV* or *wulun* 无论, they are taught in the intermediate level or third-year Chinese classes. The most difficult cohesive devices are usually borrowed from classical Chinese, *buwaihu* 不外乎, *zhisuoyi...shi yinwei* 之所以...是因为, for instance, are seldom used in daily

spoken language. However, in a sociolinguistic context, these cohesive devices are often used in writings among highly-educated Chinese people. For these advanced-level cohesive devices, students in advanced-level should effectively employ them in their writings.

Regarding the content of textbooks, all logical relations are introduced in second-year Chinese textbooks. However, in a practical situation, students only use coordinative, cause and effect, and adversative during this period. In first-year Chinese, only one logical relation is introduced. Contrastingly, in the second year textbooks, eight new logical relations appear. These arrangements are ineffective for students acquiring logical relations of cohesive devices. My suggestions are that instructors should not only focus on teaching three logical relations in an academic year, but also review the previously-learned relations. Only by gradually teaching logical relations are students able to avoid these “simplified strategies”.

When examining the results of the experiment, it is apparent that the relations of cause-and-effect, adversative, and coordinative are the three most frequently used logical relations. These three logical relations are the easiest for learners of Chinese to use. Teachers of Chinese may consider teaching these three relations at the beginning levels in order to build a solid foundation for progressive implementation. Based on the ACTFL proficiency guidelines, students should have the proficiency level to connect words to phrases in novice-high or intermediate-mid. For this reason, teachers should teach relations of connectional, alternative, and progressive at the earliest possible level.

According to the results of the experiment, concession, suppositional, and conditional relations are the three most difficult logical relations to learn. As the students’ Chinese

proficiency levels develop, it would be better to teach these three logical relations in the third-year class. For the fourth-year Chinese class, most of the students should have achieved the proficiency level adequate to write essays in paragraph length. In order for students to successfully accomplish these tasks, teachers should emphasize teaching cohesive devices that have the functions of linking sentences and paragraphs.

### THREE FURTHER SUGGESTIONS

Teaching Chinese cohesive devices by drawing comparisons to English cohesive devices would be effective for helping students understand the semantic and grammatical meanings presented. English also includes several logical relations of cohesive devices, some of which have different usages or functions from their Chinese counterparts.

Therefore, if teachers could contrast these differences, it would be a good instructional method for students to better understand Chinese cohesive devices.

Another suggestion is to review regularly the previously-instructed logical relations while learning new ones. Experiments show that it is not effective to teach students a large number of different cohesive devices that express the same logical relations. It would be better for the students' acquisition if teachers only demonstrated a limited number of cohesive devices with different logical relations, and continually reviewed them. For instance, the authors introduce forty new cohesive devices and no new logical relations in third-year Chinese textbooks, but students still only use two to three cohesive devices, those with which they are most familiar. Repeating more logical relations with some of the most important cohesive devices instead of giving students a large number of cohesive devices would improve retention of these cohesive devices and the ability to use correctly.

Different writing styles require different logical relations. Descriptive and narrative styles mainly include the relations of concession, adversative, and cause-and-effect. The expository style includes coordinative and connectional. Progressive, suppositional, and cause-and-effect are often used in the argumentative style. Teachers may combine these writing styles to teach logical relations.

## Chapter 6

### LIMITATIONS

The study examines the acquisition features of cohesive devices among Chinese learners from second-year Chinese to fourth-year Chinese. Because the experiment is conducted with a limited number of participants from one university, the results may differ with participants from other universities. In addition, the writing topics given by teachers are mainly in argumentative and narrative styles, so this may influence the students' usage of cohesive devices. The writing topics in the expository style may also result in different data.

Due to time constraints, In order to limit the scope of this study the textbooks are randomly selected from a university in southwestern of the U.S, and these selected textbooks can not be compared on the basis of belonging to a series, but instead on the basis of content within teaching cohesive devices. Furthermore, the teaching sequence of cohesive devices may differ when examining other textbooks. Future studies may compare all of the textbooks used in college levels in the U.S, compare the textbooks in same series, and provide pedagogical explanations of the reasons and methodologies of selecting the textbooks.

Because teachers provide suggested cohesive devices in the writing prompts for second-year students, third-year and fourth-year students are not given similar hints. This disparity must be recognized when discussing the research results. Further research should consider requiring students to complete the writing assignments using the same prompts.

Further research may include examining more students' writing samples among

different proficiency levels in order to find when and how students acquire, mastery of using specific cohesive devices. Other writing styles may be added to the research, so that educators may better understand the acquisition features of cohesive devices.

Finally, further research on re-arranging the orders of teaching cohesive devices in the textbooks and re-examining the teaching methods of cohesive devices is needed.

Implementing explicit instructional ideas for learning cohesive devices in standard Chinese classes or after-school practices among different levels could help develop more effective and comprehensive teaching methods for cohesive devices.

## Chapter 7

### CONCLUSION

Cohesive devices play a crucial role for learners of Chinese in producing complete and complex sentences. Moreover, cohesive devices also connect paragraphs as a whole. Based on my examination of cohesive devices in textbooks, it is apparent that educators of Chinese devote much time to teaching conjunctive adverbs and conjunctions, especially from second-year Chinese to fourth-year Chinese.

The number of conjunctive adverbs used by students in these three levels is also much lower than the number of conjunctions. Students in these three levels do not have the awareness and proficiency levels to connect separate paragraphs together to make their writing more cohesive and fluent. Moreover, the results reflect that, among these three levels, the three most frequently used logical relations are coordinative, cause-and-effect, and adversative. In contrast, the relations of suppositional, conditional, and concessive are rarely used. The numbers of progressive, conditional, concessional, and suppositional relations used do not show large differences among the three levels. It is perceivable that students often repeat the most familiar cohesive devices.

When comparing the results, the acquisition features of cohesive devices become discernible. Educators of Chinese cannot afford to delay in rethinking the methods for teaching cohesive devices to different levels. In this paper, an instruction for teaching cohesive devices is introduced, along with several other suggestions for helping students learning cohesive devices.

## REFERENCES

- Chao, Yuanren (1965). *A Grammar of Spoken Chinese*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Chu, Chauncey C. (1998). *A Discourse Grammar of Mandarin Chinese*. Berkeley, CA: Peter Lang.
- Chu, Chauncey C. (2006). *Hanyu Pianzhang Yufa 汉语篇章语法 [Discourse Grammar of Mandarin Chinese]*. Beijing: Beijing Language and Culture University.
- Chu, Chauncey C. (2008). *Guanlian lilun yu hanyu jumo xuci de yupian gongneng 关联理论与汉语句末虚词的语篇功能 [Cohesive theories and the discourse functions of Chinese function words at the end of sentences]*. *Journal of East China Normal University*, 3: 12-18.
- Chu, Chauncey C. (2010). *Hanyu Gongneng Pianzhang Yufa 汉语功能篇章语法 [Chinese Functional Discourse Grammar]*. Taipei: Wenhe Press.
- Cui, Songren (2003). *Qiantan pianzhang yufa de dingyi yu jiaoxue 浅谈篇章语法的定义与教学 [Exploring the definition and teaching methods of discourse grammar]*. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 38 (1), 1-24.
- Feng, Shengli (2007). *Wenyi Zaidao: Hanyu Zonghe Jiaocheng Gaoji 文以载道: 汉语综合教程高级 [Comprehensive Chinese Advanced Writing]*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
- Gao, Yan (2008). *Duiwai Hanyu Cihui Jiaoxue 对外汉语词汇教学 [Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language: Vocabularies Teaching]*. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.
- Gleason, M.M. (1999). The role of evidence in argumentative writing. *Reading & Writing Quarterly*, 14, 81-106.
- Gu, Baili (2009). *Huafen zhongwen de dengji: hezhe wei nan, hezhe wei yi 划分中文的等级: 何者为“难”, 何者为“易” [Dividing Chinese levels: who is difficult, who is easy]*. *Yuyanxue yu Huayu Eryu Jiaoxue 语言学与华语二语教学 [Linguistics and Teaching Chinese as a Second Language]*. Weiping Wu and Zhaolin Le (Ed), Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Hunt, K. W. (1966). *Sentence Structures Used by Superior Students in Grades Found and Twelve, and by Adults*. Tallahassee, FL: Florida State University.



- Jin, Hong Gang (2005). Form-focused instruction and second language learning: Some pedagogical considerations and teaching techniques. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 40 (2), 43-65.
- Jin, Hong Gang (2007). Syntactic maturity in second language writings: A case of Chinese as a foreign language. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 42 (1), 27-54.
- Kosaka Junichi (1997). *Baihuayu Yanji 白话语汇研究 [Spoken Chinese Research]*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Ke, Chuanren (2005). Patterns of acquisition of Chinese linguistic features by CFL learners. *Journal of the Chinese Language Teachers Association*, 40 (1), 1-23.
- Li, Charles N and Sandra A. Thompson (1981). *Mandarin Chinese: A function Reference Grammar*. Berkeley and Los Angeles, CA: University of California Press.
- Li, Duanduan and Irene Liu (2010). *Reading into a New China: Integrated Skills for Advanced Chinese*. Boston, MA: Cheng & Tsui Company.
- Liu, Jennifer Li-chia (2004). *Connections I: A Cognitive Approach to Intermediate Chinese*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Lee, Kunshan Carolyn, Hsin-hsin Liang, Liwei Jiao, Julian K. Wheatley (2010). *The Routledge Advanced Chinese Multimedia Course: Crossing Cultural Boundaries*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Li, Wendan (2004). Topic chains in Chinese discourse. *Discourse Processes*, 37 (1), 25-45.
- Li, Xiaoqi (2004). *Boya Hanyu: Qibu Pian 博雅汉语: 起步篇 [Boya Chinese: Novice Level]*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Li, Xiaoqi (2004). *Boya Hanyu: Gaoji Pian 博雅汉语: 高级篇 [Boya Chinese: Advanced Level]*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Liu Yuehua, Tao-chung Yao, Nyan-Ping Bi, Yaohua Shi, and Liangyan Ge (2010). *Integrated Chinese: Level 2*. Boston, MA: Cheng & Tsui Company.
- Liu, Yuehua, Wenyu Wu, and Wei Gu (2001). *Shiyong Xiandai Hanyu Yufa 实用现代汉语语法 [Practical Modern Chinese]*. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Lu, Shuxiang (1942). *Zhongguo Wenfa Yaolue [Essentials of Chinese Grammar] 中国文*

- 法要略. Hong Kong: The Commercial Press.
- Lu, Shuxiang (2009). *Xiandai Hanyu Babaici 现代汉语八百词* [800 Words in Modern Chinese]. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- McNamara, D.S., Crossley, S.A. & McCarthy, M. (2010). Linguistic features of writing quality. *Written Communication*, 27, 57-86.
- Monroe, J.H. (1975). Measuring and enhancing syntactic fluency in French. *The French Review*, 47, 1023-1031
- Ning, Cynthia Y. and John S. Montanaro (2012). *Encounters: Chinese Language and Culture*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Nunan, David and Bailey, Kathleen M. (2010). *Exploring Second Language Classroom Research: A Comprehensive Guide*. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press and Cengage Learning.
- Richards, J.C. & Schmidt, R. (1992). *Longman dictionary of language teaching & applied linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Spring, Madeline k. (2009). Linking curriculum, assessment, and professional development. In Michael E. Everson & Yun Xiao (Ed.) *Teaching Chinese as a Foreign Language Theories and Applications* (pp.193-225). Boston, MA: Cheng & Tsui Company.
- Stanley, J. (1992). Coaching student writers to be effective peer evaluators. *Journal of qualitative inquiry*, 1, 217-133.
- Wang, Li (1977). *Zhongguo Xiandai Yufa 中国现代语法* [Chinese Modern Grammar]. Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
- Wu, Fuxiang (1996). *Dunhuang Bianwen Yanji 敦煌变文语法研究* [Dunhuang Bianwen Grammar Research]. Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.
- Wu, Sue-mei, Yueming Yu, Yanhui Zhang, and Weizhong Tian (2011). *Chinese Link: Beginning Chinese*. Boston, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Wu, Sue-mei and Yueming (2012). *Chinese Link: Intermediate Chinese*. Boston, MA: Prentice Hall.
- Wang, Weixian, *Wang Weixian Yuyanxue Lunwenji 王维贤语言学论文集* [The Collected Paper of Wang Weixian's Linguistics Research]. Shanghai: The Commercial Press.

- Xiao, Yun (2010). Discourse features and development in Chinese L2 writing. In Michael E. Everson & Helen H. Shen (Ed.), *Research Among Learners of Chinese as a Foreign Language* (pp. 133-151). Hawaii, HI: University of Hawaii.
- Xu, Lihua (2001). *Waiguo xuesheng lianci shiyong pianwu fenxi* 外国学生连词使用偏误分析 [The errors analysis of conjunctions used by foreign students]. *Journal of Zhejiang Normal University*, 26(3), 91-95.
- Yang, Wenxing & Ying Sun (2012). The use of cohesive devices in argumentative writing by Chinese EFL learners at different proficiency levels. *Linguistics and Education* 23 (2012): 31-48.
- Yu, Na (2007). *Xiandai hanyu jiashe he tiaojian lianci yanjiu zongshu* 现代汉语假设和条件连词研究综述 [Modern Chinese suppositional and conditional conjunctions research summary], *Modern Chinese Language Research*, 7, 14-15.
- Zhang, Wenxian (2013), Chinese clause conjunction and discourse conjunction, *International Journal of Knowledge and Language Processing*, 4 (1), 47-55.
- Zhao, Yuanren (1948). *Mandarin Primer*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.
- Zheng, Guiyou (2002). *Hanyu Pianzhang Yuyanxue* 汉语篇章语言学 [Chinese Discourse Linguistics]. Beijing: Foreign Language Press.
- Zhou, Xiaobing, Shitao Zhang, Hongmei Gan (2008). *Hanyu Yuedu Jiaoxue Lilun yu Fangfa* 汉语阅读教学理论与方法 [The Teaching Theories and Methods of Chinese Reading]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Zhu, Wei (1995). Effects of training for peer response on students' comments and interaction. *Written Communication*, 12, 492-528.
- Zhu, Wei (2001). Interaction and feedback in mixed peer response groups. *Journal of Second Language Writing*, 10, 251-276.

APPENDIX A

USED COHESIVE DEVICES IN FOURTH-YEAR SAMPLES

Fourth-year	Used Cohesive Devices
401-1	due to <i>youyu</i> 由于 / the reason for...Nothing but <i>zhisuoyi...buwaihu</i> 之所以...不外乎 / firstly...secondly <i>diyige...dierge</i> 第一个...第二个 * 2 / hence <i>yici</i> 因此 / besides <i>ciwai</i> 此外 / but <i>er</i> 而 / <i>youcikejian</i> 由此可见 this shows / <i>gen</i> 跟 * and 2 / <i>weishenmene</i> 为什么呢 why? / <i>yinwei</i> 因为 because / through <i>tongguo</i> 通过 * 2 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 * 2 / for example <i>birushuo</i> 比如说 / in a word <i>zongeryanzhi</i> 总而言之
401-2	and <i>he</i> 和 * 13 / nothing but following seasons <i>buwaihuyixiajigeyinsu</i> 不外乎以下几个因素 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 2 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 2 / for instance <i>birushuo</i> 比如说 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 * 3 / so that <i>yizhiyu</i> 以至于 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 * 2 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 2 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 2 / or <i>huo</i> 或 * 3 / because <i>yingzhe</i> 因着 / besides <i>chuci</i> 除此 / but <i>er</i> 而
401-3	or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / according to <i>genju</i> 根据 / since <i>jiran</i> 既然 * 2 / not only...but also <i>ji...you</i> 既...又 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 4 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 2 / besides <i>ciwai</i> 此外 * 2 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / hence <i>yinci</i> 因此 * 2 / this shows <i>youcikejian</i> 由此可见 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 / but <i>er</i> 而 * 2 / and <i>hai</i> 还 * 3 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 3 / besides <i>chule...zhiwai</i> 除了...之外 / in addition <i>lingwai</i> 另外 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / not only <i>bujin</i> 不仅
401-4	and <i>ji</i> 既 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 3 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 3 / first of all <i>diyi</i> 第一 / why is it convenience? <i>weishenmehenfangbianne</i> 为什么很方便呢? / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 2 / for instance <i>biru</i> 比如 * 3 / besides <i>chucizhiwai</i> 除此之外 / in addition <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / in addition <i>lingwai</i> 另外 / except <i>chufei</i> 除非 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 4 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 2 / firstly...secondly <i>diyi...dier</i> 第一...第二 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 / in a word <i>zongeryanzhi</i> 总而言之
401-5	and <i>he</i> 和 * 4 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 6 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 6 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 4 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 3 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / when <i>yi...deshihou</i> 一...的时候 / cohesive adverb <i>jiu</i> 就 / firstly...secondly <i>diyi...dier</i> 第一...第二
401-6	when <i>dang...deshihou</i> 当...的时候 / why <i>weishenmene</i> 为什么呢? / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 3 / would rather <i>ningke</i> 宁可 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 * 4 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 3 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 2 / nothing but following reasons <i>buwaihuyixiajigeyinsu</i> 不外乎以下几个因素 / firstly...secondly <i>diyi...dier</i> 第一...第二 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 4 / and <i>hai</i> 还 / besides <i>zhiwai</i> 之外 / hence <i>yinci</i> 因此 / in another side <i>lingwaiyigefangmian</i> 另外一个方面 / as regards <i>zhiyu</i> 至于 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说 * 2 / for instance <i>birushuo</i> 比如说 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 / and <i>hai</i> 还 / except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外
401-7	and <i>he</i> 和 * 4 / in sum <i>zongzhi</i> 总之 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 * 2 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 2 / and <i>ye</i> 也 / for instance <i>biru</i> 比如 / and <i>you</i> 又 / so <i>suoyi</i>

	所以 / except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外 / for instance <i>biru</i> 比如 / through <i>tongguo</i> 通过 *2
401-8	no matter <i>buguan</i> 不管 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / merely <i>buguo</i> 不过 * 2 / even <i>shenzhi</i> 甚至 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 3 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 *3 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / firstly...secondly <i>diy...dier</i> 第一...第二 / hence <i>yinci</i> 因此 * 2 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / and <i>haishi</i> 还是
401-9	first of all <i>shouxian</i> 首先 /one, two, three <i>yi, er, san</i> 一, 二, 三 / for example <i>biru</i> 比如 * 3 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 2 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 7 / if <i>jiaru</i> 假如 / and <i>yu</i> 与 / conjunctive adverb <i>jiu</i> 就 / according to <i>genju</i> 根据 / in addition <i>lingwai</i> 另外 * 2 / and <i>ji...you</i> 既...又 / and <i>haiyou</i> 还有 / in sum <i>zongzhi</i> 总之 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / and <i>bingqie</i> 并且 / on the contrary <i>faner</i> 反而 / because <i>youyu</i> 由于 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 8 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / otherwise <i>fanzhi</i> 反之
401-10	for example <i>biru</i> 比如 / I will introduce my experience <i>wozaixiamianhuijieshaowodejingli</i> 我在下面会介绍我的经历 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 3 / although <i>jinguan</i> 尽管 * 2 / but <i>raner</i> 然而 * 2 / for instance <i>liru</i> 例如 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对 ... 来说 / one side, in the other side <i>yifangmian...lingyifangmian</i> 一方面 ... 另一方面 / I will indicate <i>wozaixiamianchanshu</i> 我在下面阐述 / firstly..secondly <i>diyige...dierge</i> 第一个...第二个 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / hence <i>yinci</i> 因此 / in another side <i>lingyifangmian</i> 另一方面 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / otherwise <i>fanzhi</i> 反之 / is...and also is <i>shi...yeshi</i> 是...也是 / based on the information above <i>youyushangmiandexinxi</i> 由于上面的信息 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以

APPENDIX B

USED COHESIVE DEVICES IN THIRD-YEAR SAMPLES

Third-year	Used Cohesive Devices
301-1	but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 3 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 4 / conjunctive adverb <i>jiu</i> 就 / no matter <i>bulun</i> 不论 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 * 3 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 3 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说 * 2 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 2 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / in addition <i>lingwai</i> 另外 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / and <i>gen</i> 跟
301-2	and <i>gen</i> 跟 / hence <i>yinci</i> 因此 / also <i>ye</i> 也 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 2 / and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 2 / merely <i>buguo</i> 不过 * 2 / for instance <i>biru</i> 比如 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 * 2 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 / but also <i>erqie</i> 而且 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 * 3 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 3 / but <i>er</i> 而 * 2 / in addition <i>ciwai</i> 此外 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者
301-3	and <i>he</i> 和 * 7 / and <i>haiyou</i> 还有 * 4 / for instance <i>biru</i> 比如 / but <i>que</i> 却 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是
301-4	or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 3 / first of all <i>shouxian</i> 首先 / but also <i>erqie</i> 而且 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 3 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 * 2 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说 / except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外 / also <i>ye</i> 也 / conjunctive adverb <i>jiu</i> 就 / more important <i>gengzhongyaodeshi</i> 更重要的是 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果
301-5	for instance <i>biru</i> 比如 * 2 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 / because <i>youyu</i> 由于 / hence <i>yushi</i> 于是
301-6	or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 * 3 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 5 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 * 2 / and <i>hai</i> 还 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / and <i>he</i> 和 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / and <i>bing</i> 并 / for instance <i>liru</i> 例如 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 / conjunctive adverb <i>jiu</i> 就
301-7	or <i>huo</i> 或 * 2 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 7 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 2 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 3 / compare with <i>xiangbizhixia</i> 相比之下 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 * 3 / more important <i>gengzhongyaodeshi</i> 更重要的是 / in sum <i>zongzhi</i> 总之 / firstly...secondly <i>shouxian...qici</i> 首先...其次 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / in addition <i>ciwai</i> 此外 / if <i>yaoshi</i> 要是
301-8	and <i>he</i> 和 * 10 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 3 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 2 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / as to <i>zhiyu</i> 至于 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / in other side <i>lingyifangmian</i> 另一方面
301-9	and <i>he</i> 和 * 11 / but <i>er</i> 而 / but <i>que</i> 却 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 / or <i>huo</i> 或 * 2 / but <i>dan</i> 但 * 2 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 3 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 / but <i>raner</i> 然而 / also <i>yi</i> 亦 / and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 / and <i>erqie</i> 而且 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 2 / and <i>bing</i> 并
301-10	when <i>dang...shi</i> 当...时 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 4 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / and then <i>ranhou</i> 然后 / for instance <i>birushuo</i> 比如说 / in addition <i>lingwai</i> 另外 / although <i>jinguan</i> 尽管 / but <i>raner</i> 然而 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / on side, on the other side <i>yifangmian...lingyifangmian</i> 一方面...另一方面



APPENDIX C

USED COHESIVE DEVICES IN SECOND-YEAR SAMPLES

Second-year	Cohesive Devices
201-1	and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 * 2 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 2 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 2 / merely <i>buguo</i> 不过 / in sum <i>zongzhi</i> 总之 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 * 2 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 3 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 / except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外 / and <i>he</i> 和 / not...but <i>bushi...jiushi</i> 不是...就是
201-2	because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 2 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 * 2 / and <i>hai</i> 还 / also <i>ye</i> 也 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 4 / and <i>erqie</i> 而且 / except for <i>chule...zhiwai</i> 除了...之外 / and <i>bingqie</i> 并且 / and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说
201-3	and <i>he</i> 和 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 * 2 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 2 / first of all <i>diyi</i> 第一 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 4 / except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外 / and <i>hai</i> 还 / and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 / also <i>ye</i> 也 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 / for instance <i>bifangshuo</i> 比方说 / if <i>yaoshi</i> 要是 / no matter <i>wulun</i> 无论
201-4	although <i>ruiran</i> 虽然 * 2 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 6 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 6 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 7 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / no matter <i>wulun</i> 无论 * 2 / if <i>yaoshi</i> 要是 / for instance <i>biru</i> 比如
201-5	except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外 / and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 / if <i>yaoshuo</i> 要是 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 * 2 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 * 3 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 / for instance <i>bifangshuo</i> 比方说 / at the same time <i>yibian...yibian</i> 一边...一边 / also <i>ye</i> 也 / no matter <i>wulun</i> 无论
201-6	and <i>gen</i> 跟 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 3 / and <i>he</i> 和 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 * 2 / although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / and <i>er</i> 而 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / if not <i>yaobu</i> 要不 / beside <i>chule</i> 除了 / if <i>ruguo</i> 如果 / and <i>zaishuo</i> 再说 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 / and <i>erqie</i> 而且
201-7	not...but <i>bushi...jiushi</i> 不是...就是 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 2 / for <i>dui...laishuo</i> 对...来说 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 * 2 / except for <i>chule...yiwai</i> 除了...以外 / so <i>suoyi</i> 所以 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 2 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 / but also <i>erqie</i> 而且
201-8	although <i>suiran</i> 虽然 / but <i>keshi</i> 可是 * 4 / and <i>you...you</i> 又...又 / for instance <i>bifangshuo</i> 比方说 / also <i>ye</i> 也 * 4 / because <i>yinwei</i> 因为 / but <i>danshi</i> 但是 * 2 / and <i>gen</i> 跟 * 4 / or <i>huozhe</i> 或者 / and <i>he</i> 和 * 2 / for instance <i>bifangshuo</i> 比方说 / not only <i>budan</i> 不但 / but also <i>erqie</i> 而且

APPENDIX D

HUMAN RESEARCH CURRICULUM COMPLETION REPORT



**CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative (CITI)****Responsible Conduct of Research Curriculum Completion Report**  
Printed on 9/5/2012**Learner:** Jihng Han (username: hanjihng17)**Institution:** Arizona State University**Contact Information** Arizona State University SILC

Department: Arizona State University SILC

Email: hjnhng@asu.edu

**Humanities Responsible Conduct of Research:****Stage 1. Basic Course Passed on 05/03/12 (Ref # 7879457)**

Required Modules	Date	
	Completed	Score
Introduction to the Responsible Conduct of Research	05/03/12	no quiz
Research Misconduct 4-148	05/03/12	3/5 (60%)
Data Acquisition, Management, Sharing and Ownership 4-225	05/03/12	5/5 (100%)
Publication Practices and Responsible Authorship 4-1533	05/03/12	5/5 (100%)
Peer Review 4-1534	05/03/12	5/5 (100%)
Mentor and Trainee Responsibilities 01234 1250	05/03/12	4/5 (80%)
Conflicts of Interest and Commitment 4-102	05/03/12	3/5 (60%)
Collaborative Research 4-102	05/03/12	3/5 (60%)
The CITI RCR Course Completion Page	05/03/12	no quiz
Arizona State University	05/03/12	no quiz

For this Completion Report to be valid, the learner listed above must be affiliated with a CITI participating institution. Falsified information and unauthorized use of the CITI course site is unethical, and may be considered scientific misconduct by your institution.

Paul Braunschweiger Ph.D.  
Professor, University of Miami  
Director Office of Research Education  
CITI Course Coordinator

[Return](#)

APPENDIX E  
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL

**To:** Madeline Spring  
DURHAM LAN

**From:** Mark Roosa, Chair  
Soc Beh IRB

**Date:** 09/26/2012

**Committee Action:** **Exemption Granted**

**IRB Action Date:** 09/26/2012

**IRB Protocol #:** 1209008264

**Study Title:** Discovering the progress of the participants' use of conjunctions and cohesive devices in Chinese writings among three levels

The above-referenced protocol is considered exempt after review by the Institutional Review Board pursuant to Federal regulations, 45 CFR Part 46.101(b)(1) .

This part of the federal regulations requires that the information be recorded by investigators in such a manner that subjects cannot be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects. It is necessary that the information obtained not be such that if disclosed outside the research, it could reasonably place the subjects at risk of criminal or civil liability, or be damaging to the subjects' financial standing, employability, or reputation.

You should retain a copy of this letter for your records.