AWKA JOURNAL OF ENGLISH LANGUAGE AND LITERARY STUDIES (AJELLS)

Volume 10 Number 2
April, 2024

Syntactic Contexts of Subordinators in Written Complex Sentences of Selected Students of English for Academic Purposes in Makurdi

Adaje, Ambrose Ochigbo
Department of English Language Education
Joseph Sarwuan Tarka University, Makurdi
Email: ochigboaadaje@gmail.com

&

Shehu Ibrahim Ahmad
Department of English
Nasarawa State University, Keffi
Email: shehuibrahimahmad@nsuk.edu.ng

Abstract

The study assesses the syntactic contexts of subordinators in written complex sentences of selected students of English for Academic Purposes (EAP) in Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi. The structural grammar description of the structural contexts of subordinators in modern English usage is foregrounded to provide the linguistic basis for assessment of the structural contexts of subordinators in the students' written complex sentences. The model is used to design a proficiency assessment test tagged, *Uses of subordinators in English.* The study subjects are forty-nine students, randomly selected from an EAP lecture group in 2021/2022 academic session. The results of the data analysis, using frequency, percentage and mean statistics, indicate that the students are incapable of using simple, complex, correlative and marginal subordinators to generate complex sentences in English. Specifically, the students can not construct complex sentences with *after, once, that, unless, whereas, but that, except, in so much as, as though, as...as, such…as, less…than, no*

sooner… than, scarcely…when, the…the, whether…or, even if…(yet), unless…than, seeing that…(therefore),if only, in spite of the fact that, who and *when.*The study recommends that the students should be taught the structural contexts in which subordinators are employed in English complex sentences.
Keywords: subordinators, structural contexts, complex sentence construction, EAP students' deficiencies.

Introduction

In a linguistic context where English is a second language, as in Nigeria, knowledge of basic grammar imbues learners with prerequisite linguistic competence for effective use of English. So grammar learning is a mandatory major component of Englsh language study at primary, secondary and tertiary formal school levels in Nigeria. At the university level, which is the focus of this usage research, selected basic grammatical items which have been taught at lower school levels, are revised to further solidify their linguistic competence for communicative competence. Despite the emphasis on grammar learning in Nigerian formal school system, the written English of undergraduates are mostly marred by errors of basic grammar. Some previous researches have shown that some of the students' grammatical difficulties include irregular verb inflection (Adaje & Oreoluwa, 2022), tags (Adaje & Ikyase, 2022) and many grammatical deficiencies (Adaje & Oreoluwa, 2020). However, specific research focus on the students' use of subordinators has been neglected. Although some studies have identified subordinators grammatical difficulties of undergraduate stuents, such studies only classify subordinators as wrongly used words without elucidating the nature of the difficulty probably because such studies are not primarily focused on subordinators. **(**Bodunde & Sotiloye, 2013; Amuseghan & Tunde Awe, 2016; Tsakuwa, 2016; Adekemi, 2021; Afolabi & Otemuyiwa, 2018; Ojo, 2018). A study is expedient, therefore, to characterize learners' difficulty with subordinators in English usage. The aim of the study is to find out if subordinators are used in the correct

structural contexts in the written complex sentences of some first-year undergraduate students of English for Academic Purposes in Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi.

The Theoretical Perspective

Structural linguistics theory is engaged here for the study. The main thesis of structural grammar approach is that language is structured and that linguistic items which operate in sentence structures have forms with corresponding communicative meanings (Culler 1988, Lester, 1990). So, learning forms of linguistic items with their respective communicative functions facilitate effective language use. This form-function perspective to the study of grammar has influenced some comprehensive descriptions of English grammar (Greenbaum, 1996; Huddleston & Pullum, 2002; Azar, 2003; Vince, 2003; Biber, Conrad & Leech, 2003; Carty & McCarthy, 2006; Quirk, Greenbaum, Leech & Svartvik, 2007; Foley & Hall, 2008;). These dscriptions have been found relevant to English language teaching and learning (ELTL) in a second language context like Nigeria. So, the structural grammar model description of subordinators in modern English usage is adopted in this study because the model provides significant facts on the classes, imports and usage contexts of subordinators in English. The focus here is on the structural contexts in which subordinators are engaged in complex sentences in communication. The various classes and structural contexts of subordinators are discussed here to provide grammatical basis for the assessment of the structural contexts of subordinators in the students' written complex sentences.

The Conceptual Framework

Subordinators, as linguistic connective devices, integrate two or more facts into a single sentence structure, often termed complex sentence; it is so called, not for its complex content but for its constituent structure which consists of, at least, one matrix clause

and one or more subordinate clauses. Thus, subordinators have syntactic usage contexts.

Structural grammar model recognizes four types of subordinators, namely, simple, complex, correlative and marginal subordinators with their respective syntactic contexts in which they are employed in Standard English sentence construction (Quirk, *et al* 2007). There are also some other formal indicators of subordination in English.

Simple subordinators include *after, although, as, because, before, directly, if, immediately, lest, like, once, since, that, though, till, unless, until, when, whenever, where, wherever, whereas, whereupon, while* and *whilst.* A few simple subordinators are contextualized and italicized in these complex sentences:

1. The team lost the game, *although every one played well*.
2. Do it *before you forget*.
3. James hasn't phoned *since he went to London*.
4. Paul is fond of Goodness, *though he often annoys her*.
5. This is *where she lives*

Complex subordinators can be split into those that end with *that* as in these phrases: *but that, in that, in order that, insofar that, in the event that, save that* and *such that.* But there are others that ending with *that* is optional; these are: *assuming (that), considering (that), excepting (that), given (that), granted (that), granting (that), provided (that), providing (that), seeing (that), supposing (that), except (that), for all (that), now (that), so (that).* Also, some complex subordinators end with *as,* as illustrated in these ones: *according as, as far as, as long as, as soon as, for as much, in as much as, in so far as, in so much as.* Other complex subordinators are: *as if, as though, in case.* The examples below illustrate the structural usage contexts of items from the four categories of complex subordinators enumerated above.

6. The damage was *such that it would cost themselves much to repair*.

7. We worked hard *so that everything would be ready in time*.
8. It was still painful *so I went to see a doctor.*
9. *Assuming (that) my grandmother is still alive*, how old would she be now?
10. She will go for the Children Day celebration *as long as* the weather is good.
11. It sounds *as if she had a good time.*

In correlative subordinators, the second correlative endorses the meaning of the first. Correlative subordinators are classified into five sets. The first set is made up of the proportional correlative *as…so,* as exemplified in

12. *As she grew discouraged, so* her rehearsal became irregular.

The correlative expresses a proportionality or equivalence of tendency or degree between two situations as typified below:

13. *As the strength of the lion failed, so* the courage of the hunters grew.

The second set of correlative subordinators, consists of comparative correlatives, such as, *as….as, so…as, such….as, so…. (that), such…. (that), less…. than, more …than, no sooner…. than, barely…. when, hardly… when,* and *sincerecly… when.* In this category of subordinators, the first element functions as degree modifier in the matrix clause, while the second is a subordinator that introduces the final subordinate clause, as illustrated in the contexts of these complex sentences:

14. The adulteress was *more* ashamed *than she has ever been.*
15. James is *as* intelligent *as his brother (is).*
16. The hunter had *no sooner* arrived *than he asked for water.*

The third set of correlative subordinators, contains the peculiar pair of proportional correlatives, *the…the,* as contextualized in 17 and 18.

17. *The* more I correct him, *the* less notice she takes.
18. *The* harder she worked, *the* happier she felt.

A reversal in the order of the two clauses in 18, for example, results in change in the meaning relationship: *The* happier she felt, *the* harder she worked

The fourth set of corrective subordinators contains the *whether …or* and *if … or* correlatives which are used in alternative interrogative subordinate clauses and alternative conditional-concessive subordinate clauses as exemplified in the contexts of sentences 19 and 20 respectively:

19. The meteorologist didn't say *whether it will rain or be sunny*
19b. I asked *if the guests wanted meat or fish*.
20a. You will have to answer the query, *if you want to or not.*
20b. *Whether or not he finds a better job,* he is going to get married.

The fifth and the last set of correlatives has a subordinator in an initial subordinate adverbial clause with an optional conjunct in the matrix clause. The conjunct emphasizes the relationship specified by the subordinator. Examples of subordinators here are *although, even if, though, while…yet, nevertheless, etc., if, once, since* (reason), *unless, if. then, in that case, because, seeing* and *seeing that …therefore.* Some of the subordinators are illustrated in the contexts of these complex sentences below:

21. *Though the workers were not satisfied with increment in the allowances of the proposed new salary package, nevertheless* they accepted to call off the strike
22. *If this year's harvest is good, then* they will not need to import millet.
23. *Because you have not indicated interest in the contract offer,* I am therefore withdrawing it.

The range of correlative subordinators can be extended to include, for instance, *when… there* and *when …. then,* particularly in literacy writing:

24. When his imagination was stimulated, there then the the frenzy feeling to write down his thoughts.

Marginal subordinators exist in English; they are classified into four categories: The first category consists of a subordinator with an adverb; for instance, *ever if* and *if only*. The second category consists of noun phrases that regularly function as temporal adverbials; for example, the *moment (that)* and *every time (that).* An example, illustrating the context of one marginal subordinator, *the moment*, is given below:

25. I recognized the girl *the moment I saw her*

Other marginal subordinative phrases include, *during the period when…, until such time as, since the days that.* The third category consists of prepositional phrases that terminate in *the fact that,* such as *because of the fact that, due to the fact that, on account of the fact that, in (the) light of the fact that* which are replaceable with a simple conjunction like *because.* Other examples are *in spite of the fact that* and *regardless of the fact that* which too can be replaced with the conjunction *although* for concession. The fourth category consists of participle forms such as *supposing (that), assusming that, provided that, seeing now* and *considering how.*

There are other indicators of subordination. Aside simple, complex, correlective and marginal subordinators, *wh-elements* are initial markers of subordination in interrogative, exclamation, *wh*-relative and conditional-concessive clauses. The subordinating *wh-elements* include *who, whom, whose, which, when, where, what, why, how; whoever, whomever, whichever, whenever, whatever, however, whosoever, whomsoever, whosesoever, whatsoever* and *howsoever.*

Also, the relative pronoun *that* functions as a subordination marker in restrictive relative clauses:

26. The literary style *that we are discussing in this novel* is quite unusual one.

Subject-operator is a marker of subordination in some conditional, similarity and comparative clauses. Examples of such operators are *had, were, should, could, and might:*

27. Were she here, he would oppose this motion.

Subordinators such as, *though* and *that* could be used in inversion context:

28. Bold *though he was*, he could not confront her.

The absence of a finite verb is also an indicator of subordination because nonfinite and verbal clauses are primarily subordinate:

29. *Denying interest in literature*, he clarified that he would continue with English language.

Two types of subordinate clauses namely nominal and comment clauses do not possess overt indicator of subordination. There are nominal clauses that omit *that*, though *that* is insertable, for example, as contextualized in these complex sentences:

30. *We suppose* we can use the car. OR: *We suppose* that we can use the car

Also, some comment clauses lack an obligatory verb complementation:

31. The ill-health condition could be worse, *we knew.* OR: We *know*, the ill-health condition could be worse

The above short survey of formal indicators of subordination lays the basis for assessing the structural contexts in which subordinators are used in the written complex sentences of some EAP students who are the subjects of the study.

Methodology

This expo-facto study was carried out in Federal University of Agriculture, Makurdi, during the 2021/22 academic session, among first-year undergraduate students of English for Academic purposes. All students who registered for the use of English course, termed *Communication in English*, formed the study population; from the number of the enrollees, forty-nine students were randomly sampled as the study subjects. A proficiency assessment test, tagged *Uses of Subordinators in English* was

administered to them by the lead researcher who was the lecturer of the EAP lecture group used for the study. The research instrument is made of twenty-nine subordinators. The students were tasked to construct complex sentences with the subordinators so as to unearth the syntactic contexts of the use of the subordinators in the students' sentence structures. The data analysis discriminated the students' written sentences which are not complex sentences and computed the frequency, percentage and mean scores of their performance for each use of the subordinators. The decision- criterion mean scores are 0.00-0.04 for proof of lack of knowledge and 0.05-1.00 as evidence of mastery.

Data Analysis

The results of data analysis are captured in Table1 below. The table lists twenty-nine subordinators, drawn from five classes, which the students were tasked to construct complex sentences with. The table also displays example of uses of the listed subordinators in Standard English sentences. The standard examples are mostly adopted from Hornby (2015). In this way, a standard usage basis is provided for discriminating misuse of subordinators in the structures of the students' written complex sentences.

S/N	**S**ubordinators	Subordinative constructions	Rating of Students' Complex sentences **X**	**%**	**X**
		Simple subordinators			
1.	*after*	I will never forgive him *after* what he said.	12	24	0.24
2.	*once*	The water is fine *once* you are in!	19	38	0.38
3.	*that*	She said *that* the story was true.	12	24	0.24
4.	*unless*	*Unless* l am mistaken, she was back at work yesterday.	19	38	0.38
5.	*whereas*	Some of the studies show positive results, *whereas* others do not.	9	18	0.18
		Complex subordinators			
6.	*but that*	She would have screamed *but that* her	4	8	0.08

		cry would have called her masters.			
7.	*assuming (that) Assuming (that)*	he is still alive, how old would he be now?	26	53	0.53
8.	*except*	Our dresses were the same except mine was red.	12	24	0.24
9.	*in so much as*	I didn't *so much as* catch sight of him all day.	9	18	0.18
10.	*as though*	It sounds *as though* you had a good time.	15	30	0.50
		Correlative subordinators			
11.	*as…as*	It is not *as* hard *as* I thought	11	22	0.22
12.	*such…as*	The food *such as* it was, served at nine 0'clock	1	2	0.02
13.	*less…than*	It is *less* of a problem *than* I had expected	4	8	0.08
14.	*no sooner…than*	*No sooner* had she said it *than* she burst into tears	4	8	0.08
15.	*scareely…when*	He had *scarely* put the phone down *when* the doorbell rang	6	12	0.12
16.	*the…..the*	*The* more she thought about it, *the* more depressed she became	5	10	0.10
17.	*whether…..or*	I am going *whether* you like it *or* not	14	28	0.28
18.	*even if…(yet)*	I will get there *even if* I have to walk	16	32	0.32
19.	*unless…(then)*	You won't get paid for time off *unless* you have a doctor's note	11	22	0.22
20.	*seeing that…(therefore)*	*Seeing that* he has been off sick all week, he is unlikely to come	12	24	0.24
		Marginal subordinators			
21.	*if only*	*If only* I knew her name, I would tell you	23	46	0.46
22.	*the moment*	I want to see him the moment he arrives	27	55	0.55
23.	*in spite of the fact that*	English becomes the official language for business *in spite of the fact that* the population was largely Nigerian	20	40	0.40
24.	*supposing that*	*Supposing that* you are wrong what will you do then	27	55	0.55
		Other Indicators of Subordination			
25.	*who*	The people *who* called yesterday want to buy the house.	16	32	0.32
26.	*when*	Sunday is the only day *when* I can relax.	20	40	0.40
27.	*whoever*	Come out of there, *whoever* you are	30	61	0.61
28.	*wherever*	He comes from Boula, *wherever*	32	65	0.65

	that may be.			
29.	*whosoever* Send it to *whosoever* is in charge of sales.	30	61	0.61

The table evidently displays the students' deficiency in complex sentences construction using the simple, complex, corrective, marginal subordinators except other indicators of subordination.
In other words, the students are unable to generate complex sentences with *after, once, that, unless, whereas, but that, assuming(that), in so much as, as though, as…as, such…as, less...than, no sooner...than, the...the, whether…or, even if…(yet), unless…(then), seeing that..(therefore), if only, in spite of the fact that* except *assuming that, the moment, supposing that, whoever, wherever* and *whosoever.*

Discussion of Findings

The main finding of the study is that the students cannot use simple, complex, correlative and marginal subordinators to generate complex sentences in English. The first finding is that the students are incapable of using simple subordinators to construct complex sentences. Of these simple subordinators: as *after, once, that, unless* and *whereas,* the students cannot generate written complex sentence structures with them as shown by the following defective sentences extracted from the students' written productions:

Excerpt 1: <u>After</u> the rain, the ground was wet.
Excerpt 2: The police man visited the orphanage <u>once</u> every year.
Excerpt 3: <u>That</u> is the idea I have heard so far
Except 4: <u>Unless</u> you give me piece of paper or I will not write the GST 116 examination.
Except 5: <u>Whereas</u> he was busy doing his work in the farming place.

The words *after, once, that, unless,* and *whereas* are not used as subordinators in the students' productions. *After the rain* and *once every year* are adverbial phrases; *that* in *that is the idea* is a demonstrative pronoun while *unless* and *whereas* are semantically

inapplicable in the contexts. The table displays standard uses of these simple subordinators which the students are unable to construct complex sentences with.

The second finding is that the students are cannot use complex subordinators to construct complex sentences. Of these complex subordinators, *but…. that, assuming (that), except, in so much as,* and *as though),* the students are unable use them to generate complex sentences in English. Their deficiencies are shown in these excerpts:

Excerpt 6: I ask her come <u>but</u> that girl is not serious.

Excerpt 7: She came late <u>but</u> assumed that the teacher won't take note of her

Excerpt 8: I swim before you <u>expect</u> you must be vigilant.

Excerpt 9: In <u>so much as</u> I take with you.

Excerpt 10: <u>As though</u> parent has work hard to paid their children are doing bad (sic) . Excerpt 6 is a compound sentence in which *but* and *that* function as a coordinative conjunction and a demonstrative adjective respectively. Also, excerpt 7 is a compound sentence where *but* functions as a coordinator; *assumed* works as a verb and *that* is a relative adjective. In excerpt 8, *except* is redundant and inapplicable in the context of the sentence in which the subordinator is *before.* Finally, *in so much as* does not function as a subordinator in excerpt 9. *As though* is meaningless in excerpt 10, where, structurally, the connecting grammatical item is *but,* a coordinator, even though the sentence is ungrammatical. The table unveils the standard usage of complex subordinators which the students are incapable of using to construct complex sentences.

Thirdly, the study, also, shows that inability is manifested in the use of correlative subordinators in complex sentence construction. The students are unable to generate accepted complex sentences with anyone of the correlatives. Their productions reveal the deficiencies.

Excerpt 11: <u>As</u> an actor you must be given a role to play <u>either as</u> an antagonist or protagonist.

Excerpt 12: The factory produces materials <u>such as</u> wine, cream, perfume, rollon, cornflaxes, goldern morn(SIC)
Excerpt 13: There must be <u>less</u> corruption <u>than</u> cooperation before good nation we developed (SIC)
Excerpt 14: No sooner than or later day is coming tyrant men shall be over through.
Excerpt 15: <u>Scarcely</u> when I was in university of Agriculture, Makurdi.
Excerpt 16: <u>The</u> boy is playing football
Excerpt 17: <u>Whether</u> you <u>or</u> Emmanuel, no one should carried that money I put on the table.
Excerpt 18: The lase was dropped <u>even if</u> the way yet to arrive at the court room
Excerpt 19: Read strategically <u>unless</u> you will fail woefuly.
Excerpt 20: Seeing that free that there are many snake under

In all the ten excerpts (11-20), the italicized grammatical items are not used as correlative subordinators. In excerpts *11* and*12, as…as* and *such…as* are prepositions. In 13, *less… than* is used as a comperative adjective phrase. The uses of *no sooner than, scarcely when, whether…or, even if, unless* and *seeing that* are meaningless in excerpts 14,15,17,18,19 and 20 respectively. There is no subordinator in excerpt 16 but a definite reference with the determiner, *the*. The model instances of the uses of the correlative subordinators are illustrated in the table, even though the students are unable to use them to construct complex sentences.

The fourth finding is that the students are unable to use marginal subordinators to construct complex sentences. This difficulty is evident from the following excerpts:

Excerpt 21: <u>If only</u> he came on time.
Excerpt 22: <u>The moment</u> I saw man it running.
Excerpt 23: <u>Inspite of the fact that</u> things are difficult but were are striving.
Excerpt 24: <u>Supposing that</u> we should all encouraged ourselves to do better.

In all the four excerpts (21-24), *if only, the moment, in spite of the fact that* and *supposing that* are not used to introduce any subordinate clause. Excerpts *21,22* and *24* are sentence fragments. In 23, there are both subordinator *(in spite of the fact that*) and coordinator (*but*); these grammatical deficiencies render all the excerpts as ungrammatical sentential constructions. Standard uses of marginal subordinators are demonstrated on the table; though the students are incapable of producing similar complex structures.
Finally, the study also finds out that using other formal indicators of subordination in complex sentence construction proves less difficult to the students. Of the formal indicators of subordination examined, the students have problems with only *who* and *when.* Their difficulties with *who* and *when* as subordinators are shown in the following excerpts:
Excerpt 25: Who is going to school tomorrow?
Excerpt 26: When are you coming back?
In excerpts 25 and 26, *who* and *when* are not used to introduce subordinators but as relative pronoun (*who*) and an adverbial (*when*), respectively. Model uses of *who* and *when* as subordinators are displayed on the table but the students are unable to construct similar sentence structures with who and when.
The study has proved that some EAP students are incapable of using simple, complex, correlative and marginal subordinators to construct acceptable complex sentences in English.

Implication, Recommendations and Conclusion

The implications of the findings are that the students cannot generate complex sentences in English and possibly incapable of using complex sentences in communication. The study therefore recommends that the students be taught the classes and uses of subordinators in complex sentence construction. Also, the students should be drilled on complex sentence construction, using various subordinators. Influencing EAP students to read newpapers and perodicals which are written in standard English could aid them to learn the uses of subordinators in English.

In conclusion, the study has proved that some students of English for Academic Purposes are incapable of using simple, complex, correlative and marginal subordinators to construct complex sentences in English.

References

Adaje, A.O. & Ikyase, A. V. (2021). Assessment of Simple Past and Past Participle Inflections of Irregular Verbs in the Written English of First-year Students of the University of Agriculture, Makurdi. *Issues in and Literary Studies.* Vol 7, No 1. *https://illsjournal.acuoyo.net*

Adaje, A.O. & Shehu, I.A. (2021). Tags in Written Complex Sentences of Seleted Students of English for Academic Purposes: Some Pedagogical Implications. *Issues in and Literary Studies.* Vol 7, No 1. *https://illsjournal.acuoyo.net*

Adaje, A.O. & Oreoluwa, B. O. (2020) Grammatical Deficiencies in Expository Essays of Engineering Students of University of Agriculture, Makurdi. *The Journal of Communicative English.* Volume 25

Amuseghan, S.A. & Tunde awe, B.M. (2016). Error analysis of the written English compositions of undergraduates: A case study of Nigeria. *Journal of teaching and teacher education.* 4. NO.2

Adekemi, B.T. (2021) Appraisal of common errors in spoken and written English of 400 level students s of Gombe State University. *Journal of humanities and social sciences.* VOL.22, No.4.

Afolabi, K. and Otemuyiwa, A. A. (2018). Common errors in oral and written communication of Nigeria undergraduates: A case study of Joseph Ayo Babalola University undergraduates *International Journal of English Literature and Culture.* Vol. 6 (5) http://www.academicresearchjournals.org/IJEL.index.htm.

Azar, B. S. (2003). *Fundamentals of English Grammar*. New

York: Pearson

Biber, D., Conrad, S. and Leech, G. (2003). *Student's grammar of spoken and written English*. England: Pearson Education Limited

Bodunde, H. A. and Sotiloye, B. S. (2013). A critique of undergraduate students' writing in an ESL Setting: Samples from the Federal University of Agriculture, Abeokuta, Nigeria. *World Journal of English Language.* www.sciedu.ca/wjel.

Carter, R. and McCarthy, M. (2006). *Cambridge grammar of English.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Culler, J. (1988). "Saussure's theory of language". In l*anguage and Literacy from educational perspective. Volume 1: language studies.* Ed. Neil Mercer.England: Open university educational entrepries limited.

Foley, M. & Hall, D. (2008). *Advanced learners' grammar.* England: Pearson Education Limited

Greenbaum, S. (1996). *The Oxford English grammar. O*xford: *O*xford University Press.

Huddleston, R. & Pullum, G.K. (2002). *The Cambridge grammar of the English language* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lester, M. (1990). *Grammar in the classroom.* New York: Macmillian.

Ojo, G.A. (2018). An analysis of English grammatical errors in the written essays of the first-year English students of Ekiti State University, Ado-Ekiti. *International journal of research and innovation in social sciences* (IJRISS). Vol.11, Issue VI.

Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G. and Svartvik, J. (2007). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language.* Edinburgh Pearson Education Limited.

Vince, M. (2003). *English grammar and vocabulary*. New York: Macmillan Publishers Limited.