

# Morphosyntactic Approach in Conducting Adversative Connectors in Texts Produced by Students of the 12<sup>th</sup> Grade: Analysis of the Portuguese of Angola Norm

João Pedro<sup>1</sup>, Celestino Katala<sup>2</sup>, Eugênio Salessu<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Social and Human Sciences and Educational Sciences, Polytechnic Higher Institute, Rainha Njinga A Mbande University, Malanje, Angola

<sup>2</sup>Department of Modern Languages, Faculty of Humanities, Luanda, Angola

<sup>3</sup>Department of Chemistry, Faculty of Engineering at Universidade Agostinho Neto, Luanda, Angola

## Email address:

kalendaneto23abril@gmail.com (J. Pedro), julianangolar@gmail.com (C. Katala), eugeniosalessu@gmail.com (E. Salessu)

\*Corresponding author

## To cite this article:

João Pedro, Celestino Katala, Eugênio Salessu. Morphosyntactic Approach in Conducting Adversative Connectors in Texts Produced by Students of the 12<sup>th</sup> Grade: Analysis of the Portuguese of Angola Norm. *Reports*. Vol. 2, No. 1, 2022, pp. 7-16.

doi: 10.11648/j.reports.20220201.12

**Received:** January 10, 2022; **Accepted:** January 28, 2022; **Published:** February 25, 2022

---

**Abstract:** This research has as its theme a morphosyntactic approach in the conduction of adversative connectors in texts written by students of the 12<sup>th</sup> grade, of the Economic and Legal Sciences Course, at São José de Cluny in Malanje, Angola. The main objective is: (i) to describe the morphological and syntactic approach in conducting adversative connectors in texts written by students; (ii) Analyze the theoretical foundations that support the relations of meaning of the morphosyntactic approach in the regency of adversative connectors in texts written by 12<sup>th</sup> grade students; (iii) Propose teaching and learning strategies for the regency of adversative connectors in the classes to be taught to the students in question and, then, observe if the use of these connectors are appropriate for the moment in which they are being used in the sentence, that is, if correspond to the students' communicative intentions. Therefore, to collect and perform an interpretative analysis of the data, we used comparative, observational, statistical methods, and techniques such as direct observation, pedagogical test, questionnaires applied to students and interviews applied to teachers. The results of this research point to the following conclusions: the adversative connectors present different syntactic positions. The *mas* does not have the same mobility as other connectors, that is, the *mas* is used only at the beginning of the adversative clause, while the *however*, *nevertheless*, *however* and *however* are positioned both at the beginning of the adversative and after the subject. or after the predicate. It was also found that there is a failure with regard to the production of argumentative texts, as it seems to us that teachers have not promoted the scope that connectors have in oral/written discourses, the lack of predominance of implicit and explicit teaching of grammar makes so that teachers do not awaken the great impact of the production of argumentative texts.

**Keywords:** Approach, Morphology, Syntax, Conduct, Connectors

---

## 1. Introduction

The teaching practice allowed us to approach ungrammatical constructions within the scope of the regency of adversative connectors in the texts written by the students of the 12<sup>th</sup> class of the Economic and Legal Sciences Course, in the students of the Secondary School of São José de Cluny in Malanje, Angola.

From the perspective that in languages, there are

mechanisms of cohesion that operate within sentences and in the articulation between sentences, which can be grammatical and lexical and involve not only the learner's ability to compose correct utterances as well as knowledge of rules in the appropriate use. in a given context. When an individual writes or speaks, his intention is to be understood by the reader or listener, so that both share the same meaning.

In this research, the analyzes of the regency occurrence of the adversative connectors in the texts of the students in question were made from the following variations: denial of

expectation, semantic opposition, connectors as cohesion mechanisms by the marking of semantic nexuses, syntactic description of the adversative connectors, description semantics of adversative connectors, cases in which adversative connectors mark a change in the discursive topic, inappropriate use of adversative connectors, use of adversative connectors in unrecommended situations, use of connectors in contexts in which another should be selected, because they are the that we find mostly expressed in their texts, which proves that the argumentative text favors the use of adversatives with these specific values.

The argumentative text seeks to reflect, to explain, associating itself with analysis, criticism and, therefore, with argumentation. With this, it is necessary to make reference to the cases in which the so-called adversative connectors give rise to textual products superior to the period, that is, they signal the change of discursive topic, since it is possible to verify the case of the genre in the same texts [1].

In this configuration, when the argumentative use of this construction is verified, the contrast is also verified at the level of the conclusions that each of the arguments supports.

## 2. Synthesis of the Concept on Approach

According to Álvares; Houaiss, “approach is the first contact with a certain subject or problem; [...] way of looking at something (p. 10) [1, 2].

It is in this perspective that, through the methods and instruments of data collection, it was possible to verify ungrammatical sentence structures regarding the morphological and syntactic approach in the regency of adversative connectors in the students of the school in question.

## 3. Morphosyntax

Syntax deals with the study of the relationships that words establish with each other in clauses, relationships between clauses in sentences. When words and sentences are related, discourses are created, that is, the language is effectively used to satisfy all communication and expression needs. Knowledge of syntax is, therefore, an essential tool for the satisfactory handling of the multiple possibilities that exist for combining words and clauses [4, 5].

It is in this morphological and syntactic perspective that morphology as an area of linguistics that has the word as an object of study, study and analyze the forms of words and the processes of their formation.

## 4. Concept of Regency: Summary Approach

From the perspective of Cunha and Cintra regency is the irreversible movement from a ruling term to a ruled term. The governed term is recognized for being the one that is necessarily required by the other (2014, p. 642) [5].

Example: the conjunction *although*, requires the verb in

the subjunctive, but the verb in the subjunctive does not necessarily require the conjunction *although*; therefore the conjunction is the governing term, and the verb form the governed term.

In other words, the regency would be seen as the part of the grammar that deals with the relationships between the terms of the sentence, verifying how the dependence between them is established [6].

In addition to what Cunha and Cintra presents to us, the name of regent is attributed to the term that asks for the complement (*sento*), as in (E3) and of regent to the complement (*of the mother*), as in (E4) [5].

(E3). In that moment, I feel my mother's love.

(E4). My mother's love.

In (E3), there is a dependence between the constituents of the clause, thus forming a significant whole. In the sentence referred to, the verb (*ruling term*) is directly linked to its complement (*ruled term*), establishing a relationship of dependence.

The aphorism “words fly, writing remains”. It marks an essential distinction between two products of the speech act – writing and orality.

In fact, oral and written speeches start by being distinguished by the communication situation – usually done in the presence and with the air channel, orally; deferred and having by means of a lasting material, made in writing [5].

For Casanova, the “text is coherent when its logical-semantic organization around a topic allows it to be correctly interpreted by the recipient's cognitive schemes” (p. 258) [6].

## 5. Adversative Connectors

### 5.1. Prior Approach

Adversative connectors “are discourse articulators that link two terms or two clauses in which one of the elements carries an idea of contrast [...], words that invariably relate two or more clauses of a clause [7].

Connectors as cohesion mechanisms, by marking semantic links between textual segments

Traditional grammars, instead of connecting, use the term conjunction to designate the means available to the language to establish the connection between words, groups of words and phrases and, simultaneously, to express certain semantic relationships between the linked units. Grammatical tradition has also identified conjunctions as elements with a function of linking between sentences or between sentences expressed by sentences [9].

The connected semantic entities can be of different nature, that is, they can correspond to material segments of the text, to enunciations and to the implicit contents;

- 1) The same connection movement can involve more than two entities (for example, the structure *p BUT q* involves, in addition to the arguments *p* and *q*, the implicit conclusions associated with them (*r* and not - *r* respectively);
- 2) When the connector articulates material segments of the

text, these segments are not guaranteed to occur immediately to the left or right of the connector (in the example *Lalas has already arrived. In fact, his car is parked there. But you have nothing to do with that is, the antecedent of the connector but not the segment that immediately precedes it, but the one that occurs further to the left*);

- 3) The dimension of the connected textual segments is not predictable from the start: as Vilela emphasizes, a connector can articulate entire paragraphs.

Connective adverbs are used to establish links between sentences or constituents. These can be in subordination or coordination relationships [8].

Among several connective adverbs we present: *however, however, then, so, etc.*

For the same author, connective adverbs can have two uses: either they are used in a context in which they establish a connection between, for example, two sentences, as in (1):

- (1) *I am sick, yet I am going to work; or are used only to reinforce a connection expressed by a conjunction, as in (2):*
- (2) *Almost all birds fly, but penguins, however, do not.*

The distinction between connective adverbs and conjunctions can also be established on the basis of syntactic criteria, that is, on the basis of the mobility of connective adverbs. Conjunctions always appear at the beginning of the second clause, as can be seen in (3):

- (3) *Lalas is sick, but Maria has replaced him.*

The occurrence of these in another position makes the sentence ungrammatical, as seen in (4):

- (4) *Lalas is sick, Maria, but replaces him.*

In turn, connective adverbs can occupy other positions, occurring between the subject and the predicate or between the verb and its complements, as can be seen in (5) and (6):

- (5) *Lalas is sick, he goes yet to class.*
- (6) *Lalas is sick, yet he goes to class.*

Therefore, the connector function can be associated with different grammatical categories, coordination conjunctions, subordination conjunctions, adverbial expressions and prepositionals with a connective function. In Moura perspective, for both Portuguese and other languages, coordination conjunctions and coordination connectors: the former correspond to copulative conjunctions (*and, nor*), disjunctive (*or, or...or..., neither...nor..., now... now..., wants... wants...*) and adversatives (*but, if not*) (p. 165); the second comprise contrastive (*but, nevertheless, however, nevertheless, nevertheless*), explanatory (*since, because, because, inasmuch*) and conclusive (*so, therefore, so, therefore, therefore, consequently, consequently, consequently*) connectors [4].

Relating to the concept presented by Moura, we found that the established distinction has to do with the fact that the (currently called) coordination connectors do not manifest all the formal properties attributed to the connectors, as we can see in the following point, when we establish the differences between the *but* and the other adversative connectors [4].

## 5.2. Syntactic Description of Adversative Connectors

The main adversative connector, both in Portuguese and in most European languages, is *mas*, and its correspondent in other languages, so a large part of the studies on adversative constructions has been based on the analysis of syntactic-semantic behavior of this unit (cf., for example, [10]).

According to Tomás, (2003), cited by Ducrot emphasizes that:

“in addition to *but*, the traditional grammar is practically unanimous in presenting *however, however, nevertheless, nevertheless and however* as other adversative coordinative conjunctive connectors. In syntactic terms, these connectors do not all present the same behaviors, clearly distinguishing themselves from the others (p. 183)” [11].

It is also convenient to draw attention to the implications of opting for structures with *but*. The enunciative game composed of the opposition between the enunciators, the argumentative orientation and the articulation between the two clauses creates several paths in the textual organization [12].

Initially, we showed that *but* is only used at the beginning of the adversative clause, as shown again in (7):

- (7) *Nzola rang the doorbell, but Kiese didn't answer.*

If this connector occupies other positions, the sentence will become ungrammatical:

- (8) *Nzola rang the doorbell, Kiese but did not answer.*  
 (9) *Nzola rang the doorbell, Kiese didn't answer it.*  
 (10) *Nzola rang the doorbell, Kiese didn't answer.*

This fact does not occur with the other connectors under study, whose positions in the sentences may be different: at the beginning of the adversative clause, as illustrated in (11), after the subject, as attested in (12) and after the predicate, as shown in is verified in (13):

- (11) *Nzola rang the bell, however/however/however... Kiese didn't answer.*  
 (12) *Nzola rang the bell, Kiese nevertheless/however/however... did not answer.*  
 (13) *Did Nzola ring the bell? Kiese did not answer yet/however/however...*

Tomás (2003) also established differences between these units, reaching the conclusion that such difference passes through the mobility they present (p. 71-73). This author, similarly to what was exposed by Koch, through syntactic tests, also proved that all of them can occur in absolute beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> member; simply, while for *but* this is the only acceptable position, the remaining units are more mobile (p. 531) [12].

Still according to Tomás, another of the main differences is the possibilities of combining these units with the copulative coordinating conjunction *e*. While *mas* resists this combinatorics (cf. 14), such resistance does not seem to be verified with the remaining units, as can be seen in (15):

- (14) *The order was sent a month ago and the post office still hasn't delivered it.*  
 (15) *The order was sent a month ago and, however/however/however/however/however, the post office still hasn't delivered it.*

As can be seen in examples (7) to (15), in adversative structures the clause order is fixed. The clause that contains the adversative connector always appears in second place, and cannot occur at the beginning of the structure. In examples (14) and (15) it is quite evident that the connector *but* cannot co-occur with the copulative conjunction, and co-occurrence is allowed by the remaining units.

To complete the inventory on the differences between these units, Tomás made an approach to their behavior in the face of the syntactic-semantic tests presented by Nascimento *et al.*, namely, the possibility of fitting the construction resulting from the connection as a complement to a verb, as in (19) [14]:

(16) *Lalas knows that [the parcel was sent a month ago, but the post office still hasn't delivered it].*

In utterance (16), the two sentences of the construction in parentheses work as a complement to the verb, that is, *Lalas* knows that the package was sent a month ago and also knows that the post office has not yet delivered it.

Now let's see what happens to the structure that involves the other adversative connectors:

(17) *Lalas knows that [the parcel was sent a month ago, but/however/however/however/however the post office still hasn't delivered it].*

In (17), the phrase introduced by *however, however...* does not seem to work as a complement to the verb to know: *Lalas* only knows that the order was sent a month ago.

Another test presented by Tomás is the possibility of the occurrence of the final product resulting from the connection in the scope of an adverb of phrase, as in (18):

(18) *Possibly [the parcel was sent a month ago but the post office still hasn't delivered it].*

In utterance (18), the entire structure in parentheses is in the scope of the sentence adverb. See now (19):

(19) *Possibly [the parcel was sent a month ago, however/however/however/however the post office still hasn't delivered it].*

In (19) only the first proposition is within the scope of the same adverb. From these tests, it is possible to conclude, and according to Mudiambo, that the adversative constructions with *but* are phrasal products, while the adversative constructions with *however, however, nevertheless, nevertheless* and *however* are non-phrase textual products (pp. 777-784) [15].

All the previously mentioned differences support the opposition/distinction between *but* and the other connectors. Thus, it seems clear that *but* illustrates the characteristics of prototype adversative connectors (*but* it is a coordinating conjunction that gives rise to the complex sentence), whereas *however, however, however, nevertheless* and *however* behave differently, hence the designation of “connective adverbs”.

### 5.3. Semantic Description of Adversative Connectors

Adversative connectors have a contrast value primarily, although they may, cumulatively, convey other values [7].

The semantic aspects of adversative constructions have

been studied, above all, from the analysis of the *but* connector, in such a way that several uses of *mas* have been identified. Although we do not want to generalize the adversative values of *mas* to all constructions in which they occur, we believe that the values identified configure a more or less complete picture of the semantics of adversative constructions.

In our study on adversative connectors, we understand semantic differences as all those that concern the meaning, content, and value of connectors. This meaning will be established through traits that will determine the differences and similarities between the values of the connectors, guiding their use in the texts produced by the students. The semantic approach, in this research, was supported by studies by Ducrot, from which we distributed the variations of meanings of the adversative connectors in two groups, as we will see below. We also agree with the observations that the authors make about the impossibility of determining in a closed way the various semantic manifestations of the so-called adversative connectors [11].

In fact, our analysis can take place through approximations. We also note that we are taking into account all occurrences of these connectors, regardless of their location in the sentence: beginning, middle or end.

In this context, we propose two basic variations of meaning for adversative connectors, namely, expectation denial and semantic opposition. Thus, when we define the significant features for the connectors *but, however, however, however, nevertheless, however, as of negation of expectation and of semantic opposition*, these features will be seen within a theory of enunciation. Let's see the following examples:

1) Denial of expectation → in the construction *p but/ however/ nevertheless/ nevertheless/ however/ however q*, *q* denies the expectation opened by *p*. In fact, the denial of expectation involves a contrast between the expectation opened by the first member and what is stated in the second (*p*→*r* and *q* cancel *r*, since it corresponds to  $\sim r$ ).

See (20):

(20) *Nzola prepared for the exam (p), but/ however/ however/ nevertheless/ however/ however he did not pass the class. (q)*

In (20), it is stated that, even having prepared for the exam, *Pedro* did not pass the class. We realize that *q* denies the expectation opened by *p* insofar as it is declared that the action (to prepare for the exam) did not have the expected effect (to pass the class). This analysis converges with the proposal of [16]: when enunciating *p*, the speaker expresses an argument that points to a conclusion *r* (implicit), a conclusion that *q* nullifies.

2) Semantic opposition → *p* and *q* describe two situations that contrast with each other, as in (21):

(21) *Kiesse is very organized (p), but/ however/ nevertheless/ nevertheless/...her friend is disorganized (q).*

In (21) we observe that the clause (q) introduced by the

adversative connectors does not present any negation of expectation opened by the clause (p), but simply contrasts antithetically two situations, that is, Kiese is organized, while the friend is disorganized. We also noticed that in the contrast between the two statements there is the same characteristic or property (being organized) that lends itself to a comparison.

It is important to point out, at this point, that the contrast can often serve an argumentative strategy, in a situation where a construction of type p but q presupposes a certain conclusion r, for which p is the argument and q is a counter-argument., as illustrated by the dialogue situation shown in example (22).

(22)A: We have to hire a secretary to be part of our work team.

B: We already have two candidates in view, Kiese and her friend Njinga. In your opinion, who will we stay with?

A: (p) Kiese is very committed, but disorganized (q).

The connector mas in the dialogue (22) is an indicator to the addressee/reader/listener that the conclusion that would normally be deduced from p will not take place, since q is stronger. Concretely: being very committed is a favorable argument for choosing Patricia (conclusion r), but being disorganized is an unfavorable argument for this choice (conclusion ~r). The argument presented in the second clause (q) has more argumentative weight than the one in the first (p).

The meaning of the argument of the whole sentence is found in the second clause or in the second argument; this, therefore, is the clincher. Speaker "A" does not advocate hiring Kiese, so it is inferred that he advocates hiring Njinga.

Therefore, when there is an argumentative use of this construction, the contrast is also verified in terms of the conclusions that each of the arguments supports.

#### **5.4. Situations in Which Adversative Connectors Mark the Change of Discursive Topic**

Throughout the research we made reference to the denial of expectation and the semantic opposition. However, in the same texts, we found that the adversative connectors, in addition to giving rise to complex sentences by coordination, also initiate a new period, marking the change of discursive topic, giving rise to cohesive and coherent textual products. Let's look at the following example:

(23) (p) "...at the moment there is a great deficit of semi-collective transport, known as taxi, due to the apprehension that the police have made about illegal taxis, but it is these same illegal taxis that free us from the daily grind. day". (q).

In (23) but should start a new period, through the use of a full stop, as it does not introduce an adversative clause. We believe that this connector introduces a new stage of the student's argumentation, a new discursive topic, not contrasting situations, nor denying an expectation. By underlining that "it is these same illegal taxis that free us from the daily grips", the student intends to lead the reader to conclude that "the police should not apprehend illegal taxis".

This change of discursive topic can also be seen in example (4), as can be seen below:

(24) (p) "The international crisis is accused of being the biggest influencer in the problem of prices, but in neighboring countries prices are in equilibrium". (q).

In this example, similarly to what happened in (24), before the however there should be a full stop. We believe that here, too, there is no contrast or denial of expectation.

In addition to the examples indicated above, we present below other cases in which the adversative connectors also seem to interconnect textual segments superior to the period, marking a change of discursive topic:

As can be seen from the examples presented, the adversative connectors not only give rise to complex sentences by coordination, that is, they do not always articulate adversative clauses, but also mark the change of discursive topic, with the new topic starting an argumentative course that from somehow contrasts with the argued orientation of the preceding utterance.

#### **5.5. Inappropriate Application of Adversative Connectors**

One of the functional characteristics of adversative connectors is the fact that they have a processing meaning that basically consists of the possibility that they have to give instructions on how the conceptual information present in each of the connected units should be processed.

From this point of view, it is possible to perceive that connectors, in general, are not simply elements that serve to unite the parts (phrases, clauses, utterances) of a text. In fact, they are such important linguistic items in a text, and the inappropriate use of one or the other can cause communicative problems [10].

In the texts written by the students, we found the existence of several cases of inappropriate use of adversative connectors, namely: use of connectors in contexts that do not authorize or legitimize the use of this connector (the connector is too much) and use of connectors in contexts where another one should be selected, as we will see below.

#### **5.6. Use of Adversative Connectors in Situations Where They Are Not Recommended**

During the investigation, we found situations of textual inconsistency, that is, situations in which the connectors express a contrastive nexus in a context that does not authorize it: the propositional contents of (p) and (q) do not maintain any antithetical opposition between them. On the other hand, (p) does not activate an inference nullified by (q). Observe the following example:

(25) (p) "It used to be a serious problem, but these days Angolan roads seem small. Even with the increase in transport, it is still not possible to reach certain localities or districts [...]". (q).

In (25), the connector mas expresses a contrastive nexus in a context that does not authorize it, since between propositions (p) and (q) there is no relation of an oppositional character. Under normal conditions, in this example, the

connector *mas* should indicate an inversion of the argumentative orientation, introducing the strongest argument that would guide the discourse towards the desired conclusion, which does not happen. The same situation can be seen in the following example:

(26) (p) “In our country, transport problems are vast and cause us several inconveniences in our daily routines. But although there are transports, they are often lacking due to the illegal change of routes diverted by the drivers themselves”. (q).

In example (26), the connector *but* could be deleted without causing changes in direction. That is, the connector seems to be too much, it was added improperly. The semantic sequence of the text is guaranteed by the concessive introduced by *although* [12].

From the examples presented above, it can be attested that, in cases where the adversative connectors express a contrastive nexus in a context that does not authorize it, the text becomes incoherent.

### 5.7. Use of Adversative Connectors in Situations Where Another Should Be Selected

As we have already mentioned, in the work in excerpt we also found situations of textual inconsistency, that is, cases in which adversative connectors are used in contexts in which another should be selected. Observe the following examples:

(27) (p) “There is a transport problem in Angola, however, if we go to check, at the stops, especially at those times called rush hours, we can see that there has been a lot of flooding”. (q).

(28) (p) “In our country it is very difficult to find transport in the right conditions to reach the workplace on time, however many workers as well as students arrive late to their sector because of transport”. (q).

In examples (27) and (28), the use of *however* and *however* is completely inappropriate. In our view, in these examples, the appropriate connector seems to be a reinforcer, for example “*de facto*” or “*in effect*” (markers of a reinforcement of what was said above). This situation can also be verified in (29):

(29)(p) “It is to be believed that we live in an underdeveloped country, however we demonstrate the lack of organization to try to minimize the problem”. (q).

As can be seen at this point, similarly to what happened in the previous point, in cases where adversative connectors are used in contexts in which another should be selected, the text also becomes incoherent.

## 6. Teaching Strategies - Learning to Conduct Adversative Connectors

According to Aitchison (1993) cited by Lima “teaching the grammar of the Portuguese language at the basic level is, without a doubt, a complex issue [...]”. (p. 103) [18].

So far, according to Lima, no solution has been found for teaching grammar that is applied to all students or that can

help them master all grammatical rules”. This complexity is also felt at the secondary level, since, as at the basic level, a solution for teaching grammar has not yet been found at this level [18].

This fact can be seen, for example, when teaching the functional rules of adversative connectors. When these rules are taught, the connectors are presented to the students only at the level of the connection of clauses, in the context of the complex sentence by coordination, not having their textual/argumentative function in perspective. For this question, there is a wide range of methodological options, for example, the so-called explicit and implicit teaching. These options can be taken into account when teaching and learning how to use adversative connectors, as we will see below.

## 7. Explicit and Implicit Teaching of the Regency of Adversative Connectors

According to Lima considers that “grammar is being taught in an “explicit way when students are provided with rules or part of grammatical rules [...]” [18].

Therefore, taking into account this approach, regarding the explicit and implicit teaching of adversative connectors, it is first possible to explain to students what is the semantic value of these connectors, and that in addition to *but*, grammarians are practically unanimous in presenting *however*, *however*, *nevertheless* and *however* like other adversative coordinative conjunctive connectors. Second, explain to them that, in syntactic terms, these connectors do not have all the same behavior, clearly distinguishing themselves from the others, presenting examples such as those in subheadings 4.; 41.; 42.; 4.3 and following, submitting them, for example, to the classification of clauses, within the scope of the complex sentence by coordination, clarifying, through paradigmatic examples, the semantic links expressed (cf. [19]).

In explicit teaching, it is important to work on several connectors, in the exercises, and not just the *but*. Students' writing would be richer if they were able to mobilize a diverse use of connectors. In other words, the explicit knowledge of the language, and in this case the various connectors that mark contrast (in a broad sense), will certainly translate into the ability to mobilize it in situations of written production.

The explicit teaching of grammar also involves aspects of a semantic nature and not just formal, morphosyntactic aspects. This teaching can promote higher levels of linguistic literacy, and consequently promote a higher level of language mastery, with repercussions in terms of writing [20].

We suggest this methodology because we believe that students who receive grammar instruction can outperform those who do not, both in terms of speed of acquisition and in terms of the level of competence attained. However, this does not mean that the student needs to memorize grammatical rules, but rather focus on form, and explicitly analyze the semantic nexus conveyed by the adversative connector.

From our point of view, it is not enough to focus only on

explicit teaching, as the student, in an attempt to use models provided by the teacher or teaching materials, may end up making mistakes about generalization, that is, applying a certain rule in an inappropriate context.

In view of the above, we agree with the idea that it is necessary for the explicit teaching of the use of adversative connectors to also place a space for implicit teaching, that is, for the creation of opportunities for the “natural” use of these connectors, that is, the closest possible use to that found in authentic situations. In this way, the competence to use these connectors will also be acquired as a mere consequence of focusing the student's attention on meaning [21].

Taking into account Pascual, according to which the teacher's role in this process is quite significant, as he must employ techniques that help the student to discover the basic variations in the meaning of adversative connectors, such as: denial of expectation, semantic opposition, among others [20].

So, first, teacher can propose to the student to create certain structures, or to write a text to verify how he uses the adversative connectors.

Second, he can try to make the student reflect on what he has already produced, taking into account the basic variations of meaning mentioned above. These mechanisms will provide an account of what the student is able to learn and what he or she has not. Third, the teacher can choose a text that contains the adversative connectors, recommend that students identify them within the periods and explain their functionality within these periods, that is, identify and explain the semantic values established by these connectors, within the periods. where they are.

It is also important that students carry out several group works, choosing a topic to discuss, in order to force them to create ideas and develop them. In addition to this exercise, students can practice exercises inside and outside the classroom, such as analysis and interpretation of texts and comprehension tests.

## 8. Results of the Questionnaires

In this section, we proceed to present in a general way, the data evidenced in the theoretical framework and the influence of the data collected through the pedagogical test applied to the students of the 12<sup>th</sup> grade as well as the questionnaires applied to them, which made it possible to verify that the syntax of the adversative connectors, from the perspective of discursive cohesion and coherence, and we comment on the functionality of these connectors within each period, in relation to the text as a significant whole.

*Table 1. Results of the pedagogical test applied to students*

Category	Variable	Negative Frequency	Frequency Percentage
What are the adversative connectors you know?	Yes	12	40%
	No	18	60%
	Total	30	100%

After analyzing the table, we were able to obtain the following results: 12 students, representing 40%, responded

that They know the adversative connectors, such as words that connect sentences (clauses); 18 students, representing 60%, did not respond, which leads to say that They are unaware of these essential elements that articulate the sentences, from the perspective of argumentative textual production.

According to Varela, “connectors or conjunctions are means that establish the connection between words, groups of words and phrases and, simultaneously, to express certain relationships between the linked units” (p. 259) [9].

### 8.1. Results of the Interview Guides Addressed to Students

We also analyzed the data chosen through the interview applied to the (30) students who are part of our sample.

In the first question we asked students about (what do you think about adversative connectors?), of the (30) students questioned, (21) what represents (70%) declared not to know rigorously the concept of connectors, while (05) the equivalent of (16.6%) confirmed knowing their concept and their preponderance. Which means that most students have no idea about the subject. Because, the lack of knowledge of them presupposes the irrelevance of the study of connectors in the regency scope.

And (04) students who represent (13.3%) stressed that they have more or less the idea of what it was about. Thus, it gives us the idea that there has not been much dynamics on the part of the teachers, with regard to the illustration of the mobility of adversative connectors, during their classes. Because, from the statement that the students presented to us, we can see that in order to better understand the phenomenon of the morphosyntactic approach of adversative connectors, it is important to previously understand the scope of the morphology and syntax of the connectors, since according to Quivuna, it is through which the argumentative textual function of oral/written discourses is understood, making the discourse coherence and cohesion (p. 165) [17].

Therefore, we think that in order to develop students' linguistic and communicative competence, it starts precisely from what Duarte encourages, that linguistic competence designates the knowledge of the language, in several aspects [...], organization of sentences in sentences and identification of meaning (p. 20) [22].

As for the second question about (what are the adversative connectors you know? and how do they articulate?), through the interview, we noticed that (22) students they represent (73.30%) declared not to know, and (8) students representing (26.70%) responded positively.

Pointing out the author's idea above, we understand that, firstly, the teachers had to identify and define the adversative connectors, what is their semantic value. Then explain to them that, in syntactic terms, these connectors do not behave in the same way.

In the third question (why do adversative connectors provide textual coherence and cohesion?). We verified that, (20) students who represent (66.7%), showed not having the slightest notion about the subject, and (10) students who make up (33.3%) answered in a clumsy way.

These contradictory data, from the students' answers, make us deduce that there is much to be done. This leads us to say that teachers are not creating argumentative texts so that students can express themselves freely and then explain to them the value that connectors in texts have and how a text should be coherent and consequently cohesive.

It is necessary that “the explicit teaching of the use of adversative connectors also gives way to implicit teaching, that is, the creation of opportunities for the natural use of these connectors [...], in this way, the competence to use these connectors will also be acquired as mere consequence of focusing the student's attention on meaning [24].

In the fourth question, which asks about (in Your assessment, why do you think sentences can be coordinated to each other through conjunctions and coordinating phrases?), (17) students represent Him (56.6%), answered that it is the conjunctions that link the words. And, (10) students who represent (33.3%), subscribed that they only know the sentences within the complex sentence, where, for example, the coordinated conjunctions causes, temporals, etc. And, (03) students who represent (10%), responded, pointing out that conjunctions or connectors are words that connect the sentences and that can change their meaning depending on their use.

With this, we realize that students have poor knowledge about sentence organization, coordination and use of sentence connectors from a syntactic-semantic point of view.

In the view of Mudiambo (2014), in the “text it is possible to find not only linguistic or systematic procedures of the language, but also all the possibilities of using speech” (p. 222) [23].

With this, We think that the textual analyzes that we propose do not take place in a superficial way, but in a way that a study is carried out that involves the syntactic, semantic and pragmatic components in an integrated way.

## **8.2. Result of the Interview Applied to Teachers**

Seeking to ascertain the knowledge about the morphosyntactic approach in the conduction of adversative connectors, we selected three questions that made up the range of responses from teachers.

When conducting the interview, we found that one of the professors is precisely unaware of the syntactic function of the adversative connectors and, as if that were not enough, he showed that he was unprepared to teach the Portuguese language subject, since he is training in Sociology, misfitting from the specialty principle mentioned by [17].

In the perspective of Quivuna “the fact of being a speaker of a language does not impel the reflexive and systematized level of that language to be able to teach it” (p. 119) [13].

On the subject in the paragraph above, we think that teachers have to administer specific subjects that meet their areas of academic training [22].

Likewise, Mudiambo describes that “the role of language didactics within interdisciplinarity centers on the fact that each and every subject must be taught through a language dominated by the actors of the teaching-educational process” (p. 19) [23].

This time, the correct use of the language by the teacher when teaching a certain school subject, will contribute to the development of skills to a sophisticated linguistic mastery. It is in this aspect that it is advisable that the teacher has training in teaching the Portuguese language.

We are to make it clear that we have no objection to this, we only agree with the principles presented by the academic professionals described above.

Regarding the first question (what dynamics does the teacher use so that students have the ability to identify adversative connectors and their functions in a text? texts where there are numerous connectors, and ask students to identify the adversative connectors, the difference between *mas* and the rest, so that students learn to argue about a certain subject, rigorously teach topics related to the functioning of the language, etc.

The second teacher, who is the head of the class in which we work, did not know how to respond precisely, leaving the conversation blank.

However, we ask the following: if the teacher is one of the main elements of the teaching-learning process, if not even the class advisor, how can he not master the themes to be addressed? How can he help his students to progress if he himself has no mastery over inherent matters? Facts to ponder.

To give sustainability to the statements coming from the teachers, let's stick to what Katala and Pedro highlighted when he said that “the teacher is the one who has didactic mastery [...] students [24].

In the second question, (being a Portuguese language teacher, how would you make the teaching of Portuguese language be seen as a priority from the point of view of the morphosyntax of adversative connectors?). The first teacher recognized that it is necessary to invest in the teaching of the Portuguese language, as it is the language of schooling and that all teachers use to teach other subjects. For, when you have enough arguments about the vernacular language, it is easier to interpret other disciplines. Already, the second teacher thinks that the big problem is in the programs, teaching materials that do not fit for everyone, low salaries, etc. response that, in our view, are not justifiable.

According to Mudiambo “at the level of the scientific-pedagogical dimension, the teacher must have current knowledge, solidly based on a reflective and interactive practice, in at least three domains”: language training, psychological training and pedagogical training [15].

Along with the above, it gives us to understand that the fact of reading grammars or any material whatsoever, does not qualify any teacher to teach the Portuguese language subject, it is necessary and imperative that he be a specialist in teaching the Portuguese language.

In fact, teachers with this didactic-pedagogical limitation do not reveal themselves in what [24] tells us, when they state that “teacher is seen as a guardian, the one who is the transmitter of knowledge and values [...]”.

In this way, we think that this teacher has several functions: to inform, to conserve, to renew, to animate, to organize, to

evaluate and to educate. Well, that's the teacher you want these days. The one who sees himself in the change and growth of man and not the one who only thinks about money, etc.

## 9. Conclusions

From the morphosyntactic approach of the regency of adversative connectors, and through the methods and techniques of investigation, we reach some conclusions that we believe to be the most important of this investigation.

The results showed that it is necessary to propose activities to students in which the adversative connectors and their mobilities are highlighted, which aim to help them to argue. In addition, it is important and necessary that you use the grammatical mechanisms available in the grammars of the Portuguese language.

We verified that students only know the connectors at the connection level of complex sentences, and not in the context in which they must respect the logical and semantic-pragmatic relationships that allow the conception of a unit of meaning, considering its textual/argumentative function.

We also verified that the head teacher of the class in question does not have sufficient knowledge to teach the subject of Portuguese Language, since he is studying Sociology and not teaching Portuguese. Teacher does not give place to implicit teaching, so that students create opportunities for the natural use of adversative connectors.

We assume that teacher is not equipped with knowledge, with regard to pedagogical interventions that aim to promote effective language learning, especially with regard to the morphosyntactic approach of adverbial connectors.

Therefore, we presented teaching strategies - learning in the context of the regency of Adversative Connectors, taking into account the approach, in relation to the explicit and implicit teaching of the adversative connectors, according to which, and in the perspective of several authoritative authors in the matter; explain to the students first what is the semantic value of these connectors, and that in addition to but, grammarians are practically unanimous in presenting however, however, however, however and however as other adversative coordinating conjunctive connectors. Second, explain to them that, in syntactic terms, these connectors do not have all the same behavior, clearly distinguishing themselves from the others, presenting examples such as those in points 4.; 4.1.; 4.2. and subsequent ones and submitting them, for example, to the classification of clauses, in the context of the complex sentence by coordination, clarifying, through paradigmatic examples, the expressed semantic links.

## References

- [1] Alvares, Carlos. (2001). An Introduction to the Study of Literary Text. Notions of Linguistics and Literacy. From Basic to Secondary. New Edition – Revised and Updated, 1<sup>st</sup> Ed. Lisbon. Editorial didactics.
- [2] HOUAISS ELECTRONIC DICTIONARY, of the Portuguese Language: Version 2. Oa/April 2007, Copyright 2001.2007. António Houaiss Institute, produced and distributed by Editora Objectiva Ltda.
- [3] Tavares and Camacho (2014). Dictionary of the Portuguese Language: Plátano Editora.
- [4] Moura, José de Almeida. (2006). Current Portuguese Grammar. Lisbon: Texts Editors.
- [5] Cunha, C. and Cintra, L. (2014). New grammar of contemporary Portuguese. Lisbon: João Sá da Costa.
- [6] Casanova, Isabel (2012). Portuguese for the World (Book of Grammatical Activities). Plantano Publisher.
- [7] Costa, João (2010). Modern Grammar of the Portuguese Language. School Publisher. Coseriu, E. (1956). Determination and surroundings. In: Coseriu, E. (1967). Teoriadellenguaje and Linguisticagenerale. Madrid: Gredos.
- [8] Costa, J. (2008). Adverbs in European Portuguese. Lisbon: Calibri.
- [9] Varela, L. (2000). Towards a semantics of concessive and adversative constructions in Portuguese. Master's dissertation in Linguistics presented to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Lisbon.
- [10] Tomás, O. C. C. (2003). Contrastive discursive markers: contribution to a semantic-pragmatic analysis in European Portuguese. Master's dissertation in General Linguistics presented to the Faculty of Arts of the University of Coimbra.
- [11] Ducrot, O. (1980). Leséchelle argumentatives. Paris Minuit.
- [12] Koch, Ingedore Villaça & Elias, Vanda Maria (2013). Reading and Understanding the Meanings of the Text, 3<sup>rd</sup> Ed, 8<sup>th</sup> reprint São Paulo: Context.
- [13] Quivuna, Manuel (2014). Lexicology Applied to the Teaching of the Lexicon in Portuguese Non-Mother Language. Edições Colibri, Fernando Mão de Ferro; 2014.
- [14] Nascimento, M. H. M. et al (2008). *Gramática da língua portuguesa*. 6<sup>a</sup> ed. Lisboa: Caminho. DUCROT, O. (1980). *Leséchelle argumentatives*. Paris Minuit.
- [15] Mudiambo, Quibongue. (2010). Special Methodology for Teaching the Portuguese Language. Uíge. Train Portuguese Today Teachers in Our Community.
- [16] Lopes, M; Pinto, M; Acevedo, (2014). Practical Grammar of Portuguese. Lisbon
- [17] Quivuna, Manuel. (2008). Introduction to Linguistic Studies. Uíge. Pedagogical Manual – Didactic.
- [18] Lima, Rocha (1986). The articulatory syntax of speech. Lisbon Texts Editors.
- [19] Azevedo, Fernando Jose Fraga. (2010). Portuguese Language Methodology. University Collection – Teaching Methodology 1. Luanda. Angola. Plural Editors.
- [20] Pascuall, Ulysses. (2011). Grammar of the Portuguese Language. New Edition.
- [21] Vilela, M. and Koch, I. G. V. (2001). Grammar of the Portuguese language. Coimbra: Almedina.

- [22] Duarte, I. (2003). Linguistic aspects of textual organization. In: Mateus, M. H. M. et al (2003). Grammar of the Portuguese language. 6<sup>th</sup> ed. Lisbon: Way. DUCROT, O. (1980). Leséchelle argumentatives. Paris Minuit. Teaching. Lisbon: Edições Colibri, Fernando Mão de Ferro; 2014.
- [23] Mudiambo, Quibongue. Linguistic Studies on Lexicology and Learning Lexicography (Applied) to Portuguese Language
- [24] Katala, Celestino; Pedro, João. D. Didactic Approach to s Real Teaching of Portuguese Second Language in Angola. International Journal os Science and Society. Vol. 9, 5, pp. 209-215. Doi: 10.11648/ijsts.20210905.11.