

COGNITIVE CONSTRUCTIVIST MEMORY ORGANIZATION (CCMO) IN USING “*CONSISTENT PRONOUN I*”, AS COHESIVE DEVICES IN ESSAY WRITING IN ENGLISH (COMPARATIVE APPROACH WITH ALBANIAN)

<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3596512>

UDC 37.091.3:81'243

FLORIM V. AJDINI

Department for English Language and Literature
Public University at Tetova – Republic of North Macedonia
E-mail: florim.ajdini@unite.edu.mk

ABSTRACT

Memory Organization in CCM –when using “Consistent Pronoun I (CPI)”, in Essay writing in English, compared to Albanian academic essays, represents a research paper which focuses the cognitive constructivist memory approach and techniques, regarding mental processes of students when using this kind of cohesion type, in Essay writing. There are many theories of memory organization regarding the use of CPI, with nonnative writers, which perpetrate difficulties as result of the influence of L1 over the L2. In order to avoid this influence, this paper focuses on bringing about strengthening of CCM, compared between the writing practice between L1 and L2, in order to make sure that the use of this technique, gives the necessary results towards strengthening of text cohesion in English, as foreign language and Albanian as mother tongue. As a referencing model has been taken the Bluefield’s study, which aims to make this study examining into details the effects of organization of CPPI, via using the ability of recalling it from the writer’s memory where they are stored. It is supposed to give a learning feedback for the English teachers and students, essay writers, in terms of enabling them to deliver a stronger teaching and learning input in general.

Keywords: Cognitive, Constructivist, Essay Cohesion, Consistent PPI, Theory Organization.

1. Introduction

English Consistent Personal pronouns (further on referred to as CPP), have usually triggered a constant hardship in terms of using them in particular in written assignments. The fact that this closed lexical category of words, does not exist, in Albanian, it represents a constant barrier towards using it at the beginning of sentences in the position of the subject.

ISBN: 978-608-66191-3-8

IMSC-2019, September 28, 2019. Tetovo. North Macedonia.

In other words, further on, it always goes together with the verb, which in many situations, this is not the case with Albanian usage as L1. The focus of this paper will be put on the use of Consistent Personal Proposal "I", as a typical case which triggers some difficulties when nonnative English learners use it in writing English Essays. The focus of analysis will be put on the *cognitive approach* of perception and its impact on the English essays. The issue to be tackled is the cohesive impact which CPPI, has in terms of *setting ground for good, stable and functional essay text wholeness*, by qualifying it, among others as a strong 'cohesive device'. In this regard, the CPPI, *appropriate connectivity cognition*, with the verb (predicate), as seen from the perspective of *sentence logical functionality*, which as such must reflect the grade of connectivity among these two key elements of the sentence. If used together, no matter it was in the beginning of a given paragraph or a whole essay, all seems to have reached the main aim, which is good fundament of cohesiveness has been created, to produce a good and semantically text corpora which convey a highly intelligible message to the reader.

However, the problem is with the L1 essay writers in English. In this regard, the sentence intelligibility flows, with these essay writers, works at a pretty cohesiveness rate, making the sentence unclear, this for the fact that L1 has influenced the meaning flow in English, making the sentence sound a little bit Albanian. This phenomenon, of the L1 impact over L2, has been treated by many linguists and essay writers (Cornell, A. (1985:221). Deploying the approach of distinguishing the sentence structure between the L1 and L2, is supposed to raise the appropriate essay productivity in English, making possible for these students to produce better essays, conveying higher degree of intelligibility, only by eliminating the native speaker's natural language rules, originating from the early stages of cognitive development of the learners. (Ajдини F, 2017).

In the focus of the study, there will be two target groups (each 50 students). One of these groups is ranging between B1/B2, while the other between B2/C1 languages level of the CEFR. In these research terms, there will be used a comparative, qualitative as well as quantitative method of research, which will focus the problem generator as whole, seen from the perspective of traditional essay writing techniques of English and its use in the writing practice. The so called *traditional method* of writing, based upon the L1 rules of writing i.e. Albanian, imposes the practice of using the verb, or the predicate as the only tool which indicates the impact of the action executor, in the sentence, eliminating this way the need of the use of the Consistent Personal Pronoun I. In this regard, in order to avoid this wrong practice from L1 to the essays written in English, the groups in the focus have shown that cognition of the semantic relatedness between Subject and Verb, in English, in general, never omits the CPPI. Whereas in Albanian, this omitting is pretty frequent, in particular in cases when

we as native speakers, consider that there's no need to use CPPI. In this regard, the problem becomes of a complex character especially at the point when students have to deal with the overall *essay content and cohesion control* (Cohen, J. 1988:129), where these key words, i.e. CPPI, in particular cases when they have to be put in subjective mode, are of an abstruse problem, as to should or not to be used throughout the essay flow, in particular in cases when the essay is of a narrative nature and the process or the action, goes via the CPPI, as a key action doer. This can be noticed in all resource texts (analyzed essays), where in most of the cases the traditional grammar method in using CPPI, as well as other Pronouns, proves to derange remarkably the overall *essay text engineering*, derailing this way the *essay controlling idea* from the path it should follow to the end.

To explain how this situation works in the essay writing practice, the research focus has been put on the content and the semantic functionality of these words, in 20 produced essays, involving both target groups, i.e. G1 and G2. Both target groups are 1st year students of English Language. They are not acquainted with the purpose of the research, so they are left alone for an academic hour to produce text corpora involving at least 300-400 word. In other words, each essay includes 5 paragraphs in total. To assure a concise cohesion measurement, of the appropriate use of the CPPI, an empirical analysis has been carried out all in order to detect as concisely as possible, the degree of usage of CPPI, aiming to establish the rate of the essay text cohesion which characterizes the produced essays.

2. Questions to tackle / Research methods and techniques

a) What's the cognitive approach technique towards finding the appropriate equivalent relatedness between CPPI and the verb as a predicate, covering the essay writing wholeness, without being hampered from the influence of L1, i.e. Albanian as writers' mother tongue?

b) As CPPI, (and other English pronouns, as well) have a fixed position in the sentence order, their use does not confuse the students, most of the times when starting their narrative essays at the very beginning, this for the fact that, just like the case in Albanian, the sentence has to consist of s Subject and a verb and the rest. The problem appears and persists later on, when they feel that there's no need maybe to use the CPPI, as the verb itself may just like in Albanian, indicate the doer of the action. This can be explained by the fact that in Albanian, verbs undergo conjugation, which is not the case in English (except some small exception). In this regard, most of the cases, the use of CPPI, reflects an illogical content and convey a wrong message. This triggers the need for a creating a functional writing routine, to be reached via an *enhancement of the cognitive perception* of these words, in terms of their mutual relatedness, which is different in both languages. Reaching a higher degree of *cognitive*

operational effectiveness (COE), of this phenomenon, *helps* and improves the overall essay cohesiveness as whole, achieved based upon the difference between the two languages.

c) As CPPI, isn't a complex word which acts as a colloquial construction, as such it needs to be approached via a '*Hypothetic-Deductive Reasoning*' (*HDR*), leading towards an easier decipherment of the word order in the English sentence, which in all cases, unlike Albanian sentences, it shows is consistency in terms of the permanent use throughout the text. This makes possible a stronger and easier flow of ideas at sentence as well as paragraph level, for the very fact that CPPI, not only plays a key role in terms of being a strong supporter of the message as whole, which are but they strengthen the essay overall informativity as well as essay message transfer, which all the times, reflects the doer of the actions, which is none else but the CPPI. These features, contribute concretely towards strengthening and functionality of the essay's wholeness (Dagut, M., & Laufer, B. 1985:321). This action has been made possible through an *intense cognitive action or an in-depth analysis* of the essays in the focus, seen both, from the comparative- contrastive point of view between sentences in Albanian and English. This analytical interaction of the two text categories, reveals on the surface the fact that in Albanian, the CPPI, which is '*Unë=mua (both, objective and subjective cases)*' not necessarily needs to be used as often as it is in English, for the fact that the feature of verb conjugation in Albanian, just like in Latin, has its morphological particularities, which makes the verb show, who in fact the action perpetrator is.

3. CPPI Overall Quantum in focus

Given this research, to a nonnative, is of a complex character, in order to make it easier to understand for the reader, below a table of the most frequently used cases of CPPI, in 20 analyzed essays, and has been given. Some of them are as follows: I usually do this after...I then go to the bathroom, before I eat my breakfast... Afterwards, I feel the need that I really have to consider my daily schedule of appointments... etc., which is not the case in the text structure in Albanian. This means that in many cases, in Albanian, we don't need to use the CPPI, as many times as we do use it in English, for the fact that the verb is the indicator of the action doer. The overall number of CPPI used in the analyzed essays is approximately 150. Their cognitive deciphering activity, focusing sentence as well as text overall semantics, by the students has been developed based on three determiners: *real, abstract and confuse* perception of the CPPI, which means that these determiners are the ones which indicate the overall reached scale of textual cohesion the CPPI, produces in the analyzed essays.

In order to *facilitate the cognitive decipherment* of their meaning, the students' most frequent approach is revealing their meaning which as an activity goes through a *set of thinking and cognitive activities of a constructivist character*, before they are filtered to be used in essay writing. In the practical context this means that they create a cognitive routine of word order in the sentences they produce, eliminating or using the CPPI, whenever this is needed. This strategy may be compared to the action of 'omission of the relative pronoun that", in relative sentences, when we as readers, realize that "that" is there, but we don't see it. On the other hand, we are aware that we don't use it, as this is not needed.

Ex. I told you (that) don't need to take bus no. 222! Furthermore, I let you yourself decide whether you want to join us or not and finally I, left it up to you, whether you wanted me to be the after what I said!

This approach, to some students, in particular to those attending the 1st year, is a pretty complex one, but it has proved that it supports constantly the intensity of productiveness of text consistency, even in moments when students may think CPPI, is not needed to be used. The *cognitive constructivist approach* (CCA) in essay writing has resulted to be an efficient facilitator which puts on place a wide range of possibilities in using CPPI, departing from the most frequent ones to the rare ones, acquired through learning English, while students are being passively exposed. This technique sees the CPPI, as made of two *logically connected parts*, of a sentence, which cannot stand separated. (Darwin, C. M., & Gray, L. S. 1999:87), Given this essay writers become aware that they must strengthen the meaning content of the sentence at paragraph as well as whole text unity. Reaching this point of usage of CPPI, means fitting all sentences, appropriately within the *logical contextual picture of the essay, at all levels*; at sentence, at paragraph and finally the whole essay cohesion functionality.

4. Analytical part of the research

The analytical focus in this paper has constantly been put on the way how CPPI has been comprehended and used in the source essays for analysis, how much the cognitive constructivist approach or activity has helped students in terms of its semantic as well as syntactical decipherment and what's the degree it has reached in general concerning the overall essay cohesiveness.

According to Kleinmann, (1977:211), and Schechter, (1974:232), students usually hesitate to use L2 constructivist techniques in cases when they notice that their meaning is different from L1 system, i.e. Albanian. In this regard, 25 cases of CCPI used in the essay have proved to be *reduced into 13 ones*. This is the case with the Group 1 of students, who based on a previous diagnostic assessment, are qualified as belonging to the B2/C1 level of language skills of the CEFR.

Analyzed in terms of the semantic complexity the used CPPIs, reveal, 12 of them are qualified as not being influenced by L1, and the 7 others, are seen as complex cases when CPPI, has come into expression to be used in the text, as a result of a deeper analytical approach made by the students, generated as a result of an *intensive cognitive constructivism*, concerning its position in the sentences, where 'I i.e. CPPI, is the main actor in the story. Furthermore, 'based on Brunner's theory of *efficient learning or discovery learning*, this approach has been used through discovering or revealing unlearned but acquired positions of CPPIs, by which the tested students have solved the so called situations of unfamiliarity of being able to detect the right position of CPPI, in the essays they produce. Given this, according to Kellerman (1977:67), the hesitation in using English CPPI, whenever this is needed, sometimes seems to become a tiresome and complex task. As such it is ongoing and it is present and noticeable in essay writing with almost all these students, and as such it is seen to come as a result of the fear of affecting the all wholeness (cohesion) of the essay they are supposed to produce. This feeling of uncertainty concerning a more liberal use of CPPI, at the same time, proves to have a huge impact in the overall *semantic as well as Grammatical Text Engineering Strategy, (GTES) used by the students*.

This means that the Group 1 of students has performed using these techniques with the higher intensity and in a coordinated way, which has shown that the essays produced by them, are characterized of a *higher degree of comprehensibility*, and as such they are easily understandable by the reader. *The cognitivist approach of deciphering the CPPI position in the sentence*, constantly supported by the *constructivist and logical thinking, (not recalling L1 word order rules)*, has been performing much better with this respective group. The rate of the *Essay Wholeness Functionality (EWF)* per essay has reached cca 70%, of the essay wholeness (cohesion). As to the target Group 2 of students, the number of 28 CPPIs, to be used in the essay, have proved to drop *into 12 ones*. This group, based on a *previous diagnostic assessment*, is qualified as belonging to the cca B1/B2 level of the CEFR. Checked in terms of the semantic complexity the used CPPIs, result in a total of 13, and are qualified as regular frequent ones and the 6 other cases when it needed to be used, are seen as complex and non-frequent ones, making the student think of CPPI omission. Obviously, here the L1 i.e. Albanian, has had a clear influence.

The density of CPPIs used with this group, comes as a result of a *superficial thinking* of the students, mainly based on formal decipherment of the CPPIs, content, avoiding the cognitive approach used with the previous group. It is a *slower and inactive cognitive constructivism*, which of course comes as a result of their lower language learning achievements. Seen from the perspective of Brunner's theory of *efficient learning or learning based on discovery learning attitude (in this particular case)*, using CPPIs, results permanently controlled by this rule. On the other hand, the analysis of the

database content (all essays), with the focus on the *overall essay constructiveness*, results to be affected by the *grade of the Cognition Functionality Process* of the semantic impact which boosts further the use of CPPI, an 'cognitive interactivity' which results as being triggered by a *lower free contextual approach* (LFCA), in moments when they were needed to be used (Dixon, R. 1982:149).

The cognitivist approach of deciphering the syntactical as well as semantic role of the CPPIs, constantly supported by the *constructivist thinking in the writing process*, has been performing weaker with this respective group. This means that they have performed using this technique rarely and in an irrational and unreasonable perception. The approach intensity makes the essays produced by them, to be characterized of a lower degree of comprehensibility, and as such they are not easily understandable by the fluent readers. The rate of the *essay wholeness functionality* (EWF), in these circumstances, has reached 35% of the whole essay wholeness (text cohesion).

5. Research results

To clarify how this phenomenon has been working out throughout the research analysis carried out during this study, I must put into focus two things:

Firstly, one is the concentration and the control concerning the problem approach and its impact on the written language reproduction, monitoring intensely the scale it affects the overall *essay writing cohesiveness and quality*.

Secondly, focusing the so called *double problem orientation approach* (DPOA), of avoiding the usage of the CPPIs, within the context of L1 over L2 influence, in a wide typology of texts, all the time needs to be seen from cognitive perspective (Shimura, A., & Kellerman, E. 1992:328). This would contribute to a decreasing of the influence of L1 interference, making the writing process independent and native oriented process when thinking occurs in 'English Only Approaches (EOA).

The first factor is directly related to the *tested students' English language skills*, which according to the compared data quantity as well as quality, proves that the first factor has *exercised an influence* in both tested groups of students involving more than 55% of the analyzed works i.e. produced essays (20 essays). Seen from the empiric point of view, as an appropriate research method to be used, this approach has proved to be very complex and difficult to be implemented in writing with the major part of the tested students, according to their overall language skillfulness in both English as well as in Albanian. The analysis from the database (2x20 essays, with both target groups), focusing the overall essay constructiveness, effected by the *functionality of the cognition process* of all cases where CPPIs have been used. This process has been seen

as a result of the so called *Free Contextual Approach (FCA)* of the used quantum CPPIs, fitting them into the overall meaning of a given paragraph and finally of the essay's wholeness.

This *cognitivist approach* of deciphering the semantic as well as syntactical nature of the CPPIs, constantly supported by Constructivist Thinking, has been performing differently with the two groups.

As to the quality and the overall logical functionality of the used quantum of CPPIs, is evident that unlike the 2nd group, the 1st one has used this cohesive device *as mixture of both ways* i.e completely adapted to the English syntactic rules, whereas the rest, has used a quantum of CPPIs, which has been used by Albanian as native language, meaning letting the verb as a predicate, be the indicator of the subject I, i.e. the doer of the action. This student group performance has *realized higher text cohesion* compared to the Gr.2 of student essays. In these circumstances, there has been evidenced the so called *avoidance phenomena*, of CPPIs, by this group, which has influenced the overall rate of cohesion of this cohesive tool per essay in general (Ajdini F.-2014:303). The overall avoidance phenomena compared to the tested groups or essays has shown an evident discrepancy in terms being more reserved *for these tested students'* reflecting this feature when writing (Kamimoto & Kellerman, E. 1977:233). On the other hand, with the 2nd group of students, (the weaker performing) the situation is much different, consisting of a total ranging between 34 CPPIs 80-90ones, expected to be used.

6. Discussion and perspectives-Conclusions

From the overall research carried out, concerning the importance of the CPPI as a cohesive device, aiming to *reach higher grade of essay logical wholeness*, this paper has come up with some significant conclusions, which can improve the *essay text cohesiveness as whole*, whenever English CPPIs are to be used. Given the fact that the research focus has been put on the *cognitive perspective* of this grammatical category, the cohesion as a *crucial text standard*, has proved to be reached in a functional way, as the completed research analysis of the *overall Essay Corpora Quantum (ECQ)*, used by both target groups i.e. G1 and G2 results of being influenced by the L1 i.e. Albanian, and as such, it has reached both scales; high, as well as low-intensity, showing remarkable difference between B1/B2/G2 as well as between B2/C1/G1 of the CEFRL, as defining language proficiency instrument. In this regard, the students with stronger language speaking skills, (G1), have generally used properly all PP, including CPPIs, by comprehending their power of connectivity as a cohesive device, which has showed to be a result of a stronger *cognitive activity input of syntactical nature*, needed to reveal precisely their real meaning, in the sentences and strengthen the overall texture as a logical wholeness. Such an approach has shown that this

activity, not only makes possible for them to use a larger quantum of CPPIs, when they do not recall the sentence order in L1 i.e. Albanian, but avoiding and even ignoring it, which enabled them to use a higher volume of this grammatical category as a strong cohesive device. This point of efficiency can be proved by the approach the G1 of students, takes to assimilate the problem, which as such relies on the approach of CMMO which lays in the influence of L1 word order covering the overall *linguistic content*, and which as such requires putting the process of Cognition *Memory Organization, (CMMO)*, as crucial psychological activity in the learning as well as the essay writing process. On the other hand with G2, the students belonging to the *low-intermediate level of skills*, have generally used CPPIs, *bycomprehending their impact as a subject in the sentence, but a subject which if repeated several times in a longer Complex Compound Sentence (LCCS), from time to time needs to be omitted, as the verb reflects or indicates the doer of the action*. Having a Medium Cognitive Operational Activity, this group, has been characterized with a lower intensity of actions which with better performing groups, are known to prevent the influence of L1 over L2. This approach has proved that with this group of students, the use of CPPIs, has shown a low *input of cognition intervention as a supporting technique, and for this, the activities related to it, with* these students, impact the overall paragraph coherence, and stretching further on the full essay cohesion functionality. With this target group G1, this approach has shown that *the stronger use of the cognitive activity*, by recalling the rules and the so called sense the sentence conveys, based upon the natural language rules, not only makes possible for them to broaden the span if usage of CPPIs in a flexible and accurate way, but it enables them to use it in a very convinced way many of them, whenever they are needed.

This is for the fact that the cognition process, towards revealing the full meaning of CPPIs, for this group is more than clear and free to be used. By revealing their impact over the overall sentence functionality, i.e. their connectedness to the sentence and further to the paragraph coherence and cohesion, the students with higher language skills (B2/C1 of CEFR, 75% of them), are managing their use CPPIs in essay writing, constantly based upon both, i.e. language and grammatical rules, which lead them to detect the logical *content this approach conveys*. In the practice of writing, this means that they match the *CPPIs action first to the English sentence syntactic rules* which is usually done by feeling the 'logical flow the sentence' and further on the paragraph conveys. In this regard, the CPPIs, used per analyzed essay, result in an overall abundance and have a proper semantic as well as syntactical effect matching the overall essay story.

Having these data at disposition, as a final conclusion for this paper may be given the fact that CPPIs' appropriate usage in essay writing needs to be further on studied, in particular with students with lower language mastery, for the fact that these students

need to create a routine of writing which will make possible for them to avoid L1 influence. This endeavor needs a lots of writing practice, lots of instructions, as well as lots of passive exposure to the language, i.e. English, which give the learners a boost towards a better and more secure usage of these pronouns in the quality of cohesive tools in general. The higher is the intensity of the Cognition activity, based upon Memory organization, as to how these pronouns need to be used in English, the higher is the degree of the overall text cohesion produced in the written essays, and in particular in those which CPPI put on the first place of narration as type of writing. This is the approach which has been taken by G1 of target students, and as such the overall degree of the text cohesion and wholeness with these essays, has reached 93%, of the overall essay text consistency and wholeness. On the other hand, those who have avoided, Cognitive Constructivist Memory Organization (CCMO) groups such as G2, its use, has reached barely 55% from the overall text cohesion of 100%. This means than the less this approach is used, the more the writer is getting ridden to the L1 syntactical and overall writing rules, meaning that the English essays in this regard may be seen as 'Syntactically Albanicised' essays which need an immediate transformation.

References

- Ajdini, F. (2017) A cognitive constructivist theory of Using Phrasal Verbs in English in Essay Writing, UBT-University Press, 6th, International Conference-Prishtina, R. of Kosova.
- Ajdini F. (2014)-Phrasal verbs as cohesive devices in Narrative essay writing , 5th Edition, St. Petersburg University Press - Russia
- Cornell, A. (1985) Realistic aims in teaching and learning ph. verbs *IRAL*, 23
- Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd ed). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
- Dagut, M., & Laufer, B.(1985). Avoidance of phrasal verbs: A case for contrastive analysis. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 7
- Darwin, C. M., & Gray, L. S. (1999) - Going after the phrasal verbs: An alternative approach to classification. *TESOL Quarterly*, 33
- Dixon, R. (1982).The grammar of English phrasal verbs.*Austrl. J. of L.* 2
- Fraser, B. (1976). *The verb-particle combination in English*. New York: Academic Press.
- Kamimoto, T., Shimura, A., & Kellerman, E. (1992). A second language classic reconsidered the case of Schachter's avoidance. *S L Research*, 8
- Kellerman, E. (1977). Towards a characterization of the strategy of transfer in second language learning. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 2
- Kellerman, E. (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.)