

## ANALYSIS

1.
  - A. Incorrect. Although this option is grammatically correct, it is inappropriate because the word "moreover" is an illogical connector, and the conjunction "and" establishes no relationship. Further, it is ineffective since three ideas have been loosely coordinated in one sentence. Writers should coordinate only when the ideas are equal in importance which is not the case here. Try again.
  - B. Correct. All the ideas have been fluently and logically blended into one sentence. The time that fasting occurs is joined to the main clause by a phrase.
  - C. Incorrect. This option uses an illogical subordinate conjunction ("since," a word which signals cause/effect). The thirty day period does not cause Moslems to avoid food and water. Try again.
  - D. Incorrect. There is no clear connection between the subordinate clause and the independent clause in the first sentence. Be aware that "being as" and "being that" are nonstandard usages. Substitute the word "because." The second sentence would be more appropriately written as a coordinate structure since the two elements of fasting are equivalent; one is not subordinate to the other. Try again.
  
2.
  - A. Incorrect. The subordinate conjunction "as" can suggest either time or comparison. Neither is appropriate here. In the coordinate sentence, the word "however" is illogical since there is no contrast between the two clauses. Look at your choices again.
  - B. Incorrect. The participial phrase "protecting. . ." is a reasonable modifier of "air bags," but from there on, the sentence is unclear. A second participial phrase, "working. . .," confuses the reader by burying the subject "air bags." Finally, the coordination is faulty: "yet" is inappropriate. Look for a more logical option.
  - C. Correct! In the first sentence, the semicolon is used effectively to join two contrasting statements. The second sentence subordinates one idea with the word "while," accurately establishing a time relationship.
  - D. Incorrect. The first coordinate conjunction "and" is ineffective since it shows no real connection between the clauses. The third clause is attached with the coordinate conjunction "for," a cause/effect word which is inappropriate here. Finally, notice that four clauses are aimlessly coordinated, so no idea is emphasized. Look for a more coherent combination of these ideas.

3. A. Incorrect. The two parts of this coordinate sentence are illogically joined with the conjunction "but" since there is no contrast. Try another one.
- B. Incorrect. The subordinate conjunction "even though" should be used to show that two ideas are in contrast to one another. However, the content of the dependent clause is not a contrast to the independent clause. Look again at your choices.
- C. Correct. This sentence logically coordinates two verbs ("tolerate" and "adapt"). Notice, too, that effective coordination often results in an economical, precise sentence.
- D. Incorrect. This sentence is a victim of excessive subordination. A reader would have a difficult time distinguishing the main items from the myriad of twists and turns. Try another option.
4. A. Correct. This one is best. The sentence fluently and logically subordinates with an adverbial clause ("when . . .") and a relative clause ("that . . ."). Notice also that the passages in this section of the CLAST can be fairly long--as many as 55 words. Be prepared to read carefully and thoughtfully.
- B. Incorrect. This sentence simply strings together all the clauses without emphasizing any point or establishing any relationship among the ideas. Coordination is appropriate when the linked sentences are equally important. Putting on a helmet and glove is not as important as the re-creation of reality. Try again.
- C. Incorrect. The subordinating conjunction "because" should suggest a cause. The virtual reality does not cause the person to put on a helmet and a glove, so the statement is illogical. Look at your choices again.
- D. Incorrect. Although the participial phrase at the beginning ("putting . . .") is effective, the problem is the adverbial conjunction "thus" which coordinates two clauses. "Thus" should indicate an effect or a result, but it does not. Read carefully! These passages can be difficult. Try again.

5. A. Incorrect. Remember that coordination is used to join closely related ideas, but the relationship must be stated if it is not evident. The semicolon may be grammatically correct; however, the reader does not see the connection. Try again.
- B. Incorrect. The two clauses are illogically connected with the subordinate conjunction "where." Use the word "where" to show place. Try another option.
- C. Incorrect. Maybe the effective adjective clause ("which . . .") compelled you to select this one. The problem lies with the faulty coordination: "so" should be used to show an effect; however, daily hair loss does not cause 100 hairs to fall out. Look again.
- D. Correct! This sentence uses a subordinate adjective clause and a prepositional phrase ("as many as. . .") to combine the ideas into one coherent sentence.

This completes the coordination and subordination practice. If you need further study, turn on the monitor and review the lesson. If you understand the material, you are ready to take the **Mastery Test on Coordination/Subordination**.