The Relationship Between Cohesion and the Students' Written English Quality

SALIH IDRIS IBRAHIM AHMED
Assistant Professor of Applied Linguistics, English Language Department
Faculty of Education, University of Al-Butana

Abstract
This study aimed to find out the relationship between cohesion and the quality of the students' written English at the third level of Sudanese secondary schools. The study subjects were two hundred (200) students from Rufa'a city secondary schools. The study assumed some factors that underlie ignorance of cohesion such as L1 interference, overgeneralization, misuse of communicative learning strategies, inadequacy of practical English classes, students' negative attitudes towards English writing and insufficiency of qualified teachers. a test was the elicitation technique to obtain data in this respect. The analytical method was adopted to analyse the test to demonstrate the problem. However, results and findings revealed that students ignore cohesive devices and sentence boundaries. This ignorance is due to MT and overgeneralization sources, teachers' misuse of learning and communication strategies, inadequacy of practical English writing classes, students developed negative attitudes towards English writing, then neither teachers nor students are enthusiastic about writing courses. Accordingly, recommendations are submitted to develop writing standard, beside a prerequisite to qualify teachers for better linguistic performance in order to achieve coherent effective writing
Keywords: cohesion, EFL students, writing, attitudes

1. Introduction
Since language is an inevitable means of communication and it is actually one of the major characteristics that distinguish human beings from other existing creatures, so, any lack of its coherence distorts its functions and fails contact with community. Therefore, to realize different purposes and needs of communication, learning linguistic cohesion is an obligation that elevates restrictions which narrow chances of contacting people, sharing experiences with them and so forth...

Writing is the most prominent productive skill of language. Consequently, knowing English writing techniques is the major target via which an advanced level of language competency, namely in a coherent consideration, is attained.

Cohesion in English is concerned with a relatively neglected part of the linguistic system: its resources for text construction, the range of meanings that are specifically associated with relating what is being spoken or written to its semantic environment. A principal constituent of these resources is 'cohesion'. This study is concerned with the cohesion that arises from semantic relations between sentences. Reference from one to the other, repetition of word meanings, the conjunctive force of but, so, then and the like are considered. Further, it describes a method for analysing and coding sentences, which is applied to specimen texts. However, for several years, the analysis of cohesion in texts has been a key topic in the study of discourse.

1.1. Statement of the Problem
It has been noticed that Sudanese students do not carry out coherent writing tasks in order to communicate effectively in English. So, cohesive devices are either ignored or mistaken in writing, the matter that indicates learners' weakness in English language, namely their acquaintance with sentence boundaries and connectivity strategies.

1.2. questions of the study
- What is the Relationship between Cohesion and the Students' Written English Quality?
- Why EFL students face cohesion and coherence difficulties in writing performance?
- What type of errors do the EFL students commit in their writing?
- How is negative attitude and MT affect the students writing performance?

1.3. Assumptions of the study
- There is a significance relationship between Cohesion and the Students' Written English Quality.
- The ignorance be attributed to MT interference or overgeneralization sources.
- Different learning and communication strategies underlie in such errors.
- Students' negative attitudes towards hinder the solutions for such a problem.

2. Literature Review

2.1 definition of Cohesion

Cohesion is the act or state of sticking together sentences and paragraphs in a text to form a united whole. In other words, cohesion refers to the linguistic links between sentences that distinguishes them from a random collection of sentences. Such links demonstrate the relationship between the ideas contained in these sentences. Thus, a paragraph that is made up of sentences that are well-linked is said to be cohesive.

The writer might think of cohesion as a means of establishing connections within a text at all sorts of different levels, e.g., section, paragraphs, sentences and even phrases. Moreover, cohesion can be thought of as all the grammatical and lexical links that link one part of a text to another. This includes use of synonyms, lexical sets, pronouns, verb tenses, time references, grammatical reference, etc. For example, 'it', 'neither' and 'this' all refer to an idea previously mentioned. But, 'first of all', 'then', and 'after that' help to sequence a text, whereas, 'however', 'in addition', and 'for instance' link ideas and arguments in a text.

Nevertheless, empirical studies on cohesion in written discourse of native and non-native speakers of English indicate that judgments of writing quality may depend on overall coherence in content, organization, and style rather than on the quantity of cohesion (Witt 1981 & etal). However, the studies concerning non-native speakers of English have not included data from the first language nor controlled the language and cultural background of ESL writers.

2.2 Importance of Cohesion

An awareness of cohesion and coherence in all texts is a very important skill for students to develop. Hence, Elugbe (1995: 284) notifies that students' attention is expected to be directed to the acquisition of the knowledge of the rules of grammar as well as the structural patterns associated with formal and informal varieties of English and use them appropriately. The present write-up on 'cohesion' in the written texts of subjects becomes relevant as it embraces the means by which texts are linguistically and logically connected.

2.3 Types of Cohesion

There are two main types of cohesion: grammatical, referring to the structural content, and lexical, referring to the language content of the piece. A cohesive text is created in many different ways. In Cohesion in English, Halliday and Hasan identify five general categories of cohesive devices that create coherence in texts: reference, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion, and conjunction.

a. Grammatical Cohesion

In linguistics, grammar refers to the logical and structural rules that govern the composition of clauses, phrases, and words in any given natural language. The term refers also to the study of such rules, and this field includes morphology and syntax, often complemented by phonetics, phonology, semantics, and pragmatics (Connor 1984:67).

For the educational system to achieve its educational aims and objectives, learners' work must show some form of cohesion and coherence in their presentation of ideas. Consequently, Halliday and Hasan's (1976) study figures out the importance of cohesion into two main points:

- cohesion ensures that the written text flows smoothly, and
- it (cohesion) enhances clarity as the reader is able to follow the   development of ideas in a text more easily.
    a. Lexical Cohesion

Transitions are one technique of cohesion but are not enough to make writing cohesive. Repetition of key words and use of reference words are also needed for cohesion. An awareness of cohesion and coherence in all texts is a very important skill for students to develop. For instance, a paragraph unity is maintained by adopting the principle of main clause unity—relating the main clause of each supporting sentence (subject and predicate) to the controlling idea of the topic sentence.Therefore, cohesion refers to the sense of sentence-by-sentence flow by which we move easily through a passage.

Should we use the passive?

- The collapse of a dead star into a point perhaps no larger than a marble creates a black hole.
- A black hole is created by the collapse of a dead star into a point perhaps no larger than a marble.

Which passage is cohesive?

Some astonishing questions about the nature of the universe have been raised by scientists studying black holes in space. The collapse of a dead star into a point perhaps no longer than a marble creates a black hole. So much matter compressed into so little volume changes the fabric of space around it in puzzling ways.

Some astonishing questions about the nature of the universe have been raised by scientists studying black holes in space. A black hole is created by the collapse of a dead star into a point perhaps no larger than a marble.

What is the Difference?

l. The sentence with the passive voice causes the paragraph to flow better.

2. It connects easily to the sentence that precedes it and the sentence that follows.

2.4 Cohesion Studies

Three important scholars have made great contributions to cohesion studies in China and paved the way for other scholars to further cohesion studies. They are Zhuanglin, Yongsheng and Delu. In 1989, the three scholars introduced Halliday and Hasan's cohesion theory and its classification in their book Xitong gongneng yufa gailun (A Survey of Systemic-Functional Grammar).

They have continued to study cohesion and have developed cohesion theory from different perspectives. After the publication of Cohesion in English, the concept of cohesion has been applied to different fields such as stylistics, discourse analysis, language teaching and learning, translation studies, psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics.

Language teaching, psycholinguistics and translation studies for example, in the field of language teaching, many scholars have investigated cohesion in language teaching (McCarthy, 1991 & et al).

Despite the great amount of research on cohesion and the wide application of it to different fields, the researcher observes that the concept of cohesion is yet not fully understood and is still a matter of continuing debate.

Halliday and Hasan (1976: 04) note that cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse is dependent on that of another. In cohesion, features like repetition of items as well as complex relations of collocation and structural semantic sense connections across sentence boundaries are examined. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 279) present the following as evidence of lexical cohesion in texts; same item, synonymy, near synonymy, super ordinate, general word and collocation. For example, there are cohesive ties between the following sentences:

* There is a boy singing a song.
* The boy will strain his voice.
* The lad will strain his voice.
* The child will strain his voice.
* The idiot will strain his voice.

The item 'boy' in sentence (b) is considered as a repetition of the same item 'boy' in sentence (a) 'Lad' in sentence (c) is a synonym of 'boy'. In sentence (d), the word 'child' is considered as a super ordinate term while the word 'idiot' in sentence (e) is considered a general word. Another way of looking at cohesive ties in texts is by examining the recurrence of certain words e.g. nouns (anaphoric nouns).

These groups of nouns fall into certain semantic classes.

These are nouns which can be used to sustain an on-going discourse by being used to refer to a stretch of discourse preceding it.

It also faces forwards, that is, it must be presented as the given information in terms of which the new propositional content of the clause or sentence in which it occurs is formulated.

2. 5 Principles of Cohesion

2. 5.1 The First Principle of Cohesion:

Sentences are begun with information familiar to the reader. This can be information that has recently been introduced within the text. Or can be brought to the text with the general knowledge of the audience.

2. 5.2 The Second Principle of Cohesion:

Sentences are ended with information readers cannot anticipate. So, the Principle of Cohesion as a 'Law of Cognition' is that the principle of old-before-new is built into perception of time and story. Consequently, the principle forms the conceptual basis of the introduction or background sections of an essay.

Readers first remember: the sentence ending, then the sentence beginning, and at last the sentence middle. So, cohesion is very important because it ensures that the written text flows smoothly and enhances clarity as the reader is able to follow the development of ideas in a text more easily.

2. 6 Précis Writing and Cohesion

A précis is a summary, gist or digest of an original longer passage. So, Broukal (1994:121) asserts that the

reader of the précis can familiarize himself with the substance of the longer passage without having read it.

Furthermore, the précis writer must be accurate and concise. He may not agree with the opinions expressed in the original passage, but he must reproduce them without distortion and without comment. He must be concise because in reducing a passage to its essentials he cannot afford to waste any words. This does not mean that a précis consists of notes, or of sentences strung together in a disconnected and jerky manner. A good précis is a connected and readable piece of prose.

2.7 How to Write Well

Writing is a comprehensive ability including grammar, vocabulary, conception, rhetoric and many other elements. Besides having everything engaged with listening, speaking and reading. However, reading and writing are connected together, so that good readers write well, i.e. good writers read well.

The word has two meanings:

a. Reference meaning: thoughts, ideas and images (prosaic).

b. Emotion meaning: feelings such as capitalist, Bolshevik, monopoly, window.

The word red for example has a precise reference but it can also acquire an emotive meaning. Then the context is to emphasize the reference meaning or the emotive meaning. So the importance of emphasizing either depends on the purpose of the writer. In general there are two uses of the language; the referential use and the emotive use of language.

Moreover, there are some important facts, introduced by Burton (1955: 146-147), about the use of words that must be understood by all who wish to think clearly and write well:

- The unit of the thought is the sentence and not the word, though it is of words that sentences are made.
- The same word may mean different things to different people.

The word 'value', for instant, may mean to someone a little glass container with wire inside which glows when one switches on his set, but to the radio engineer it has a much more precise meaning, for he understands how it is made and what it does.

Then again, different people not only know different things and therefore, sometimes understand different things from the same word; they also feel differently about words. These are the thoughts, ideas and images (the reference) of the word, and the feeling associated with it (its emotive meaning).

In the following examples the distinction is obvious:

Don't go too near the edge, the lake is very deep.

They thought they'd got him then, but he was too deep for them.

However, a careless reader may go wrong with these:

The statesmen of thirty nations signed the protocol with a golden pen.

In order to understand the full meaning of words, something about their ancestry must be known. However, it is not enough to merely know the definition of a word, its derivation must be known. Therefore, the use of an etymological dictionary is an obligation.

2.8 The Golden Rule

Zinsser, (2001:55) shows 'The Golden Rule' which states that whatever the kind of composition; there should be movement in the essay: a progression from the beginning, through the middle, to the end of the essay.

To plan the composition, as he indicates, firstly is to think of the paragraph unity; to ensure coherence, otherwise the reader gets bewildered and irritated for the badly paragraphed composition. Each paragraph should mark a distinct stage in the development of the composition.

However, composition consists of many paragraphs. The paragraph consists of a number of sentences all of which bear on one thought, and known as the topic of the paragraph. The topic or key sentence should be clearly distinguished. It may come at the beginning, middle, or end of the sentence. All other sentences must carry clear relationship to the topic sentences.

The paragraph is a small composition in itself, deriving its importance from the contribution that it makes to the whole, but should be well planned: with beginning, middle and end as the same as the whole composition.

2.9 Connotation

Ostman (1978:122) maintains that the connotation of a word refers to the special associations, apart from its dictionary definition, that it may convey. Connotation especially depends on the audience. The word "dog" denotes any animal from the genus canis, but it may connote friendship to one reader and terror to another. This partly depends on the reader's personal dealings with dogs, but the

author can provide context to guide the reader's interpretation.

2.10 Punctuation

Punctuation is now so standardized that it rarely is a factor in a writer's style. The same is true for gratuitous changes to spelling and grammar, unless the goal is to represent a regional or ethnic dialect in which such changes are customary.

However, the researcher believes that punctuation in the domain of writing has a great deal to do with meanings intended to be conveyed unless there are semantic intentions required by the writer. Nevertheless, punctuation is intended to handle coherent effective writing.

2.11 Conjunctions

2.11.1 Definition of a conjunction

A conjunction, as Hassan (1968:21) describes, is a word that syntactically links words or larger constituents, and expresses a semantic relationship between them. In other words a conjunction is positionally fixed relative to one or more of the elements related by it, thus distinguishing it from constituents such as English conjunctive adverbs.

Some kinds of conjunctions are: coordinating conjunctions and subordinating conjunctions. **However, coordinating conjunctions** are: and, or and but. Whereas **Subordinating conjunctions** are: because, when and unless.

2.11.2 Conjunction and Transitions

Hassan (1984:77) notifies that conjunction sets up a relationship between two clauses. The most basic but least cohesive is the conjunction and. Transitions are conjunctions that add cohesion to text and include then, however, in fact, and consequently. Conjunctions can also be implicit and deduced from correctly interpreting the text.

2.12 Coordination

The term coordination, as Halliday & Hassan (1976:89) notify, refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements. The units may be words, phrases, subordinate clauses, or full sentences.

Examples:

My husband supports and adores Juventus Turin.

I realize that you were right and that I was mistaken.

The units combined in a conjunctive coordination are called conjuncts, and more generally, the units of any coordination will be called coordinands here. Adversative coordination is always binary, i.e. it must consist of two coordinands. Ternary or other multiple coordinations are impossible here.

This is illustrated in:

 *The queen tried to kill Snowwhite but Snowwhite escaped but she went through much hardship.

*The mountain climbers were tired but happy but bankrupt.

2.13 Logical bridges

The same idea of a topic is carried over from sentence to sentence.

Successive sentences can be constructed in parallel forms.

2.14 Verbal bridges

- Key words can be repeated in several sentences.
- Synonymous words can be repeated in several sentences.
- Pronouns can refer to nouns in previous sentences.
- Transition words can be used to link ideas from different sentences.

However, awareness of cohesion and coherence in all texts is a very important skill for students to develop. Coherence, as Maclin (2001:84) explains, is that all parts of composition are clearly related to each other in order to explain one idea or give one impression. So, coherence can be thought of as how meanings and sequences of ideas relate to each other.

3. Methods

3.1. Subjects

Two hundred (200) students were chosen (150 females &50 males) from the third level at Rufa'a secondary schools in Gezira state, Sudan, to establish the subjects of this study. The students' ages range was between 17-18 years. They had had an average of six years of formal education in English as FL at schools. They also have had the same MT, which is Arabic. Therefore, the selected group was homogeneous with regard to age,

educational level and linguistic background.

3.2. Data Collection Instruments
Data Collection Instrument utilized for this study, was a test in forms of gap filling, multiple choice and a composition.
3.2.1 The Test
The test of the study consisted of five questions implementing four technical items of testing undertaken in forms of: filling spaces from a list of words, choosing the right word from four distracters (multiple choices), a passage with blanks to be filled with the right item and two compositions; an expository composition and a narrative one. These different testing techniques were executed with the aim of examining the appropriateness of cohesive devices mastery and usage.
The test was administrated under strict exam conditions; the data which was collected by means of this test underwent the very data collection methods and was compared and studied.
Test paper items were constructed by the researcher, assuming that they will measure students' ability in using cohesive devices with very little guidance to structure and punctuation and means of unification to be recognized. The reasons behind that were to see how much English unification techniques the subjects had learned through their study and what type of errors they made. The topics had been submitted to a jury before they were introduced to the test-takers in order to judge their appropriateness to the student's level as an elicitation technique. Worth mentioning, that instructions were stated clearly to the students.

4. Analysis and Discussion
4.1 Analysis of Test Results
Four major error categories were found in this study: Ignorance of English sentence initiation in the domain of cohesive devices, Sentence boundaries, Sentence connectivity and Text connectivity strategies or maintenance of unity in writing.
    Sub-categories for these main categories are monitored in terms of Nouns, Pronouns, Choppy Sentences, Run-on Sentences, Punctuation, Conjunctions, Relative pronouns, Transitional words and Transitional phrases as shown in the table below:
Table 4.1.
Potential errors categorization:

Category	Sub-categories	
Initiation	Nouns	Pronouns
Sentence boundaries	Choppy Sentences	Run-on Sentences
Sentence connectivity	Punctuation	Conjunctions, Relative pronouns
Text connectivity	Transitional words	Transitional phrases

4.1.1 Analysis of Initiation Errors
As coherence is sometimes lost from the very beginning of a sentence, initiation errors were considered initially. However, 'Initiation Errors' were more frequent; (they form 33.75% or 135 cases out of 400 cases) than Limits of the sentence as shown in the following table:
Table 4.2
Occurrence of Initiation Errors in Percentage

Type of Error	Cases	Percentage
Initiation	135	33.75%
Sentence boundaries	129	32.25%
Sentence connectivity	102	25.5%
Text connectivity	34	8.5%
Total	400	100%

The frequent repetition was the same reference for the subject by using the noun followed by the pronoun a matter that cases uneven flow of reading and hinders the immediate meaning collecting:
* The boatman he was born in our village.
   The boatman was born in our village.
* The people in the boat they believed him.
   The people in the boat believed him.
The grammatical term 'pronoun' is known as a word used in a place of a co-referential noun or a nominal phrase to make a statement brilliant and avoid monotonous repetition when the connection is shown between the subject and the object of a clause or the connection series of clauses like:
Fahmi bought a grey jacket and wore it.

I saw a snake under the stone. It was a big black one.

4.1.2 Analysis of Sentence Boundaries Errors

Ignorance of 'Sentence Boundaries' or boarders prevents the writer apply proper cohesion techniques. Hence, cohesive devices will not be utilized. Sentence Limits Errors were more frequent; (they form 32.24% or 69 cases out of 400 cases) than Sentence connectivity as shown in the following table:

Table 4.3

Occurrence of Sentence Limits Errors in Percentage

Type of Error	Cases	Percentage
Initiation	135	33.75%
Sentence Boundaries	129	32.25%
Sentence connectivity	102	25.5%
Text connectivity	34	8.5%
Total	400	100%

Occurrence of Sentence Boundaries Errors constitute (32.25%) or 129 cases out of the total number of errors.

Notably errors occur in the use of comma splices as in:

* She moved far away from him, she did not look at him.

She moved far away from him. She did not look at him.

She moved far away from him without looking at him.

Shamsher (1994) explains this as attribution to that English does not sound the same as its written words and is not written as it sounds. Therefore, this is due to that English is not like other languages that Sudanese students, as target strata, made wrong guessing of sentence limitation; dividing sentences with commas. For example:

*The court sentenced him, by imprisonment, seven years

The court sentenced him of imprisonment for seven years.

Therefore, the problem of error here is attributed to the fact that in Arabic sentences are not divided in the same system of English sentence types: simple, compound, complex or even compound complex to help the writer know the limitation of thoughts taking action in writing.

4.1.3 Analysis of Sentence Connectivity Errors

Sentence connectivity Errors were more frequent; (they form 25.75% or 103 cases out of 400 cases) than Text connectivity as shown in the following table:

Table 4.4

Occurrence of Sentence connectivity Errors in Percentage

Type of Error	Cases	Percentage
Initiation	135	33.75%
Sentence Boundaries	129	32.25%
Sentence connectivity	102	25.5%
Text connectivity	34	8.5%
Total	400	100%

Sentence connectivity, known as cohesion, may occur at all levels of language production, where it leads to misuse of conjunction. It constitutes 25.5% or 103 cases of the totality of cohesion errors. This misuse was represented in cases of lacking cohesive devices and wrong use of the devices to connect the different parts of the sentence which is shown in the following table:

Table 4.5

Occurrence of Omission/ Wrong choice Errors of Sentence connectivity in Percentage

Sub-category	Cases	Percentage
Omission of devices	231	56.34%
Wrong choice of device	179	43.66%
Total	410	100%

Data collected, revealed errors occurrence as a result of not knowing the different functions of combining words, which constitute the highest frequency of this domain.

Examples:

* Foeman drowned and he was an excellent swimmer.

Foeman drowned yet/though he was an excellent swimmer.

* Foeman drowned because he was an excellent swimmer.

Foeman drowned in spite of the fact that he was an excellent swimmer.

Foeman, who was an excellent swimmer, drowned.

Foeman, who drowned, was an excellent swimmer.

It is also noticed that strategies of sentence connectivity is missed where the written sentences are chopped by periods when they are stated in hurry, so sounding childish. Short, choppy sentences may give the impression

that ideas are not connected. In turn, this may weaken the overall impact of essay.

Showing a relationship between thoughts at the sentence level provides power and clarity for written ideas. Coordinating conjunctions (and, but, for, nor, or, so, yet…) or correlative conjunctions (both–and, either-or, not only-but also…) are used to combine sentences or by joining independent clauses with a semicolon, such as:
*   The old man drowned in the river. He was excellent swimmer. People searched for him. He was found three days later.

The old man drowned in the river though he was an excellent swimmer; however, people searched for him; finally he was found three days later.

In spite of being an excellent swimmer, the old man drowned in the river, where people searched for him but unfortunately, he was found three days later.
However, this type of lacking of cohesive devices counts to (56.34%) or 231 cases out of the total cases that counts to 410 cases.

There are also transpositions of noun-pronoun referent being monitored in the students' writing. Such transposition redundant constitutes (25.7%) of all the errors in the data displayed. Such as in:
* He drowned in the river. The old man was very good swimmer but he was not found.

The old man drowned in the river. He was a very good swimmer but he was not found.
4.1.4. Analysis of Text Connectivity Errors
However, text connectivity Errors were less frequent; (they form 8.41% or 18 cases out of 214 cases) than Sentence connectivity as shown in the following table:
Table 4.6
Occurrence of Text connectivity Errors in Percentage

Type of Error	Cases	Percentage
Initiation	135	33.75%
Sentence Boundaries	129	32.25%
Sentence connectivity	102	25.5%
Text connectivity	34	8.5%
Total	400	100%

This low percentage (8.5%) is due to the number of cases registered which showed students timidities to develop their texts lest fall in more errors. Nonetheless, lack of connection in the text is categorized into linking parts of each sentence and linking of a paragraph as the following table shows:
Table 4.7
Occurrence of Text connectivity Errors in Percentage for linking sentences and linking a paragraph

Sub-category	Cases	Percentage
Linking a sentence	110	75.3%
linking a paragraph	36	24.7%
Total	146	100%

Errors of linking a sentence were 75.3% or 110 cases, whereas errors of linking a paragraph were 24.7% or 36 cases out of the 146 total cases.
4.1.5 Analysis of Transitional Words Errors
Here the use of transitional words is either of wrong selection or entirely not used as it appears in the following table:
Table 4.8
Occurrence of Omission/ Lack of devices and Wrong choice Errors in Percentage

Sub-category	Cases	Percentage
Omission/ Lack of devices	243	67.5%
Wrong choice of device	117	32.5%
Total	360	100%

Omission of devices were more frequent, (67.5%) or 243 cases, than Wrong choice of device.
i) Lack of cohesive devices:
* She described him the ugliest person she had ever seen he was smart.
She described him of being the ugliest person she had ever seen though he was really not.
*The old man drowned in the river he was excellent swimmer.
▪   The old man drowned in the river, yet he was an excellent swimmer.
▪   The old man, who was an excellent swimmer, drowned in the river.
▪   Although the old man was an excellent swimmer, he drowned in the river.
▪   The old man, who drowned in the river, was an excellent swimmer.
There are many varieties of structures that add more consolidation to the intended meaning and gives extra unification for the idea. Such varieties of expressing ideas and illustrating the meanings, shows great flexibility

of the language and diversity of expressions.

ii) Wrong selection of cohesive devices:

Wrong choice of cohesive devices is represented in data at32.5% or 117 cases out of the 360 total cases. Examples such as:

* The young girl was upset, and she attended the party but that enabled the man to persuade her though she was not eager.

The young girl was upset but she attended the party the fact that enabled him to persuade her in spite of her objection.

* She described him by the ugliest person she had ever seen in her life and he was not.

 She described him of being the ugliest person she had ever seen in her life, though he was really not.

Even adding the word 'really' in the last example, gives extra consolidation to the intended meaning and further amalgamation.

4.1.6 Analysis of Paragraph Linking Errors

An awareness of cohesion and coherence in all texts is a very important skill for students to develop. For instance, a paragraph unity is maintained by adopting the principle of main clause unity—relating the main clause of each supporting sentence (subject and predicate) to the controlling idea of the topic sentence.

To develop a coherent paragraph, Idrees (2006:118) confirms the provision of a topic sentence and addition of supporting details or examples showing exact relevance to it (the topic sentence). All sentences that containing details or examples must be arranged in a logical order. Moreover, to achieve paragraph unity, a single generalization must be specified to focus attention and the content must be controlled to relate and join every other sentence in the paragraph to its body.

Table 4.9

Occurrence of Text connectivity Errors in Percentage for linking a paragraph

Sub-category	Cases	Percentage
Linking a sentence	110	75.3%
linking a paragraph	36	24.7%
Total	146	100%

Errors of linking a paragraph were 24.7%or 36 cases out of the 146 total cases, excluding errors of individual sentences within the sole body of the paragraph.

There are some errors monitored in the study, though of minor importance in the field of cohesion, but they distort unity of the text and hinder its flow. Their results are shown in the next table:

Table 4.10

Occurrence of Concord, pronominal and wrong choice of pronoun Errors in Percentage for linkage

Category	cases	Percentage
Concord errors	159	55.2%
pronominal errors	69	24%
wrong choice of pronoun	60	20.8%
Total	288	100%

4.1.7 Analysis of Concord Errors

Concord errors amount to 159 cases or 55.2% of the errors captivated in the study. These errors have been dealt with under only one heading, i.e. subject-verb agreement because it is the merely type of errors revealed in the data.

The normal notable rule is quite simple since a singular subject requires a singular verb and a plural subject needs a plural verb. For example:

This car is new but it is not comfortable. (Sing. subj. + sing. v.)

These cars are new but they are not comfortable. (pl. subj. + pl. v.)

In this concern, the students made faults of subject-verb agreement, namely the omission of 3rd person singular marker (-s) as in:

* My friend Salih write effectively and show carefully the smallest details.

(My friend Salih writes effectively and shows carefully the smallest details.)

Many errors made by the students in this data were approved to be as an omission of the plural marker the (-s). For example:

* Many beautiful girl came to the party.

(Many beautiful girls came to the party.)

4.1.8 Analysis of Pronominal Errors

The grammatical term 'pronoun' is known as a word used in a place of a co-referential noun or a nominal phrase to make a statement senseful and avoid silly repetition when the connection is shown between a subject and the object of a clause or the connection series of clauses like:

Journal of Education and Practice
www.iiste.org
ISSN 2222-1735 (Paper)   ISSN 2222-288X (Online)
Vol.9, No.33, 2018

Fuhmi bought a grey jacket and wore it.

I saw a snake under the stone. It was a big black one.

In fact, the English language demonstrates concord in number, gender and person between the pronoun and its antecedent to show connection. For example:

The boatman does his work patiently. (sing. M.)

The girl does her work successfully. (sing. F.)

The boatmen do their work patiently. (pl. M.)

The girls do their work successfully. (pl. F.)

You have to help the poor. (2nd person, M/F, sing./pl.)

In addition to that, English language distinguishes many types of pronouns. They are:

   a.   personal pronouns,
   b.   possessive pronouns,
   c.   reflexive pronouns,
   d.   demonstrative pronouns,
   e.   relative pronouns.

Accordingly, the pronominal errors constitute 69 cases or 24% of the errors in the hereby study and they were treated under the sub-category 'Wrong choice of pronoun', not the other category 'Redundant pronoun'.

4.1.9 Analysis of Wrong Choice of Pronoun

The errors of the wrong choice of pronoun count to 60 cases or 20.8% of the total pronominal errors. Personal pronouns were used in a variety of mistaking and the result is the following error examples:

* I told their about the English people and them lives.

(I told them about the English people and their lives.)

* Them village was very near to the forest.

(Their village was very near to the forest.)

4.1.10 Analysis of Errors Resulting from False Analogy

The errors of the Resulting from False Analogy count to 60 cases or 20.8% of the total pronominal errors. So, students, in this respect, made errors like:

* We crossed the River Nile by a boat.

(We crossed the River Nile in a boat.) or

(We crossed the River Nile by boat.)

4.1.11 Analysis of Synonymy Errors

Synonymy Errors were 24.7%or 36 cases out of the 146 total cases. As for synonyms, English is assumed to be very rich because of the French, Latin and Greek influence on the language and also due to the extensive number of borrowed words from other languages.

Richards (1985:28) defines synonymy as: "a word which has the same or nearly the same meaning as another word". For example, in English: hide and conceal in:

Aila hid his shoes under the bush also Hanadi concealed her shoes under the bush too.

However, the emphasized point, which has been universally argued in semantics, that there are no real synonyms in a language.

It is vitally important, from the FL learning point of view, to whether TL learners preserve the differences that actually exist between synonyms. Nevertheless, the existing differences are indicated by Hough (1969:154), as difference of style, geographic distribution, formality, attitude of the speaker, connotation, collocation and perhaps some other ways.

These differences, in a huge figure of cases, can be specified in terms of features that might be tend to be more language specific than universal as the FL student could imagine. If we consider the words 'tall' and 'long' as examples, 'tall' might have the feature [+human], and 'long' might have the feature [-human], as the following examples:

My elder brother was tall.   The way/street is long.

Yet, in Arabic both 'human' and 'way/street' as described as (taweel) to include the two modelized adjectives 'tall' and 'long' in a single utterance.

For more assumed synonymy, the following examples are provided:

* The Nile is very **large** (wide) near our village,

* I was playing with my **old** (elder) sister, whereas the Arabic equivalent '**kebeer**' can stand for both adjectives; 'wide' and 'elder', so the learners are perplexed which one to use. Moreover, the FL student is liable to suppose that a number of associated words are synonyms to the extent that they can be used interchangeably.

   Hornby (1975:104) verifies this view by stating that there are few real synonyms in the English language. Therefore, rounded definitions are dangerous mainly in a dictionary anticipated for learners to whom the language is foreign. He also adds that a monolingual dictionary is insufficient in this respect. This tendency is reinforced by the fact that in a bigger number of words the dissimilarity in meaning is fine and subtle. Or such

discrimination is not produced in the MT. This is converted into a severe problem in the case of words that Runkle (1988:51) labels as 'loose sense of synonymy.'

To sum up the description and analysis of the students' malperformance in writing without proper use of cohesive devices, it is revealed that students have got a pitiable command of English language despite the fact that they have studied English for at least seven years in their general education.

5. Conclusions
5.1. Summary of the findings
According to the results being attained from the analyzed data of the research, the findings are summarized as such:

- Students ignore cohesive devices, sentence boundaries and cohesion in writing.
- This ignorance is due to MT and overgeneralization sources.
- Teachers misuse learning and communication strategies.
- Practical English writing classes are inadequate.
- Students developed negative attitudes towards English writing.
- Neither teachers nor students are enthusiastic about writing courses.

5.2. Pedagogical Implications
After analysis, the following might be interpreted:

Students' ignorance of the cohesive devices and sentence boundaries is strongly approved beside their ignorance of connectivity strategies (cohesion) in text writing Data analysis results in this respect showed totality of 100%. Such ignorance is strongly related to L1 interference, overgeneralization and the misuse of different learning and communication strategies almost totaling to 100%. On the other hand, inadequacy of students' previous English classes, students' bad handwriting, their negative attitudes to writing and lack of enthusiasm towards English writing by both teachers and students have all lead to this critical situation with an agreement of 100 percent for each individual item. Yet realistic knowledge of the theme, frequent practical writing tasks, adequate listening, reading and summary errands attract students to write and help improve their performance. However, application of the writing courses techniques needs teachers' full acquaintance with the cohesive devices and other techniques of coherent writing. A total of 100% confirms this. Finally, all teachers agree that time and concern allotted for writing courses, in terms of periods, are not sufficient with a percentage of 70%.

References
Burton, S.H.A. (1955). Comprehensive English Course. London: Longmans, Green and Co.

Conner, U. (1984) "A Study on Cohesion and Coherence in English as a Second Language Students' Writing". Papers in Linguistics: International Journal of Human Communicate On, Vol.(17), 1984, PP. 300-317.

Elugbe, B. (1995) Nigeria Pidgin: 'Problems and Prospects'. In: Bamgbose, Banjo and Thomas (eds.), New Englishes: A West African Perspective, pp. 284–299.

Halliday, M. A. K. and Hasan, R. (1976) Cohesion in English, (London, Longman Group Limited).

Hasan, R. (1968). Grammatical cohesion in spoken and written English. London: Longman.

--------------(1984). Coherence and cohesive harmony. In J. Flood (Eds.), Understanding reading comprehension: Cognition, language and the structure of prose (pp. 181-219). Newark: International Reading Association.

Hough, G. (1969) Style and Stylistics (London, Routledge and Kegan Paul)

Hornby, A S. (1975), Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary of Current English, Oxford University Press.

Idrees, A. (2006) Writing Skills 2, Open University of Sudan. (EDU programme; text book).

Maclin, A. (2001). Reference Guide to English: A Handbook of English as a Second Language. Washington, DC. United States Department of State.

Ostman, J. (1978) Cohesion and Semantics, (Publication of the Research Institute of the Abo Akademi Foundation).

Richards, J. C. (1985). Language Dictionary of Applied Linguistics. London: Longman.

Runkle, R. (1988) A technique to teach writing, English Teaching Forum, XXVI, pp. 50-51.

Shamsher, M. A. (1994) Problems of cohesion and coherence in the wring of non native advanced learners of English: The case of 4th year English specialists, College of Education, Sana'a University Yemen.

Witte, S.P. and Faigley, L. (1981). "Coherence, cohesion and writing quality". Vol. (32), No. 3, pp. 189-204.

Zinsser, William (2001). On Writing Well. Quill. ISBN 0-06-000664-1