



An Assessment of EFL Learners' Ability to Use Grammatical Cohesion in Written Discourse

Asst. Lect. Hatem Jasim Khudhair

م.م حاتم جاسم خضير

Author Information

Asst. Lect. Hatem Jasim Khudhair

*Iraqiya University
College Of Artsn. English Department*

Article History

Received:
March 28,
2023

Accepted:
April 5, 2023

Keywords: EFL. Ability. Learners' Grammatical

هذه مقالة وصول مفتوح بموجب ترخيص

CC BY 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract

The study aimed to assess EFL learners' ability to use grammatical cohesive devices, to identify the types of grammatical cohesive devices which are frequently used in EFL learners' descriptive essays, to find out the problematic areas related to grammatical cohesion in Iraqi EFL learners' essays, and to suggest appropriate strategies for enhancing learning abilities to use cohesive devices. The study followed the descriptive analytical method. Two tools were used as a means of data collection; a questionnaire and a test were distributed and administrated among (50) students from Iraqia university. The collected data were analyzed statistically by using the Statistical Packages for Social Sciences Programmer (SPSS). The study comes up with many results, the important of which are: the majority of Iraqi EFL learners are not able to use English Grammatical cohesive devices in their English essay, students have no ability to use cohesive devices such as consequently, to sum, theirs, you, yours, students lack the ability of receiving instruction on how to use or interpret ellipsis and substitution devices. The study recommends the followings, the important of which are: there should be more exposure to cohesive devices through many texts and sources, students can improve their writing by practicing more exercises at home, students should be aware of the functions of grammatical devices, and learners should have a time table for learning grammatical cohesive devices .



CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.0 Background

The field of linguistic study has been bounded at one end by the concept of sound and at the other by the concept of the sentence. Recently, it has been made clear that linguistic investigation can no longer treat the sentence as the ultimate unit since language does not occur in stray words or sentences, but is connected discourse (Stern, 1983: 133). Second language acquisition researchers on writing skill as Halliday and Hassan's (1976) emphasize the act of producing coherent as well as cohesive discourse in order to ensure texture or cohesion in writing. The effect of discourse on writing is very strong since they provide various kinds of grammatical devices which are used to stretch any piece of discourse to be cohesive. It is clear that without having linguistic ties, one can never construct a cohesive discourse. Thus, there is a need to have sentences in combination which are created with discourse analysis attempts. Researchers such as Halliday and Hassan see that using devices make the text more cohesive. But, it seems that students do not use grammatical cohesive devices efficiently.

1.2 Statement of the problem

Being a lecturer for eight years, the researcher has noticed that a great majority of EFL students at Iraqi university face problems of producing coherent texts. Their production lacks cohesive devices that stick ideas together. They use only a limited number of those devices and are unable to realize their functions. Their main problem is in missing or wrongly using grammatical cohesive devices to link the sentences of the texts. Hence, the researcher intends to assess the learner's ability of using grammatical cohesion in particular so as to suggest solutions to improve EFL learners achievement in written discourse.

1.3 Objectives of the Study

- 1- To assess EFL learners' ability to use grammatical cohesive devices.
- 2- To identify the types of grammatical cohesive devices which are frequently used in EFL learners' descriptive essays.
- 3- To find out the problematic areas related to grammatical cohesion in Iraqi EFL learners' essays.
- 4- To suggest appropriate strategies for enhancing learning abilities to use cohesive devices.

1.4 Questions of the Study

- 1- To what extent are Iraqi EFL learners able to use English grammatical cohesive devices in written discourse?
- 2- What is the frequency of the use of each device used by EFL learners in descriptive essay writing?



3- What are the problems detected in EFL student's essays which are related to grammatical cohesive devices?

1.5 Hypotheses of the study

1- The majority of Iraqi EFL learners are not able to use English grammatical cohesive devices (references, substitution, ellipsis and conjuncts) in their English essay.

2- Most of Iraqi EFL college learners find problems in connecting sentences to each other in a text.

3- The grammatical devices that are used frequently in EFL learners' descriptive essays, are references and conjunction devices.

4- Intensive practice in teaching grammatical cohesive devices improves the learners' performance in writing descriptive essays.

1.6 Significance of the study

1.7 This study will help the researcher to propose solutions on how to help EFL learners to improve their written discourse since writing is generally considered to be one of the active or productive skills of language. Therefore, the findings of this study are expected to be useful for the EFL teachers at university level to help to improve their student's written discourse, and improve their overall writing skill. The outcome of this study is hoped to arrive at a pedagogical conclusion to provide academic suggestions for English lecturers in the Arab world on how to tackle the grammatical cohesive devices errors to contribute to the field of applied linguistics.

1.8 Methodology of the Study

1.9 The researcher will adopt the analytical descriptive method to conduct this study. The sample consists of (50) university students from the fourth class using the simple random technique in which the researcher will randomly choose the students from the department of English, Faculty of Education for Women/Iraqi University (2021-2022).

1.10 Two tools will be utilized for data collection :a writing test and questionnaire survey for EFL learners. The collected data will be analyzed by SPSS program.

1.11 Limits of the study

1.12 The study is limited to an assessment of EFL learners' ability to use grammatical cohesion in written discourse. The sample is limited to fourth years' university students at the department of English, Faculty of Educations for Women/Iraqi University (2017-2018). The study will be conducted during the years (2021-2022).

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter consists of two parts. The first part is devoted to the theoretical framework of the study which deals with the terms: discourse analysis and grammar, concept of cohesion, textuality and grammatical cohesion, types of grammatical cohesion, essay writing, types of essay, descriptive essay. The second one is devoted to the review of some previous



related studies to identify the position of the present study among other similar studies and state how it is different from its counterparts.

2-1 Discourse Analysis and Grammar

McCarthy (1991: 73) shows that the relationship between the grammatical form of a sentence and the wider context in which it occurs lies in the interaction between grammar/syntax and discourse analysis. Cohesion plays an extended role in this relation where the inclusion of the concepts Theme and Rheme are important in the progression of any discourse. English learners consciously acquire the structure of the English sentence either by repetition or drills or by mere grammatical analysis. Thus, discourse analysts are interested in the implication of these different structural options for the creation of text. It seems well known that English has a quite fixed word order, normally summarized as "SVOA", that is, subject+ verb+ object+ Adverbial. "SVOA" means that a declarative statement must carry a subject at the front of the sentence, a verb after it and an object and/or an adverbial at the end of the sentence. However, McCarthy, (1991) states that, there is a variety of ways in English in which one can record the basic elements of the sentence by altering different elements to the front of the sentence. This movement is called "fronting devices", as illustrated in: sometimes Joyce reads the Guardian A S V O

1.13 E.g. What Joyce reads is the Guardian WhS V O

1.14 E.g. it's the Guardian Joyce reads O S v

1.15 The writer decides where to start the sentence at the beginning of each sentence. The rest of the sentence tells the reader something about the theme. The theme is the framework of the point of the departure of the message, and it is what the addresser wants to convey about (McCarthy: 1991: 30).

1.16 Halliday, (1994: 43) describes the theme-theme dichotomy. First, the theme is marked in intonation as separate tone unit, frequently followed by a brief pause. Second, only the basic elements of the kernel structure can become topic themes: the process (main verb), the participants (subject and object) and the circumstantial factor (adverbials). In English, three possible themes are found: Textual theme (discourse markers are conjunctions) + interpersonal theme (vocative) + topic theme (SVOA elements).

1.17 The addresser uses theme and rheme to highlight a piece of information in the sentence. McCarthy, (1991: 54) says, for example, it is quite common that in spoken narrative anecdotes, speakers will often put in the front place the key orientational features for their listeners. There are most obviously time and place markers ('Once upon a time', 'one day', 'then, suddenly', 'at the corner', 'not far from here', etc), but may also be foregrounding of key participants and information about them felt to be important for the listener. Theme and Rheme are also used to organize information in the text. Thus, the rheme is one sentence which becomes the theme in a following sentence.

1.18 "Them/ rheme assignment is a general way of organizing information reference over from one proposition to the text" (Widdowson, 2007:43). Furthermore, there is a thematic



organization of the paragraph. In English, the sentence of a paragraph is also a theme (topic sentence), whereas the following sentences have a rhematic value (supporting sentences), which develops the idea proposed by the theme by means of examples, arguments, etc. (Trujillo, 2007).

1.19 2-2 Concept of Cohesion

1.20 In the study of discourse, a question may be asked in connection to how materials are organized. To answer a question like this, one needs to carry out further investigation into the facets of discourse organization. Some of these facets are described in terms of cohesion, or the connection which exists within texts cohesion is a semantic property of a text sticking together in some way; i.e., a cohesive text tends to link its sentences together semantically. This semantic aspect of cohesion has a relation with the reader who interprets the elements in a given co-text depending on the other element within the same co-text. Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 36) assert that "Cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one presupposes the other in the sense that it can be effectively decoded".

1.21 In Fact, the presupposition is an important aspect in cohesion because it extracts the unrelated sentences by the connected one. The relations in meaning of any sentence depends on the surrounding elements. In other words "cohesion refers to the range of possibilities that exist for linking something with what has gone before. Since this linking is achieved through relations in meaning" (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 10). An illustrative example is "Wash and core six cooking apples, put them in a fire proof dish" the item "them" in the second sentence refers back to "six cooking apples" in the first sentence. In this, since one cannot understand the second sentence without referring to the first one which gives sign to what "them" stands for. That is to say, "them" is an item which facilitates the reader's understanding of the relation between sentences in the text.

1.22 As in the case of the above example, cohesion is focused on the relation of the boundaries between sentences rather than within sentences. In other words, it is interested in the "inter sentence" which ensures texture. Moreover, although cohesion exists within the limit of a single sentence, it is of less importance because the sentence is naturally cohesive due to its grammatical structure. "Cohesion ties between sentences stand out more clearly because they are the only source of texture, whereas within the sentence there are the structural relations as well" (Halliday and Hassan, 1976: 9). According to Halliday and Hassan (1976), for instance, "if you happen to see the Admiral, don't tell him his ship's gone down". In this sentence, "His" and "Him" refer to "admiral" in the first half of the same sentence. Thus, the realization of cohesion within the sentence is governed by rules of pronominalisation ;i.e., the use of a given pronoun to be referred to is determined by the sentence structure. For example, a sentence such as "John took John's hat off and hang John's hat on a peg": cannot be accounted as a cohesive sentence unless one uses some of the pronominal forms to be referred to the identity of the pronominal form. Talking about the same "John"



and the same "hat".

1.23 Meanwhile, one gets sentence structured as "John took his hat off and hang it on a peg" in which "his" refers to "John" and "it" refers to "hat" The inter sentence cohesion is the most important aspect in cohesion. Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 8), points out that "Cohesion relations have in principle nothing to do with sentence boundaries. Cohesion is a semantic relation between an element in the text and some other crucial and its interpreted elements: but its location in the text is in no way determined by the grammatical structure the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, may be structurally related to each other or they may not.

1.24 2-3 Textuality and Grammatical Cohesion

1.25 Textuality can be summed up by McCarthy, (1991: 35) as "the feeling that something is a text and not just a random collection of sentences" In contrast to sentence grammar which focuses on the construction of only one sentence, text grammar is a discipline which is interested in the way sentences (in a text) are interrelated and combined together. For this reason, text grammar does appeal to discourse analysis which is constantly concerned with how sentences stick together.

1.26 Grammatical cohesion refers to the various grammatical devices that can be used to make relations among sentences more explicit. Cohesive devices are used to tie pieces of text together in a specific way. The aim is to help the reader understand the items referred to, the ones replaced and even the items omitted (Harmer, 2004: 21). Furthermore, the combination of sentences using cohesive devices which have semantic relation needs a shared linguistic environment to interpret items.

1.27 A sentence such as "he said so" is semantically correct as it is grammatically in that it means what it means though one does not know who is meant by "he" and what is meant by "so". To analyze the sentence, one has to seek in the surrounding environment what "he" and "so" refer to. Many other examples on the serious cohesive situations are going to be dealt within the covering types of cohesive devices.

1.28 There are two broad divisions of cohesion identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) – grammatical and lexical. Reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction are the various types of grammatical cohesion. Lexical cohesion is realized through repetition of lexical items, synonyms, superordinates and general words. The researcher will focus on the grammatical cohesion that will be described further in this chapter.

2-4 Types of Grammatical Cohesion

Halliday and Hassan, (1976:58) provide the basic categories of grammatical cohesion pointing that they can systematize this concept by classifying it into a small number of distinct categories, they refer to them as: reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunctions; these categories have a theoretical basis and specific types of grammatical cohesion, which also provide a practical means for describing and analyzing texts.



2-4-1 Reference

One of the options that grammar of English offers creating surface links between sentences is reference. Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 31) point out that reference features cannot be semantically interpreted without referring to some other features in the text. Pronouns are the most common linguistic element as referring devices in a textual environment. However, there are other linguistic elements used to fulfill the same function such as: articles ,demonstratives and comparatives. References can be created as "exophoric" or "endophoric" functions. This is because simply when people refer to a given item, they expect the reader to interpret it by either looking forward, backward and outward.

Exophoric involves exercises that require the reader to look out of the text in order to interpret the referent. The reader, thus, has to look beyond or out of the text with a shared world between the reader and the writer. "Exphoric reference directs the receiver out of the text and into an assumed shared world"(McCarthy, 1991: 41). For example, 'that must have cost a lot of money' in this example one has to look out of the situation to retrieve the meaning of the sentences (Halliday and Hassan, 1976) Endophoric function refers to the text itself in its interpretation. Brown and Yule, (1983: 192) point out that "where their interpretation lies within a text, they are called 'endophoric' relations and form cohesive ties within the text". Endophoric reference is itself two classes: to start with, anaphoric relations is all kinds of activities which involve looking back in texts to find the referent. For example: "it rained day and night for two weeks, the basement flooded and everything was under water, it spoils all our calculations" (McCarthy, 1991; 36). Here, the first "it" refers to the discourse itself, the second "it" refers to the event of two weeks, or the fact that it rained or flooded i.e., the whole situation rather than an event in particular, whereas cataphoric relation looks forward for their interpretation.

2.4.1.1 Personal reference

Is the linguistic element used as referring device; "reference by means of function in the speech situation through the category of person" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:37). Personal reference uses personal pronouns, such as 'I, you, he, she, it, etc', and possessive pronouns such as 'mine, yours, his, her, hers, etc', and possessive determiners such as 'me, your, his, her, etc'.

2.4.1.2 Demonstrative reference

It is reference to an item by the use of demonstrative determiners; "reference by means of location on a scale of proximity" (Halliday and Hasan 1976:37). It is attained by the use of proximity determiners such as 'this, these, that, etc' and adverbs like 'here, there, now, etc'.

2.4.1.3 Comparative reference



It is a linguistic elements used to fulfill the function of comparison; “indirect reference by means of identity or similarity” (Halliday and Hasan 1976:37). It uses adjectives such as: ' same, equal, other, better, etc' and adverbs like 'so, such, similarly, otherwise, etc'. From that we can say that these linguistic elements help listener/reader to interpret what has been said by referring backward or forward to items exist in the text or outside the text. Halliday and Hasan (1976) distinguish these two types as endophoric reference and exophoric reference.

2.4.1.4 Endophoric Reference

It is the cohesive relations that took place in the text; so the meaning is interpreted by referring to the text. Brown and Yule (1983:192) state that "where their interpretation lies within a text they are called endophoric relations". Reference items can be expressed within a text into two different ways anaphoric or in a cataphoric way.

2.4.1.5 Anaphoric Reference

It refers back to the item which has been previously identified in the text, “anaphoric reference points the reader or listener backwards to a previously mentioned entity, process or state of affairs” (Nunan, 1993: 22). This reference is clearly exemplified by McCarthy (1991:38) And the living room was a very small room with two windows that wouldn't open and things like that. And it looked nice. It had a beautiful brick wall. The reader of this example can understand that 'It' refers backward to 'the living room'.

2.4.1.6 Exophoric

Reference directs the receiver out of the text and into an assumed shared world" (1991: 41). That is to say, in order to interpret the meaning different aspects shared between the sender and the receiver should be given. McCarthy (1991:41) presented a good example of that: She was using one of those trimmers to get rid of the weeds. In this example we can notice that the shared world between the speaker and the listener is necessary part to know what 'those' refers to.

2-4-2 Substitution

Whereas reference functions to link semantic meanings within text, substitution differs in that it operates as a linguistic link at the lexicogrammatical level.

Bloor, (1995: 96) shows that substitution and ellipsis are used when "a speaker or writer wishes to avoid the repetition of a lexical item and is able to draw on one of the grammatical resources of the language to replace the item ".Unlike reference, substitution is a relation between linguistic items such as words or phrases. Reference is a semantic phenomenon, substitution is a grammatical phenomenon.

Halliday and Hassan, (1976) state that substitution takes place when one feature (in a text) replaces a previous word or expression, for instance "I left my pen at home, do



you have one"?. In this example, "one" is replaced or substitution for "pen". It is important to mention that substitution and reference are different in what and where they operate, thus, substitution is concerned with relations related with wording. Whereas reference is concerned with relations related with meaning. Substitution is a way to avoid repetition in the text itself ;however, reference needs to retrieve its meaning from the substitutional textual occurrence.

2-4-2-1 Nominal substitution

According to Bloor (1995: 96) the substitute 'one', including its plural form 'ones' always functions as head in the nominal group, and can substitute only for an item which is itself head of a nominal group e.g. My axe is too blunt. I must get a sharper one. The substitute "one" in the second sentence substitutes for the noun 'axe' in the first sentence. It would be possible to repeat the noun 'axe' in the second sentence to read 'I must get a sharper axe'. Moreover, the substitute 'one' assumes the function of the presupposed item.

2-4-2-2 Verbal substitution

Unlike the nominal substitute 'one', which always operates on the nominal group, the verbal substitution operates on the verbal group. It functions as the head of the verbal group, in the place that is occupied by the lexical verb, and its position is always final in the group. According to Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 50) verbal substitution in English language is made by using the verb 'do', e.g., A: You think Joan already knows. B: I think everybody does.

2-4-2-3 Clausal Substitution

Unlike the two preceding substitution types, nominal substitute 'one' which always operates on the nominal group and verbal group 'do' which always operates on the verbal group, clausal substitute 'So' and the negative form 'not' operate on the entire clause, i.e., they do not presuppose a noun or a verb but the entire clause, i.e., A: Is there going to be an earthquake? – It says so. B: Has every one gone home? – I hope not.

2-4-3 Ellipsis

The relationship between substitution and ellipsis is very close because it is merely that ellipsis is "substitution" by zero (0). What is essential in ellipsis is that some elements are omitted from the surface text, but they are still understood. Thus, omission of these elements can be recovered by referring to an element in the preceding text (Harmer, 2004: 24). On considering the following example: "Penny was introduced to a famous author, but even before, she had recognized him". It appears that the structure of the second clause indicates that there is something left out "introduced to a famous author", the omission of this feature kept the meaning still clear and there is no need of repetition; Carter et



al, (2000: 182) state that "ellipsis occurs in writing where usually functions textually to avoid repetition where structures would otherwise be redundant".

2-4-3-1 Nominal Ellipsis

Quirk et al. (1975: 261) define nominal ellipsis as the one which operates on the nominal group. The structure of the nominal group consists of a head with optional modifier. The modifying elements include some which precede the head, known as "premodifiers", and some which follow it, known as "postmodifiers". The former usually consists of a deictic, uncreative, epithet, or a classifier, whereas the latter consists of only a qualifier. For example "These two fast electric trains with pantographs". The head of the nominal group is the noun "trains". Within the modifier, "these" has the function of deictic, "two" numerative, "fast" epithet, and "electric" classifier, while with "pantographs" is a qualifier.

2-4-3-2 Verbal Ellipsis

Unlike nominal ellipsis, which always operates on the nominal group, verbal ellipsis, as the name implies, operates on the verbal group. The structure of the verbal group usually expresses its systematic features, i.e., the choices that are being made within the verbal group system. Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 40) believe that an elliptical verbal group is one whose structure does not fully express its systematic features: they have to be recovered by presupposition, as in: "What have you been doing"? "Swimming". In the elliptical verbal group "swimming", there is only one lexical element, and that is the verb itself "swim". The presupposition "have been swimming" express all the features of the verbal group that is presupposed by the elliptical verbal group: finite, indicative, non-modal, positive, active and past, present or future.

2-4-3-3 Clausal Ellipsis

Clausal ellipsis is a very complicated relation: there is no clear-cut distinction between verbal ellipsis and clausal ellipsis. The former involves the omission of other elements in the structure of the clause besides verbal ones. Within this context, Halliday and Hassan (1976: 194), illustrate ellipsis is always accompanied by the omission of the related clause elements, these that are in the same part of the clause as the relevant portion of the verbal group. So in operator ellipsis, where there is omission of the finite part of the verbal group, the subject is also omitted; in lexical ellipsis, where there is omission of the non-finite part of the verbal group, all complements and adjuncts are also omitted.

2-4-4 Conjunction

Halliday and Hassan, (1978: 227) describe conjunction as follows: "In describing conjunction as a cohesive device, we are focusing attention not on semantic relation as such, as realized throughout the grammar of the language, but on one particular aspect of them, namely the function they have of relating to each other linguistic elements that occur in



succession but are not related by other, structural means". Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 111) point out that there are four types of conjunction additives, adversative, causal and temporal conjunction.

2-4-4-1 Additive Conjunction

Under this heading "additive", Halliday and Hassan group the words "and", "or" and "nor". They believe that these words are all used cohesively, as conjunctions; and all of them are classified as additive. All the three, (and, or, nor), may express either the external or the internal type of conjunctive relation.

2-4-4-2 Adversative Conjunction

Halliday and Hassan (1976: 170), believe that the basic meaning of the adversative relation is "contrary to expectation". The source of expectation is either the content of what is being said, or the communication process, the speaker-hearer situation. According to Halliday and Hassan (1976: 50), an external adversative relation is expressed in its simple form by the words "Yet". In English, the conjunction "but", "however", and "though" are very similar to "Yet". "But" differs from "Yet", in that "But" contains the element "and" as one of the components, whereas "Yet" does not.

2-4-4-3 Casual Conjunction

According to Halliday and Hassan, (1976: 50) the simple form of causal relation is expressed by the words "So", "thus", "hence", "therefore", "consequently", and a number of expressions like "as a result (of that)", "because of that", "in consequence (of that)". All these words and expressions regularly combine with initial "and".

Under the heading of casual relations, Quirk et al. (1975: 190) include the specific ones of result, reason and purpose. They are not distinguished in the simplest form of expression; "so", for example, means "as a result of this", "for this reason".

2-4-4-4 Temporal Conjunction

According to Cook, (1990: 21) the relation between two successive sentences may be simply one sequence in time: the one is subsequent to the other. This temporal relation is expressed by words such as "then", "and then", "next", "afterwards", "after that", "sequentially" and a number of other expressions.

2.5 Essay Writing

An essay is a group of paragraphs, each with the function of supporting a controlling idea (Brandon, 2001, 60). Moreover, writing an essay can be used as a way of encouraging one's personality as a sensitive human being to sympathize and identify those towards whom he aims his writing to (Harmon and Dickinson, 1972: 3).

Perhaps, the need for writing an essay is associated with the idea that both in college and in a profession, one is required to prepare pieces of writing. That is, he has to deal



with subjects in greater detail than is possible in a single paragraph. An essay can cover numerous facets of a subject, exploring many different angles of interest. Paragraphs are the building block of essays (Kelly and Lawton, 2004:166).

2.6 Types of Essay

In terms of content and purpose, essay can be classified into narrative, descriptive, argumentative, expository, etc. The following sections present the most common types of essay, focusing on the descriptive in correlation with the aim of the present study.

2.6. 1 Descriptive Essay

A descriptive essay creates a picture in the reader's mind, sometimes writers employ observable factual details expressed in an unemotional language to create objective description. For example, a real estate appraiser who describes a house to determine its fair market values would write an objective description of the house. Sometimes, writers want to include their feeling about what they are describing, or they want to create certain feelings in the reader. At such times, writers use more emotional or expressive language to describe. This is subjective description (Clouse, 1996: 127) In fact, description draws a picture of someone or something through words. Through story details, precise words choice, and sound organization, the writer allows his readers to visualize the subject matter clearly. He does not merely tell them that something is remarkable, unusual, or pretty. He shows them so that they can see the uniqueness, rare qualities, or beauty for themselves. Thus, the description may also involve the senses of sound, touch, motion, and even smell in addition to the senses of sight (Meyers, 2006:130)

2.7 Previous Studies

Several studies have been conducted on Methods of Teaching English. However they did not assess the EFL learners' ability to use Grammatical cohesion in written discourse. The following examples concerning this area are presented in this part of the study. Regarding local studies, several local studies were conducted in Iraqi universities, they are as follows:

The first study was carried out by, Hameed(2004). The study investigated lexical cohesion in a corpus of 12 editorials from English- Iraqi newspapers with the aim of identifying which type is used by our writers and whether it is the most effective type or not. And since the writers of these editorials are non- native speakers of English, they may overuse one kind of these devices to connect the different parts of these texts which is of argumentative, persuasive nature. It is hypothesized that they overuse two types of lexical cohesion, which are: repetition and near synonym. The analytic framework adopted in this study is based on the model put forward by Halliday and Hasan(1976).



Another study was conducted by Joda (2006), The aims of this study were: Investigating the repertoire of cohesive devices that college students use in producing their written texts, outlining the level of development these students undergo in the light of these devices through making comparisons between the groups chosen as a sample for the study. Two hypotheses have been tested of for this purpose. The first is that Iraq EFL learners of English make less error in their manipulation of cohesive devices as they progress in their study. The second states that the greatest number of error by learners in (1) above is attributed to the strategy of interlingual transfer .In order to investigate these two hypotheses a pilot test is carried out to determine the reliability of the final test. The main test ,in its turn, that each student at the fourth-year level writes consists of two compositions about the same two topics that he had written about in his final composition exams when he was in the first-and second level.

A third study was conducted by Jubouri, (2008) . The aim of this study was to discover whether lexical cohesion in English differs from that in Arabic, the extent this difference reaches and how it functions in the poetic variety of both language systems .To achieve the aim of the study, two types of procedures had been followed: theoretical and analytical. In theoretical procedure six models of lexical cohesion in each language have been presented, then two modified models have been adopted: one for that in Arabic. In their analytical procedures, eight poems had been selected: four are English and others are Arabic.

Concerning regional studies: the first study was conducted by Abdullah SaadAl-dera(2016) entitled" Cohesion in Written Discourse: A Case Study of Arab EFL Students – Department of English, College of Arts and Sciences Najran University, Saudi Arabia. The study analyses cohesion and coherence in selected discourses written by advanced learners in the Department of English at Najran University, Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. A case study of Master Degree (M A) students in the female section of Najran University English Department the study comes up with a number of results that show that writing is still a great difficulty for them even at a relatively higher level of education. They show weakness in logical thought and organizational pattern. They lack the fundamental knowledge of the rules of syntax, inter-sentence relations, cohesive devices and other advanced methods of composition. The study is expected to help L2 Saudi teachers to address the problems of cohesion and coherence at discourse level and take pedagogical precautions to prevent them. The study follows content analysis method. The results indicate the learners' inefficiency at the application of language as well as the basic mechanics of writing.

Regarding an international related studies, the researcher has come across the following studies: The first study was Ph.D. thesis conducted by Donald J. Leu, Jr. (1982)



Differences Between Oral And Written Discourse And The Acquisition Of Reading Proficiency University of California, Berkeley. The study aims to examine discourse conflicts between the structure of written text and the oral expectations of young readers. Twenty-eight second grade students read and retold two stories: one with oral and one with written discourse structures. ANOVA results suggest that written discourse stories were more difficult to comprehend. In addition, an interaction appeared between familiarity with written discourse structures and comprehension of the two story versions. As familiarity with written discourse structures increased, the interference effect on reading comprehension decreased. Oral reading error results paralleled these findings, suggesting that expectations based on a knowledge of oral discourse structures may, in some cases, actually interfere with the reading comprehension of young readers .

A PhD thesis, was carried out by Gabriella Jenei(2014) entitled: Referential Cohesion in Academic Writing A descriptive and exploratory theory- and corpus-based study of the text-organizing role of reference in written academic discourse. This thesis aimed to contribute to the study of written discourse and to writing pedagogy within the field of teaching English for academic purposes. The study has both a theoretical and an empirical focus. First, it advances the theory of cohesion analysis by refining the cohesive reference related aspects of Halliday and Hasan's (1976) taxonomy of cohesion, and transforming it into a reliable and valid analytical tool for cohesive reference analysis in academic discourse in particular. Secondly, it tests the tool and presents the results obtained by applying it to a corpus-based comparative analysis of research articles and EFL writers' MA theses.



CHAPTER THREE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the procedures followed in carrying out the study. It provides a description of the sample, instruments for data collection and data analysis. In addition, this chapter includes the procedures for checking reliability and validity of the tests and the questionnaire. The study used the descriptive analytical method.

3.1 Population And Sample Of The study

The sample for the current study consisted of fifty female students, who were studying in the fourth-grade classes, participants ranged in age 21-23, having larger number of students is preferable. They were full-time students enrolled in undergraduate courses at the Department of English, Faculty of Education, Al-Iraqiya university in Baghdad. All Of them are Arab speakers, who speak Arabic as the first language and Study English as foreign language.

The selection was based on the assumption that they had the basic knowledge of the English language. The choice of fourth year students to be the sample of the test is due to the fact that they are at advanced stage of the English Department. They are expected to be familiar with the use of grammatical cohesive devices in their writing. The selected participants are considered homogenous in terms of their ethnicity, linguistic, and socio-economic background. However, they received English Language Learning differently. While some of them studied English since the age of six, others learnt English overseas or out of schools.

3.2 Tools for Data Collection and analysis

A Test and a questionnaire were chosen as instruments for data collection, The researcher has used SPSS programme (Statistical Packages for Social Sciences) for data analysis using percentage, standard deviation and mean for the tests and percentage for the questionnaire. The data collected were summarized and displayed in tables.

3.2.1. The Test

The test was designed for EFL University students. It was designed to assess EFL university students' performance in English language. The test was designed to measure EFL learners' ability to use Grammatical Cohesion in Written Discourse. The test contains two items, the students were asked to write three paragraphs of descriptive essay of (200-250) words in either a place you visited before or a journey to a seaside (see appendix A) The test aims at assessing EFL university students to use the cohesive devices and grammatical ability.

3.2.1.1 Validity of the Test



The test was checked by three staff members at the Department of English- Faculty of Education – University of Baghdad. In addition, the test was also checked by six staff members at the department of English at Iraqia University. The researcher made the amendments they suggested and finally they judge the test to be valid.

3.2.1.2 Reliability of the Test

To check the reliability of the test, a pilot sample consisting of ten (10) EFL university students were given the test, Then the test was administered to a group consisting of fifty EFL university students in Faculty of Education, University of Iraqia – Baghdad-Iraq. . The Spearman formula was used to make co-efficient of reliability for the test. The reliability obtained was (0.82). This means that the test is perfectly reliable.

3.2.2 Questionnaire

The researcher employs the structured questionnaire because it is simple and easy to complete, as well as ensures that participants will be able to answer the questions accurately and quickly. The aim of this step is to identify the format of answering the statements to be able to get the required data right from the questionnaire. The Likert scale was chosen because it is very easy to manage. These statements. were easily answered, as well as the instrument is extremely reliable. The Likert scale with five levels of points is utilized for this study because it decreases the chance of measurement error along with the violation of normality within the distributed data. For these reasons, Likert scale is the best option when compared to other scales such as Guttman or Thurstone. The scales of 5 points yield a better-quality data as compared to 7 points. Therefore, this study adopted 5-point scales (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3=to Some Extent 4= agree, and 5= strongly agree). The questionnaire has fifteen statements; Appendix B presents the questionnaire of this study. Each statement was constructed purposively to fulfill the objectives and the hypotheses of the study.

3.2.2.2 Validity of the Questionnaire

The field of studies establish content and face validity of the survey instrument .The accuracy of the instrument can be confirmed by the experts in the field of linguistics to allow for results to be generalized. The face validity would be either a formal face validity or informal face validity test which is important before instruments were used for the actual study.To make sure the instrument content validity, the items that selected for the questionnaire were validated and reviewed by a panel of experts. Since all the measurement items for this study were adapted from prior studies which had already been tested. However, because of possible differences in the environment and scope of the study, a face validity testing was carried out by six specialists in English language teaching and linguistics to verify and check the instrument capability to measure what is supposed to measure.



This is consistent with Venkatesh, et al., (2003) who suggested testing the instrument with six to nine professionals with terminal degrees to determine that the survey questions. Some modifications were made in the questionnaire to be able to exclude wrong grammar and vocabulary, duplicated meanings, Typographical errors, long sentences, and also words that participants could have a difficult comprehending. All modifications, advice and suggestions set and agreed by the specialists have been taken into considerations.

3.2.2.3 Reliability of Questionnaire

To measure the reliability of the questionnaire, the researcher chose spearman correlation. The value of spearman coefficient was (0.985) which indicates that the questions of the questionnaire are considerably reliable. The appropriate value of Cronbach's alpha coefficient is usually 0.70 or above regarding instruments to consider reliable. Reliability testing was accomplished to measure 15 items. Based on the results, just about all the scales were considered reliable because they met with the required Cronbach's alpha.

To check the reliability, this study used pilot study. The pilot study is a smallscale evaluation before the actual survey (Chua, 2009). According to Zikmund, (2003) the pilot study is an experimental study that aims to enhance particular research instrumentations. Based on the mentioned guidelines, the pilot study has been conducted on (April, 2021). A total of 15 copies of questionnaire were distributed personally to students in Iraqiya University. The responses to the pilot study were excluded from the main study. The pilot study was allowed respondents the freedom to criticize the instruments regarding the content, format, and terminology. The collected data was analyzed statistically using SPSS version 21 to determine the reliability of the scales in the questionnaire.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

4.0 Introduction

This chapter is concerned with the analysis and discussion of the results of the test for students and questionnaire for EFL lectures. Tables will be used for summarizing the data collected from both tools. The results of the test can be divided into two sections



4.1.1 Results of the Test

Table No (4.1.1) Student's Performance in using reference devices

S.N	Demonstrative Reference	De-vices No	%	Personal refer-ences	De-vices No	%	Compara-tive Reference	De-vices	%
1		15	30		17	34		5	10
2		11	32		14	28		0	0
3		12	24		16	32		2	4
4		20	40		11	22		4	8
5		11	42		20	40		3	6
6		10	18		13	26		1	2
7		21	32		13	26		1	2
8		9	34		11	22		0	0
9		16	38		13	26		2	4
10		17	34		12	24		4	8
11		19	38		10	20		3	6
12		13	36		17	34		1	2
13		19	38		13	26		1	2
14		13	26		10	20		0	0
15		11	22		10	20		0	0
16		17	34		13	26		1	2
17		21	42		12	24		0	0
18		18	36		11	22		2	4



19	13	26	12	24	3	6
20	11	22	10	20	1	2
21	18	26	12	24	2	4
22	12	24	11	22	1	2
23	13	26	10	20	0	0
24	11	22	7	14	3	6
25	9	18	11	22	0	0
26	11	22	8	16	0	0
27	10	20	9	18	0	0
28	17	34	10	20	4	8
29	12	24	11	22	0	0
30	14	38	12	24	0	0
31	15	30	16	32	0	0
32	20	40	17	34	0	0
33	7	14	10	20	0	0
34	11	22	10	20	4	8
35	16	32	7	14	3	6
36	21	42	12	24	2	4
37	13	26	8	16	3	6
38	11	22	10	20	1	2
39	12	24	11	22	4	8
40	16	32	10	20	0	0

41		13	26		8	16		0	0
42		21	42		15	30		4	8
43		16	32		15	30		3	6
44		18	36		11	22		6	1 2
45		10	20		7	14		0	0
46		17	34		12	24		1	2
47		19	38		13	26		2	4
48		11	22		8	16		2	4
49		16	32		13	26		3	6
50		11	22		10	20		0	0
	Total	714	28. 50		553	22. 12		81	3. 2 4

Table (4-1-2) frequent occurrences of reference devices

Tot	Demonstrative Devices used	Number of Devices	%	total	Personal devices used	De-vices	%	To-tal	Com-parative ref-erence	De-vices	%
	The	241	48.2		I	118	23.6		Other-wise	3	0.6
	This	131	26.2		You	0.0	0.0		More	7	1.4
	These	62	12.4		We	47	9.4		As	8	1.6

714	That	204	40.8	553	He	27	5.4	81	Differ- ently	7	1.4
	Those	26	5.2		She	25	5.0		Else	2	0.4
	Here	13	2.6		It	38	7.6		Differ- ent	7	1.4
	Now	17	3.4		They	83	6.6		Other	0	0.0
	There	10	2.0		One	0	0		Like- wise	3	0.6
	Then	10	2.0		My	12	2.4		Simi- larly	3	0.6
714	Per- sonal								So	7	1.4
	Your	8	1.6%						Same	8	1.6
	Our	30	6.0						Equal	3	0.6
	His	11	2.2						Identi- cal	3	0.6
	Her	6	2.1						Identi- cally	3	0.6
	Its	10	2.0						Such	10	2.0
	One's	0	0						Smaller	4	0.8

553	Them	82	16.4							
	Mine	8	1.6							
	Yours	0	0							
	Ours	15	3.0							
	His	14	2.8							
	Hers	7	4.1							
	Theirs	0	0							
	Its	12	2.4							

Summary table for using of reference devices

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Demonstrative references	714	53%
Personal references	535	40%
Comparative references	81	7%
Total	1348	100%

The results in table (4.1.2) indicates that the students widely use the demonstrative references, (53%) whereas personal references used were (40%), and the rest of them do not use comparative references only 7% .

Table No (4.1.3) Student's performance in using substitution devices

S.N	Nomi- nal sub- stitu- tions	De- vices no	%	Verbal substi- tu- tions	Num- ber of de- vices	%	Clausal substitu- tions	Devices no	%
1		0	0		1	0.2		2	0.4
2		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
3		1	0.2		0	0		1	0.2
4		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
5		1	0.2		1	0.2		0	0
6		1	0.2		1	0.2		1	0.2
7		2	0.4		0	0		1	0.2
8		0	0		0	0		0	0
9		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
10		2	0.4		1	0.2		0	0
11		1	0.2		1	0.2		0	0
12		0	0		1	0.2		1	0.2
13		0	0		1	0.2		1	0.2
14		1	0.2		0	0		2	0.4
15		0	0		1	0.2		1	0.2



16	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
17	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
18	2	0.4	0	0	1	0.2
19	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
20	3	0.6	1	0.2	1	0.2
21	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
22	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.1
23	2	0.4	0	0	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	1	0.2
25	0	0	1	0.2	2	0.4
26	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
27	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.2
28	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
29	2	0.4	0	0	1	0.2
30	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
31	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.2
32	0	0	1	0.2	2	0.4
33	0	0	0	0	0	0



34		2	0.4		1	0.2		1	0.2
35		1	0.2		1	0.2		0	0
36		2	0.4		0	0		0	0
37		1	0.2		0	0		1	0.2
38		0	0		1	0.2		1	0.2
39		2	0.4		1	0.2		2	0.4
40		2	0.4		0	0		1	0.2
41		1	0.2		1	0.2		1	0.2
42		0	0		0	0		0	0
43		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
44		1	0.2		0	0		1	0.2
45		1	0.2		1	0.2		2	0.4
46		0	0		0	0		0	0
47		1	0.2		1	0.2		0	0
48		0	0		1	0.2		1	0.2
49		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
50		2	0.4		1	0.2		0	0
	Total	42	16.8		25	10%		40	16.0

Table (4.1.4) Frequent occurrences of substitution devices

Nominal substitution word used	Number of Devices	%	Total	Verbal substitutions word used	Number of devices	%	Total	Clausal substitution words used	Number of device
One	31	6.2	25	Do	11	22	40	So	28
				Does	10	20			
				Did	4	0.8			
				Done	0	0%			
Ones	11	2.2%					Not	12	
Total	42	8.4			25	42.8		40	

Summary table for Using of substitution devices

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Nominal substitution	42	39%
Verbal substitution	25	23%
Clausal substitutions	40	38%
Total	107	100%

Table (4.1.4) and its summary show that the majority of students used the nominal substitutions in essay writing, (39%) whereas (23%) used the verbal substitution, and the rest used clausal substitution (38%).

Table No (4.1.5) Student's performance in using ellipsis devices

S.N	Nominal ellipsis	De-vices No	%	Verbal ellipsis	De-vices No	%	Clausal ellipsis	De-vices No	%
1		0	0		1	0.2		0	0
2		0	0		0	0		0	0
3		0	0		0	0		0	0
4		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
5		0	0		0	0		0	0
6		0	0		0	0		1	0.2
7		1	0.2		0	0		0	0
8		0	0		0	0		0	0
9		0	0		0	0		0	0
10		1	0.2		1	0.2		0	0
11		1	0.2		0	1		1	0.2
12		0	0		1	0.2		0	0
13		0	0		0	0		0	0
14		0	0		1	0.2		0	0
15		1	0.2		0	0		0	0
16		0	0		0	0		0	0
17		0	0		0	0		0	0
18		0	0		0	0		1	0.2



19	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
20	1	0.2	1	0.2	0	0
21	0	0	0	0	0	0
22	2	0.4	1	0.2	0	0
23	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
24	0	0	0	0	0	0
25	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
27	0	0	0	0	1	0.2
28	0	0	1	0.2	0	0
29	0	0	0	0	0	0
30	0	0	0	0	1	0.2
31	0	0	0	0	0	0
32	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
33	0	0	1	0.2	1	0.2
34	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
35	0	0	1	0.2	0	0
36	0	0	0	0	0	0
37	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
38	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
39	0	0	0	0	0	0

40	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
41	1	0.2	0	0	1	0.2
42	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	1	0.2	1	0.2	1	0.2
44	2	0.4	1	0.2	0	0
45	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
46	0	0	0	0	1	0.2
47	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	1	0.2	0	0	0	0
Total	21	8.4	12	4.8	14	5.6

Summary of Frequent Occurrences of Ellipsis Devices

Type of Ellipsis	Number of Ellipsis used	%
Nominal	21	45%
Verbal	12	26%
Clausal	14	29%
Total	47	100%

The above table and its summary(4.1.5)show the frequent occurrences of Ellipsis devices explaining that the frequent using of nominal ellipses is the widest (45%), while the verbal one is represented by (26%) and the causal ellipsis devices were (29%). So the results reveals that the use of nominal substitution exceeds the use of both verbal and clausal substitution, it differs also from one type to another.

Table No (4.1.6) Student's performance in using conjunction devices

S. N	Additive	Devices No	%	Ad-versa-tive	No	%	Caus-al	Devices No	%	Temporal	De-vices No	%
1		4	0.8		4	0.8		5	1.0		10	2.0
2		7	1.4		5	1.0		6	1.2		7	1.4
3		6	1.2		4	0.8		7	1.4		7	1.4
4		8	1.4		7	1.0		6	1.2		8	1.6
5		8	1.6		4	1.6		7	1.4		8	1.6
6		9	1.8		5	1.0		7	1.4		5	1.0
7		8	1.6		7	1.4		5	1.0		3	0.6
8		7	1.4		7	1.4		8	1.6		3	0.6
9		3	0.6		4	0.8		10	2.0		3	0.6
10		5	1.0		3	0.6		11	1.4		7	0.35
11		12	2.4		10	2.6		8	1.6		5	1.0
12		14	2.8		11	2.2		7	1.4		6	1.2
13		7	1.4		5	1.0		6	1.2		6	1.2
14		8	1.6		3	0.6		5	1.0		5	1.0
15		5	1.0		5	1.0		6	1.2		3	0.6
16		5	1.0		3	0.6		5	1.0		3	0.6
17		6	1.2		5	1.0		4	0.8		5	1.0



18	8	1.6	7	1.4	4	0.8	6	1.2
19	11	2.2	8	1.6	8	1.6	4	0.8
20	10	2.0	5	1.0	6	1.2	4	0.8
21	9	1.8	3	0.6	7	1.4	6	1.2
22	10	2.0	4	0.8	5	1.0	5	1.0
23	8	1.6	2	0.4	5	1.0	4	0.8
24	8	1.6	3	0.6	8	1.6	3	0.6
25	5	1.0	3	0.6	4	0.8	4	0.8
26	6	1.2	4	0.8	5	1.0	3	0.6
27	10	2.0	8	1.6	10	2.0	5	1.0
28	5	1.0	4	0.8	12	2.4	3	0.6
29	6	1.2	5	1.0	13	2.6	4	0.8
30	7	1.4	3	0.6	5	1.0	3	0.6
31	7	1.4	3	0.6	7	1.4	6	1.2
32	11	2.2	7	1.4	7	1.4	5	1.0
33	8	1.6	6	1.2	4	0.8	3	0.6
34	5	1.0	3	0.6	6	1.2	2	0.4
35	7	1.4	4	0.8	5	1.0	3	0.6
36	7	1.4	6	1.2	6	1.2	2	0.4
37	8	1.6	6	1.2	8	1.6	2	0.4
38	11	2.2	8	1.6	5	1.0	5	1.0

39	3	0.6	2	0.4	6	1.2	6	1.2
40	4	0.8	2	0.4	6	1.2	4	0.8
41	4	0.8	3	0.6	6	1.2	4	0.8
42	11	2.2	4	0.8	5	1.0	7	1.4
43	8	1.6	5	1.0	6	1.2	3	0.6
44	7	1.4	3	0.6	5	1.0	4	0.8
45	11	2.2	5	1.0	4	0.8	3	0.6
46	10	2.0	7	1.4	6	1.2	5	1.0
47	5	1.0	3	0.6	7	1.4	6	1.2
48	6	1.2	4	0.8	5	1.0	6	1.2
49	7	1.4	7	1.4	6	1.2	7	1.4
50	7	1.4	5	1.0	6	1.2	3	0.6
Total	37	7.6	24	9.8	332	15.16	246	9.84
	7		5	0				

Summary table for using conjunction devices

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Additive cohesive devices	377	32
Adversative cohesive devices	245	22
Causal cohesive devices	323	27
Temporal cohesive devices	233	19
Total	1178	100%

Results in table (4.1.6) and its summary table, reveal that the majority the total number of additive conjunctions is (377) (32%) occurrences in students essay while the total

number of adversative conjunction is (245) (22%) occurrences. It has been noticed that the total number of causal conjunctions is (323) (27%) occurrences while the total of temporal conjunctions is (246) (19%) occurrences in students essay.

The above table indicates that some students are not familiar with the use of adversative and temporal cohesive devices due to the student's little experience in using these devices. The results also show that the prevailing device in using additive devices (32%). It seems that some students master the use of most additive cohesive devices in their writings, for the causal conjunction the results indicates that the majority of the students were able to use some causal cohesive devices in their essay writing.

Table No(4.1.8) Frequent Occurrence of grammatical cohesive Devices in essay writing

Type of device	Total	Percentage
References	1348	50
Substitution	107	4
Ellipsis	47	2
Conjunction	1102	44
Total	2694	100

The above mentioned table shows that the majority used grammatical cohesive devices that means half of the sample used references devices (50%) , while only (4%) (2%) used substitution and ellipsis respectively, and the rest are (44%), so most of the students used conjunction widely because they seem familiar with this grammatical cohesive device. However, some of conjunction cohesive devices are not used widely.

4.1.2 Results of the Questionnaire

Table No (4-2-1) Pay more attention on intensive exercise on the use of various cohesive devices, particularly ellipsis and substitution devices.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	12	24.0
Agree	30	60.0
To some extent	2	4.0
Disagree	6	12.0
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total	50	100.0

The results in the table (4.2.1) show that (60%) of the respondents agree that revising regular introduction and intensive exercises on the use of various cohesive devices. While (24%) of the students strongly agree an (12%) disagree and (4%) agree to some extent.

Table No (4-2-2) I always focus on conjunctions and how to join two sentences to make coordination and complex sentences.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	27	54.0
Agree	4	8.0
To some extent	6	12.0
Disagree	3	6.0
Strongly disagree	10	20
Total	10	100.0

The results in the table (4.2.2) indicate that (8%) of the respondents agree, while (12%) are agree to some extent and (6.0%)disagree. This means that more than half of the subjects believe that the main focus is on how to join sentences to make coordinate or complex. .

Table No (4-2-3) I care about how to write essays by using grammatical cohesive devices, particularly comparative cohesive devices.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	30	60.0
Agree	4	8.0
To some extent	4	8.0
Disagree	12	24.0
Strongly disagree	0	0
Total	50	100.0

The results in the table (4.2.3) show that (4)(8%) of the respondents agree, and to some extent (82)% and disagree (2) (24)% and the rest are strongly agree (30) 60%).

Table No (4-2-4) Pay attention on reviewing homework.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	24	48.0
Agree	15	30.0
to some extent	5	10.0
Disagree	6	12.0
strongly disagree	0	0
Total	50	100.0

The table (4.2.4) shows that five (84%) of the respondents strongly agree, (15) of the respondents while (30%), and (12%) of the respondents disagree that reviewing homework by giving suggestions, correcting mistakes, and giving notes on the appropriate use of cohesive devices.

Table No (4-2-5) Ability to recognize the sequence of idioms with the role of cohesive devices enables students to make sentences in a text.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	24	48.0
Agree	5	10.0
to some extent	16	32.0
Disagree	5	10.0
strongly disagree	0	0
Total	50	100.0

The results in table (4.2.5) reveal that only five (10%) of the respondents agree, (48) %agree to some extent that students have ability to recognize the sequence of idioms and the role of cohesive devices.

Table No (4-2-6) A timetable for the writing process helps the students to develop their ability.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	12	24.0
Agree	24	48.0
to some extent	5	10.0
Disagree	4	8.0
Strongly disagree	5	10.0
Total	50	100%

As it is observed in table (4.2.6) that less than half of the respondents (48%) agree that EFL university students strongly agree with this statement followed by (24%) are strongly agree, then to some extent and strongly disagree (10%) for both, that they make a timetable for the writing process before they start writing a paragraph

Table No (4-2-7) Focusing on looking at a model written by students before start writing.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	11	22.0
Agree	27	54.0
To some extent	3	6.0
Disagree	6	12.0
Strongly disagree	3	6.0
Total	50	100%

Table (4.2.7) indicates that (22%) of the respondents strongly agree, followed by (54%) agree, while (6%) agree to some extent, and the rest (6%) disagree that they look at a model written by a students before start writing.

Table No (4-2-8) The student should have a plan in mind before writing a paragraph.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	7	14.0
Agree	34	68.0
To some extent	2	4.0
Disagree	5	10.0
Strongly disagree	2	4.0
Total	50	100.0

Table (4.1.8) demonstrates that above two thirds of the participants (7) (14) %respondents agree that they think about what to write and have a plan in mind before writing a paragraph, (4%) for strongly disagree, (10%) for both disagree and agree to some extent respectively with this statement

Table No (4-2-9) Pay more attention to the teaching of essay at English department.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	16	32.0
Agree	18	36.0
To some extent	6	12.0
Disagree	5	10.0
Strongly disagree	5	10.0
Total	50	100

The results in the above table (4.2.9) the majority of the respondents (36%) agree, followed by (32%) strongly agree, then (12%) agree to some extent, whereas (10% of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that to pay more attention to the teaching of essay at English department.

Table No (4-2-10) Sometimes I use conjunction to connect ideas as well as references.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
Strongly agree	12	24.0
Agree	23	46.0
To some extent	2	4.0
Disagree	8	16.0
strongly disagree	5	10.0
Total	50	100.0

It is obvious that the results in table (4.2.10) indicate that (24%) from the respondents strongly agree, (46%) agree, (16%) disagree, whereas (10%) strongly disagree and the rest (4%) agree to some extent that Using conjunctions to connect ideas as well as references. This means conjunctions were to connect ideas as well as references.

Table No(4-2-11) Pay attention on understanding syllabus objectives before starting to write.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	4	8.0
Agree	26	52.0
To some extent	5	10.0
Disagree	2	4.0
Strongly disagree	13	26.0
Total	50	100.0

The results in the table (4.2.11) indicate that more than half of the respondents (52%) agree that understanding syllabus objectives before beginning While (13) (26%) strongly disagree, (8%) strongly agree, (10%) to some extent and the rest disagree (4%) with the statement.

Table No (4-2-12) The gradual development of the information on the syllabus made it possible to comprehend it easy.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	10	20.0
Agree	21	42.0
To some extent	5	10.0
Disagree	9	18.0
Strongly disagree	5	10.0
Total	50	100.0

The results in the table (4.1.12) reveal that (42% of the respondents agree, while (71% (strongly agree, (10%) agree to some extent, (18%) disagree and the rest strongly disagree (10%) that the gradual development of the information on the syllabus made it possible for me to comprehend.

Table No (4-2-13) Supporting the course by academic resources helps the students to use grammatical cohesive devices in their writings.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	10	20.0
Agree	21	42.0
to some extent	5	10.0
Disagree	9	18.0
Strongly disagree	5	10.0
Total	50	100.0

The table (4.2.13) shows that twenty one (42%) of the respondents agree that Supporting the course by academic resources, while (20%) strongly agree. Followed by (18%) for disagree, whereas (10%) for both to some extent and strongly disagree, This reveals that more than half of the respondents think that students receive input well when lecturers support the course by academic resources.

Table No (4-2-14) The use of cohesion and coherence were given attention in the course

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	14	28.0
Agree	18	36.0
To some extent	5	10.0
Disagree	8	16.0
Strongly disagree	5	10.0
Total	50	100.0

The table (4.2.14) shows that eighteen one of the respondents (36%) agree, While (28%) strongly agree, (10%) agree to some extent and the rest (16%) disagree that the use of cohesion, and coherence) should be given attention in the course. This reveals that less than half of the subjects think that students receive input well when the use of cohesion and coherence should be given attention in the course.

Table No (4-2-15) The usage of cohesive writing essays in the course improves the students' written discourse.

Statement	Frequency	Percentage
strongly agree	13	26.0
Agree	21	42.0
to some extent	6	12.0
Disagree	8	16.0
Strongly disagree	2	4.0
Total	50	100.0

The table (4.7.15) illustrates that (42%) of the respondents agree that the rich amount of the composition and essay in the course under the aware of the basics of the well cohesive writing improves the student's written discourse, whereas (26%) strongly agree, (16%) disagree, (12%) agree to some extent with this statement. The result means that more less than half of the respondents see that the rich amount of the composition and essay in the course under the aware of the basics of the well cohesive writing improves the student's written discourse

4-3 Discussion of the Hypotheses in Relation to the Results

Each hypothesis will be discussed separately.

4.3.1 The first Hypothesis

The majority of Iraqi EFL learners are unable to use English Grammatical cohesive devices in their English Essay. The analysis of the test and the questionnaire in tables, (4.1.1), (4.1.3), (4.1.4), (4.2.1) and (4.2.2), shows that a considerable number of the sample (96.76%), (94.8%), (96.6%), (97.8%) and (46%) respectively, agree that the students have a poor performance in using cohesive devices in their English essay. Hence, the first hypothesis is proved.

4.3.2 The second Hypothesis

Most of Iraqi EFL learners find problems in connecting sentence to each other in a text According to the results of the test and the questionnaire in tables (4.1.5), (4.1.6) and (4.2.2) some of the responses (91.6%), (90.16%) and (46%) respectively agree that Most of Iraqi EFL learners find problems in connecting sentence to each other in a text.

4.3.3 The Third Hypothesis

The grammatical devices that are used frequently in EFL learners' descriptive essay are references and conjunction devices.

With reference to the test and the questionnaire (4-1-2) (16%), (4.1.3) (90.84%), (4.2.2) (54)% and (4.2.3) (60%) that the grammatical devices that are used frequently in EFL learners' descriptive essay are references and conjunction devices.

4.3.4 The Fourth Hypothesis

Incentive practice in teaching grammatical cohesive devices improves the learners performance in writing descriptive essays

EFL students responses in tables (4.1.4) , (4.1.9) and lecturers responses in table (4.2.10) ,(4.2. 14), and (4.2.15) shows that the use of Incentive practice in teaching grammatical cohesive devices improves the learners performance in writing descriptive essays the participants positive responses reach (46%),(36%)and (42%) respectively. hence the hypothesis is proved.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Introduction

This chapter will cover the conclusion and recommendations.

5.1 Conclusion

1- The majority of Iraqi EFL learners are unable to use English Grammatical cohesive devices in their English Essay (4.1.1), (4.1.3) , (4.1.4), (4.2.1)(91.6%) , (90.16%) and (46%) respectively.

2- The majority of the students are unaware of using the comparative cohesive devices Tables, (4.1.1)(96.76%) and(4.1.2) (84%).

3- Students have no ability to use cohesive devices such as consequently, to sum, theirs, yours and one 100% tables (4.1.2) (4.1.8)

4- The students' ability of using and, because is more than other cohesive device. Table (4.1.8) (64%), (69.4%) respectively.

5- Students lack the ability of receiving instructions on how to use or interpret ellipsis and substitution devices. Tables (4.1.8) (98%), (96%) respectively.

6- Students have a high ability of using nominal substitution (45%) in comparison with verbal (20%) and clausal substitution (26%). Table (4.1.5).

7- The Student main focus is on how to join sentences to make compound sentences (54%). Table (4.2.2).

8- A considerable number of the EFL teachers believe that reviewing homework by giving suggestions, correcting mistakes and giving notes on the appropriate use of cohesive devices improves their student's writing (48%). Table (4.2.4).



9- Students have the ability to recognize the sequence of idioms and the role of cohesive devices (44%). Table (4.2.5).

10- Nearly half of the teachers think that making of a time table for teaching cohesive devices helps the student to develop their ability (48%). Table (4.2.6).

11- Most of the experts think that students should have a plan before writing (68%), Table (4.2.8).

12- Many teachers see that student should provide a model of writing descriptive easy before writing (54%), Table (4.2.7).

5.1.2 Recommendations

Based upon the above findings, the study recommends the followings.

- 1- There should be more exposure to more cohesive devices, through many texts and sources.
- 2- Learners should have more intensive practice in using the comparative cohesive devices.
- 3- Students should be made aware of the functions of grammatical devices.
- 4- Students can improve their writing by practicing more exercises at home.
- 5- Learners should have a time table for learning grammatical cohesive devices.
- 6- Learners should have a plan so as to improve their skills and writing descriptive essays.

Appendix A**The Written Test**

Write at least a three- paragraph descriptive essay of (200-250) words on one of the following topics:

- 1- A place you visited before.
- 2- A journey to the seaside.

Appendix B

Statements	Strongly agree	Agree	To Some extent	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Pay more attention on intensive exercise on the use of various cohesive devices, particularly ellipsis and substitution devices.					
2. I always focus on conjunctions and how to join two sentences to make coordination and complex sentences.					
3. I care about how to write essays by using grammatical cohesive devices, particularly comparative cohesive devices.					
4. Pay attention on reviewing Homework.					
5. Ability to recognize the sequence of idioms with the role of cohesive devices enables students to make sentences in a text.					
6. A timetable for the writing process helps the students to develop their ability.					
7. Focusing on looking at a model written by students before start writing.					



8. The student should have a plan in mind before writing a paragraph.					
9. Pay more attention to the teaching of essay at English department.					
10. Sometimes I use conjunction to connect ideas as well as references.					
11. Pay attention on understanding syllabus objectives before starting to write.					
12. The gradual development of the information on the syllabus made it possible to comprehend it easy.					
13. Supporting the course by academic resources helps the students to use grammatical cohesive devices in their writings.					
14. The use of cohesion and coherence were given attention in the course					

تقييم قدرة متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية على استخدام التماسك النحوي في

الخطاب الكتابي

معلوماتهم	الباحثين
الجامعة العراقية – قسم اللغة	م.م حاتم
الانكليزية	جاسم خضير
<i>Email:</i>	
ziyad.hamadameen@su.edu.krd	
+964 750 445 41 7	
الكلمات المفتاحية : المحاكمة ، الحقيقة ، المحكمة ،	
كافكا ، العدل.	

هذه مقالة وصول مفتوح بموجب ترخيص

CC BY 4.0 (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

المخلص :

هدفت الدراسة إلى تقييم قدرة متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية على استخدام أدوات التماسك النحوي ، للتعرف على أنواع الأدوات التماسكية النحوية التي تُستخدم بشكل متكرر في المقالات الوصفية لمتعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية ، لاكتشاف المجالات الإشكالية المتعلقة بالتماسك النحوي في مقالات متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. واقتراح الاستراتيجيات المناسبة لتعزيز قدرات التعلم لاستخدام الأدوات التماسكية. اتبعت الدراسة المنهج الوصفي التحليلي. تم استخدام أداتين كوسيلة لجمع البيانات ؛ تم توزيع وإدارة استبانة واختبار على (50) طالبا من الجامعة العراقية. تم تحليل البيانات التي تم جمعها إحصائياً باستخدام برنامج الحزم الإحصائية للعلوم الاجتماعية (SPSS) توصلت الدراسة إلى العديد من النتائج أهمها: غالبية متعلمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية في العراق غير قادرين على استخدام أدوات التماسك النحوي الإنجليزية في مقالهم باللغة الإنجليزية ، ليس لدى الطلاب القدرة على استخدام الأدوات التماسكية مثل، بالتالي، ليجمع، لهم، أنت، ولكم، يفقر الطلاب إلى القدرة على تلقي تعليمات حول كيفية استخدام أو تفسير علامات الحذف وأدوات الاستبدال. وتوصي الدراسة بما يلي: أهمها يجب أن يكون هناك مزيد من التعرض لأدوات التماسك النحوي من خلال العديد من النصوص والمصادر، يمكن للطلاب تحسين كتاباتهم من خلال ممارسة المزيد من التمارين في المنزل، يجب أن يكون الطلاب على دراية بوظائف الأدوات التماسك النحوي، ويجب أن يكون لدى المتعلمين جدول زمني لتعلم الأدوات التماسكية النحوية.



References:

- 1- Abdullah, S (2016). Cohesion in written discourse. Najran University. Saudi Arabia.
- 2- Bloor, T. (2003), Text, Context and Schema. New York: Harcourt. Jovanovich Press.
- 3- Brandon, L. (2001). Paragraphs and Essays, (8th ed), New York: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- 4- Brown, G. and Yule, G. (1983). Discourse Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- 9- Gabriella, J (2014). Referential Cohesion in Academic writing. Lorand University, Budapest.
- 10- Halliday, M (1985). Introduction to functional Grammar. English. London: Edward Arnold.
- 11- Halliday, M and Hasan, R. (1976). Cohesion in English. London: Longman.
- 12- Hameed, K. (2004). The Study Investigated lexical Cohesion in a Corpus of 12 editorials from English. University of Baghdad. Iraq.
- 13- Harmer, J, (2004). How to teach writing: England: dear son Education: Paterson Education ltd.
- 14- Hartman, G. and Dickinson, R (1972). Write Now, Substance, Strategy, style. New York: Holt Rinehart and Winston's Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.
- 15- Joda. L. (2006). Investigating the Repertoire of Cohesive Devices that College Students Use in Producing their Written Texts University of Baghdad.
- 16- Jubouri, A. (2008). Lexical Cohesion in English Differs from that in Arabic. Al-Basra University. Iraq.
- 5- Carter, R. (2000). Linguistics and the Teacher. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul. Ltd.
- 6- Clouse, B. (1996). The students writer Editor and Critic 4th (ed). New York: McGraw- Hill, inc.
- 7- Cook, C. (1990). Seeing Through Language: a guide to styles of English Writing Oxford: Blackwell.
- 8- Donald, J. (1982). Differences between Oral and Written Discourse. University of California.
- 17- Kelly, W. (2004). A Guide to Better Writing. (2nd ed) New York: McGraw- Hill, Inc.
- 18- McCarthy, N. (1991). Poetry as Discourse. London: Methun Co. Ltd.
- 19- Meyers. D. (2006). Sociolinguistics Patterns. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- 20- Quirk, R. (1975). A University Grammar of English. London: Longman. 61. Ramasawmy.N. (2004). Conjunctive Cohesion and Relational Coherence In Students' Compositions. Thesis: University Of South Africa.
- 21- Stern, L. (1983). An Introduction to discourse analysis: Theory and Method. London: Routledge.
- 22- Trujillo, H. (2007). English Composition. Oxford: University Press. 73. Trujillo, F. (NA). Uses of Spoken and Written English., June 2007, SciELO Colombia - www.scielo.org.co
- 23- Widdowson. H. (2007). Exploration in Applied Linguistics. Oxford: Oxford University Press.