



# **Sudan University of Science and Technology**



College of Graduate Studies  
College of Languages

## **Grammatical Cohesion in Graduate Students Writing in Zalingei University**

**التماسك النحوي في كتابة الطلاب الخريجين بجامعة زالنجي**

**(Graduate Students in University of Zalingei)**

A thesis submitted in fulfillment of the requirements for  
PhD degree in English Language

Submitted by: Adam Mohamed Ishag Yagoob

Supervised by: Prof: Mohamed Al Amin Elshingeety

2022



Approval Page

(To be completed after the college council approval)

Name of Candidate:

Adam

Mohamed

Ishag

Yagoub

Thesis title: Grammatical Cohesion in Graduate Students Writing

Degree Examined for: PhD

Approved by:

1. External Examiner

Name: Prof. Tahya Elshamy Al Haman

Signature: Prof. Tahya Elshamy Al Haman Date:

2. Internal Examiner

Name: Prof. Mahmoud Al Amr

Signature: [Signature] Date: 24/4/2020

3. Supervisor

Name: Dr. Mohamed Elamin Elshingety

Signature: Dr. Mohamed Elamin Elshingety Date: 24/3/2022

## Table of contents

<b>Chapter One</b>	<b>Page</b>
1.0 Background	1
1.1 Problem of the Research	1-2
1.2 Objectives of the Research	3
1.3 Questions of the Research	3
1.4 Hypotheses of the Research	4
1.5 Significance of the Research	4-5
1.6 Methodology of the Research	5
1.7 Layout of the Research	6
1.8 Limitation of the Research	6
<b>Chapter Two</b> <b>Literature Review</b>	<b>Page</b>
2.0 Introduction	7
2.1 Necessity of Cohesion and Coherence	8-10
2.2 Cohesion and its relationship with Coherence	10-11
2.3 Clarification of Cohesion and Coherence	12
2.4 Cohesion in Writing and Speaking	13-15
2.5 Narration and Cohesion	16
2.6 Clinical Values for Assessment of Cohesion	17
2.7 Grammatical Cohesion	18-19
2.8 Types of Grammatical Cohesion	19-20
2.9 Functions of Grammatical Cohesion in Writing	20
2.10 Definition of Cohesion	21
2.11 Cohesive Devices in Grammar	21-22

2.12 Types of Cohesion (Grammatical & Lexical)	22
2.12.0 Grammatical Cohesion, Explanation	22-23
2.12.1 Cohesion by reference	23-24
2.12.2 Anaphoric Reference	24-26
2.12.3 Cataphoric Reference	26-27
2.12.4 Exophoric Reference	27-29
2.12.5 Cohesion by Substitution	29-30
2.12.6 Cohesion by Ellipsis	30-31
2.13 Lexical Cohesion in Grammar	31-32
2.14 Cohesion with Conjunctions	32-34
2.15 Cohesion with Prepositions	34-35
2.16 Cohesion with Adjective plus a preposition	35-36
2.17 Cohesion with Auxiliary Verbs	36-40
2.18 Cohesion problems with primary Auxiliary verbs	40-42
2.19 Use of Modal Verbs in Scientific Field	43-45
2.20 The use of Transition Signals in Writing	45-47
2.21 Transition Signals	47-49
2.22 Models of Writing	49-50
2.22.0 The thinking behind the text	50-53
2.22.1 Cognitive Overload	53-56
2.22.2 Thinking of text production	56-59
2.22.3 Writing as a knowledge constituting process	59-62
2.23 Word Combination of English in Writing	63-65
2.23.0 Types of Collocation	65-66
2.23.1 The importance of Collocation	66-68
2.23.2 Collocation and Lexical Competence	68-70

2.23.3 Collocations/Metacognition and L1 influence	70-71
2.23.4 Collocations and nativeness	71-73
2.23.5 Collocations and native fluency in writing	73-75
2.24 Word Choice and Synonymy in Writing	75-82
2.25 The Role and Function of the Antonyms in writing	82-83
2.25.0 The Definition of Antonymy	83-86
2.25.1 The Classification of Antonymy	86-88
2.26 Antonymy in specific English texts	89
2.26.0 Antonymy Used in Poetry	89
2.26.1 Antonymy Used in Dramas	89-90
2.26.2 Antonymy Used in Novels	90-91
2.26.3 Antonymy Used in Speeches	91-92
2.26.4 Antonymy Used in Proverbs	92
2.27 Cohesion and Coherence in a paragraph	92-93
2.27.0 Academic writing is an argument	93-94
2.27.1 Academic writing is an analysis	94-95
2.27.2 Cohesion and Coherence in Academic writing	95
2.27.3 Cohesion in a paragraph	96-97
2.27.4 Coherence in a paragraph	97-98
2.27.5 Cohesion and Coherence for Communication	98
2.28 Importance of punctuations in cohesive writing	98
2.28.0 Cohesion and punctuations in writing	98-99
2.28.1 Punctuations in reading and writing	99-100
2.28.2 Presenting punctuation marks	100-101
2.28.3 Functions of punctuation	101
2.28.4 ESL learners, punctuation errors in English	102

2.28.5 Types of errors	103-104
2.28.6 Punctuations change the meaning	104
2.29 Essential skills for creative writing	104-105
2.30 Domains on specific perspective on creative writing	105-106
2.31 Skills for creative writing	106-107
2.31.0 General knowledge and cognition	107
2.31.1 Creative cognition	108
2.31.2 Motivational and cognitive factors	108-109
2.31.3 Executive function	109
2.31.4 Linguistic and literacy factors	109-110
2.31.5 Psychomotor factors	110
2.32 The present study in writing	110-111
2.33 Cohesion devices in written discourse	111
2.33.0 Text and texture	112
2.33.1 Cohesion	112
2.33.1.0 Grammatical Cohesion	112
2.33.1.1 Reference	112-113
2.33.1.2 Substitution	113
2.33.1.3 Ellipsis	113-114
2.33.1.4 Conjunctions	114
2.33.1.5 Lexical Cohesion	115
2.33.1.5.0 Repetition/Reiteration	115
2.33.1.5.1 Collocations	115-116
2.33.1.5.2 Synonyms	116
2.33.1.5.3 Antonyms	117

<b>Chapter three Methodology</b>	<b>page</b>
3.0 Introduction	118
3.1 Study participants	118
3.2 Sample of the study	119
3.3 Methodology	119-120
3.4 Role of the researcher in data collection	120
3.5 Materials	120-121
3.5.0 Pretest and posttest results	121
3.5.1 Questionnaire	121
3.7 Procedure	121
3.8 Data collection Techniques and Procedures	122
3.9 Data analysis	123
<b>Chapter Four Data Analysis</b>	<b>page</b>
4.0 Introduction	124
4.1 Tables	124-151
<b>Chapter Five Suggestions and Recommendations</b>	<b>Page</b>
5.0 Introduction	152
5.1 Findings	152-153
5.2 Recommendations	153
5.3 Suggestions	153-153
5.4 Conclusion	154-155
5.5 Appendix	156-160
5.6 Bibliography	161-191

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this thesis to my family and friends.



## **Acknowledgements**

I express my sincere thanks and profound appreciation to supervisor, Professor: Mohamed Al Amin Elshingeety and Dr. Wajdan Yagoob co-supervisor for their scholarly guidance, insightful remarks and incredible support throughout all the stages of my thesis. Surely, as an outstanding savant, I have gained a great deal of knowledge and learned many invaluable values such as punctuality, friendliness, generosity, honesty, kindness and above all seriousness. I hope that these norms and others, I have acquired under this supervision, will be my future assets of dealing with future generations. I also thank Professor Ahmed Mokhtar Al Mardi, for his genuine help and advice that it would be more relevant and practicable work of a cohesion in graduate students; writing refereed pre and posttest conducted along with the questionnaire. Thanks extended to Professor Mohmoud Ali Ahmed, Professor Al Sadiq Yahia Izzad for their unremitting support, useful comments and observation on the teachers' questionnaire. Moreover, it would be unfair if I do not acknowledge the moral encouragement, financial support and provision of other sources of research aid of my closest friends at University of Zalingei. Indeed, their continuous assistance has been a source of great motivation. I owe special thanks and gratitude to my family, in particular my wife Riahin Idress Adam Mohamed and my brothers, whose continuous support and enthusiasm gave me a real strength to overcome most of the difficulties in the period of dissertation doing. I am extremely indebted to all teachers and students for their tremendous assistance and unfailing cooperation, especially in answering the questionnaire of the study, and convincing the students to take part in cohesive and coherent writing of essays cohesively. My sincere thanks too to the Secretariat of Academic affairs at the University of Zalingei Likewise; I owe thanks to Dr. Abdalla Adam Al Gazouli Ustaz: Fiasal Mahdi, for unfailing cooperation and advice, tireless support, namely in providing me with updated books and journals related to the area of the study.

## **Abstract**

The study conducted in Zalingei University in (2018) and aimed to investigate the positive and negative usage of cohesive devices by graduate students in writing essays in English and the investigation of the teacher's role for encouraging the students to write well using grammatical and lexical cohesion in writing essays. The researcher used the analytical descriptive approach. First data collected through questionnaire for (20) university teachers and an aptitude tests for (50) graduate students and secondary information from books and relevant sources. It resulted to teachers, answers in all items in the questionnaire were very clear that they generally use the right methods to teach their students. The results revealed that most of the students have problems that made them to misunderstand the linking words. In several areas, the researcher found in many sentences of the tests answers were wrong for identifying the functional words. Some content and functional words were very clear to respondents thus they did not face any problem to categorize and diagnose the functional words. The misunderstanding of functional word forms in English writing essays were due to the lack of grammatical skills. It recommended that the support for non-native of English learners for applying accurate ways of learning English four skills to master the most important areas earlier as well as spelling, parts of speech in grammar specifically functional, content words and their meanings. Before students, admission to Universities there must be qualified teachers in all levels who will strengthen the learners to familiarize the aspects of English language words.

## المستخلص

أجريت هذه الدراسة في جامعة زانجي عام (2018) بهدف تحقيق استخدام الطرق الإيجابية والسلبية لأدوات الربط المنطقية في كتابة المقالات باللغة الإنجليزية من قبل الطلاب الخريجين والدراسات العليا وتقصي دور المعلمين في تشجيع الطلاب في الكتابة جيدا مستخدمين الروابط النحوية المتناسكة في كتابة المقالات المنظمة مستخدمين هذه الأدوات في تعلمهم للغة الإنجليزية استخدم الباحث المنهج الوصفي التحليلي وجمعت البيانات الأولية عن طريق الاستبانة لعدد (20) من أساتذة الجامعة والاختبارات لعدد (50) من الطلاب الخريجين والمعلومات الثانوية من الكتب والرسائل ذات الصلة بالموضوع. وصل الباحث للنتائج الآتية. أجوبة الأساتذة توضح بأنهم يستخدمون طرق التدريس الصحيحة في تدريس الطلاب. النتائج تشير بان أكثر الطلاب لديهم مشكلة وسوء فهم في كلمات الوظائف. في عدة الحالات وجدها الباحث في أجوبة الاختبار كانت خاطئة في تحديد كلمات الوظائف. بعض كلمات المحتوى وكلمات الوظائف كانت واضحة للطلاب في ترتيبها وتشخيصها بسهولة. سوء فهم اشكال كلمات الوظائف في كتابة المقالات باللغة الإنجليزية ترتب علي عدم دراسة النحو جيدا. ينبغي ان تتوفر مساعدة لغير الناطقين باللغة الإنجليزية في تطبيق طرق التعلم بدقة للمهارات الأربع في إيجاد نطاقات اللغة مبكرا أيضا في الاملاء وأجزاء الكلام وبالتحديد كلمات المحتوى والوظائف ومعانيها. قبل دخول الطلاب الي الجامعة يلزم وجود معلمين اكفاء لرفع مستوى الطلاب لمؤلفة كل ظوهر اللغة الإنجليزية يجب للطلاب تطبيق كل مهارات التعلم لتقوية معرفتهم لأجزاء الكلام في اللغة الإنجليزية.

# **Chapter One**

## **Introduction**

### **1.0 Background**

Grammatical cohesion in English language is always the topnotch problem that causes many problems for English learners all over the world as well as researchers, the teachers, writers and grammarians. Good linguists feel annoyed when they hear or see someone has either written or spoken words, problem from new English language learners when begin to write or speak. In the matter of fact, the investigation related to this problem in this field on analyzing the sentences to pieces of whether a written or spoken expressions, it should be indicating regularities to be accurate and clear in meaning and structures. Any piece of writing must be immaculate in a way that ensures and assures its cohesion in sentences and paragraphs. For that reason, grammatical cohesion is one of the tools used to pave the way of having a cohesive and solid body according to English grammar rules.

Indeed, grammatical cohesions whether it is heard spoken or written as a process of discourse is a production both as an attempt to give a general view of affirmation and its relation to cohesion in general and grammatical cohesion in particular. Cohesion devices considered as one of the most challenging aspects of writing in English language sentences where they have their own unique manners in which they employ cohesive devices in the creation of cohesive texts.

### **1.1 Problem of the Research**

The researcher investigated the problems of grammatical cohesion devices. These devices considered as the most difficult part of knowledge in English grammar as well as functional and content words. Therefore, they always cause some hindrances for new learners to write cohesive sentences. Even though the new learners focus on redundancy in using in writing essays, short sentences and even sometimes students

master some of functional words more than others in the same category. As along as an experience and a good background in this field I taught different levels for ten years in Sudanese schools in addition to four years higher education, but I found that many problems encounter non-native English learners are in coherence and cohesion in English. Even sometimes, teachers feel dubious that there may be a problem somewhere in non-native countries syllabus, teaching methods or a classroom environment is not fit. However, the insistence to look for a suitable way to test this issue to know what is behind these difficulties of using grammatical cohesion. It is something horrible and irritates educators spending very long time giving classes, making efforts and reading English grammar books check and limit types of writing reports, essays, and letters in academic field to guide students, learning English as a second Language (ESL) in Sudan. A bit difference from person to another or the students, attitude to integrate in English language. On the other, hand a second language acquisition researchers on writing skills in cohesion and coherence in English grammar emphasizes that the act of producing a coherence and cohesion in writing paragraph as well as cohesive expressions in order to ensure a texture or a cohesiveness of writing. The effective cohesion of sound English language grammatical sentences are the standards of academic learning. The effect of cohesive devices on writing is very strong since they provide the readers with various kinds of grammatical devices, which used to stretch any piece of writing to be cohesive. It is worthwhile that without arrangement of the linguistic ties, one cannot construct a cohesive writing topic, essay or articles. In addition, it seems that students do not use grammatical cohesive devices in efficient way. In general using cohesive devices in particular the cohesive devices in writing essays or complex sentences is necessary to provide readers with various types of grammatical devices which used to stretch a piece of a single topic to be cohesive and comprehensive to its readers.

## **1.2 Objectives of the Research**

- 1- It aims to look for various kinds of linguistic ties in English language particularly functional words.
- 2- The effect of linguistic ties, in cohesive writing using lexical & grammatical cohesion.
- 3- Investigating difficulties behind the complexity of English cohesive devices and their use through non-native English language learners in writing.
- 4- To know the importance of lexical & grammatical cohesion in English language for writing sentences using cohesive devices.
- 5- To classify the techniques of avoiding redundancy in writing, using lexical & grammatical cohesion in writing essays.
- 6- To identify problem-solving areas in students, writing using lexical & grammatical cohesion in writing essays.

## **1.3 Questions of the Research**

- 1- What characteristics of cohesion and coherence observed in students, writing?
- 2- To what extent learners commit errors in writing using cohesive devices?
- 3- What makes students to confuse using lexical & grammatical words in correct places in writing?
- 4- Which measures teachers must take for solving a problem of non-English learners in writing difficulties?
- 5- What affects non-native English learners of creating sound sentences in writing essays using lexical & grammatical cohesion in English language?
- 6- To what extent the use of lexical & grammatical cohesion in students' writing challenge non-natives in English language?

## **1.4 Hypotheses of the Research**

- 1- Through this study the researcher, hypothesizes that the appropriate use of lexical & grammatical cohesive devices would enhance students writing.
- 2- Students may catch and master lexical & grammatical cohesive devices use in writing with guidance through good teaching.
- 3- If students play a good role to differentiate between linking words in writing using lexical & grammatical cohesion, it may be easy to improve the language.
- 4- Learners will make strength in cohesion and coherence through reading English grammar books in every stage during the learning process.
- 5- If non-native English learners are serious in writing, may master difference aspects of English as a foreign language.
- 6- Some difficulties may encounter non-natives while thinking that English language is not easy to acquire as well as a mother tongue.

## **1.5 Significance of the Research**

Investigation of lexical and grammatical cohesion in graduate students, writing is one of the most and hottest issues. Concerning every language teacher around the globe today using the language without mastering its parts of speech or skills it will be wasting of time or accumulating massive bulk of vocabulary and information without fruit. Without proof learning earlier is the loss of energy. The scope of this research is to determine and provide English learners some highlights in the role of lexical and grammatical cohesion in English language. The role-played in writing essays producing a consistent piece of writing from students will work when they use correct lexical and grammatical cohesive devices in an appropriate way. All languages nearly have rules formation according to their time expressions as grammarians predict where grammar is said that it is an art of putting the right words in the right places according to the work these grammatical parts of speech do.

Moreover, it would be beneficial for a written expression from teachers where they can help students to produce grammatical cohesive writing. Through an empirical work focuses on the student's production of writing expressions, that will identify whether the students are aware of using lexical and grammatical cohesive devices to in writing or not. Therefore, this research attempted to discover the strength and weaknesses of non-native English language students in English discipline especially graduate students in writing essays, using lexical and grammatical devices. Finally, identifying types of English cohesive devices is one of the most important areas that teachers must look for it while investigating lexical and grammatical cohesion devices in writing sentences, articles or paragraphs in English language.

## **1.6 Methodology of the Research**

The researcher adopted the analytical empirical method in doing this research. Depending on a right procedure that investigated the problems of using lexical and grammatical cohesion in writing. Two tests designed (pre and posttest) for (50) graduate and postgraduate students at University of Zalingei. Moreover, this study also investigated a group of fifty students at University of Zalingei and students asked them to write essays, articles, and different topics serving linking words in English language, also different lexical and grammatical cohesion like conjunctions, prepositions and adjectives in their writing. Then described the production carried out to show to what extent they are able to use lexical and grammatical cohesive devices appropriately. Finally, the questionnaire for (20) University teachers and Doctors is to verify the correctness of teaching lexical and grammatical cohesion suitably as they needed to be grammatically true according to the work they do. Therefore, these grammatical cohesion devices are important for writing cohesively and coherently.



## **1.7 Layout of the Research**

A study covers five chapters in the first chapter is the plan of the research, comprises the significance of lexical and grammatical cohesion of English vocabulary in a creative writing depending on function words, in other words their relationship in cohesion and coherence for English learners. In chapter two, the researcher explained the uses of lexical and grammatical cohesion, coherent articles and reports in English. In addition to clarification of literature review in functioning the above mentioned elements. Chapter three focused on research methodology designing of two tests for (50) students pretest, posttest and a questionnaire for (20) university containing items of teaching methods Moreover, in chapter four the data collected and made comments of the Student's results of pretest and posttest plus teachers questionnaire. Finally, chapter five includes suggestions, recommendations and conclusion.

## **1.8 Limitation of the Research**

The purpose of this research presented at philosophical assumptions underpinning to introduce the strategic and the empirical techniques applied. The researcher defines the scope and limitations design, and situates amongst the existing traditions in information systems. Underlying this paper came from the interpretive tradition. This implies a subjective epistemology and the ontological belief that the reality is socially constructed. It adopted to conduct case study in graduate students, writing using cohesive devices in writing essays in English language. The fieldwork from December 2018 to April 2021 and a steady correspondence maintained with the different informants at the sites. Finally, all sections dealt with the research design covers the reasons for selecting data sources, research analysis sub-units, data collection and analysis and brief summary of the expectations from the theoretical framework adopted.

## **Chapter Two**

### **Literature Review**

#### **2.0 Introduction**

Major English lexical and grammatical cohesion is the core of language that shapes and decorates the building of structures in cohesive and coherent writing. Thus English learners must keep monitoring their flow of writing in every step of writing sentences in English. These cohesive devices unless weaved firmly there still the reflection of an enormous catastrophe in forming intact expressions in this phenomenon. In this chapter, the researcher expounded these major cohesive devices in details and found out that the diagnosing of specific problems, which encounter the students of non-native English in performing correct rules of writing in English Language. Literature review of the study conducted to evaluate the learners' writing and showed the few empirical studies conducted to analyze the cohesion ties and their types in writing cohesive expressions in English language. Instructors, in general and more specifically rhetoricians should encourage their students to pay attention for the importance of the cohesion and coherence in learning, teaching and evaluating or analyzing the chunks of written words. Many of today's students, whether English non-natives, cannot write clear or meaningful sentences using linking words. Moreover, many university students particularly graduate considered without this fundamental skill, i.e. writing. Coherent and cohesive sentences are serious matters in learning the language. While, some learners ignore writing that is why they commit mistakes in forming coherent and cohesive sentences in writing to link the units of this small area in English, to put sound sequence of sentences or paragraphs. Language learners must prove their qualifications as conversant English writers unless they write coherent and cohesive texts. Students' problems in writing usually arise from the fact that many of them unaware of being serious.

## **2.1 Necessity of Cohesion and Coherence**

Coherence and cohesion are very important in academic writing they, it involve producing texts, which are appropriate for formal contexts, such as schools and universities (Oshima & Hague, 2007). These authors have suggested that English academic texts may differ from those written in other languages regarding words, grammar, and organization. As a result, EFL/ESL learners should develop their studying skills like, writing for academic purposes (Hyland, 2006). According to this author, it is necessary for them to learn how to produce academic texts in order to express ideas to other users of the L2. For this reason, textual coherence and cohesion is an essential component of academic writing. On the one hand, a written text needs to be coherent and comprehensible by the readers. Hyland (2006) defined coherence as: “The ways the text makes sense to its readers through the relevance and accessibility of its configuration of concepts, ideas and theories. From this point of view, coherence involves logical connections at idea level (topic). Thus, to facilitate the reader’s comprehension, all the sentences that made up each paragraph must be logical and arranged by following the continuous order based on the message; they are trying to convey (Hinkel, 2004). Within this framework, coherence is important in writing as it relates to expressing consistent and understandable ideas in a text. On the other hand, cohesion has been defined as “joining a text together with reference words (e.g. he, theirs, the former) and conjunctions (e.g. but, then) so that the whole text is clear and readable” (Bailey, 2011, p. 115). Cohesion is the writing task, which consisted of reacting to the prompt by producing one paragraph in English. The level of these activities applied according to the (elementary level). The topics covered were culture and traditions as suggested by the Chilean curriculum for the EFL subject level. The learners asked to produce their tasks in three stages every week by following the cognitive writing model proposed by Flower & Hayes (1981). The stages were planning (pre-writing),

monitoring (while-writing), and evaluating (post-writing), which are metacognitive writing procedures. First, in pre-writing, the students taught to brainstorm ideas and write the outline of their draft by considering paragraph structure. In the while-writing stage, the learners produced their draft by monitoring their text, which involved revising it constantly in terms of coherence and cohesion. They then had to carry out the post-writing step, which consisted of proofreading, receiving feedback from the teacher, and editing in terms of textual coherence and cohesion. It is worth noting that the students had the opportunity to repeat the previous stage when they found it necessary. Writing is the productive language skill. Specifically, it is the act of forming letters or characters on writing materials in order to communicate ideas (Harmer, 2004; Hyland, 2004). It follows, then, that learners are able to produce the written pieces of work once they are successful at listening, speaking, and reading the cohesion (revision). Finally, they edit their production for publishing it (rewriting). According to process of writing can be considered recursive rather than linear, meaning that writers put anything when they believe it is appropriate, and it can be moved back and forth between stages. Writing procedures employed by the EFL students prior to the metacognition-based intervention. The conceptual network for writing procedures employed by the EFL students prior to intervention displayed. It includes the subcategories of pre-writing, while-writing, and post-writing, which were based on students, responses on the focus-group discussion carried out with the experimental group before the pedagogical intervention took place. From the oral data collected in the initial focus group discussion, in the context of the writing procedures employed by the EFL students prior in English, with one of the learners asserting, “English class is sometimes hard, so when writing using a web page that translates text from L1 to English. Further examination of the students’ oral answers in the initial focus-group discussion revealed that the identification of lexical items while the students wrote a text also employed support from the EFL teacher. From

the point of view of the EFL students, they asked for the teacher's assistance while writing in English language, in order to verify correct spelling. One of the learners corroborates evidence of this: "I asked the English teacher about the words to be included in my text. Another learner made a similar comment: "I sometimes do not know how to spell certain words in English, so I show my writing to the teacher, and he tells me if I am writing them well or if I am making mistakes. When the participants took part in the initial focus-group discussion, also referred to post-writing activities, confirming their use of the dictionary for revision. According to the EFL learners' responses, the use of this resource focused on identifying the correct spelling of the words in English. The following excerpt is an example of this view: "When I finish writing a text in English, I use a dictionary to make sure the words I wrote are correct.

## **2.2 Cohesion and its relationship with Coherence**

As stated above, coherence itself considered the difficult concept to understand and express, and this has led to some rather vague explanations. It has been described as "...the feeling that a text hangs together, that it makes sense, and is not just a jumble of sentences as cited in McCarthy, 1991, p. 26). Yule (2006, p. 126) adds that coherence is "everything fitting together well." However, there is more to coherence than just the cohesive qualities of a text. Yule (2006, p. 126) adds that the coherence is something that exists in people's interpretations, not words or structures. People, he says, "...make sense of what they read and hear. They try to arrive at an interpretation that is in line with their experience of the way the world is." McCarthy (1991, p. 26) asserts that when understanding texts, we interpret items and understand them. Cohesive items are often indications of how texts reading, not "absolutes" (McCarthy 1991, p. 26). For instance, the pronoun 'it' in the text only tells us something non-human being referred to; we do not necessarily know what, readers can usually interpret this, so that they produce the coherent reading of the

text. Hence, cohesion is only support for coherence, and coherence is “something” created by readers while reading a text, this “something” being a logical interpretation to create a meaningful and unified whole. Halliday and Hasan (1976) argued that cohesion is necessary to create meaningful discourse. However, this has been disputed by many authors (e.g. Brown and Yule, 1983, p. 196; Widdowson, 1985, p. 30) have given examples of written (and spoken) discourses that have no apparent cohesive test but demonstrate how they can make up a unified and meaningful whole. Brown and Yule (1983, p.196) state that readers will naturally assume sentences presented as texts are indeed texts, and try to interpret the second sentence after considering the first sentence because they assume semantic relation exist between the sentences. However, Tanskanen (2006, p. 17) claims that these examples are few, with the same ones often quoted. Martin (2001, p. 44) adds that these examples are “short ... and carefully selected” but for those in natural texts, with even only the small number of clauses, the “stereotype ethnic association” between being Irish and loving potatoes, or is willing to assume the cause-effect connection between the two (McCarthy, 1991, p. 26). Thus, cohesion is only part of coherence. It is clear that cohesion can help to form coherence (and occasionally vice versa). In addition, a lack of explicit cohesion does not necessarily mean no coherence, although there are underlying forms of cohesion in the coherent piece of discourse, which created by the actual perceived coherence. We have also seen that texts displaying cohesion can lack coherence, and it had demonstrated that irrelevance or lack of world knowledge could lead to a cohesive text not being coherent. Irrelevance is particularly important because some learners produce “oblique” or “vague” writing (Hinkel, 2011, p. 528), which can appear to be irrelevant.

## **2.3 Clarification of Cohesion and Coherence**

The importance of understanding coherence for learners cannot be overstated since, as Lee (2002 a, p. 139) explains, the concept may be different in their own language. Furthermore, Chinese students may have a weakness in academic English writing because in China, there is a comparative lack of emphasis on developing English writing, and few teachers have good English writing skills (Jin & Cortazzi, 2006). Hence, Chinese students may not know the discourse patterns expected and use a background-before-main-point presentation of ideas, often misunderstood by native speaker teachers (Jin & Cortazzi, 2006). These problems exacerbated by the college entrance examination, in which the required structures for answers provided students did not need to learn text organization (Ma, 2012, p.23). Although Halliday and Hasan (1976) talk about cohesive texts being coherent, Carrell (1982) argues that in order to learn about textual coherence, we must use wider theories than just cohesion, looking at both reading and writing as interactive processes which involve the writer, the reader and the text. Hence, coherence considered as both text based and reader based (Lee, 2002 a; Johns, 1986). Text based coherence is primarily defined by the linking of sentences (cohesion) or as the relationships among propositions in the text (Johns, 1986). However, to have reader based coherence means that a text cannot be elaboration, illustration or exemplification. Johns (1986) also stresses the importance of a thesis and thesis statement in persuasive essays (a common text type students have to produce), particularly for inexperienced writers. Nunan (1993, p.21) states that coherent text- that is, sequences of sentences or utterances which seem to 'hang together'- contain what are called text-forming devices. Coherence is the quality of sentences paragraphs, and essay when all the text semantically well-formed (Halliday and Hasan: 1976). When two sentences, parts are clearly connected. A coherent text identified by finding a unity of texture in the text.

## 2.4 Cohesion in Writing and Speaking

In pragmatics, coherence and cohesion are two factors distinguished in discourse (Roelofs 1998). Coherence is the relatedness of the story on macro level (Peterson 1993). That means, utterances related on a clear and meaningful manner to each other (Craig & Tracy 1983). For coherence, there are no specific components in discourse, because implicit relations of meaning (Roelofs 1998) establish coherence. Cohesion is a tool to attain coherence and it is the meaningful connection between sentences (Norbury & Bishop 2003; Roelofs 1998). Cohesion refers to apparent components in the discourse. It occurs when the interpretation of an element in the discourse is dependent from another element inside the discourse (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Cohesive relations are semantic ones realized by the lexical-grammatical system, especially by verbal devices (Adams 2002; Roelofs 1998). The use of cohesive devices sets up the series of inferences used by the speaker and reduces redundancy in communicative exchanges (Adams 2002). To use cohesion correctly, the narrator has to take into an account that the perspective of the character in order to make the actions of this character must be understandable for the listener. (Roelofs 1998; Wigglesworth 1997). Such a skill requires Theory of Mind abilities (Roelofs 1998) the narrator has to possess cohesive ties between sentences consist of conjunctions (coordination and subordination) and references (introductions and referrals) (Halliday and Hasan 1976; Liles 1985; For example, if a child says ‘The bus drove further. *And* he came in a city. The word ‘*and*’ is a coordination and the use of links these two utterances by expressing an additive relationship. The use of ‘*he*’ is another example of a cohesive device, namely a referral; the speaker has referred to an individual named in a previous utterance. One way to achieve cohesion is the use of references with pronouns and demonstratives. This, to refer to a person, object or act, which established in the interaction (Adams 2002). Halliday & Hasan (1976) distinct personal, demonstrative and comparative reference. Personal and



demonstrative expressed by pronouns: comparative reference by adjectives or adverbs. Only personal references (introductions and referrals) are measured. That the development of cohesion, the use of both of them increases with age (from two until ten years). However, it is not clear when the acquisition starts. In scientific literature, some authors state that there is an early acquisition, others say there is a late one (Roelofs 1998; Wigglesworth 1997). According to Bamberg (1987) there are several strategies used in referring. Those strategies guiding children's reference in a given periods: 1. Nominal Strategy: children younger than four year old. Each character named by a noun, less pronouns are used i.e.: '*The bus* is going to drive'. '*The bus* drives fast'. 2. Local contrast strategy: in children under six years old. No pattern for reference. Children choose references based on the situation. 3. Thematic subject strategy: middle school age children, seven, eight and nine years old. One person referred to by pronoun. The other personages referred with a noun, i.e.: '*The bus* drives into a meadow.' '*He* sees a cow.' '*The cow* says moeh!' '*The cow* says I cannot believe what I see'. 4. Anaphora strategy: This is the adult strategy. This strategy starts to occur at the age of five and is the most important strategy in nine-year-old children. Introducing the character had done by an indefinite noun phrase. If the entity had mentioned, the narrator would have been obliged to use a definite noun phrase. In case of reference maintenance, a pronoun is used. Conjunction is another tool to achieve cohesion. Conjunction used to express the relationship between episodes (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Furthermore, conjunctions are words that tie two syntactic components together. Besides this obligatory feature, conjunctions also possess a semantic feature, whereby the nature of the relationship can be expressed (Halliday & Hasan 1976). One of the relation can be 'cause'. (i.e. The bus continued on its own, *because* the train goes into the tunnel). The conjunction is a special form of cohesion, because the meaning of the word reflects the relationship between previous components of the discourse and that what comes

next (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Types of conjunctions the speaker can use are coordination (e.g. but, or, thus, than etc.) and subordinations (e.g. while, next, meanwhile, because, whereby etc.). A coordination connects two head sentences with each other (i.e. 'There stands a cow *and* he says moeh'). A coordination placed at the beginning of the following sentence or can consider as a contracted one (Roelofs 1998). A subordination connects a depending clause with a head sentence or another depending clause (i.e. 'There stands a cow *who* says moeh'; 'there was a policeman *who* was shouting at the bus, *which* did not want to listen '). The relation between sentences can show implicitly in the meaning of the following episodes. When there is no conjunction used, it does not mean that no relation between episodes is present (i.e. 'Hij besloot (*om*) het nooit meer te doen'. English translation: 'He decided never to do it again') (Roelofs 1998). In studies considering development of cohesion, the authors state that children at the age of four start to realize that every individual has its own knowledge. Besides, this knowledge (belonging to the Theory of Mind), can differ from the knowledge the child itself possess (Roelofs 1998). In child's expressive language, this not found at this age. In addition, Wigglesworth (1997) researched cohesive devices in children in the age of four, six, eight, ten years and as an adult. Wigglesworth (1997) noticed that four-year-old narrators did not demonstrate any clear strategy in cohesion. Thereby, making it difficult to the listener to comprehend the story in case the listener did not see the pictures (Wigglesworth 1997). Children older than four years old choose a thematic strategy; used pronouns to refer to the character regardless of the situation. Bamberg (1987) mentioned earlier, talking about subdivisions in children's cohesion in narratives. Development in the use of cohesive devices in children older than four years seem to contain conjunctions and references (Roelofs 1998). There showing that the amount of references increased with age. In conjunctions however, there were only differences in subordinations, who increased with age (Roelofs 1998).

## 2.5 Narration and Cohesion

In order to measure cohesion, narratives characterized by one long speech turn of the child in which all language abilities do (e.g. language content, language form and language use) have to be integrated into the listener's understandable story (Blankenstijn & Scheper 2003). Narration is one of the most complex skills in linguistic ability; it requires an integration of linguistic and social skills (Befi-Lopes et.al. 2008; Ketelaars 2010; Mc Tear & Conti-Ramsden 1994; Norbury & Bishop 2003; Paul & Smith 1993). It requires skills such as idea formation, linearization of these ideas, adequate referring as well as taking adequate perspectives towards the listener in telling about the events, happening to the protagonists in the story (Levelt 1989). These aspects of narrative competence are subject of developmental growth throughout the school years (Ketelaars 2010). At the age of six years, the narratives consist of complete episodes, with initiating events, motivating states, attempts and consequences (Peterson & McCabe 1983; Roelofs 1998) Narratives considered an ecologically valid measure to assess pragmatic performance (Botting 2002; Ketelaars 2010; Paul & Smith 1993; Roelofs 1998). The advantage narratives, as an assessment tool on several linguistic levels obtained. Besides, it is possible to analyze specific aspects of linguistic structure both within sentences, but also to assess the organization of story content (Ketelaars 2010). It is useful to assess idea formation, planning, perspective taking and referencing (Befi-Lopes et.al. 2008; Levelt 1989; Norbury & Bishop 2003; Roelofs 1998). Thereby, states that narration may be a sensitive instrument to profile language learning disabilities in children with pragmatic language impairment. In addition, narration is a tool to measure any change in narrative ability over time, particularly in school-aged children. In conclusion, narrative tasks would seem to be an ideal index for assessing these higher-level language skills and thereby making predictions about academic performance in young children (Ketelaars 2010; Paul & Smith 1993).

## **2.6 Clinical value for assessment of cohesion**

With the test used by (Jansonius & Borgers 2009), it is possible to diagnose children with (specific language disorder) or (pragmatic language disorder) (Ketelaars 2010). Ketelaars (2010) found that, with the Ring Tone No Answer (RTNA) (Jansonius & Borgers 2009), children with specific pragmatic disorder problems can be detected. Pragmatic language disorder characterized as an impairment in the use of language in social contexts and has originally been classified as a language disorder (Adams 2002; Ketelaars 2010). Children with pragmatic language disorder show a different language use compared with typical developing children. This is because the pragmatic difficulties are clustered with other linguistic domains, such as syntactic or semantic difficulties (Rapin & Alan 1983; Roelofs 1998). These children show difficulties in taking perspectives in the communication, inadequate conversational skills, poor maintenance of the conversation topic and they often use stereotypes in their language output (Rapin & Allen 1983). Nowadays, language tests assessing language development deal with language content and language form. With these assessments, children with Pragmatic language disorder are hard to detect, because their syntactic skills and phonology are rather unimpaired (Rapin & Allen 1983). Children with Programming Language Interface or Personal Limited Intelligence (PLI) suffer also from word finding deficits (Rapin & Allen 1983). These problems also lead to less accurate references. Furthermore, Ketelaars (2010) found in her study evidence of difficulties relating to cohesion, although she used only one measure as indicator of cohesion, namely implicit referencing. We assume, that the narratives of children with Pragmatic Language disorder, show also poor cohesion, due to their pragmatic problem. We have the opinion that cohesion can be studied in a more detailed way with the RTNA Bus Story Test (Jansonius & Borgers). Therefore, more information about the normal development in cohesion in children with a typical language development is needed.

## **2.7 Grammatical Cohesion**

Grammatical cohesion of all language learning skills, speaking and writing defined as active skills. Both are forms of communication. While speaking is the spoken utterances and thought that cannot be undone, writing is recorded thought that can be edited and revised; therefore, it is more complex. Murray (2009: 3-4) identified writing as a process which entails rehearsing, drafting, and revising. This process involves the exploration of thought, the composition of a written draft, revision, and lastly, the final draft. For second language learners, especially in college, writing is undoubtedly important. Students are required to analyze, compare and inform through writing; nevertheless, lack of practice, especially structured writing, makes them to have a lack of experience to convey their ideas into a cohesive writing. Moreover, when they reach the end of their study, they should write a thesis as part of a requirement to graduate. When learners are unable to create a well-constructed and understandable composition, they will not be able to create good thesis. There are many things to take into account in writing. Some of them are cohesion and coherence. Halliday and Hasan (1976: 28-30) emphasize the importance of cohesion as well as coherence discourse in order to achieve well-constructed and understandable writing. In addition, Azzouz (2009: 11) emphasizes that discourse devices of writing give great effect. Cohesive discourse will never be constructed without a good command of linguistic ties. As a compulsory requirement for those seeking specific degree in both private and public colleges, thesis writing becomes important for college students. Thesis writing is an academic writing, and hence, it inevitably needs appropriate cohesion and coherence in order to be accepted as academic writing. Students are expected to be able to write a long paper, which is mainly consisted of five chapters of a certain topic. The paper should be effective in terms of quantity and quality. Students are expected to be able to demonstrate their ability to express their ideas clearly and analyze their research findings. When

students are writing thesis, plagiarism is prohibited. Students are expected to use their own ideas and insight while accurately referencing published material. Additionally, from the writer's initial observation when doing grammar check from some of students' thesis writing, writer found out that many students misplaced the conjunction from their thesis, which then distracted writer's attention to understand their writing ideas. An easy example is when; they use "**on the other hand**" to signal additional information. In fact, "**on the other hand**" is used to signal the dissimilarity or the contrast of anaphoric and cataphoric idea. Furthermore, they also committed many referring mistakes, such as using "they" to refer to "student". Furthermore, Azzouz's (2009) and Tsareva's (2010) researches mainly focused on analyzing the use of grammatical cohesion in the essay writing. Both of them asked students of each to write an argumentative essay. Writer is interested to analyze the use of similar variable in students' thesis writing, particularly the research background part. As previously mentioned, when writing a thesis, students have to be able to show their position and reasons of the proposed research in the research background section. This is quite similar to the argumentative essay in which students have to take a position and show logic evidence to convince readers (Kirszner & Mandell, 1999: 91-96). For reasons above, the writer is interested to these phenomena and wants to know the quality of students' writing in term of using grammatical cohesion to integrate sentences in their research background.

## **2.8 Types of Grammatical Cohesion**

Reference: (Personal pronouns, Demonstrative pronouns and Comparatives)  
Substitution & Ellipsis: (Nominal, Clausal and Verbal) Conjunction: (Adversative, Additive, Temporal and Causal) One part of thesis writing that is affected by the inappropriate use of cohesive devices is the background section. In this part, students have to explain why they chose their particular research and to provide the big picture in this case are their thesis's, background for the readers connect the idea

closely on to more specific ideas through the correct use of cohesive devices in a coherent way. In conclusion, background section is similar to argumentative essay in which cohesion and coherence are inevitably important. From the background, the writer intended to know. 1-Which cohesion devices do English Education department students of teaching and learning use mostly. 2-How do grammatical cohesive devices used by the students to create cohesive discourse within students' thesis. This study focused on investigating students' writing background of using grammatical cohesion about language teaching and learning by using cohesive devices. Their writing then investigated in terms of the number of cohesive devices used, and divided into types of grammatical cohesive devices. After that, the investigation took into account of the appropriateness of cohesive devices used by students in writing essays, paragraphs and sentences in English language.

## **2.9 Functions of Grammatical Cohesion in Writing**

The function of grammatical cohesion is consisting of three types. (Personal, demonstrative and comparative reference). Reference links two items meaning that one item refers to another item mentioned previously or after the first item discussed (Halliday & Hasan 1976, 38). Different from reference, substitution connects between items of a text anaphorically and cataphorically by replacing an item with another item in the same grammatical class. It has three types; they are nominal, verbal, and clausal substitutions. Another part of grammatical cohesion is conjunction used to create strong cohesion by the virtue of its specific meanings. By using specific conjunction, it can relate to the preceding or following texts, which semantically connected to what has gone before. Thus, conjunction can establish the semantic relation. Halliday & Hasan (1976, 248) posit that there are three types of conjunction. They are additive, adversative, and temporal. They have different signal words and relate sentences indifferent ways based on their actual meanings.

## **2.10 Definition of cohesion**

The term cohesion is very important in the text. It is a part of the system of a language. Halliday and Hassan (1976:4) state that the cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the discourse depend on each other. That one presupposes the other, in the sense that it cannot be decoded except by resource to it. When this happens a relation of cohesion is setup, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially make an integration into a text. Which states that cohesion is the formal link between sentences and between clauses. Moreover, statement by Baker (1992:180) supports that cohesion is the network of lexical, grammatical, and other relation, which provide linking between various parts of a text. This relationship functions is to convey the meaning from the speakers' mind, idea or thought, in order to make a sentence conveyed meaningfully and to be easier for readers to understand the whole meaning. In addition combining some statements above the writer can conclude that a cohesion is used to link one part of a text to another part of the same text. It has functions as a tie to link one sentence to another for indicates the relationship between the sentences.

## **2.11 Cohesive devices in grammar**

A text has words, clauses, sentences, and textual units chained. The chain connecting those components of text named coherence. Dealing with coherence, not all people can do that. For example in the writing class, students sometimes miss how to connect among ideas and even misuse the cohesive devices. Along with that condition, this research tries to figure out the uses of the cohesive devices, how to be used and create a usefulness in texts. Talking about text, Halliday & Hasan (1976, 1-3) specify a text as both spoken and written passage consisting of words, phrases, and sentences correlated each other and have a principle called cohesion. The



cohesion connects ideas (semantic relation) among sentences to create a coherent text. Moreover, they posit that cohesion takes a role as the property of text constructing the writing pattern. Cohesion is thus one of the text properties that contribute to the organization of a proper written text. Further, cohesion refers to how words and various parts of a text associated by using the devices like grammatical cohesion devices (conjunction, reference, substitution and ellipsis) lexical cohesion devices (collocation, antonyms, synonyms and repetition) (Halliday & Hasan 1976). Simply, cohesion is the tool to create coherence in the text, hence it connects ideas embedded in sentences or even paragraphs so that the sentence-to-sentence, paragraph to paragraph are coordinated through cohesion. In addition to, a cohesive device makes sentences correlated to each other; the two sentences together constitute a text that is united or coherent so the definition is. Cohesion is a lexico-grammatical connection among the componential parts of a text, it classified into five cohesive ties, it also clarifies simply how text components will stick or hang together and described into three broad kinds of linguistic devices that are useful to realize connectedness in texts as following.

## **2.12 Types of Cohesion (Grammatical and Lexical)**

Cohesion is an important part of neat writing and it is a necessary element to create a firm text, and plays the role of expressing the continuity that exists between parts of a text. There are two main types of cohesion: lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion. The latter consists of reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction.

### **2.12.0 Grammatical Cohesion, explanation**

Halliday & Hasan (1976, 4) posit that cohesion refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text and define it as a text. It defines something as a text because a text is a unit of meanings, not merely a form. Moreover Halliday and Hasan (1976, 8) also stated that a cohesion is a semantic relation among elements in the text that

is crucial to the interpretation of one to another. It means that the cohesion used to create a relation in a text. This relation, which can also lie on and bridge sentences, called semantic relation. When cohesive devices used in the sentence, sentences can connect to each other, then can create a meaning and make a text as a whole text. Determining coherence of text is also a part of discourse analysis. In this case, cohesion is a tool to create interconnected parts of a text. Both Halliday & Hasan (1976) also probe that a cohesion occurs where the interpretation of some elements in that writing are dependent to each other. It means that one item in the sentence refers to another or other items. When it happens, the relation of cohesion is setup, and two elements are presupposing and presupposed. Thus, these two sentences can be integrated as a complete and coherent text. For example, in the sentence (*Wash and core six cooking apples put them into a fireproof dish*). The word „them“ presupposes to another item which is „six cooking apples“ in the preceding sentence. On other words, Halliday and Hasan concluded that the presupposition provides cohesion between the two sentences. Further, Halliday & Hasan (1976) classify cohesion into grammatical and lexical cohesion. The grammatical cohesion includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Meanwhile, lexical cohesion includes repetition, synonymy, antonym and collocation. All of them established with two different elements. Grammatical cohesion established with the use of grammatical elements of the text expressing the semantic relation within and between the sentences. It includes reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction.

### **2.12.1 Cohesion by reference**

In the following examples below the full explanation of the work to cohesiveness concerning tools of reference in English grammar. As some scientist of the language elaborated that, a reference commonly achieved throughout the use of certain grammatical items. Especially, the personal pronouns (he, she, I, you, we and they) and demonstratives pronouns (this, that, these and those) and comparatives the

definite article (the) and they said these items use to orientate the readers. Moreover, for written text to retrieve and access information from the other sentences elsewhere in the text. This is known as (Endophora) when it is inside and from a situation outside the text as (Exophora) examples of cohesion by reference, there are three types of references in English language. Anaphoric, Cataphoric and Exophoric reference their clarification and their functions showed below in the following way. Moreover, how to use these references in a correct way of forming sentences in English language.

### **2.12.2 Anaphoric Reference**

Using words that point back to a word used before: such as Look! At the sun. It is going down quickly. If John wants to pass the exam, he has to work hard. After lady Nancy appeared on television music awards in a dress made completely of meat. She was criticized by animal rights group. He liked the students. He however would have nothing to do with *them*. Three blind *mice* see how *they* run. Doctor Foster went to *Canada* twenty years ago. He went *there* again last month. The definite article (the) can also play the role of Anaphoric reference as it helps the reader to refer to an earlier mentioned noun. For instance, Lady Nancy appeared in a dress made completely of meat, *Franc Fernandez designed the dress*. To understand the cohesion by reference depends on a good knowledge of understanding the use of these personal pronouns. Demonstrative pronouns and a definite article (the) so the personal pronouns have many cases that make them fall under several categories as well as subjective case. (he, she, it, we, they, I and you), and an objective case as in (him, her, it, us, them, me and you) and possession, possessive adjective case like (his, his, her, hers, its, its, our, ours, their, theirs, my, mine, you and yours). The demonstratives also have numbers estimated by a distance or position of something that a writer or speaker indicates. According to the subject of the sentence as well as the nearness of position we use. (This) to show something is very near and singular

not plural, the demonstrative (that) used to demonstrate something far and should be singular too, but the demonstrative (these) used for nearness of plural things, people, places, animals, and (those) used to indicate the plural cases especially when they are far. So not to confuse organizing the grammatical ties we should know how to deal with the above-mentioned elements in English grammar. The definite article (the) used for specific references to countable nouns the rules for using the definite article are very clear first use of (the) is for the second and subsequent references to an item. The item could explicitly refer to, or implied (for instance the committee has approved a new policy. The policy...) (A survey administered to the committee the results show that the policy was reliable). Second use of (the) when you use mostly as the superlative form (for example the most critical step is shameful). Third use of (the) when using ordinal forms to show order or number (for instance. The first students to graduate were above forty degrees. The last students to leave were under forty). Fourth use of (the) when using words that specify a particular item. (For example, the same student, the only essay, and the principal reason). Finally use (the) for reference to an item that is understood by all speakers. e.g (the sun, the planets, the moon, the stars). The definite article (*the*) used when both the writer and the reader know the specific person, place, or thing being referred to. When using the definite article, the context of the sentence in questions will contain information already shared in an earlier part of the piece. For example, when we read the sentence, “I really enjoyed the book,” we can infer that the specific details of the book mentioned in a previous sentence. (Teaching and Learning Support (TaLS) – Fact Sheets University of New England). Moreover, using (the) is to point to a specific one. Unlike *a*, which means “any one,” (*the*) points out a specific one or a *particular* one. Here are some examples of using (the) what is *the assignment for Wednesday?* (Specifies it and distinguishes it from other assignments, like those for Monday and Friday.) *The* new Chevrolet that Linda bought is beautiful. (Specifies

it and distinguishes it from other cars or Chevrolets.) Let's eat *the* apple pie. (Specifies it and distinguishes it from other pies, like peach or cherry pies) *The* man standing over there asked to speak to the manager. (Specifies *man* and distinguishes him from others who may be present) use (the) When You Mean the *Only One*. Sometimes there is only **one** of something in a room, or in a house, or in the whole world. When you refer to that thing, you cannot use the article *a*, for (*a*) implies that something comes from a group containing more than one. You must use the article (the) e.g *the* roof of this house is leaking. (The house has only one roof.) I want to buy carpeting for *the* floor. (There is only one floor.) What time does *the clock* say? (There is only one clock in the room.) *The sky* is cloudy today. (There is only one sky.) Use (*the*) to Refer to Nouns You Have Already Mentioned. Once you have mentioned a noun, you have specified which one you mean. When you mention it a second time, you should use (*the*) before it instead of (*a*). For instance, would you buy *a second hand car* from that man? Yes, but only *if the car* is repaired (now specified) and had a five-year guarantee. You will find *a pair of earrings* and *a necklace* in my drawer. *The Necklace* (now specified) was my grandmother's.

### **2.12.3 Cataphoric Reference**

Cataphoric reference defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as looking forward in the text in order to know the elements where the reference items refers. Brown and Yule (1983) define cataphora as “looking forward in the text for their interpretation”. In addition, Nunan (1993) identifies cataphoric reference as pointing, the reader or listener forward - it pulls us further into the text in order to identify the elements to which the reference items refer. That is to say, Cataphora refers to any reference that “points forward” to information that will be presented later in the text. Examples: if they are late again, the director will probably reprimand the employees. The personal pronoun ‘they’ refers to the noun phrase ‘the employees’ so, it is a cataphoric reference because the pronoun (they) mentioned before the (employees). This

section of the references will follow the same format as the previous one. In addition, cataphoric reference is using words that point forward to a word that had not mentioned yet. For instance when (*she* was challenged by reporters *Lady Nancy* insisted that the dress was not intended to offend anyone. *It* is going quickly *the sun*. Jack asked *her* to sing and so *Mary* sang.

#### **2.12.4 Exophoric reference**

Exophoric reference is using words that point to something outside the text to create Exophoric reference. If *you* want to know more about this issue, you can read *the comments* people have left on the animal rights. Modern discourse analysts like Eggins (2004), Martin and Rose (2003) have come up with more classifications concerning cohesive devices particularly cohesion by reference in grammatical expressions. When the writer uses a presuming reference item, the reader actually tries to retrieve the identity of that item in order to follow the text. If the reader becomes unable to retrieve the referent, the interaction between the reader and the writer will run into problems, Martin and Rose (2003). They said that the identity of presuming reference item may be retrievable from a number of different contexts which are divided into three categories (1) General context of a shared culture (2) Shared context of situation (3) From elsewhere within the text itself so *General context of a shared culture* is known as homophoric reference. Eggins (2004) assumes that both the reader and the writer share a homogeneous culture or knowledge. For example how hot *the sun* is today, (we all know which sun we are talking about the specific sun of our solar system). *He* kicked the bucket due to eating too much *fat*. *Shared context of situation context* it is known as an Exophoric reference pointing outside the text. Look at that car it is damaged put *it* down next to *her* please (if you are in the same place and in the same time you will be able to decode *it* and *her*). *From elsewhere within the text itself* it is known as an Endophoric reference. Martin and Rose (2003) Eggins (2004) further classified an Endophoric

reference into seven types. (Anaphoric, Cataphoric, Esophoric, Comparative, Location, Bridging and Whole text) *Anaphoric reference*, it happens when the referent is earlier mentioned in the text. *Jane* is dermatologist *she* works in Canada. *Cataphoric reference*: it takes place when the referent will be mentioned later. *She* is a doctor. Doctor *Cathy* works in Canada. *Esophoric reference*, it occurs when the referent is mentioned within the same noun phrase. *Obama* the *president* of the United States visited Canada. *Comparative reference*, it happens when the writer compares what is going to be mentioned with what has earlier been mentioned. We realize throughout the use of words like (*the same, similar to, the best*) African countries encounter many educational challenges such as basic level and kindergarten *the same* challenge encountered in Kordofan. *Location reference*, it involves the use of transitional words like (*here, there, as well as, firstly, secondly, thirdly, finally*) these words anaphorically refer to what has been mentioned earlier Martin & Rose (2003) *there* are many educational challenges encountered in Sudan. *Firstly* the curriculum *secondly* the teachers and *thirdly* the payment. *Doctor Foster* went to Canada twenty years ago *he* went *there* again last month. *Bridging reference*, it happens when the reference item refers to an earlier mentioned item from which it can inferentially derived. E.g the writer can talk in one paragraph about how the situation is in Sudan for example is unaffordable. Then in any following paragraph mentions that Sudanese universities lack the qualified teachers particularly the Ph.D. holders. Inferentially we understand that this unaffordable situation forces the teachers to fly out. *Whole text reference*: it occurs when the referent is a sequence of actions or ideas that have mentioned previously. As Eggins (2004) said that, the thesis statement of any essay includes controlling ideas. Each idea developed in a separate paragraph. So all these paragraphs refer or anaphorically to the thesis statement in the introductory paragraph consider the following example. Look at that (pointing at a bird) I cannot see it. Load the *program* into your PC. Then to see how

*it* works press *enter*. You will see *this* on your screen: Microsoft excel Home Edition. Look at *the sun*. *It* is going down quickly. *It* is going down quickly, *the sun*. If *John* wants to pass the exam, *he* has to work hard. Robert asked *her* to sing, and *Mary* sang. *She* was called *Mary* by her parents. Look at *that* (looking at the Moon). I love *John*. *He* is my husband. I hate *it*, *the book*. *The news* came as a terrible shock to *them all*, but most of all to Mrs. Mallard. It seemed that *her* husband *Thomas* had been killed in a railroad disaster. His friend Richard carried the sad tidings to Mrs. Mallard and her sister Cathy. Here we begin with the presuming references to *the news* and *them all* but it is only in the second sentence that we learn what that news was, and only in the third that we can establish the exact referent for them all (Mrs Mallard, Richard, Cathy).

### **2.12.5 Cohesion by Substitution**

As mentioned before, reference is a semantic link among the constituent parts of a text realized throughout the use of grammatical items such as pronouns and demonstratives and others Halliday (1994). Halliday (1994) reviews ellipsis and substitution as two variants of the same type of cohesive relations, which also contribute to the semantic structure of the written discourse. Halliday adds that in Ellipsis and Substitution, in contrast with reference, the semantic relations are wording (lexical-grammatical) rather than directly in the meaning. Both Ellipsis and Substitution the anaphoric cohesion achieved when something is pre-supposed by means of what is substituted or left out. Substitution: is the replacement of one item by another. For instance the lion was about to leap when they suddenly came to another *gulf* across the road. However, this *one* was so broad and deep that the lion knew at once he could not leap across it. The word (*one*) substitutes the word (*gulf*). The process of substitution: in substitution there are two expressions (a) and (b) in the text (a) for example could be repeated as in (a) But instead we replace it with a substitute word or phrase (b).e.g. *I bet you get married (a) before I get married (a)*



repetition. I bet you get married (a) before I do (b). Substitution by using auxiliary verb (*do*) as a substitution for (get married). Types of substitution: (Nominal substitution, Verbal substitution and Clausal substitution. So *nominal substitution*: as well as John thank for the *meeting*, let us start the next *one*. The word *one or ones* the terms most commonly used for nominal substitution in English language. *Verbal substitution*: is realized through an auxiliary verbs (do, be, and have) sometimes together with another substitute term such as (so or the same). Thursday the sixth looks pretty good and, *so does* Monday the tenth. *Clausal substitution*: where (*so*) substitutes the previous clause as the items used in clausal substitution are *so* and *not*. Do you think we will need an hour, if *so*? How about the twenty sixth three to four (*Clausal substitution*) *so* substitutes *we need an hour* (*Nominal substitution*). The following the examples of substitutions and ellipsis as mentioned above. John bought round *glasses*. The oval *ones* hurt his nose ( Hatch 1992) N.S Robert gave his daughter some *chocolates* and *a toy*. He gave *the same* to his son. *Nominal substitution* Eastern people *take this issue seriously*, at least some of them *do* (Hatch 1992) *Verbal Substitution* is there going to be an earthquake, *it says so*. *Clausal substitution*. Halliday & Hasan (1976). Do you have a *red pen*? Sorry I have *blue*. It is omission of a noun which the noun modifier is upgraded to the status of a noun. *Nominal Ellipsis* Is he *coming* He *may be*. I don't care Halliday and Hasan (1976 - 171) *Verbal Ellipsis*. Who killed Cock Robin? *The sparrow* Zero. Is there any problem? (*Yes*) Elliptical clause: *there is a problem*. So it is the process in which the clause is omitted as in the case of direct response e.g. Yes /No and (Wh) questions.

### **2.12.6 Cohesion by Ellipsis**

Ellipsis: is the omission of one item (*substitution by zero*) or called reduced forms in English grammar for Example. Have you settled the matter, I am trying to. The omitted part is the verbal group: (settle the matter). Differences between substitutions and ellipsis: It can be noted in the answers of the following e.g. (0:)

indicates what has been elided): *Is anyone here a linguistic major? I am* instead of (0: a linguistic major) this is *ellipsis*. *I am one* where *one* substitutes for a linguistic major) *substitution* when the entire clause or a large part of it is elided or substituted. This is typically done with (yes/no) responses (as well as *if so* and *if not*) or wh question words. E.g. are you alright? Yes (0: iam alright) I need them. What (0: is it you need). Are you coming to the party, *If so* bring something to drink. *If not* let me call John. Who is coming, I do not know. The *verbal group* when a verb phrase is elided or substituted. E.g. *Ellipsis*: have you read much, iam trying to. (0: read much). *Substitution*: who ran to school, I did so the auxiliary verb (*did*) substitute (ran) to school *the nominal group* when the noun phrase is elided or substituted. E.g. *ellipsis*: I will ask my dad about the pens and whether he has any. (0: pens). *Substitution*: often with the words (*one or ones*). E.g. who has a pen, I have *one (one)* substitute for a pen.

## 2.13 Lexical cohesion in grammar

It is another type of cohesive ties to do with repeated lexical items. It seems that the complement of grammatical cohesion involves a system of open lexical items (Halliday and Hasan 1976). Lexical cohesion is the use of lexis or vocabulary that semantically related in meaning to another lexis or vocabulary in an earlier part of the text. Lexical cohesion provides cohesive effect which achieved by the selection of vocabulary. The categorization of lexical relations includes the following items. (*Reiteration or repetition, Synonymy, Antonymy, Hyponymy (opposite of Hypernymy) genus, super ordinate, Meronymy (opposite of Holonymy) denote whole and Collocation ( juxtaposition) Repetition / reiteration*: It is the use of the same word in a writing for instance *a conference* will be held on national environment policy. At this *conference* the issue of Salination will play an important role (*conference*) lexical cohesion by repetition Halliday (1985). *Synonymy*: it is the use of two or more words having the same or similar meaning for example the meeting

*commenced* at six thirty, but from the moment it *began* it was clear that all was not well. (*commence/began*) (McCarthy 1991:65). Antonymy: Is a relation between lexical items established through the meaning of oppositeness (Thornbury 2005). Bill *created* a new life for himself and he *destroyed* all reminders of his old one. (*Create/Destroy*) are opposites. Hyponymy: (*Hypernymy*) super ordinate/genus: Is a lexical relationship between words, the meaning of one word includes the meaning of the other (Halliday,1985) in the other words hyponymy is one word represents a class of a thing and the second represents a super-class or a sub-class. E.g *tree-oak, pineapple, strawberry*. We were in town today shopping for *furniture*. We saw a lovely *table* (*table*) hyponymy relationship with *furniture*. Meronymy: (*Holonymy*) denotes whole: Is a relation between a concept and its parts. Two words have a relationship of meronymy if (a) is inseparable part of (b). In the other words Meronymy: words that refer to parts of a whole. E.g Tree-trunk, branch, leaf. It was *a Canary*. *The beak* was injured. *The beak is the part of Canary*. Collocation: (*Juxtaposition*). Refers to the use of words that co-occur together, e.g when one sees the noun (*pipe*) in a sentence it is more probable that the verb to follow is (*to smoke*) will also appear in the sentence. The noun *bicycle* could more likely occur with the verb to *ride*. Drink water, sip coffee/ tea, smoke cigarette.

## **2.14 Cohesion with conjunctions**

Conjunctions are the third type of cohesive devices. McCarthy (1991) draws a clear distinction between conjunctions and the previously mentioned cohesive devices (Grammatical and lexical) by saying that a conjunction does not set off a search of meaning backward or forward for its referent. In the other words, conjunctions play the role of linking and organizing the relationship among the sentences of a text. Cook (1989) confirms that the conjunctions are the most *apparent* type of cohesive devices of formal relations between sentences within a text. He adds that conjunctions contribute to the cohesiveness of the text as they connect one clause or

a sentence to another and they can classify as the following. Words or phrases, which add more information to what been said called (*additives*) conjunctions in English grammar and they: (*And, Further, Moreover and Add to that*). Words or phrases, which may elaborate or exemplify the information, were given called (*exemplifiers*) and they: (*For instance, for example and in the other words*). Words or phrases, which may contrast new information with old information or put another side to the writing called (*adversative*) conjunctions in grammar and they: (*On the other hand, But and However*). Words or phrases which may relate new information to what has already been in terms of causes are called (*causal*) conjunctions in grammar and they are: (*consequently, because and for this reason*). Words or phrases which may indicate a new departure or a summary of something as well as (*well, anyway, to conclude and to sum up*) also Halliday and Matthesiseen in (2004) added what is known as (*conjunctive cohesion*) which refers to how the writers create and express logical relations between the parts of the text using conjunctions. Martin and Rose in (2003) said that conjunctions create inter-connections within a text through the process of (*adding, comparing, sequencing or explaining*). This connection creates the semantic unity. Different conjunctions serve different purposes within a text such as *connecting arguments* so conjunctions used to connect arguments and to organize writing shows that there is more to say to support the writing such as. (*Also, And and Further*). On the other hand, the conjunction “*thus*” tells the reader what follows is a conclusion to say it clearly additive conjunctions (*Also, And and Further*) add arguments to support a thesis and the consequential conjunction “*thus*” is used to draw a conclusion. These conjunctions link logical steps within a text. They also used to organize the stages of a text Martin & Rose (2003). *Comparing arguments* conjunctions used to exemplify and compare general statements with specific instances. The writers should give real examples to convince their readers like: (*For instance and For example*) there are also other conjunctions that play a role of

ordering arguments in English and they tell the reader that a new stage is beginning and they play a significant role in organizing the whole writing. Therefore, they are called (global discourse writing markers) and they are (*Firstly, Secondly, Thirdly* and *finally*). Eggins in (2004) said that conjunctions play three significant roles in ordering and organizing a writing discourse as in the following words. (*Elaboration, Extension* and *Enhancement*) so *Elaboration*: Is a relationship of restatement by which one sentence represents the previous one as well as in (*In other words, For example* and *That is to say*). The *Extension*: Is a relationship of either addition or variation. A sentence may add or change the meaning of the previously mentioned sentences through these conjunctions (*And, Also, Moreover, In addition, But, Yet* or *On the contrary*).

## **2.15 Cohesion with prepositions**

Preposition choice: Certain prepositions must follow certain words, and the correct preposition must use to make relationships between words in the sentences. Prepositions placement: Prepositions must be followed by *nouns*, and prepositions can *only* ever go on the end of the sentence in certain situations. *Preposition Choice*: Determining what preposition to use is not simple. This can be especially difficult when dealing with idioms (expressions in the English language that require the use of a certain word, simply because of that is the word we have chosen to use). Idiomatic expressions are expressions you just have to memorize, and when errors made, they are almost prepositional errors. Here are some examples of idioms, together with the correct prepositions: (*Able to, Concerned by, Prohibited from, Capable of, Preoccupied with*) each of the italicized words is the only acceptable prepositions to follow these words. It would not be grammatically correct to say "able *from*" or "preoccupied *for*" *Preposition placement*: Prepositions must be followed by a *noun* or *pronoun*. That noun is called the *object* of the preposition. A verb can't be the object of a preposition. The antenna was *for* the car. This is correct-

the preposition *for* is followed by the noun "car." The antenna was for drive. This is not correct. The preposition *for* is followed by a verb "drive." Drive can't be the object of a preposition. This rule may seem confusing at first, because you may have seen words that look like verbs following the preposition *to* in sentences; for example: I like *to dance* or this rope is for *jumping*. However, in these examples, the *dance* and *jumping* are not actually acting as verbs. In the first example, *to dance* is part of the infinitive. An infinitive is not a verb. An infinitive occurs when a verb is used as a noun, adjective, or adverb. Here, "to dance" is a thing that the person likes doing, not an action that they are doing. It is a verbal noun. *Prepositions at the End of Sentences*: Because prepositions must be followed by a noun and have an object, they usually cannot be used at the end of a sentence. For example, it is not correct to say: The table is where I put my books on. However, there are certain circumstances where it is acceptable to end a sentence with a preposition. These exceptions exist when the preposition needs to be there, and if it were not, the meaning of the sentence would change. In the above example, "*The table is where I put my books on.*" the use of the preposition "on" is not necessary. We could take the "on" out of the sentence and the meaning would be the same. Therefore, the use of the preposition was unnecessary and we do not need it. However, here is an example where it is perfectly acceptable to use a preposition to end a sentence: "I turned the television on." If you removed the "on" from the end of this sentence, it would change the meaning. Instead of switching on the set, you would be saying that you turned the television itself. (Nova Southeastern University College of Graduate Studies).

## **2.16 Cohesion with adjectives plus a preposition**

Adjectives+ *of*: (nice, kind, good, generous, mean, stupid, silly, intelligent, clever, sensible, (im) polite, rude, unreasonable of) someone to do something for instance It was *stupid of me* to go out so late at night. Thank you. It was *nice/kind/polite of* you to help me. (*Afraid, frightened, terrified, scared of*) someone / something for

example Are you *afraid* of dogs, (*ashamed, proud, aware, (in)capable, conscious, fond, full, , jealous, envious, suspicious, short, tired of* somebody/something) for example I'm ashamed of what I did. I'm short of money. Can you lend me some? I'm tired of waiting. She was jealous of his secretary. Adjectives + *to*: (nice, kind, good, generous, mean, (im) polite, rude, (un)pleasant, (un)friendly, cruel *to* someone eg. They have always been nice to me. She is always rude to Ann. *married, engaged to someone* eg. Susan is married to an American. (Addicted, allergic, attentive, grateful, immune, indifferent, liable) (Likely to suffer from) *to* something eg. He has become addicted *to* drugs very early. Adjectives + *with*: delighted, pleased, satisfied, disappointed, bored, fed up, connected, happy, obsessed, preoccupied, crowded *with* someone/something eg. I was disappointed with the gift. Adjectives + *with / about*: angry, annoyed, and furious *with* someone *about* doing something (angry, annoyed, and furious *about* something) eg. What are you so angry with, I'm furious with her for not inviting me to her party. Adjectives + *about*: excited, worried, upset, sorry, anxious, certain, right, wrong *about* something eg. I'm sorry about the noise last night. I was right about the results. Adjectives + *at*: good, bad, excellent, brilliant, and hopeless *at* something eg. I'm hopeless at repairing things. Adjectives + *at/by*: surprised, shocked, amazed, and astonished *at/by* something eg. Everybody was shocked *at/by* the news. Adjectives + *for*: famous, sorry, late, ready, and responsible *for* something eg I'm sorry *for* shouting at you. She is responsible for everything. Adjectives + *in*: interested, experienced *in* something eg. Are you interested in art?

## **2.17 Cohesion with auxiliary verbs**

English auxiliary verbs, as the name implies, simply called helping or supporting verbs. They are called helping verbs because of their functions in English, which they perform in communication and writing. They help to make up the verbal group in sentences, that is, they support the main verbs, which could be either transitive or intransitive. This meant to communicate meaning fully in sentences where they are

used. Even though the English auxiliary verbs are of two kinds: Primary and Modal auxiliary verbs, the English primary auxiliary verbs, which are the focus of this paper, are different from those of the modal auxiliary verbs in that the former is used as lexical verbs in our sentences. In other words, they sometimes exist on their own, apart from functioning as helping verbs. The modal auxiliary verbs cannot function as lexical verbs. They only serve as helping verbs. With the additional function, which the English primary auxiliary verbs perform, it shows that they are as important as lexical verbs in our communication and writing. Thus, any misuse or omission of this type of auxiliary verbs in focus leads to distortion in the message meant to be related to our listeners. It is interesting to note that correct use of the English primary auxiliary verbs makes our communication and writing to be error-free so as to convey meaningful information to our listeners. This is why palmer (1965:12) mentions that “language as the means of communication among people have a sensitive aspect, which is the verb.” According to him, learning to speak or write correctly and meaningfully is like trying to operate the verbal forms of the language involved. This means that if we were conscious of the fact that the verbal forms contain the words that carry the message in our sentences, we would not misuse the verbal forms. Based on this fact, we can say that the verbal forms in any Language are the life-wire of any message meant to be communicated. Therefore, should there be any misuse of the verbal forms, particularly the English primary auxiliary verbs, the message, which has any of them, is considered somewhat distorted. This is why the emphasis in this paper focuses on the fact that these closed systems of verbal forms (the English primary auxiliary verbs) which take the positions of lexical verbs in some sentences have to be applied correctly. The present study is one that uses a linguistic approach to make a careful study of the use of the English primary auxiliary verbs among the learners or speakers of English. The finding in this paper would serve as complement to many studies that had carried



out on the use of English among numerous speakers for primary auxiliary verbs. They opine that this type of auxiliary verbs is such that contain words that are used along with the main verbs to make up a verbal group in a given clause. According to them, the fact that they co-occur in a verbal group in a sentence is what earns them the name “helping verbs” Each of these grammarians identified (‘Be’ ‘Have’ and ‘Do’) as the English primary auxiliary verbs which function both as auxiliaries and lexical verbs. For example, Ann is Learning English. They had two children (Quirk et al, 1985: 129). With regard to their argument the first sentence shows the English primary auxiliary verb ‘is’ being used as helping verb while in the second sentence ‘had’ is being used as lexical verb. Similarly, Stageberg (1981) opines that the English primary auxiliary verbs are always closely associated with the main verb. However, in his own opinion, the English primary auxiliary verbs are divided into two: primary auxiliaries ‘Be’ and ‘Have’ and **periphrastic** auxiliary ‘Do’. In his explanation why he separated auxiliary ‘Do’ from auxiliaries ‘Be’ and ‘Have’ and why he called it periphrastic auxiliary ‘Do’, that it is meant to show how periphrastic auxiliary ‘Do’ could be used to replace an inflected form of verb. For example, It does work, for it works. (Stageberg, 1981: 125) In this sentence, inflected form of verb, ‘works’ replaces the periphrastic auxiliary ‘Do’. Refers to the English primary auxiliary verbs ‘Be’, ‘Have’ and ‘Do’ as three basic non-modal auxiliaries. He opined that they always serve the purpose of helping the verb to form a verb phrase. He pointed out that the non-modal auxiliaries (the English primary auxiliaries) have different forms that can be grouped into present, past and past participle tenses. For example, (am, was, is, was, are, were, has, had, had, have, had, had, do, did, done, does, did, done). Describes the English primary auxiliary verbs as elements of structure, which may precede the lexical element in any construction. He identified the English primary auxiliary verbs as ‘Be’, ‘Have’ and ‘Do’ which he called non-modal auxiliaries. According to him, the morphology of auxiliary verbs differs from

that of lexical verbs such that the auxiliary verbs in focus (Be, Have, Do) have either more or less forms than the lexical verbs. Muir discussed four main criteria by which the English primary auxiliary verbs are classified. They include Negation, Inversion, Substitution, and Marked positive elements. He illustrated these in the following sentences: -I am not coming. (Negation) -Is the boy coming? (Inversion) -I scored and so did John. (Substitution) - He did it the boy. (Marked positive) Reid (1991) discussed the English primary auxiliary verb 'Do' as a verb that is used to show emphasis, to ask questions and to make denials in our sentences. He illustrated these in the following sentences: -The boys do play soccer. (Emphasis). - Do the boys play soccer? (Interrogation) - The boys do not play soccer. (Making denials) (Reid, 1991:18). Paul and Arthur (1969) describe the English primary auxiliary verbs as words that occur with verbs to form verbal groups or verbal phrases. Instead of classifying the English primary auxiliary verbs as other authors have done, they decided to subgroup them according to the form of verb with which it occurs. Through this method of classification, they reveal the English primary auxiliary verbs and their various uses. For examples, Primary auxiliary 'Do' used with the base form of the verb often called the 'plain infinitive'. E.g. (a) the man does/did remember the boy. (b) Primary auxiliary verb 'Be' used with the '-ing' form of verb. E.g. I am/was going. (c) Primary auxiliary verb 'Have' used with the past participle of main verb. E.g. He has/had gone. (Paul and Arthur, 1969:78). Based on these opinions from the grammarians, the English primary auxiliary verbs are a type of auxiliary verbs in English, which considered sensitive words that the speakers of English cannot ignore, but use them along with the lexical words so that accurate sentences can be made. In other words, because the English primary auxiliary verbs are so important in our communication and writing, speakers and writers must consider the various ways thus type of auxiliary verbs can be grammatically used in sentences. Traditional Grammar Approach to the Use of English Auxiliaries

Greenbaum (1988) defines grammar as a general theory of language description. In this sense, grammar refers to the properties processes that underlie the use of language. This means that speakers are expected to be equipped with the knowledge of the rules of the language they intend to speak and to apply such rules accurately when using them. Traditional grammar precedes what is known as scientific approach to the study of language. Its approach is one that is normative, definition oriented, and prescriptive in nature. It represents an attempt to prescribe rules for language use. It prescribes rather than merely describes language. Emphasis is on correct usage, that is, what speakers should say. Truly, it is this attitude to correctness of the traditional grammar that has made it always prescribes what sort of language ought to be used. Such terms as nouns, verbs, adverbs, prepositions, object, subject, auxiliary verbs, e.t.c., are derived from traditional grammar and are used to analyze sentences today. Take for instance, the traditional grammar would analyze the following sentence using the features mentioned above. The students have done the assignment. In this sentence, the subject is the person being talked about while the predicate constitutes what is said about the person. The predicate is broken into the auxiliary verb (have), the main verb (done) and the object (the assignment). Being what the traditional grammar is, it is interesting to note that traces of these grammatical terms or features are still being used in most of our schools today. However, the traditional grammar, which is normative, perspective, and definition – oriented has provided us with clear explanation on the general uses of the English auxiliary verbs.

## **2.18 Cohesion Problems with Primary Auxiliary Verbs.**

There is no doubt that speakers and writers of the English language today commit grammatical errors of different kinds when communication takes place among them. The wrong use of English primary auxiliary verbs said to be prominent. When we take into consideration the way speakers and writers use the auxiliary verbs in their

sentences, it shows that they do not understand the principles guiding the use of the English primary auxiliary verbs. Thus, each time they speak or write they misapply the function of each of the auxiliaries in English. In fact, this has spread widely in new learners of the language so to investigate on the use of the English primary auxiliary verbs among writers of English to improve the proficiency of the writers of English language. Numerous writers or speakers of English, we infer that writers commit errors of different kinds whenever they make use of the English primary auxiliary verbs in their sentences. The errors show that they are insensitive of the principles guiding the use of the auxiliary verbs whenever communication takes place among them. The learners of English, most of the time, fail to understand the grammatical concord rule (plural noun should go with plural verb while singular noun should go with singular verb) in sentences they make. This could be because of inability to receive intensive teaching on the basics of English language. They sometimes fail to understand that 'is' and 'does' are used as singular verbs while 'do' and 'are' function as plural verbs. Thus in the context where they are expected to use singular primary auxiliary verb they make use of plural primary auxiliary verb instead, not minding whether the tense is correct or not. This is a clear signal that they are not always conscious of the principles guiding the use of the English primary auxiliary verbs (be, have, do) whenever they communicate or write in English. This can be seen in the following sentences. Being one of the distance, though not necessarily temporal distance). In contrast, *be*, *do* and *have* all have inflecting and tensed forms, and the auxiliary forms of *be* and *have* can appear in non-finite forms too it should also be noted that the non-modal auxiliaries have other uses where the verb contributes semantic information which it does not in its auxiliary uses. This may be because the auxiliary use does not contribute any semantic information (as in the case of *do*), or it could simply be different semantic information, as in the case of *have* which can be possessive in its non-auxiliary use,

but represents the perfect tense in its auxiliary use. The fact that the lexical forms of these verbs sometimes behave syntactically like auxiliaries but sometimes do not further muddies the distinction between the categories. A basic consensus is possible because auxiliary verbs in English seem to act as functional elements, meaning that semantically they contribute notions of time, possibility, obligation and necessity, though not any concrete or conceptual meaning, and they have syntactic peculiarities, not shared by the *lexical* verbs. In addition, the roots of auxiliaries can be traced diachronically, to earlier stages in the development of English when they were not distinct from lexical verbs, although there is little agreement as to why or how such changes took place. From a syntactic point of view, there are strict restrictions on when and where auxiliary verbs can occur in modern English sentences. They are always optional in declarative sentences and precede a lexical verb. Whose form determined by the preceding auxiliary, but which is always a non-finite form; an infinitive either a *base*-infinitive or a *to*-infinitive, a present participle (or *-ing* form, though there is some confusion in the terminology with gerunds, I shall refer to them as *-ing* forms, following Palmer (1988)) or a past participle (or *-en* form, as before). In addition, whilst auxiliaries can co-occur, there are strict restrictions on the possible grammatical orders available. Sometimes called “helping verbs,” auxiliaries are little words that come before the main verb of a sentence. Including forms of: (be, have, do, can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, and would). They tend to be involved in the expression of time, necessity, possibility, permission, and obligation. Moreover, to such things as negation, affirmation, and questioning Some Basic Facts about auxiliaries, they are optional, they precede any non-auxiliary verbs, and they determine the form of the following verb. When they co-occur, their order is fixed, and auxiliaries of any given type cannot iterate.

## **2.19 Use of Modal Verbs in Scientific Field.**

English in technical writing is often pointed out as being different from “general” English in terms of the function of words (Salager-Meyer, F. (1992). The language used in science is required to reflect the precise and objective nature of science, and scientists need to choose their words carefully. In particular, they need to pay attention to the function of words when they express their logic. When scientists use such modal verbs as (must, may, could, might and should) in research papers, the epistemic modality expressed with these auxiliary verbs can play an important role. When these modal verbs are used to express certainty or possibility toward findings and hypotheses, their roles seem to be more significant, and the scientist, therefore, need to carefully select an appropriate modal verb in order to convey the idea to the readers precisely. English grammar books for scientists often advise that the use of such modal verbs as (may, might and could) should be avoided in scientific writing since they are considered to be the reflection of the scientist's uncertainty about the findings or conclusions. The imprecise use of a modal verb in a scientific paper could lead the reader towards making a wrong interpretation of the conclusion and could interfere with the purpose of scientific papers, which is to state scientists' ideas and findings to their scientific community. Hyodo (1993) notes that the wrong use of modal verbs in scientific writing tends to make the credibility of argument unclear and may cause the reader to question the findings and conclusions discussed in the papers. However, many scientists, especially those in the natural sciences, feel that it is necessary to use the modal verbs to express inference in their papers, since nothing is one hundred percent are certain in science and inference is an important part of scientific research. By summarizing empirical studies on hedging in scientific discourse, Hyland (1994) points out the frequent occurrence of modal verbs in academic writing. Harada's survey (1994) also shows that scientists often use modal verbs to express conjecture in their research papers. According to, his survey on

scientific writing, scientists who are native speakers of English use, on average, *may* and *might* more than seven times in ceramic science papers and more than three times in polymer chemistry papers. In the study of medical English abstracts, Salager-Meyer (1992) points out those modal verbs are used in the recommendation, conclusion and data synthesis sections. In the result, the modal verbs represent 45 % of all the verb forms in the recommendation section and more than 20 % in the conclusion section. The use of modal verbs in “general” English has been studied by many linguists.(Jespersen 1964; Quirk et al. 1985). Halliday (1985) gives a diagram to show probabilities expressed with propositions. The diagram rates that the modal verb (*must*) as carrying highest probability among modal verbs. In the use of modals to express certainty or probability, Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman (1983) have established a hierarchy among modals. They rate (*could*) and (*might*) as having the lowest certainty, and (*may*) as having a higher degree of certainty than (*could* and *might*). While they rank (*will*) as having the highest degree of certainty, and (*must*) as the second most certain, and then (*should*) as having less certainty than (*must*). They also noted that the degrees of probabilities expressed by these modal verbs are not necessarily equi-distant: there is a smaller gap between (*May*), (*could*) and (*might*), but a bigger one exists between (*may* and *should*) in their probability scale when the modal verbs are used affirmatively (Celce-Murcia and Larsen-Freeman 1983). In addition, comparing (*may* and *might*) in terms of their functions, Quirk et al. (1985) noted that (*might*) is used to express less certainty. Huddleston (1971) has examined the use of these modal verbs in scientific writing. He concludes that (*may*) is often used to express uncertainty or possibility,(*might*) is an “unreal” counterpart to(*may*) regarding certainty/possibility, and (*must*) expresses something necessarily true (Huddleston, 1971). Although his analysis indicates the features of these modal verbs in scientific writing, it does not explain the semantic functions of these verbs in the discourse of scientific writing. Many researchers (Adams-Smith 1984; Hyland

1994) have discussed the use of modal verbs as hedging devices in scientific writing. Hyland examines the epistemic functions of modals, and claims that modals appear to be the typical devices to express hedging in scientific writing. He states that the modal auxiliaries are important means of allowing a scientist to adjust the degree of certainty about the claims and to build the writer-reader relationship that the writer wants to achieve. In consequence, it is valuable to measure how the reader will interpret the degree of certainty/ possibility attributed to each modal verb. Although the qualitative measurement of the epistemic modality was done for the modals in scientific writing (Salager-Meyer, 1992), how much certainty/possibility each modal verb carries has been rarely quantified according to their empirical uses in real scientific writing. In addition, quantifying the pragmatic meanings of modals with a scale of certainty acceptance and understanding by scientists, who are more familiar with quantitative representations than qualitative ones. An investigation to establish quantitative criteria for the epistemic uses of modal verbs in scientific writing seems important in this sense. In this study, the author conducted a survey to examine the epistemic uses of the modal verbs such as (*must, may* and *might*) and their semantic functions in scientific writing. The study focused on the degree of certainty attributed to each modal verb by scientists. The statistically analyzed results of the survey presented, along with the interpretation of the results from pragmatic aspects of the modal verb use in the following sections. Based on the analysis, a hierarchical order of these modal verbs in terms of the degree of certainty regarding scientists' inferences suggested. In addition, what the implications stemming from the results are for ESL/EFL teachers and scientists who are nonnative speakers of English.

## **2.20 The use of Transition Signals in Writing.**

For foreign language learners, especially in university, academic writing is essential. Students are required to analyse, compare, and inform through academic writing. Moreover, when they reach the end of their study, they should write a thesis as part



of a requirement to graduate. Thus, thesis writing is a major challenge for students. Halliday and Hassan as cited in Hinkel (2001) emphasize that academic writing should achieve cohesiveness to make it well constructed and understandable. Transition signal is one of prominent cohesive devices that should be into account in academic writing cohesive sentences in English language. Therefore, the aims of good writing is to identify students' problems and tendency in using transition signals in academic writing. In addition, the understanding of these small words is necessary for university students in academic writing production, which, built in a form of corpus. Its implication on English Language Teaching (ELT) concerning the teaching of transition signals will also be important in; thesis writing as a major challenge for both students and lecturer. When learners are unable to create a well-constructed and understandable composition, they will not be able to create good thesis in English. However, good writing will change this view as purpose and genre of writing that determines students' performance on writing. Particularly in university level, students taught free writing to academic writing. Compared to free writing, academic writing emphasizes more on the accuracy instead of fluency. Therefore, a different way of assessment of the students' writing product can take a main concern. Focusing on the academic writing, students' mastery in writing is common overview from their competence in constructing sentences. In relation to L2 writing, the common approach implemented by teachers is grammatical construction or words-by-words approach. Then, the result of students' writing assessed on the fulfilment of several criteria such as grammar, coherency, and cohesiveness indicating constructing sentences capability. In consequence, mastering writing competency achieved when students' sentences constructions satisfy lecturers' expectation. Among several things to take into account in writing, this present study focuses on cohesion. Hinkel (2001) and Tanskenan (2006) emphasize the importance of cohesion in order to achieve well-constructed and

understandable writing. Cohesion is also about connectedness of the text, in which becomes prerequisite of discourse. There are five general categories of cohesive devices that create coherence in texts: reference, ellipsis, substitution, lexical cohesion and conjunction (Thompson, 2004). In the teaching of L2 composition and writing, text cohesive devices play an important role. Researchers have conducted further investigations of cohesion devices in English-language corpora of published texts. L2 instruction associated with cohesion in academic texts has largely continued to focus on specific and limited types of devices, such as sentence transitions and coordinating conjunctions intended to conjoin ideas and sentences. For instance, Reid (1992) points out that in L2 writing instruction, the teaching of explicit cohesive devices, such as coordinators and sentence transitions, is common because ESL writers often employ various cohesion conventions differently than native speakers of English do and that L2 texts may sometimes appear incoherent to native readers. Reid emphasizes that text cohesion and issues in the coherence of ideas need to be taught to provide learners linguistic means of developing unified text. In addition, Hewings (2001, p.199) noted that the difference of cohesion convention is much caused by interpersonal function.

## **2.21 Transition Signals**

The previous section has explained about cohesion as one of essential elements to make a good composition. Transition signal as one of cohesive devices is the focus in this study. Transition signals are words and phrases that connect the idea in one sentence with the idea in another sentence and show the relationship between them (Oshima and Hogue, 2007). Transition signals are usually at the beginning of a sentence or paragraph to relate it to the one preceding it and they can come within sentences to connect one idea to another within a sentence. The following is the list of transition signals according to their function (Oshima and Hogue, 2007; Zemach and Rumisek, 2003). By using those transition signals properly and correctly,

cohesion in writing achieved. Taking into account of the previous explanation, a substantial body of academic writing had examined in this study. However, many studies have concerned on the use of cohesive devices (Eun & Jeon, 2009; Hinkel, 2001), but less have narrowed their study on the use of transition signals by non-native speakers compared to native speakers' writing products. Therefore, this present study will cover the following matters to investigate further: (1) the frequency of transition signals used by essay writers (2) students' problem and tendency of transition signals usage. The implication of the findings of this study will also be addressing the case in students, writing. Transition signals as primary concern in teaching and writing that integrated in grammar review as a focus of practice. Students need teaching about the function of particular transition signals in paragraph construction. The other idea to solve this problem is assigning students to have extensive reading outside the classroom. They may read articles from international journal to enrich their knowledge how international writers construct their paragraphs coherently and cohesively. In addition to extensive reading, they also need to practise writing by using appropriate transition signals to certain writing condition. In this case, teachers should provide exercise that triggers them to comprehend the transition signals. The exercise can be a cloze test, where the students provided with a model text and the transition signals part omitted. It can also be a judging task, where the students are provided with a model text containing transition signals, and they have to judge whether its usage has been appropriate or not. When writers connect sentences and paragraphs, they provide a sense of movement that allows their readers to follow the main and subordinate ideas easily and, as a result, to understand the writer's purpose and message. Clear transitions are essential to the coherence of paragraphs and essays. There are several types of transitions, each leading the reader to make certain connections or assumptions about the areas you are connecting, based on the words or phrases you choose. Some lead

the reader forward and imply the "building" of an idea or thought, while others make the reader compare ideas or draw conclusions from the preceding thoughts. A list of common transitional words and phrases aforementioned above clarifies different signals and there to use. When linking two paragraphs, the writer must explain how the two paragraphs connected logically. Transitional words or phrases sometimes will be precisely what you need to underscore for your readers the intellectual relationship between paragraphs to help them navigate your essay. Since clarity and effectiveness of your transitions will depend greatly on how well you have organized your paper, you may want to evaluate your paper's organization before you work on transitions. In the margins of your draft, summarize in a word or two what each paragraph is about or how it fits into your analysis as a whole. This exercise should help you to see the order and connection between your ideas more clearly. If after doing this exercise, you find that you still have difficulties in linking your ideas together in a coherent fashion; your problem may not be with transitions but with organization. Perhaps something crucial is missing between this paragraph and its neighbors most likely an idea or a piece of evidence or both. Maybe the paragraph is misplaced, and logically belongs elsewhere.

## **2.22 Models of Writing.**

Two themes have dominated psychological theories about the cognitive processes involved in writing since their inception in the early eighties. The first is the basic insight that writing is not simply a matter of translating preconceived ideas into text, but also involves creating content and tailoring the way presented to the needs of the reader. Writing is as much a matter of discovering or inventing the thought to be expressed in the text as it is a matter of expressing it in an appropriate and convincing way (Flower & Hayes 1980a). The second is that, because writing involves a complex interaction between wide ranges of different processes, it places extremely high demands on the limited capacity of working memory. In order to avoid

cognitive overload, writers have to develop effective strategies for managing the writing process (Flower & Hayes 1980b). In this study, the researcher will first outline the classical cognitive models of writing that embody these themes. Moreover, he will then argue the research that is more recent has involved a shift in perspective to a view of writing as text production and sketch a dual process model of writing designed to capture the interaction between high level thinking processes and the more implicit linguistic processes involved in text production.

### **2.22.0 The thinking behind the text**

Early research on writing inspired by psychological research on problem solving. This provided a conceptual language for categorizing the mental processes involved, a set of methods (verbal protocol analysis in particular) for examining these processes, and a body of empirical findings from research on problem solving in general which could be applied to understanding writing. It led to the development of a general model of the processes involved in writing (Hayes & Flower 1980), and to a theory of writing expertise (Hayes & Flower 1986). Hayes & Flower's model distinguished between three basic processes: planning, which included generating ideas, organization and goal setting as components; translating plans into text; and reviewing, which included reading and editing as components. These processes operated upon two kinds of information: a representation of the task environment, which consisted of the writing assignment and the text produced so far; and knowledge stored in long-term memory, which consisted of such things as topic knowledge, a model of the audience, the writing plan, rules for grammar production and knowledge of text standards. (Note, incidentally, that "translating" in this context refers to the process of converting conceptual content into a linguistic form, rather than to the process of translating from one language to another). An important feature of the model, which distinguished it from a traditional product-based view of writing as a linear process of plan-write-edit, was the recursive nature of the

process. Planning, translating and revising can occur in principle, at any moment during writing – they refer to cognitive processes rather than stages in the writing process. The coordination of these processes was the responsibility of a monitor. The monitor in Hayes & Flower's model therefore played a vital role in controlling the writing process deciding when enough content generated, that revision was necessary, and so forth. Individual differences in the way these basic processes combine were attributed to different configurations of production rules representing the knowledge of the writing process stored in long-term memory. Perhaps the most important consequence of this research was that it enabled a characterization of differences between expert and novice writers (Hayes & Flower 1986). Thus, Flower & Hayes (1980a) argued that experts construct a more elaborate representation of their goals, and continue to develop and modify this representation throughout the course of writing. In particular, they develop explicit rhetorical goals for the text as a whole, and use these to guide retrieval of content, whereas novices rely on concrete content goals and tend to generate content in response to the topic alone. In consequence, experts develop elaborate plans, and continue to develop and modify these throughout the course of writing. In addition, the more elaborate conceptual representation of goals for the text enables experts to revise more extensively, evaluating their text in terms of its underlying function with respect to their goals, rather than simply considering whether the text is appropriately expressed (Hayes et al. 1987). Consequently, experts modify content more during both writing and revision. Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) summed up these differences between experts and novices as a contrast between a knowledge-telling model of writing and a knowledge-transforming model of writing. According to this model, the development of ideas during writing depends on the extent to which the retrieval of content strategically controlled in order to satisfy rhetorical goals. Novice writers assumed to employ a knowledge-telling strategy in which text production guided by

the direct retrieval of content from long-term memory and organized solely by the associative relationships between content, as it is stored in long-term memory. By contrast, expert writers employ a knowledge-transforming strategy, which involves elaborating a representation of the rhetorical or communicative problem solution. Using the goals derived from this representation to guide the generation and evaluation of content during writing. In consequence, more expert writers show much more evidence of reflective thought during writing: they develop more elaborate plans before writing, modify and elaborate these more radically during writing, and revise their initial drafts of texts more extensively. The result is that more expert writers' texts tailored to the needs of the reader, and that in adapting their thought to their communicative goals, such writers develop their understanding of what they are writing. Bereiter & Scardamalia (1987) formalized these differences in their knowledge transforming model of writing, stressing that this should not be seen simply as an evolution of the knowledge telling model but that it involved a radical change in the way that the writing task is defined by the writer and in the way that it is carried out. Thus, although it retains the knowledge-telling model as a characterization of the process whereby contents retrieved from memory, this is embedded within a dialectic between content and rhetorical problem spaces. This intended to capture two features of the writing process. First, it reflects the fact that ideas are represented, not just as a reflection of the writer's knowledge (content space), but also in terms of their rhetorical function within the text (rhetorical space). Second, writing is not simply a matter of adapting content to the rhetorical context, but is an emergent process in which contents formulated as the text develops. Thus, not only is content retrieved in response to a more elaborated representation of the assignment as a rhetorical problem, it is also formulated in the context of, and as a contribution to, the series of rhetorical acts gradually emerging in the text. The knowledge transforming model shares the general emphasis of classical cognitive

models on the higher-level reflective thinking involved in writing. At first sight, the clear separation between thinking processes and text production processes made by these models can take to imply that the focus of research on L2 writing should be on text production processes. One might assume that the goal-directed thought involved in effective writing is common to both L1 and L2 contexts, and that the essential difference between the two is in how the output of these central processes are formulated in language. However, a key feature of the knowledge-transforming model in particular is that it emphasizes the origin of the writer's goals in their discourse knowledge. To the extent that L2 involves not just using a different language but also adopting different discourse conventions it may also involve learning different ways of thinking. A skilled L2 writer may find it difficult to adapt their writing process to an unfamiliar genre even when, and perhaps because, they are skilled and fluent writers in an L1 genre.

### **2.22.1 Cognitive overload.**

Aside from this difference in the goals towards which writing directed, the other main factor emphasized in early models of writing was cognitive overload, arising from the fact that a complex set of processes have carried out in a limited capacity working memory. In particular, the demands of translating ideas into well-formed text may consume resources required for higher level planning. Although this is particularly true for children, for whom even the basic mechanics of forming letters may be resource consuming, it is a pervasive problem stemming from the nature of the process itself. A series of studies by Bourdin & Fayol comparing written and spoken recall with varying age groups suggest that low-level processes involved in spelling and handwriting can impair retrieval. In simple word-recall tasks, Bourdin & Fayol (1994) found that both second and fourth grade children recalled substantially fewer items when their responses were written (i.e. using relatively less practised handwriting and spelling skills) than when their responses



were spoken (i.e. they could rely on more automatic speech production skills). There was no corresponding difference for adults. Similar results found for complex sentences production task. (Bourdin & Fayol 1996). However, when the composition task was substantially more complex (Bourdin & Fayol 2002), they found that even adults perform worse in writing compared to speaking. This suggests that even when spelling and handwriting are very well practised, they can still have a residual effect on memory retrieval if resources overloaded by other cognitively demanding processes. The main implication of this general line of research is that it is important for other components of the writing process can carry out as automatically as possible. Being able to write or type fluently and having well-developed language skills should reduce cognitive overload and facilitate more fluent retrieval of content from long-term memory. In addition, strategies for managing the writing process, which help reduce cognitive load, should also enable more effective planning. The most thorough investigation of the effectiveness of different drafting strategies carried out in a series of experiments by (Kellogg 1988, 1990; Kellogg 1996 for a review). Kellogg (1988) compared the effectiveness of an outline strategy, in which writers generate and organize their ideas prior to writing before focusing their attention on translation and revision, with a rough-drafting strategy, which involves translating text without worrying about how well expressed it is, leaving monitoring of expression to revision of the draft after writing. There were two main findings. First, the strategies led to a redistribution of processing during writing (as measured by directed retrospection). In the outline conditions, writers planned less during text production, presumably because this largely completed the prior to writing in the rough draft conditions and revision reduced during the initial draft and postponed until later. Second, although outlining was associated with higher quality final drafts, rough drafting showed no effect, despite the fact that revision postponed until after the initial draft. A later study by Kellogg (1990) suggested that the construction of a

hierarchically organized outline prior to writing is associated with a higher quality final product than is the construction of an ordered list of ideas, and that this in turn is associated with higher quality final text than a simple clustering strategy. Kellogg's (1996) general conclusion is that the effectiveness of the outlining strategy is a consequence of the fact that it enables writers to organize their ideas better prior to writing, as well as that it then enables them to devote more resources to formulating these ideas effectively in text. The most obvious implication of these models for L2 research is that L2 language skills should have a strong impact on the writing process. Thus, L2 language proficiency would be expected to affect not just how well-formed the written product is from a linguistic point of view, but also the writer's capacity to engage in the higher level problem-solving activities characteristic of expert writing. Thus, even when L2 production is linguistically accurate, to the extent that L2 language production in L2 remains more effortful than in L1 one might expect writers to be less able to engage in goal directed creation of content and the quality of the text to suffer accordingly. It would be interesting to test, for example, whether writers in L2 showed similar decreases in their ability to retrieve content compared to retrieval in L1 as young writers do in retrieving content when writing compared to speaking (as in Fayol and colleagues' research). Furthermore, if the effort involved in L2 language processes does impair the ability of writers to engage in higher level planning processes, then one would expect corresponding improvements in the quality of text produced under outlining conditions compared to single draft conditions, and that would be a consequence of a reduction in the need to generate content at the same time as producing text (as in Kellogg's experiments on effects of outlining in L1). This might seem a trivial replication of this research. However, in a recently completed experiment (Baaijen et al. 2008), in which we compared a group of students with dyslexia with a group of non-dyslexic students writing

outlined planned texts, we found that outlining had very different effects for the two groups. For non-dyslexics, there was a strong negative correlation between the amount of content generated during text production and the quality of the text, as one would expect if the benefit of outlining were that it enables writers to separate content generation from full text production. By contrast, dyslexic writers wrote better texts the more they generated content at the same time as formulating the text. This could be because dyslexic writers' difficulties with formulating text mean that, even when allowed to outline before they write, they still need to reconstruct content during text production. Alternatively, it could be because, for dyslexics, formulation in language improved when carried out close to the point at which content generated. Whatever the reason for the difference, the point for present purposes is that even the most robust findings of research on "normal" populations do not necessarily generalize to other populations. This is not to say, of course, that writing in L2 is like writing with dyslexia. However, it does demonstrate the need to test even the most obvious implications of models of L1 writing in L2 contexts, and the need not to take them for granted.

### **2.22.2 Thinking of text production**

Early cognitive models of writing, then, focused on the goal-directed nature of the thinking behind the text, and treated the translation of thought into text as a relatively passive component of the process, of interest primarily because a lack of fluency in translation assumed to interfere with writers' ability to engage in higher-level thinking. Research that is more recent has begun to redress this balance and has paid much more attention to the processes involved in translation, and, in some cases has claimed a much more active role for it in the generation of content. This reflected in Hayes' (1996) revision of the Hayes and Flower model, which makes much less clear-cut distinctions between the different components of the writing process. Thus, planning has become one component of a more general „reflection“ module;

translation has been renamed as text production, reflecting, perhaps, a less passive view of its role in content generation; and revision is treated, not as a separate process in its own right, but as a combination of the more basic processes of text interpretation, reflection and text production. In addition, working memory incorporated into the model, and characterized in terms of Baddeleys, (1986) multicomponent model of working memory rather than as general resource for which different components of the writing process compete. In the same volume as Hayes'' revised model, Kellogg (1996) presented a model of working memory in writing, subsequently elaborated in more detail by Kellogg (2001). In Baddeley''s model (Baddeley 1986), working memory has three main components. The central executive is responsible for retrieval from long-term memory, control of attention, supervision of the system as a whole, and for coordinating the activity of the other two subsidiary systems. This central component is supported by, and controls the operation of, two „slave“ systems: the phonological loop, which stores and maintains verbal material in active memory, and the visuospatial sketchpad or voice switch signaling point (VSSP), which stores and maintains visual and spatial material in active memory. According to Kellogg, the planning component requires both the VSSP and the central executive but since it is concerned with prelinguistic ideas, not the verbal component of working memory. The translation component requires the central executive to plan sentences and the phonological loop to store and maintain verbal material while sentences being constructed. Transcribing language, which involves programming and executing motor routines, requires central executive resources, though this may be a minimal demand for practiced writers, and such resources have minimal involvement in the executing as opposed to programming component of transcription. Reading previously produced text requires the central executive and the phonological loop, editing requires the VSSP because it involves maintaining an image of where text is on the page. The basic features of this model

supported by a range of empirical research (Kellogg 2001 and Torrance & Galbraith 2006, for reviews). In particular, two studies have suggested that the spatial component of working memory plays a crucial role in the development of new ideas (knowledge transforming) during outlining (Galbraith et al. 2005; Galbraith et al. 2009). In a series of studies, Hayes (Chenoweth & Hayes 2001, 2003; Hayes 2009) has developed a more detailed model of the processes involved in text production and made comparisons of writers writing in L1 and L2. The model consists of four components. The *proposer* is responsible for creating conceptual content – an idea package –, which is sent to the *translator*. (For more extended texts, the proposer may involve goal-setting and other planning functions). The *translator* produces a language string, which is then evaluated by the evaluator/reviser. If the string is acceptable, it passes to the *transcriber* to turn into text. If the string is not acceptable, then the *reviser* can call on the other processes to produce a revised version of the language or idea package, and this principle can operate over a number of cycles before text is output. The reviser is also able to interrupt all other processes at any time. The model is designed to capture the fact that written language is typically produced in bursts of sentence parts rather than in complete sentences (Kaufer et al. 1986). These bursts often, but not necessarily always, consist of grammatical units. In particular, Chenoweth & Hayes contrast *P-bursts*, which end in a pause followed by further language production, with *R-bursts*, which are followed by revision of the language already produced. Their key claim is that the length (in words) of a *P-burst* depends on the capacity of the translator and this in turn depends on the writer's linguistic resources. Essentially, the length of a *P-burst* depends on how much language the writer is capable of producing before the capacity limits of the *translator* are reached. For present purposes, their most important finding is that the length of *P-bursts* is reduced when writers write in L2 compared to L1 and that less linguistically proficient L2 writers produce shorter bursts than, more proficient L2

writers. L2 writers also produce a higher percentage of R-bursts, i.e., they revise a higher percentage of the sentence parts they produce. A key question this raises for L2 writing is what impact this has on a writer's ability to formulate ideas in text. In earlier models of writing, the emphasis has been on the potential disruptive effect of translation on global planning and reflection. In principle, this will overcome by strategies like outlining. However, once one moves closer to the point of utterance, this is much harder to manage strategically. Ideas often fleetingly generated at the point of text production and maintained in working memory until the complete sentence transcribed. Clearly, how long it takes to complete the sentence, and the size of the parts that sentences produced in, could have an impact on the ability of the writer to maintain the idea package they want to express in working memory. This could affect the complexity of ideas that the writer is able to express and perhaps also on the local coherence of the text.

### **2.22.3 Writing as a knowledge-constituting process**

According to the interpretation of Chenoweth & Hayes' model that we have just considered, text production may affect not just the extent to which the writers are able to engage in higher level planning, but also the writer's ability to capture fleeting thoughts as they occur, locally, in the course of text production. In a recently proposed dual-process model of writing, Galbraith (1999, 2009a, 2009b) goes further than this, and claims that spontaneous text production is an active knowledge-constituting process in its own right. In a series of experiments investigating the conditions under which writers develop new ideas through writing. Galbraith and his colleagues (Galbraith 1992, 1999; Galbraith et al. 2006) have suggested that writers do develop their ideas more when they plan in note-form than when they try to produce full text. At the same time as planning, as the knowledge-transforming model would predict, they also produce new ideas when they write spontaneous drafts of full text, and these ideas are associated with the development

of the writer's personal understanding of the topic. This has led to the development of a dual process-model in which effective writing assumed to be the joint product of two conflicting processes. The first – *knowledge retrieval* – process involves retrieving already-formed “ideas” from an explicit store of knowledge in long term memory, and either translating these directly into text what (Bereiter & Scardamalia would characterize as “knowledge telling”) or the goal-directed evaluation and manipulation of ideas prior to translating them into text what (Bereiter & Scardamalia would characterize as “knowledge transforming”). By itself, however, this can only lead to the reorganization of existing knowledge or to the selection of different items of existing knowledge, which are more appropriate for the rhetorical context. In order to create new content, the writer has to engage in a different – *knowledge constituting* – process, which involves the synthesis of content guided by the connections between sub symbolic units stored in an implicit semantic memory system. Although this process can prompt to higher-level problem solving, the content produced by it is the product of the implicit organization of content in semantic memory, rather than the explicit manipulation of content in working memory. Furthermore, because the units involved are sub symbolic – i.e. they are components of meaning and do not correspond to external referents – the meaning of what the writer wants to say only becomes apparent after the content has been formulated. The result is new content that added to the store of existing knowledge in explicit memory. This model makes two claims about the knowledge-constituting process. The first is that, during text production, ideas synthesized by constraint satisfaction within semantic memory, rather than retrieved from episodic memory. In this respect, the model seen as a proposal about how the *proposer* component of Chenoweth & Hayes“ (2003) model produces the “idea package” that serves as the input to the *translator* component. The main consequence of this way of conceiving of the *proposer* is to emphasize the transient nature of ideas during text production:

Not fixed ideas retrieved from long-term memory but are temporary patterns of activation across the set of units constituting the writer's semantic memory. The second, more radical, claim is that a sequence of utterances need not necessarily to be the product of explicit planning in between syntheses of content. Galbraith (1999) suggests that when inhibitory feedback from a previous utterance input to semantic memory it reduces the activation of units corresponding to the preceding utterance so that, without any change in the writer's goals, subsequent syntheses will correspond to the "remainder" of the content implicit in semantic memory. This allows thought to be "self-moving", with each successive utterance causing subsequent utterances. There are two key features to this. The first is that, because the writer does not have direct access to the constraints within semantic memory that guide the synthesis of content, they only become aware of the content of any given utterance now created. Second, because any given utterance is only a partial representation of the content of semantic memory, in order to capture the content implicit in semantic memory, the writer has to allow the process to unfold without interruption by explicit planning. Their understanding constituted by the interaction between successive utterances and the implicit content of semantic memory, and in order to articulate it they have to allow the process of text production to unfold without interruption. This characterization of text production as a knowledge-constituting process has an important implication for writing in L2, arising from the fact that language is produced in bursts and that the size of these bursts appears to be reduced in L2 (Chenoweth & Hayes 2003). If, as the knowledge-constituting model claims, these bursts play a constitutive role in the development of the writer's understanding, then the reduced size of the bursts in L2 should alter, and perhaps, reduce the extent to which writing in L2 leads to such developments. This could be tested by replicating the measures used in Galbraith's experiments, and comparing the extent to which writers develop their understanding in L1 and L2. A second



important implication arises from the conflicting nature of the two sources of content organization assumed by the dual-process model, both of which are required for effective writing. The knowledge-retrieval process organizes content in terms of the relationships between preexisting ideas in explicit memory and the writer's rhetorical goals, whereas the knowledge constituting process guided by the implicit organization of the writer's semantic memory. Galbraith (2009a) suggests that this is not simply a cognitive conflict. It related to the writer's conception of self. The priority that the writer gives to the two processes depends on the extent to which they are motivated to present a coherent self-image to the reader (through goal directed planning) or to actualize the potential self-latent in their implicit disposition towards the topic (through spontaneous text production). Writing in L2 may affect the balance between these two processes in a number of ways. On the one hand, to the extent that it is a more self-conscious process than writing in L1, it may lead the writer to prioritize explicit planning processes more than they would in L1. This is not to say that these will carry out more extensively. Rather they may shift their attention to satisfying constraints on the text at the expense concerned with the extent to which the text captures. It articulates their personal understanding. On the other hand, to the extent that the writer finds it harder to articulate their personal understanding in L2, their motivation to writing reduced. If one of the factors that motivate writers is the sense that they are developing their understanding, then any reduction in their capacity to do this may reduce their motivation to write. There is a dialectical relationship between cognitive and social/motivational processes: the processes employed by writers affect their motivation, and their motivations influence the processes they employ. Cognitive processes in L2 writing cannot be studied separately from the social and motivational contexts in which they occur.

## **2.23 Word combinations of English in writing**

Collocations, no matter where to use them, are an important linguistic issue is the native's fluency that is longed for academic writing. In line with that, the present study aimed at increasing the awareness towards the importance of collocations in order to have native fluency in academic writing; making some suggestions regarding involvement of collocations in academic texts, and creating a practicable list of collocations to be used especially in research articles by non-native writers of English. The impact and role of phraseology have received due recognition in foreign language teaching. Thanks to the advent of corpus linguistics, phraseological patterns in academic texts became visible, which spawned valuable building blocks in vocabulary learning of a learner (Jurko, 2010). Later Nation (2006) pointed out that L2 word combination, also called collocation, deserved special attention. Collocation is recurrence of two or more words in a way more than arbitrary, is used by writers heavily in academic texts. In contrast with the views that often regard collocations as arbitrary, many wording preferences in English sentence structure cannot be explained on the base of syntactic or semantic grounds, but on the base of relations between words that mostly occur together (Smadja, 1989). It is known that many important facts that were previously neglected as extra-linguistic gradually started to expand its influence (Telia, Bragina, Oparina, & Sandomirskaya, 1994). Once considered as trivial, collocations began to gain importance, and a considerable interest attributed to lexical collocations, which largely seen as pre-fabricate language units at earlier times (Cowie, 1994). Today it is a definite proof that lexical collocations have pivotal roles in ELT particularly in vocabulary acquisition and phraseology. There is an extensive literature that proves the benefit of collocations for language producers. The first benefit is that collocations are valuable for learners in order to increase their knowledge of lexicon and general language proficiency. The second is that brain seems to work better with chunks and formulaic expressions

while L1 influence in metacognitive issues remain as a major challenge that needs to be overcome. The final is that collocation may assist writers to have native-like writing skill. In other words, it is through collocations that a language user has native-fluency in their spoken or written discourses because “collocation is the key to fluency” (Hill, 2000, p. 164). Better understanding of collocations may contribute us to increase our awareness toward them. For that purpose, definitions explaining collocations from various aspects by different researchers are due to help us understanding the importance of collocations for academic writing. Although definitions of a collocation in the literature Centre on intuitive co-occurrence of words in the speaker’s mind, many other definitions provide us a better way of understanding collocations, some of which chronologically are: A collocation addresses to syntagmatic relations, the meaning of which is not directly committed to the conceptual meaning (Firth, 1957). - Collocations are two or more words occurring together with a strong tendency (Halliday, McIntosh, & Stevens, 1964). - Contextually, collocations are appropriate forms of language. They have the power of specifying one another’s occurrence (Kororsadowicz-Strazynska, 1980). - Because a collocation is a sequence of lexical item that occurs habitually together, it is idiomatic. The difference that makes a collocation different from an idiomatic expression, which is that a collocation is wholly transparent, and a semantic constituent (Benson, 1985). - A collocation is a type of semantic cohesion in which varies by the constituent elements in mutual degrees. The co-occurrence between lexical units in a collocational constituent may be strong or weak (Cruise, 1986). - A collocation is composed of two co-occurring words that connected in a native-speaker’s memory (Aghbar, 1990). – A collocation in English described as a formulaic, prefabricated, and conventionalized combination of two or more words (Zhang, 1993). Apart from being word combinations, the issue cannot overlook is that collocations are *patterned speech*. These patterned speeches include (Becker,

1975; cited in Kennedy, 1990): Although collocations include majority of the patterned speech, they do not cover all of them. For example, idioms are patterned speech that may confuse with collocations. Concisely, every patterned of speech not considered as a collocation, which is “recurring sequences of words” (Kennedy, 1990, p.217).

### **2.23.0 Types of collocation**

***Lexical collocations vs. grammatical collocations:*** Collocations, which previously had been regarded as a single title, were divided into two as lexical and grammatical collocations by Benson, and Elson (1986). Grammatical collocations include an adjective, a verb or noun, plus an infinitive, a preposition or clause. The patterns of a phrasal grammatical collocations form from a lexical unit and a pattern that specifies the sub-categorization property of the head (Bentivogli & Pianta, 2003). Similarly, verb + noun, preposition + noun, and infinitive verbs have dominant places in grammatical collocations, reported Fontenelle (1998). On the other hand, lexical collocations, as stated by Bahns (1993), do not include infinitives, prepositions, or clauses; instead, various combinations of adjectives, adverbs, verbs, and nouns. Again, if compared to closed class structure of grammatical collocations, lexical collocations are composed of two equal open-class lexical items, and include no subordinate element (Fontenelle, 1998). This study dealt with lexical collocations rather than grammatical collocations. ***Solid lexical collocations-*** When compared to lexical collocations, solid lexical collocations are much more rigorous in constructing a lexical word combination. The term was first used in a dissertation titled “Personal Communication” in 2002 under Dr. Aghbar” advising (cited from Sung, 2003) to refer to sequences of lexical items that occur repeatedly, hence get a strong bound to each other. There is such a strong interconnection among lexical items in solid lexical collocations that the native speaker hardly considers them as separate items or free combinations. *High winds, acute pain, light drizzle* can

consider as examples of solid lexical collocations. The present study did not make a distinction between lexical collocations and solid lexical collocations, and referred to both as lexical collocations. **Mis-collocation**- Mis-collocations, contrary to well-established collocations, are in contravention of co-occurrence restrictions (Cruise, 1990). However, they are very prevalent in non-native writers' writings. For example, a native speaker would say *the fast train; rancid butter; or a quick shower* but not *the quick train; rotten butter; or a fast shower*. Incorrect collocations are not acceptable in academic discourse at all, and they are regarded as "a major indicator of foreignness" (McArthur, 1992, p. 232).

### **2.23.1 The Importance of collocation**

Having introduced by Palmer (1933) and then brought to the discipline of theoretical linguistics by Firth (1957), collocations have had a growing influence on ELT. Vocabulary teaching, to which Lewis (2001) attracted attention through his theory of *Lexical approach*, is one of the issues that fell under the influence of collocations. Lexical approach entails teaching vocabulary to learners by using the power of word combinations already in their chunks. Accordingly, vocabulary knowledge is not only to know its dictionary meaning but also to understand a number of details about the word. In addition to possible combinations of words, their derivational aspects such as suffixes and prefixes, their semantic behaviour, and their sociolinguistic attributes have importance in familiarizing with a word (Richards, 1976). Therefore, word combination predictability plays a significant role in determining the way we use language, and likewise, prefabricated sentences taught in units make the learner to store and recall words readily (Nattinger, 1980) because "the importance of prefabricated speech routines in language behaviour" (Nattinger, 1980, p. 337) is known to language users. Not all researchers made a consensus on the influence of collocation. For instance, Kennedy (1990) casted some doubts on whether collocation truly existed, which is a view in stark contrast with other eminent

researchers in the field (e.g. Lewis, Nattinger, Pawley) who achieved an agreement on overwhelming prevalence of collocations. Similar to Kennedy, Krashen and Scarcella (1980) denied the views of that a large part of language included collocations. In spite of the objections regarding the prevalence of collocations, they did not make any serious claims with respect to the importance of collocations. The close relationship between collation and specialized translation is worth mentioning specifically. Some researchers (e.g. Castro, Martinez, & Faber, 2014) established a strong bond between specialized translation and collocation. Specialized translation cannot be achieved only with accurate meaning transfer but adjustment to format specifications, punctuality in delivery (Bonet, 2002), satisfaction of communicative expectations (Montero, Silvia, & Mercedes, 2001), and understanding the concepts formed by various types of specialized lexical units; for example terminological phrases and terms (Montero, Silvia, & Pedro, 2002). It understood that -to great extent- phraseological units composed of prefabricated chunks and collocations contribute to achieve better-specialized translations. Similarly, Castro et al. (2014) stated that collocations gain importance for both decoding and encoding the texts in the course of specialized translation. According to Rundell (2010), even grammar is not important than collocations while making a translation because collocations make writers sound fluent. It is becoming gradually apparent that “language is largely formulaic in nature, and that the competent use of formulaic sequences is an important part of fluent and natural language use” (Durrant & Schmitt, 2009, p. 157). Although to what extent non-native writers use collocation is not evident (Durrant & Schmitt, 2009), it is stated that non-native writers tend not to know much about collocations (Kjellmer, 1990), which are ready-at-hand and pre-constructed in minds of natives. That is not a no-objection case in terms of having native fluency because the strong bond between academic writing and collocations well established. Howarth (1998) reported that ESL/EFL learners might become native-like writers if

they become aware of the important role of collocations, and pay the necessary attention on collocation competence. Brown (1974) stressed that collocation competence enables language producers to realize formulaic expressions or language chunks used by natives in their writings, and to get the intuitive use of word combinations in a natural way as natives do. Thanks to collocations, a writer may shift his/her concentration from individual words to structures of the discourse, which is a case done through teaching lexical phrases in ELT, and the most important reason to teach lexical phrase is that it leads to writing fluency (Li C, 2005). We have witnessed different studies persevering on the benefits of collocations on behalf of language users in the last decade. For example, an early experimental study by Zhang (1993) conducted to detect the effect of collocations on EFL/ESL writing. In addition, the relationship between collocations and general language proficiency was aroused some researchers' interests (e.g. Al-Zahrani, 1998; Bonk, 2000). The literature points to studies which aim to detect the relation between collocation and four English skill: collocation and listening (Hsu & Hsu, 2007); between collocations and reading (Lien, 2003), between collocations and speaking (Sung, 2003; Hsu & Chiu, 2008), and collocation and vocabulary acquisition (Kennedy, 1990). However, although it seems that collocation does not only have an influence on writing skill but also on other basic skills like speaking, reading, and speaking, the most significant benefit remains for writing quality.

### **2.23.2 Collocations and lexical competence**

Some studies focused on positive correlation between collocational knowledge and level of lexicon (cf. Wray, 2002). To start with, the foremost of them belongs to Nation (2001) who claimed that a language producer's collocational knowledge constitutes "one important aspect of vocabulary knowledge" (p. 328). There are passive and active vocabularies in our mind. Active vocabularies are much faster than passive vocabularies in recalling when needed. Wu (1996) conducted an

empirical study in order to find out whether passive vocabularies could be turned into active vocabularies through the frequent use of lexical collocations, and concluded that a good command of lexical collocations is a useful way to turn passive vocabularies into active ones. Concerning the relationship between language proficiency and lexical competence a study (Zareva, Schwanenflugel, & Nikolova, 2005) that aimed to determine what features of language were associated with the macro level of lexical competence showed that word association increased lexical competence of language producers, and accordingly their L2 proficiency. Likewise, go back to Nattinger,s study (1980), it is understood that there are some prefabricated phrases and sentences that could be taught in chunks. According to Nattinger, if vocabularies taught in chunks, a learner could get use of them by expanding their lexicon, which is to say concisely; collocations may assist writers in enhancing their vocabulary fluency and accuracy in L2 by improving communicative functions of language. Similarly, Howarth (1998) made a comparison between native and non-native writers in terms of measuring their language performances. The findings put forth those lexically competent writers, internalized collocation successfully, which seen as a sign of relation between collocation and lexical competence. In contrast to studies favouring the contribution of collocation, Tekingul (2012) conducted a study to find out whether explicit collocation teaching or single-item vocabulary instruction is more successful on reading comprehension. She reported an inconclusive result, which proved no significant difference between collocation teaching treatment and single-item vocabulary instruction treatment. However, she did not deny the importance of collocation on vocabulary teaching, but only stressed no superiority regarding the two teaching methods. The issue of whether lower-level language users had limited knowledge of collocations when compared to higher-level language users investigated, and it was concluded that language users with lower collocational knowledge demonstrated lower language proficiency when



compared to learner with high collocational knowledge (Bonk, 2000). Another study (Nizonkiza, 2011) assessed the relationship between lexical competence, EFL proficiency, and collocational competence. Nizonkiza performed an experiment with 104 freshmen, sophomore, and senior students in total, and the results clearly revealed that lexical competence is a reliable predictor of L2 proficiency and mastery of collocations found to relate the frequency. To be able to enhance academic performance, and make a voice in the wider community, together with lexical competence, Turner (2004) stressed the importance of improving, what he called, “collocation repertoire” (p. 107). It understood from Turner’s writings that collocation is at least as much important as other linguistic features in academic prose. An empirical study with a purpose of measuring the direct effect of collocation on English language proficiency by Rahimi and Momeni (2012) showed systematic teaching of collocation could enhance learners’ language proficiency. Cloze tests are generally designed to gauge the general English proficiency of learner due to its large sphere of measuring area ranging from vocabularies and prepositions to basic grammar skills. Whether there was a correlation between collocational competence and cloze test proficiency was investigated (Keshavarz & Salimi, 2007), and statistical analyses yielded a statistically significant difference between performance on cloze tests and competence of collocation, which may be construed as the effect of collocational knowledge on general English proficiency.

### **2.23.3 Collocations, metacognition, and L1 influence**

Since Ellis’s (1986) study, L1 influence has always been a factor that should not be kept outdoor while investigating linguistic issues. It is quite common for non-native English speakers to transfer L1 word combinations into target language, which is a major cause of errors in non-native speakers’ language productions (Koosha & Jafarpour, 2006). The negative effect of L1 on L2 collocation acquisition studied by Gabrys-Biskup (1992), and the interference seen as the prime cause of errors in mis-

collocations. A year later, Bahns and Eldaw (1993) argued that non-native speakers of English could convey their L1 collocational knowledge conventions into target language inappropriately. Sadeghi (2009) aimed at discovering whether native language might be an obstacle for non-native speakers in the course of acquiring English collocations and demonstrated that negative transfer of linguistic knowledge of L1 into L2 context was a troublesome issue that dealt with immediately. Similarly, Martelli (2006) gathered a group of advanced Italian students of English in order to detect the influence of L1 in L2 lexical collocation use. Unsurprisingly, he corroborated the role of L1 interference in the generation of wrong lexical collocations. Different from other studies, Martelli's study yielded that certain types of collocation errors are more prone to occurring than others, which carried the issue to a different point. Martelli prompted us to notice that some types of collocations affected from L1 influence more than other types of collocations. Martelli's findings corroborated Li (2005) who detected that *verb+noun* collocation types are the most common errors while *adjective+infinitive* errors are the least experienced ones, which proved that not all types of collocations are affected by L1 interference on an equal basis. Another study (Fan, 2009) attempted to have a deeper understanding of collocation usage and problems by adopting a task based approach while analysing British and Honk Kong ESL learners' written texts. Likewise, apart from absolute L1 influence, the study found that any lexical or grammatical inadequacy in L2 could adversely affect L2 collocation use. Concisely, L1 transfer seems to be an important issue that may affect academic writing negatively, thus must take into consideration while creating a word combination in writing.

#### **2.23.4 Collocation and nativeness**

It does not matter whether collocations are associated to "ready-made chunks (Robins, 1967, p. 21)", or to "mutual expectancy (Zhang, 1993, p. 1)", they are word combinations that linked in a native speaker's memory (Aghbar, 1990). According

to Fillmore (1979), the proficiency of how to combine words in association with one another is a source of fluency. Therefore, knowledge of collocation undoubtedly brings benefits to non-native writers who desperately long for native fluency in writing. It is understood that collocations are word combinations that occur in a native speaker's mind intuitively (Sung, 2003), which refers to a situation occurring without resorting to vocabulary memory purposely but instinctively. The instinctive formation of word combinations in a native speaker's mind can attribute to its association with nativeness because there is a strong positive correlation between nativeness and automation on a linguistic component (Nation, 2001). According to Allerton (1984), words in non-native writers' minds do not co-occur freely; instead, they lead to co-occurrence restrictions. Accordingly, Hill (2000) commented on the natural way of word combinations occurring in mind, as "within the mental lexicon, collocation is the most powerful force in the creation and comprehension of all naturally occurring text" (p. 49). Concerning non-native writers' characterization of collocation fallacies, Korosadowicz-Struzynska (1980) uttered that "errors in the use of word collocations surely add to the foreign flavour in the learner's speech and writing, and along with his faulty pronunciation they are the strongest markers of an accent (p. 115)." Similar to all, Stubbs (2001) emphasized, "Native speakers' unconscious knowledge of collocation is an essential component of their idiomatic and fluent language use and an important part of their communicative competence (p. 73)." Until now, it seems blatantly apparent that the collocation competence differentiates native and non-native speakers from one another (Wouden, 1997; Nation, 2001; Koya, 2006). Due to the fact that knowledge of collocation is an essential component of communicative competence (Partington, 1998) and a source of fluency, non-native writers should aim at gaining the competence of collocation to have native fluency in the target language (Coxhead, 2000; Olson, Scarcella, & Matuchniak, 2013; Sonbul & Schmitt, 2013). What about if a writer is not a native

speaker of the language? Does it make any sense to claim that the competence of collocation is not possible to acquire by non-native writers because it is a skill intuitively acquired and used? We know that collocations are ready-made chunks just like other fixed expressions and idioms (Benson, Benson, & Elson, 1986), and it is possible to teach ready-made chunks, including collocations, to all types of learners (Approach, 1993). Likewise, Wray (2002) claimed that learning formulaic language like collocations through conscious effort is possible. Therefore, any claims that address to impossibility of acquiring collocations must dismiss because the literature provides the opposite.

### **2.23.5 Collocations and native fluency in writing**

According to Prodrômou (2003), on the path of achieving native-fluency in written productions, the use of collocation is a potential difficulty that non-native writers usually face. Prodrômou, like many other researchers, claims that there is a close relationship between collocations and native fluency. Some researchers carried their allegations further, and made experimental and/or theoretical investigations in order to prove the relationship. One of these valuable studies belongs to Martynska (2004) who had a study with a twofold purpose; one of which was to reveal non-native English speakers' level of collocational competence, and the latter of which was to take attention to the role of collocation in the process of L2 learning. Martynska concluded that the knowledge of how to combine words into chunks efficiently is a compulsory act, and non-native speakers of English are bound to have collocational competence if native-like proficiency is wanted. Furthermore, Martynska reported that "the richer in collocations the learner's lexicon is, the higher precision, accuracy, coherence and authenticity of his/her speech, which is a perfect way to fluency and proficiency in the language as well as to greater language competence" (p. 11). Hsu (2007) compared Taiwanese English majors' and non-English majors' written texts in order to obtain some insights on how Taiwanese

English majors and non-English majors used lexical collocations in their writings. The findings showed a statistically significant correlation between two types of majors in terms of writing scores and frequency of lexical collocations. Furthermore, the analysis put forth a significant correlation between subjects' online writing scores and their variety of lexical collocations. In other words, diversity and frequency of lexical collocations in an academic paper obtained higher writing scores. Therefore, it is the effect of lexical collocation awareness on writing skill is overwhelming that helps writers to have fluency in their writing (cf. Eidian, Gorjian, & Aghvami, 2014). Brain function is an important process in collocation acquisition. In terms of brain functionality, the processes of learning a collocation involve the same paths as learning a vocabulary. Different from vocabulary, a collocation involves sequences of words processed in a more efficient way because single memorized units can process more easily and quickly than the same sequences of words that are produced creatively (Pawley & Syder, 1983). Investigated the processing of formulaic sequences by comparing reading times for non-formulaic phrases and formulaic sequences of native and non-native speakers of English. The findings showed that non-formulaic phrases read more slowly than formulaic sequences, which proved that formulaic sequences have a processing advantage. At the end of their study, advised nonnative speakers to get accustomed to formulaic sequences if they want to enjoy the same type of processing advantages as native speakers do. Having considered playing a significant role in written language (Wei & Lei, 2011), collocations are for scholarly writing, and a non-native writer with insufficient collocation knowledge will have difficulties and some infelicities regarding their academic positions while composing a scientific writing. One important problem that could rise due to insufficient collocation knowledge is inappropriate word combinations. McArthur (1992) asserted that a failure to use collocations appropriately is a principal indicator of foreignness in academic texts.

Therefore, any inappropriate of collocations, i.e. wrong or weird word combinations may give rise to lack of confidence to writer's language ability no matter how worthy the content of the writing is. It is difficult for non-native writers to escape seemingly inept and unnatural expressions in their written production without appropriate knowledge of collocation because the knowledge of collocation is critical for L2 writers to be able to have full communicative mastery of English (Bahns & Eldaw, 1993). Therefore, writers who want to improve their writing fluency need to have competence of collocation at a certain extent (Sung, 2003), otherwise they may fall into collocation failures that may adversely affect the language quality of the manuscript.

## **2.24 Word Choice and Synonymy in Writing**

Just as isolated words are not sufficient for an effective communication or writing essay, report, letter or a book. However, a group of words cannot meet the intended goal unless properly organization or employed in academic writing. The functions performed by language relate both to content and form, as a piece of information may convey stylistic or emotional associations in addition to the descriptive meaning. A number of scholars (Halliday, Hasan, 1985) have discussed the ways vocabulary used flexibly and appropriately to avoid linguistic rigidity. Lexical cohesion considered as one of the most effective ways to meet the above-mentioned expectations. Despite the diverse and numerous studies on lexical cohesion, they all refer to one common consideration, the identification of various linguistic devices to achieve text organization. Therefore, as "when speaking about a topic, we need to refer to the same things again and again and if using the same word each time would be inelegant", (Schmitt, 2000:106) we should then make use of a variety of tools to avoid it. The model of lexical cohesion designed by Halliday and Hasan (1985) consists of a number of lexical cohesive devices classified into two main categories: reiteration and collocation. Their category of reiteration includes Repetition of the

same word (*mushroom – mushroom*) - Synonym use (*sword – brand*) - Superordinate (*Jaguar – car*) - General word (*We all kept quiet. That seemed the best move.*) According to Halliday and Hasan (1985), collocation is the cohesion achieved through lexical units reoccurring regularly. Thus, the connection obtained when the lexical units have the tendency to occur in similar lexical contexts or when they are lexically and semantically related. For example, *boy* and *girl* are cohesive because they have opposite meanings; *laugh* and *joke*, *boat* and *row* are also cohesive in spite of not being related but they are typically related to each other. On the other hand, McCarthy (1988) has designed a model with four lexical relations:

1. Equivalence 2. Entailment 1: specific – general 3. Entailment 2: general – specific 4. Opposition. If we switch our attention to the tools for achieving cohesion in specific pieces of academic writing such as the paragraph or the essay, we need to consider a number of linguistic devices. One way to achieve this is “to repeat key nouns frequently in your paragraph” (Oshima, Hogue, 1999:41). Here is the example provided to illustrate the way key nouns are employed throughout the paragraph: *Gold*, a precious metal, is prized for two important characteristics. First, *gold* has a lustrous beauty that is resistant to corrosion. Therefore, it is suitable for jewelry, coins and ornamental purposes. *Gold* never needs to be polished and will remain beautiful forever. For example, a Macedonian coin remains as untarnished today as the day it was minted twenty-three centuries ago. Another important characteristic of *gold* is its usefulness to industry and science. For many years, it was used in hundreds of industrial applications. The most recent use of *gold* is in astronauts’ suits. Astronauts wear gold-plated shields for protection outside spaceships. In conclusion, *gold* is treasured not only for its beauty but also for its utility. The risk of overusing the key noun is avoided by the use of the relevant pronouns referring to the key noun, called “pronoun references”. For example, the pronoun *it* would be an appropriate substitute for the key noun *gold* in the paragraph. A common way to make a piece

of academic writing more cohesive is the use of another linguistic device, namely the “transitions”. Otherwise called “transition signals” (Oshima, Hague, 1999:43), or simply linking words by many. In addition to the above-mentioned cohesive devices, it must be pointed out that word choice is of primary importance when it comes to producing both a coherent and cohesive piece of writing. Commonly referred to as diction, it means, “finding and using the word that fits your meaning and tone exactly” (Macmillan English, 1986:83). Moreover, such words “should be appropriate for the writer’s purpose, audience, point of view, and tone” (Nadell, 1997:121). Scholars of academic writing generally consider the following aspects of word choice: Denotation vs. connotation (associated emotions or ideas),- concrete vs. abstract words,- general vs. specialized words, -levels of formality (formal, informal, slang, etc.),- words that suit the intended tone, etc. Nevertheless, insufficient attention paid to another useful linguistic device, lexical synonymy, which could increase the lexical cohesion of a piece of writing. Discouragement may have stemmed from such statements as “confusion results from synonym use”, “Do not indulge in overuse of a synonym dictionary”, “Synonyms always confuse or irritate readers” (Norris, 2014). While these statements may be partly true with reference to the use of synonymy in certain kinds of writing (technical writing for example) or misuse of synonymy by writers whose knowledge of synonyms is inadequate, they do not undermine the numerous expressive possibilities provided by the employment of the right synonym in the right context. It is also true that the linguistic phenomenon of synonymy sometimes tends to oversimplified by language users. They consider two or more synonyms as words with the same meaning, interchangeable in any given context, thus neglecting the really fine but essential shades of meaning, which, if not taken into consideration, may spoil the overall stylistic picture of a piece of writing. Selecting one synonym instead of another means taking into account at least one of the following dimensions of synonym



differentiation: 1. Denotation (what Lyons (1995) calls descriptive synonymy) 2. Style 3. Collocation. The simplistic use of such a complex linguistic device results in the use of inappropriate synonyms in a piece of writing, thus producing a negative impact on either the tone, accuracy or even intended message of the piece of writing. Another factor bringing about the misuse of synonymy is misunderstanding the role of thesauruses. Those lists of synonyms (in most cases near-synonyms, or simply semantically related words) do not always imply interchangeability. They remind us of words of a certain semantic resemblance, but it is then up to the (professional) user to distinguish one from the other by using other books of reference or test them in a variety of contexts. If this differentiation process is not completed, we may end up using what I call “thesaurus synonymy”, i.e. using lists of synonyms from thesauruses without taking into account the differences, which prevent them from being interchangeable. This is reinforced by Nadell (1997:123) who claims, “even two words listed as synonyms in a dictionary or thesaurus can differ in meaning in important ways”. Many textbooks underline the risks of misusing synonymy. Bailey (2003) states that “when writing it is necessary to find synonyms in order to provide variety and interest for the reader”. However, he gives the following warning to his book users: “synonyms are not always exactly the same in meaning, but it is important not to change the register. Firm is a good synonym for company but boss is too informal to use for manager. Both pupil and student used to identify a 15-year-old schoolchild, when she goes to university only student is normally used. Scholar might be a possible synonym, but it is very formal. Similarly, at university a lecturer could also be called a teacher, but in school the only possible synonym for teacher is the old-fashioned master or mistress”. Nevertheless, many claim “knowledge of synonyms can help you improve your writing vocabulary. Instead of repeating the same word over and over, you can use a synonym” (Macmillan English, 1986:554). The following examples provided as possible substitutes: respond –

answer - impede – obstruct- reluctant – hesitant - chains – shackles - evident – obvious - signify – mean admonition – reprimand - remnant – remainder - pertinent – relevant. These examples show that synonymy extends our lexical choice and provides us with a myriad of opportunities to “avoid the repetition of words and add color and variety to the language” (Colona, 2006:49). It is obvious that lexical choice is greater when the language user is given the possibility to choose between the members of the following pairs or sets of synonyms: finish - end - terminate; alter - change; achieve - reach; concentrate - focus; confine - limit; improve - ameliorate - get better; found - establish - set up; trend - tendency; component - part; begin - start - initiate - commence. Tuttle (2009) has highlighted the importance of using synonyms as tools for avoiding text “monotony”. Who gives the example of the paragraph below to show how the repetition of the same word within one paragraph avoided. Ralph, Tom’s dog, is very fast. He is so fast that I cannot keep up with him. Ralph is so fast that he can catch a thrown ball before it hits the ground. He is a fast runner; he almost catches cars. “Synonyms can also serve the purpose of describing research results to support thesis statements. For example, a number of related words can be used to replace the verb said such as commented, stated, added, reported, emphasized, stressed” (Colonna, 2006:108). In addition to adding variety, synonyms can also perform a number of semantic roles in a piece of writing. Two or more synonyms (or sometimes semantically related words) employed to emphasize the degree or intensity of the quality/action described. A writer can therefore choose between the following pairs of synonyms, with the second member being of a greater intensity or emphasis: dirty – filthy; hot – boiling; cold – freezing; tired – exhausted; big - enormous; tasty – delicious; small - tiny; old - ancient; happy - exhilarated, etc. Intensity can sometimes increase progressively throughout the synonymic set, with the first member of the synonymic set standing at the bottom of the intensity scale and the last member of the synonymic set standing at the top of the intensity scale:

to like, to admire, to love, to adore, to worship. However, an accurate scale of synonymy in such cases may prove difficult as the associations created by the different members of the synonymic set may sometimes vary from person to person. In many instances, differences in intensity combined with differences in shades of meaning, especially in sets with a great number of synonyms such as happy, pleased, thrilled, glad, contented, ecstatic, exultant, joyful or angry, mad, furious, wrathful, indignant, enraged, exasperated. Synonyms can be used to convey the right level of formality. When it comes to academic writing, style is of paramount importance. This is the reason why a number of tables with academic writing words designed to provide writers with possible and appropriate words to be used in a piece of academic writing. You will find below words extracted from such as (Bailey, 2003:109-110): results – findings; area – field; authority – source; benefit advantage; category – type; component – part; behavior – conduct; output – production; expansion – increase; option – possibility; trend – tendency; drawback –disadvantage; assist – help; achieve – reach; concentrate – focus; show – demonstrate; found – establish; predict – forecast; retain – keep; strengthen – reinforce; eliminate – remove. Schmitt (2000) discusses the role of language formality by referring to the distinction of the English vocabulary between Old English and Greco-Latin vocabulary, with the latter giving discourse a more formal or academic tone. Such examples as brotherly – fraternal, kingly – regal, happiness – felicity, empty – vacuous, demonstrate the difference along the formality scale between the members of the synonymic pairs, with the second member of the pair showing a greater level of formality. Jackson (1988) offers the following list of synonyms, with the first member of the pair of synonyms being more formal or neutral as (pulchritude, beauty, decease, die or missive, letter.

Accuracy of meaning can be achieved via using of the appropriate word. For example, attention must be paid to the discrimination of meaning between such

words as *walk – stroll – stride – saunter* ; *see – gaze – stare – glimpse*; *laugh – giggle – chuckle*; Despite their considerable semantic overlap, the members of these sets differ in certain semantic components, which are essential to the accuracy of the expression. The need for accuracy reinforced by C S Lewis’s statement: “Don’t use words too big for the subject. Don’t say “infinitely” when you mean “very”; otherwise you’ll have no word left when you want to talk about something really infinite.” Writers can better express their attitude by choosing the word, which best suits their intended effect (generally based on purpose and audience). The expression of positive and negative attitudes facilitated by the employment of synonyms (near-synonyms) of either positive or negative connotation. Such examples include *politician – statesman*, *skinny – slim*; *goof – error*, etc. Word choice also depends on the collocational possibilities of words. The table below clearly shows the collocational differences between the words *big*, *large* and *great*. In spite of their semantic overlap, these three words have their typical collocates. Collocational restrictions of *big*, *large* and *great*. The arguments presented above show that the writing process closely linked with lexical cohesion and word choice. The latter is of primary importance when it comes to expressing the intended meaning in any piece of writing. However, in academic writing, the focus of this study, special attention to the different dimensions of meaning. Lexical synonymy used by writers to make a piece of writing both more cohesive and colorful. Synonyms employed by writers to add variety to their piece of writing, thus avoiding inappropriate repetition of the same word. Moreover, sets of synonyms give writers the possibility to choose the word which best suits the tone and intended audience. Accuracy improved by using the word, which fits the context. Nevertheless, synonymy, while both interesting and useful, if not used properly, may produce the opposite effect, that of distorting meaning or the tone of writing. As a result, whenever we think of replacing a word with a synonym (near-synonym), “pick” one

from the myriad of words. If the search for an appropriate synonym is unsuccessful and the use of a similar word would spoil accuracy, it better to take Crowley's advice: "repetition is not necessarily negative; if used with mastery, it is a figure of speech" (Crowley, 1994:202).

## **2.25 The Role and Function of the Antonyms in writing**

The practical importance of antonyms relies on their understanding in use of everyday life communicational situations and academic writing in any written language. Even though the linguistic explanation is important and fundamental, it helps other disciplines to understand better situations and circumstances when antonyms are used. Their misuse can cause a lot of misunderstandings and cultural clashes. Note, "Antonym has more powerful relationship between lexicon-semantic relations." Antonyms from native speakers are use intuitively in all lifestyles. Antonym plays an important role in several fields of study, such as linguistics, psychology, literature or psycholinguistics and language acquisition in children. It is used to express binary opposition in all modalities and communication registers as spoken language in the writing, as to the facts as well as fiction, as the in the standard and unofficial use of language. First, the role of linguistics in particular antonyms shown clearly their ability explain the meaning of the words clearly analogous or bilingual dictionaries. Therefore, the contribution in the field of lexicography is of particular importance. In the field of linguistics, antonyms serve as a source of enrichment of the English language through word formation, namely through the establishment of antonymic couples with the same root as the word-grammar by means of prefixes and rarely, in cases of stylistic antonyms, through suffixes. Secondly, the connection with psychological antonyms can be linked with studies associating the word (word association) through which detects when the human mind is able to function in relation to countering. Thirdly, in the field of literature, opposites are analysed as distinguishing features of dramatic prose. Even

literary figures often influenced by broader role of antonym. It also underlies such phrases as "Timid men prefer *calm despotism* to the *tempestuous* sea of *liberty*" aimed at emphasizing and clarifying the idea and the message given. Thus, it serves as a powerful tool in argumentation, narrative, explanation and description. Moreover, it is also important in the process of language acquisition. In this process, it shows interest the fact of antonyms stored since early childhood. It documented that children from an early age tend to perceive the concept of opposition by teaching antonyms in pairs with more than one at a time. Kagan notes (1984) that immediately after the child learns the word "up" and "down" or immediately after the word "good", the meaning of the word "bad". This related to what Lyons (1977) calls "the tendency to dichotomy". However, it may simply be a learning strategy used by children as part of a general mechanism in language acquisition. Practice seems to learn words in a family of similar meaning is simple. However, Jones stresses, "Pairs of words which simply appropriated the children are obviously antonyms". Antonym occupies an important place in lexicography as well as lexicographic works, which centered on language learners. Linguists state the "antonyms (as well as synonyms and polysemy) enhances and strengthens the expressive character of political and social vocabulary to become more diverse, in its structure". It is precisely the need and demand for this style counterpoint to reality, occurrences, opinions, etc. that gives such value to the antonym. This presence in the lexicon of the antonym made due to the emergence of new units such as non-bureaucratic (from the noun bureaucratic). It made through word-production models of the English language. Antonym is also important in the process of designing signs and icons such as traffic lights, as well as visual art works of various kinds.

### **2.25.0 The Definition of Antonymy**

The word "antonymy" coined by C. J. Smith as an opposite of "synonymy". Since 1867, many efforts took to define "antonymy", but the problem is that the definition

of antonymy tends to illustration rather than description. For example, if we would like to tell others what antonymy is, to give some examples like *old/young*, *tall/short*, *open/close*, *bad/good*, etc. will be more effective than to give a definition. However, finding a definition that could account for every example of antonymy is difficult, even problematic. Lyons (1977) defines “antonym” as the words which are opposite in meaning and “antonymy” as the oppositeness between words. For example, “buy” and “sell” is a pair of antonyms and the relation between these two words is termed as antonymy. Leech (1981) puts forward the definition of antonym and antonymy in *Semantics* that the opposite meaning relation between the words is antonymy and word of opposite meaning is antonym. Moreover, a famous Chinese linguist Hu Zhuanglin (2001, p.164) simply says, “Antonymy is the name for oppositeness relation”. Traditional definitions of antonymy only concentrate on the oppositeness of meaning. Some traditional definitions are as follows: word of opposite meaning; (Leech, 1981) word of opposite sense; (Pyles & Algeo, 1970) words opposite. (Watson, 1976) These definitions are ideas and over ambiguous. First, they do not explain the ways of oppositeness very concretely. The antonym pairs like *hot/cold*, *dead/alive* and *lend/borrow* differ from each other in the way of oppositeness. The pair *hot/cold* belongs to the gradable antonyms; the pair *dead/alive* belongs to the complementary antonyms; and the pair *lend/borrow* belongs to the relational antonyms. Second, these definitions focus more on the discrepancy of the antonyms but they ignore the similarity of the grammar and usage of each of the antonym pairs. Just look at another three pairs, *heat/cold*, *single/married*, and *beauty/ugly*. Although either of them is opposite in meaning, they could not be regarded as antonyms in that they are not the same in grammatical units. Furthermore, people use the antonyms most of the time just for the effect of contrast. For instance, the juxtaposition of *spring* and *winter* found in the English literature, as presented in *Ode to the West Wind*, “If winter comes, can spring be far behind?” Considering the above factors,

Lyons classifies opposition into three categories: antonymy, complementarity and conversances in *Semantics and Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Lyons only regards words that are gradable and opposite in meaning as antonyms. Cruse (1986) thinks the same way in his *Lexical Semantics*. In addition, the term “antonym” only refers to the set of gradable opposites, which are mostly adjectives, for gradable antonyms reflect one distinguishing semantic feature: polar oppositeness. However, in our daily life, words like *male/female*, *dead/alive*, *husband/wife* are also considered as antonym pairs, for these words are also opposite in meaning. Therefore, the other two categories, complementarity and conversances, included in the field of antonymy only in a very broad sense. In general, there are two criteria in defining antonymy: semantic and lexical. We explain elaborately the antonymy being semantic above, and yet not all semantically opposed words are antonyms. Cruse (1986) exemplifies this with the words *tubby* and *emaciated*. Almost all established antonyms have synonyms which could not constitute the antonym pairs, for example, the antonym pair of *heavy* and *light* is better than *weighty* and *insubstantial*; antonym pair of *fast* and *slow* is better opposites rather than *speedy* and *sluggish*; antonym pair of *happy* and *sad* is more reasonable than *ecstatic* and *miserable*. Although both of the antonymy and synonymy link words together in the lexicon, Gross et al. (1988) argue that antonymy and synonymy are different. They say while synonymy is “a relation between lexical concepts”, antonymy is “a relation between words, not concepts”. Justeson and Katz (1991) also refer to antonymy as a lexical relation, “specific to words rather than concepts”. In fact, the definition of antonymy must be lexical as well as semantic. Antonyms need to have “oppositeness of meaning”, but they also need to have a strong, well-established lexical relationship with one another. Jackson, (1988) Lexicographer Egan (1968) makes a rather satisfying definition of “antonymy” based on her understanding of the nature of the antonymy: “An antonym is a word so opposed in meaning to another word;



it's equal in breadth or range of application, that is, negates or nullifies every single one of its implications". This definition shows clearly, what makes two words to be antonyms. The antonym pairs are equal in breadth or range of application but opposed in meaning. Moreover, the words, which contrast in meaning, may not be antonyms because they may be different in their breadth or range of application. Therefore, we can draw a conclusion that Egan's definition of antonymy may be fitter or easier to employ into the actual cases than the theories and definitions of antonymy referred to above.

### **2.25.1 The Classification of Antonymy**

There are generally three kinds of sense relations, that is, sameness relation, oppositeness relation and inclusiveness relation. Antonymy is the name for oppositeness relation. In addition, there are three main types of antonymy, that is, gradable antonymy, complementary antonymy, and converse antonymy. (Hu, 2001, p.164-168) (1) Gradable Antonymy: Gradable antonymy is the commonest type of antonymy. The antonym pairs like *hot/cold*, *big/small* and *tall/short* all belong to the gradable antonyms. We can find that they are mainly adjectives. The gradable antonymy has three characteristics: first, as the name suggests, they are gradable, that is, the members of a pair differ in terms of degree; second, antonyms of this kind are graded against different norms; third, one member of a pair, usually the term for the higher degree, serves as the cover term. (Hu, 2001, p.164) As for the first characteristic, it also means that if you deny one thing, you do not necessarily assert the other. Moreover, the antonym pairs may have the comparative and superlative degrees. For example, "good" and "bad", both of these two words have the comparative and superlative degrees: "better"/"best" and "worse"/"worst". Therefore, being not good is not necessarily bad; and being not bad is not necessarily good. Between "good" and "bad", we can find a degree that is "so-so". Look at other examples, between the two extremes of the size "big" and "small", there is a degree

that is “medium”; between the two extremes of the temperature “hot” and “cold”, there are degrees that are “warm” and “cool”. From the information referred to above, we can see that the gradable antonyms differ in terms of degree. Look at the second characteristic, it means there is no absolute criterion by which we tell an object is “big” and another is “small”. The criterion is relative but not absolute. As we all know, *a small car* is always bigger than *a big apple*. This is why the antonyms of this kind are graded based on different norms. As for the third characteristic, one of the antonym pairs is the cover term, which known as “unmarked”. “Unmarked” used more widely than “marked”. We may ask “how old are you” or “how tall is she” instead of “how young are you” or “how short is she”. In that, “old” and “tall” are cover terms, “unmarked”; and “young” and “short” are marked. The distinction between “unmarked” and “marked” reflect the potential value system that the speech community holds. People want to be *tall* rather than *short*. (2) Complementary Antonymy: Antonyms like *awake/asleep*, *married/single*, *pass/fail*, *alive/dead* and *male/female* are of this type. Complementary antonyms also have three characteristics: first, they divide the whole of a semantic field completely; second, the norm in this type is absolute; third, there is no cover term for the two members of a pair. (Hu, 2001) As for the first characteristic, unlike the gradable antonyms, the complementary antonyms share a semantic field. Nevertheless, between the two complementary antonyms, there is no intermediate ground. As Cruse (1986) describes it, the essence of a pair of complementary antonym is that between them they exhaustively divide some conceptual domain into two mutually exclusive compartments, so that what does not fall into one of the compartments must necessarily fall into the other. The members of the antonym pairs of this kind is complementary to each other. For instance, “He is more *female* than *male*”. Actually, he is a *male* but not *female*. He is a *male* but he is closer to the state of being *female*. The denial of *male* is the assertion of *female* and the assertion of *female*

is the denial of *male*. They do not have the comparative and superlative degrees. In addition, they do not have the intermediate degree between these two words of an antonym pair. The second characteristic is that the norm in this type of antonymy is absolute, that is, the norm is the same when used for all the things it is applicable. The criteria to tell male from female is the same when we refer to the human beings and the animals. Moreover, the death of human beings is the same as that of any animal. As for the third characteristic, in the complementary antonymy, there is no cover term or covered term. Not ask somebody's sex like age. It means we cannot say "how boy/male is it" like "how old are you". We should ask, "Is it a boy or a girl". That is a normal question. (3) Converse Antonymy: The antonym pairs like *husband/wife*, *doctor/patient*, *teacher/student*, *buy/sell*, *above/below* and *employer/employee* are all converse antonymy. They show a reversal relationship. A is B's husband means B is A's wife. A is B's doctor means B is A's patient. A is B's teacher means B is A's student. It is also known as relational opposites. Egan (1968) describe these antonym pairs as pairs of words, which include such a relationship that one of them used without suggesting the other. Therefore we can see that there is a huge difference between converse antonymy and the other two subtypes of antonymy, that is, one should presupposes the other as for the two members that involved in an antonym pair. If there is a buyer, then there must be a seller. We cannot say he is a husband, we must say he is whose husband, because one can not be a husband if he has no wife. Just like the parent who can not be a parent if he has no child. In this relationship, one can not talk about A without B. However, there is something special to the "child". Child and parent is an antonym pair if the child means the parent's son or daughter. However, when it refers to somebody under the age of eighteen, *child* is the antonym of *adult*. It is the same as the word "teacher". Teacher is a single word when it refers to an occupation. Only when it means one is a teacher only to his student, can this word constitute an antonym pair with "student".

## 2.26 Antonymy in specific English texts

Antonymy helps to achieve textual cohesion. It reveals the opposition and the unity of objects in languages. Employing antonyms in English texts correctly reveals the oppositeness of objects and produces a strong sense of comparison. Therefore, writers are fond of and good at employing antonyms in their literature works, because it makes the works artistically charming and powerfully convincing.

### 2.26.0 Antonymy Used in Poetry

Antonyms are widely used in poetry. English poet Alfred Tennyson had the famous lines in his *Ulysses* “Though much is *taken*, much *abides*; and though/ We are not *now* that strength which in the *old days*/ Moved *earth* and *heaven*; that which we are, we are;/ One equal-temper of heroic hearts,/ Made *weak* by time and fate, but *strong* in will/ To *strive*, to seek, to find, and not to *yield*.” How encouraging it is! Even a man in despair can get the power from the lines. In addition, what makes the lines memorable and powerful is the use of antonyms. In *Romeo and Juliet*, Romeo has the poem, “O *loving hate*,/ O *anything*, or *nothing* first created!/ O heavy *lightness*, serious *vanity*,/ *Misshapen* chaos of *well-seeming* forms,/ *Feather* of *lead*, *bright smoke*, *cold fire*, *sick health*,/ *Still-waking sleep*, that is not what it is!”

### 2.26.1 Antonymy Used in Drama

Antonymy is also widely used in dramas. It is seen obviously from the works of William Shakespeare. In *Romeo and Juliet* “My only *love* sprung from my only *hate*. Too *early* seen *unknown*, and *known* too *late*. Prodigious birth of love it is to me, that I must *love* a *loathed*” In the quotation, four antonym pairs are there and they constitute the well-known figures of speech in English, oxymoron and paradox. When we read the words at first, we may think them very ridiculous, illogical and raving. However, when we explore the plot of the dramas, we can find that the drama uses these antonym pairs and corresponding figures of speech to depict the

contradictory mind of Juliet on the occasion. Juliet says this in Act 1 Scene 5 when she finds out who Romeo is. She is expressing a bunch of information and emotion all at once here she has fallen in love with Romeo, but she was upset that he is a member of the rival family. She saw him first (too early) and fell for him before she found out who he was (too late). Love now seems very strange to her, that she can love someone she is supposed to hate. Antonyms for the most of time used to make irony and oxymoron. In *The Tragedy of Julius Caesar*, Caesar states, “I thank you for your *pains* and *courtesy*.” Different listeners interpret it differently. Caesar meant one thing; to the audience, who knows that Caesar will soon be killed, the statement means something entirely different. Oxymoron formed whenever two words that are contrary in normal usage combined. (Watson, 2006, p.29)The master of the oxymoron was William Shakespeare. In the Act 5 Scene 1 of Shakespeare’s *A Midsummer Night’s Dream*, Theseus remarks about the choices for the entertainment in the evening: “A *tedious brief* scene of young Pyramus/ And his love This by; very *tragically mirth!* Merry and *tragically?* *tedious* and *brief?*! That is *hot ice* and *wondrous strange* snow. How shall we find the concord of this discord?”

### **2.26.2 Antonymy Used in Novels**

In the process of writing novels, numerous novelists are very good at employing antonyms. The following excerpted from *A Tale of Two Cities* written by Charles Dickens. “It was the *best* times, it was the *worst* times, it was the age of *wisdom*, it was the age of the *foolishness*, it was the epoch of *belief*, it was the epoch of *incredulity*, it was the season of *light*, it was the season of *darkness*, it was the spring of *hope*, it was the winter of *despair*, we had *everything* before us, we have *nothing* before us.” It uses six pairs of antonyms to depict the complication and dangerous atmosphere before the French revolution. These six antonym pairs are parallel and overwhelming. In Maxwell Anderson’s *Lost in the Stars*, you will read, “That you are all lost here, *black* and *white*, *rich* and *poor*, the *fools* and the *wise!*” In O.

Henry's *The Duel*, you will read, "I despise its very vastness and power. It has the *poorest millionaires*, the *littlest great men*, the *haughtiest beggars*, the *plainest beauties*, the *lowest skyscrapers*, the *dolefulest pleasures* of any town I ever saw." In T. Dreiser's *Sister Carrie* you will read "there was an *audible stillness*, in which the *common* voice sounded *strange*." Every famous novelist without exception has a good master of antonyms.

### 2.26.3 Antonymy Used in Speeches

When antonymy used in a speech, a clear-cut stand and a clear point of view easily made. The language has stronger rhythm and helps being persuasive. As a result, many people employ antonymy in their speeches to state their opinions, justify their positions and influence the public opinion. This can be the best seen from the speeches of American presidents. Observing Barack Obama's first victory speech in 2008. Easy to read following lines: "It's the answer spoken by *young* and *old*, *rich* and *poor*, *Democrat* and *Republican*, *black*, *white*, Latino, Asian, Native American, *gay*, *straight*, *disabled* and *not disabled* Americans who sent a message to the world that we have never been a collection of *red* states and *blue* states; we are, and always will be, the United States of America."... "In this country, we *rise* or *fall* as one nation as one people."... "our stories are *singular*, but our destiny is *shared*, and a new dawn of American leadership is at hand. To those who would tear this world down: We will *defeat* you. To those who seek peace and security: We *support* you."... "And tonight, I think about all that she's seen throughout her century in America the *heartache* and the *hope*; the *struggle* and the *progress*"... "because after 106 years in America, through the *best* of times and the *darkest* of hours, she knows how America can change. Yes, we can." Abraham Lincoln once in his *Address at Gettysburg* had "The brave men, *living* and *dead*, who struggled here, have consecrated it, for above our poor power to *add* or *detract*. The world will little note nor long *remember* what we *say* here, but it can never *forget* what they *did* here.

”. The effect achieved by the use of these antonyms is rather striking. With the beautiful language, forms with the use of antonymy the persuasive power of the speakers are strengthened greatly and the audience are more likely to be convinced to a greater extent. Examples are many, not only in presidential speeches, like Barack Obama, Abraham Lincoln. Martin Luther King had “one hundred years later, the Negro lives on a lonely island of a *poverty* in the midst of vast ocean of material *prosperity*.”

#### **2.26.4 Antonymy Used in Proverbs**

Proverb is a form of language with the presentation of each figure of speech, which a fixed short verse naturally coming from the usual use of some composition of the language. (Xu, 2009) Proverb is simple; meanwhile, it entertains a thought deeply. When antonyms used in proverbs, the rhetorical effect of phonological harmony, formal beauty and conciseness achieved. Several examples given as follows. “More *haste*, less *speed*.” “Easy *come*, easy *go*.” “Art is *long*, life is *short*.” “An *idle* youth, a *needy* age.” “Small sorrows speak; great sorrows are silent.” Very famous people are more skilful of using antonymy in proverbs. George Herbert has “Love makes all *hard* hearts *gentle*”. And George Eliot has “It is surely better to *pardon* too much than to *condemn* too much”. All these examples listed above are neat in the construction of the sentences. No matter visually or phonologically, a kind of beauty of harmony sensed, which helps convey profound messages.

#### **2.27 Cohesion and Coherence in Paragraphs**

Academic writing is a kind of formal style of writing practiced mainly in the universities and in publications. Cohesion and coherence, which refer to intra-text connectedness, and the contextual fitness of the ideas, are the essential properties of the texts in academic writing to create them (the texts) more comprehensible. The points below attempt to acquaint the readers with academic writing; and introduce

cohesion and coherence, which add quality in the standard of textuality in academic writing. Academic writing, in a broad sense, is any writing assignment accomplished in an academic setting such as writing books, research paper, conference paper, academic journal, and dissertation and thesis. More specifically, it is writing activity performed to fulfill a requirement of a college, university, conference, and publication. According to Irvin (2010), “Academic writing is always a form of evaluation that asks you to demonstrate knowledge and show proficiency with certain disciplinary skills in thinking, interpreting, and presenting” (p. 8). Murray (2005) defines academic writing as ‘the set of conventions used in publishing a paper or in writing a thesis in a specific discipline’. Oshima and Hague (2007) view that academic writing is a kind of formal writing used in high schools and a college classes, which is clearly different from personal and creative writing. Concisely, academic writing is a style of written expression with specific intellectual boundaries, and area of expertise. Studying the definitions of academic writing given by the scholars, two distinctive features identified; academic writing is: (i) discipline-specific, and (ii) evidence-based. The feature ‘discipline-specific’ refers to the fact that the academic writers strictly maintain the methods and conventions of the discipline such as font, style, organization, or format of writing. In this way, a good academic writing gives an identification of the writer’s academic community. Similarly, the character ‘evidence-based’ indicates that the statements and the viewpoints put forwarded in an academic test are based on reliable sources. The assertions and the ideas of the writer supported by accurate and verifiable facts, and real world relevant examples. Irvin (2010) uses the term ‘literacy task’ for ‘academic writing’, and he discusses two important characteristics of this ‘complex literacy task. Moreover, the points below clarifies the details.

**2.27.0 Academic writing is an argument:** Presentation of logical argument is one of the main characteristic features of academic writing. The arguments not for the



purpose of winning the disagreeing sides, but they (the arguments) are arranged so carefully that they support the presentation of a viewpoint. The presentation “resembles a conversation between two people who may not hold the same opinions, but they both desire better understanding of the subject matter under discussion” (Irvin, 2010, p.10). In this way, a well academic writing holds the great value of an organized argumentative presentation that consists of strong supporting evidences.

**2.27.1 Academic writing is an analysis:** Academic writing is the analytic interpretation of the viewpoint. In the presentation, the writer needs to seek the answer of ‘how and why questions’ much more than that of ‘what questions’. According to Irvin (2010, p 10), such analytic presentation involves three important activities: (i) engaging in an open inquiry where the answer is not known at first, (ii) identifying the meaningful parts of the subject, and (iii) examining the separate parts and determining how they relate each other. Academic writing is a well-structured product with careful considerations to the factors like audience, purpose, organization, style, flow, and presentation (Swales & Feak, 2012, p. 3); and these factors are specific to who, why, and how questions. The audience, related to who question, is the reader or readers of the message of the writer. The selection of content, organization, explanation, example supplied, and vocabulary in the writing are determined according to the nature of the audience. Similarly, the purpose is concerned with why question and that guides the focus of writing. Purpose is the intention of the writing, or the main goal or message of the writer. Finally, the how question is concerned with the aspects such as organization, style, presentation, and flow of ideas. Dividing the writing text into three parts- introduction, body, and conclusion helps make the writing well organized so that the readers feel comfortable in understanding the ideas or issues. Likewise, the style of writing needs to be clear and precise with formal grammar and formal vocabulary. Formal writing also needs avoidance of using the features like contraction, negation, weak endings,

multi-word verbs, or redundancies. Similarly, good academic writing requires formal spelling, appropriate punctuation marks, and a good citation and referencing. It should have fluent flow in the presentation of ideas in such that it maintains cohesion (connectedness of the consecutive ideas using the techniques like repetition, substitution, and transition), and coherence (occurrence of the ideas contextually in orderly sequence), which are discussed in more detail in the following paragraphs.

**2.27.2 Cohesion and coherence in academic writing:** The terms cohesion and coherence related for making the sense of language in the text/discourse analysis. Cohesion and coherence have significant role in the interpretation of message, and in the negotiation of meaning in the discourse. A good academic writing requires a good combination of cohesive ties and coherent features in the text. The paragraphs below attempt to introduce cohesion and coherence, and their role in communicating messages in the text.

**2.27.3 Cohesion in a paragraph:** Cohesion, like other semantic relations such as synonymy, antonymy, polysemy, is the relationship of meaning of one item with another item in the text or discourse. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), “Cohesion refers to the relations of meaning that exist within the text, and is expressed through the striatal organization of the text... It occurs where the interpretation of some elements in the text is dependent on that of another” ( p 4). Taboada (2004) defines cohesion as ‘the internal hanging together of the text’. To Yule (2008) ‘Cohesion is the tie and connection that exists within the text’. It is the part of the system of a language; a type of intra-sentence relation of an item either with the preceding or following items in the text. In communication process, cohesion gives insights into how the writer structures what he/she wants to convey. Halliday and Hasan (1976) view that cohesion expressed partly through the grammar and partly through the vocabulary in the text. It is therefore, there can be two types

of cohesion: grammatical cohesion, and lexical cohesion. Grammatical cohesion is the cohesive tie that expressed through the grammatical system of a language such as reference, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. Followings are the illustrative examples that show the cohesive tie in italics in each:

- (i) Wow, how beautiful *flower vessel!* How much does it cost? [reference]
- (ii) *You are going to attend the party.* If *so*, what about these agenda? [substitution]
- (iii) We can *buy those apples* if we need to (*buy those apples*). [ellipsis]
- (iv) *He passed the exam.* *However*, he did not obtain A plus. [conjunction]

Lexical cohesion, on the other hand, is ‘the cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary’ (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p 274). Lexical cohesion can be realized in reiteration (using the same, or semantically related vocabulary such as repetition, synonym, superordinate, general word) and in collocation (co-occurrence of lexical items). Followings are the examples showing cohesive tie in italics.

- (i) Reiteration: I have a *puppy*. The *puppy* is black. [Repetition] I have a *puppy*. The *pup* is black. [Synonym] I have a *puppy*. The *animal* is black. [Superordinate] I have a *puppy*. The *baby dog* is black. [General word]
- (ii) Collocation: With their *hammer-nail* relation, the boys won the match.

**2.27.4 Coherence in a paragraph:** A text formed not only with the structured string of words, but also with the contextual occurrence of the sentences. Coherence, generally, is the contextual appearance of the utterances in the text. Specifically, the contextual fitness of in the text that contributes in understanding the meaning of the message. According to Taboada (2004), “Coherence is the hanging together of the text with relation to its context of situation or culture” (p. 158). Yule (2008) views, “Coherence is everything fitting together well, and it is not something that exists in words or structures, but something that exists in people” (p 126). Coherence is the result of the interpretation of the meaning of the text, and it depends on the relation between the audience and the text

(Tanskanen, 2006). It is therefore, the coherence of a text perceived only if the receiver's background knowledge is sufficient to interpret the linkage of messages in the discourse. The examples below show the coherent and non-coherent texts: (i) A text with coherence: A: Did you bring the car? B: Yes, I brought it yesterday. (ii) A text with no coherence: A: Where did you go last week? B: That sounds good. My brother paints it.

**2.27.5 Cohesion and Coherence for Communication:** it discussed that cohesion is the intra-text connectedness of the items, and coherence is the appropriateness of the contextual occurrence of the text to make the sense of the message conveyed. In cohesion, the surface elements appear connectedly, whereas in coherence, the elements of knowledge or sense appear to form conceptual connectivity. Some researchers such as Morgan and Sellner (1980), Carrell (1982) claim that cohesion is not sufficient to make a text connected or appear a unified whole. It is because a highly cohesive text with lots of connections and ties may cause difficulty in the interpretation of the message as Yule (2008, p 126) presents the following example: My father bought a *Lincoln convertible*. The *car* driven by the police was *red*. That *color* does not suit *her*. *She* consists of three letters. Coherence, on the other hand, has important role for creating unity between or among the propositional units in the text. Without coherence, a set of utterances cannot form a text, no matter, how many cohesive ties appear between the utterances. To show a text with no cohesive ties, but perfectly coherent, Widdowson (1978) presents following example (as cited in Yule 2008, p 127): A: That's the telephone. B: I'm in bath. However, in spite of the fact is that the importance of cohesion, in contrast to coherence, may have been criticized; many researchers (such as Hasan, 1984, Tanskanen, 2006, Hoover, 1997) view that the contribution of cohesion to unity cannot be challenged. Tanskanen (2006) claims that although coherence without cohesion might be possible, it may actually be quite uncommon to find a coherent text having no cohesive links in real

language data. Hasan (1984) insists, “The perceived coherence depends upon the interaction of cohesive devices called cohesive harmony; the denser the cohesive harmony of a text, the more coherent it will be judged” (as cited in Tanskanen, 2006, p 20). The role of cohesive ties in a text is that they predispose the readers to find the coherence, and ultimately to interpret the message. As Tanskanen (2006) states, cohesion and coherence are independent, but intertwined to create texts that are more comprehensible.

## **2.28 Importance of Punctuations in Cohesive Writing**

Reading and writing play an important role in language learning; it is more than knowing words and grammar." Reading is the most important activity in any language class, not only as a source of information and a pleasurable activity, but also as a means of consolidating and extending one`s knowledge of the language". Reading is an interactive process between the writer and the reader and it is a means of communication and sharing information and ideas. Moreover, many believe that it is a mental process, so it needs other skills to be combined with such as writing, speaking and listening (Graham & Perin, 2007); Underline that "reading texts also provide opportunities to study language: vocabulary, grammar, punctuation, and the way they construct sentences, paragraphs and texts.

### **2.28.0 Cohesion and Punctuations in Writing**

Writing is an important tool of learning subject matters and it is a tool of extending and deepening knowledge. Jozsef (2001), states that writing is the most complex human activities. It involves the development of designing ideas, experiences with subjects, and the capture of mental representation of knowledge. Writing is not about group of letters or sentences, it is about writing in a right way using different vocabulary, grammar and punctuations. Graham and Perin (2007), state that writing plays the distinct roles: It is a skill that draws on sub-skills and processes such as

handwriting and spelling; a rich knowledge of vocabulary; mastery of the conventions of punctuation, capitalization, word usage, and grammar; and the use of strategies such as planning, evaluating, and revising text (p.23). In 2000, Danielson (cited in Naeem 2007) defines, mechanics as "standard writing conventions such as spelling, punctuations, capitalization, and sentence structure skills". Besides, formatting correct grammar, punctuation, spelling, and sentence structure are essential components of scholarly writing. In addition, punctuations are very crucial, because if the writing is not well written, many educated readers will not even bother to read it, either because it is too difficult what the author is trying to state, or they will just assure that it will not be good as it does not appear to be well written. A proof of that could be the correct use of punctuation marks and how they cut the stream of words into meaningful groups and prevent confusion, (Robert, 2006).

### **2.28.1 Punctuations in Reading and Writing**

Writing and reading are quite similar and closely related. Some would say, better writers tend to be better readers, and better readers produce better writing. "Writing is sometimes seen as the 'flip side' of reading. It is often assumed that adolescents who are proficient readers must be proficient writers"(Graham & Perin,2007, p.7). Reading is the ability to use the symbols of writing system, the experience and knowledge between readings and writing, can strengthen a reader's ability to write and a writer to read. Both of them are not contrary processes, they rely on similar cognitive mechanisms that allow for simultaneous growth as well as transfer of knowledge. The two skills reading and writing considered and related activities and they totally complete each other. In both of writing and reading, punctuations stand as an essential tool in conveying the message. They help the writer and reader to make sense of a text, and they make what is composed clear and easy to read. Allen (2002), assumes that punctuations have useful purpose for having whatever kind of

writing clear and easy to understand. In addition, if a text laid out correctly, it will consider as a strong piece of writing. On the other hand, poor punctuations can cause complications for both of the reader and a writer; they can change the meaning of a text. Moreover, in speaking, humans use body language, pauses and gestures to clarify the message. In writing, punctuations such as commas, colons and dashes help to know the exact meaning and provide most of these interpretation clues. Therefore, they are signals to the reader that indicate place emphasis, pauses, and show the relationship between the elements of a text.

### **2.28.2 Presenting Punctuation Marks**

Punctuation marks are a basic role in the interpretation of a certain text, to help the reader to understand the message clearly. Therefore, using them incorrectly leads to misunderstanding the message. Lukeman (2011), states that punctuations are like the music of a writing text. As the maestro could affect the practicality of a song by manipulating its rhythm, punctuations could do so for reading experience, highlighting the optimum in a written passage. Therefore, they are symbols that used in various languages to organize sentence structure, to indicate the vocal rhythm and emphasis of words, phrases as well as sentences. Writing is all about communicating ideas; each sentence consists of a complete thought that the writer aims to communicate in his/her style of writing to readers and in turn, they have to understand. Nevertheless, the audience will not understand that chunk if they could not figure out where it begins and where it ends, and so this is what punctuations are for writing. In Oxford Advanced Learner`s Dictionary (2000), punctuations are defined as the marks or signs used in writing to separate sentences or phrases. Likewise, when punctuations are correctly used, they lead the reader through the text and makes a text more understandable. Moreover, they can help to strengthen the text and change the meaning of a sentence. Some proper punctuations work on a

subconscious level. They direct the reader to the exact meaning without becoming too curious (Woods, 2006). In addition, Allen (2002), adds that punctuations have two levels: At sentence or phrase level, marking out structure and at the word level, linking or separating individual words. As well as there are two roles in relation to these levels: To separate sentences or separate parts of sentences and to link groups of words into one sentence. There are very important and essential punctuations that English teachers should not ignore and inform students with, especially when teaching writing and reading.

### **2.28.3 Functions of Punctuations**

Without punctuation marks, many sentences are mere disorders of words. In 2012, Awad explains that there are three functions for punctuation marks in English and they are as the following: first, *Phonetic function*: This function is very significant as punctuation marks indicate obviously the rhythm, pauses, and tone inflexions in a written document; a written document has a tone. Connelly (cited in Awad 2012) that, commas, semicolons, colons, and points of ellipsis etc. Control the tone. Many times, the tone neglected, and readers are free to interpret that tone in the way they understand and that may lead to misunderstanding. In this respect, punctuation marks are like traffic lights telling us to slow down and stop. Second, *Grammatical function*: Punctuation marks are utilized in direct style like to mark emphatic content, to form interrogations, to emphasize syntactic elements displaced from their natural positions, and to frame the structure of the sentences, complex sentences, paragraphs and so on. Third, *Semantic Function*: By means of punctuation, readers are enabled to comprehend exactly the transmitted meaning which was intended by the writer and to understand the significance of particular words/phrases by highlighting them differently than ordinary text, utilizing italics, underlining, bolds, capitals, etc.



#### **2.28.4 ESL Learners' Punctuation Errors in English**

Without punctuation marks, several sentences are just a combination of words could not transmit the desired meaning. English rules of punctuation marks vary from the Arabic punctuation rules; therefore, many students commit many errors regarding this field. In 2012, Awad has found that the most common errors among Arab world University students tend to overuse of comma at the expense of the period, the incorrect use of the capital letter, the wrong use of the quotation marks and the misuse of semicolon respectively. *Abbreviations*: They are shortened forms of words or phrase like the word Prof. for the word professor. Abbreviations commonly used in business communication and technical writing. Almost all abbreviations formed from a letter or group of letters taken from the original word. In a scholastic paper, abbreviations rarely used to stand in for major concepts or terms. Rather, they are usually shortened forms of commonly used but minor words, like Dr. for doctor. Most are common enough that a writer does not need to provide the reader with an extended definition. *Capitalization*: It is when the uppercase style adopted. The function of capitalization is to emphasize words or to show their importance. There are some rules for capitalization. First, writers capitalize the first word of a sentence, because it marks the beginning of a new idea and indicates its importance too. Furthermore, it applied with proper nouns and titles. *Hyphenation*: It is the splitting of words into smaller units. It used mainly to help the reader and to avoid ambiguity. The main aim of hyphenating a term is to prevent confusion on the part of the reader. However, some hyphenated words found in the dictionary, others simply formed by convention. Therefore, hyphenation is used chiefly to make the reader follow what has been written easily.

### 2.28.5 Types of Errors

Learners who do not yet have fully commands of language system typically produce errors. They arise due to the imperfect competence in the target language. Chomsky (1998), confirms that errors are inevitable and a fundamental stage of learning. They are noticeable verification that learning is occurring. In (1981), Corder clarifies that there is a distinction between a mistake and an error. He states that the mistake, which is a performance error due to arbitrary speculation or slip, and the error, which pertains characteristic in the learner's interlanguage, reveal the learner's system of operation while learning. There are two predominant sources of errors, namely, interlingual errors and intralingual errors (Brown, 2000). *Interlingual Error*: Interference, language transfer, and crosslinguistic interference are also known as interlingual errors. In 1981, Corder explains that these types of errors occur when the learner's habits; patterns, systems, or rules, interfere or prevent him or her, to some extent, from learning the structure and rules of the second language. Foreign language learners tend to transfer some of their native language rules to express their needs in the foreign language. Furthermore, Brown (2000) clarifies that the greatest learners' errors in the second language arise mainly from their assumption that the second language forms are similar to their native language. There are two kinds of language transfer, the positive and negative one. According to positive transfer happens when there is some likeness between the learner's native language and second language. However, negative transfer occurs when there are dissimilarities between the learner's first language and second language. *Intralingual Error*: Interference from the student's own language is not the only reason for making errors. Students may commit some errors in the target language, since they are not fully equipped with its rules. , Intralingual errors defined as the sophistication that the learner encounters when confronting patterns of a new language system, irrespective of how the target language patterns may appear

differently in relation to the learner's mother tongue. Therefore, they are not related to the first language transfer, yet they contributed by the target language itself.

### **2.28.6 Punctuations Change the Meaning**

It had deduced that punctuations serve as an important tool in writing and help the reader to understand the message easily. On the other hand, missing or overused them can change the meaning unintentionally and confuse the reader. Misplaced or insufficient punctuations create ambiguity as well. "Proper punctuation is both the sign and the cause of clear thinking "(Truss, 2003, p.202). Moreover, punctuations are vital to disambiguate the meaning of a sentence. Therefore, punctuations can make a big difference in the meaning of whatever the writing or the reading is. The writer should pay more attention not to use them randomly. In addition, the reader should learn for what reason they exist so he/she can use them appropriately.

### **2.29 Essential skills for Creative Writing**

Writing is a recursive process involving both cognitive and metacognitive skills (Larkin, 2009) and critical for academic and vocational achievement (e.g., Graham & Perin, 2007;). Ways to develop effective writing instruction from a young age are therefore of great interest. Teaching creative writing that is, encouraging students to write by drawing upon their imagination and other creative processes may support writing development in all its components. Creative writing often defined as the production of fictional narratives. (Non-documentary, non-academic). Alternatively, written representations (Nettle, 2009). Others define creative writing more broadly to include non-fiction (Root & Steinberg, 1999) or as a form of writing that is unusually original while operating under appropriate constraints of structure and language (Sharples, 1996). Creative writing is an open-ended design process that builds on creativity and is relevant to child is thinking skill development (e.g., Chen & Zhou, 2010). It can help children explore and understand the functions and value

of writing, contribute to improve their reading and writing skills (e.g., Essex, 1996; Shanahan, 2006; Shatil, Share, & Levin, 2000; Tompkins, 1982), and may help teaching them how to approach life in a creative way (Sternberg, Kaufman, & Kaufman, 2009). Furthermore, engaging the imagination during the process of learning through writing helps to ensure that facts (and other forms of knowledge) are enlivened and imbued with personal meaning through interpretive and constructive processes: the knowledge encoded through these processes will, in turn, serve as fuel for future imaginative thinking and learning (Newell, 2006; Runco, 2009). Young children are especially imaginative, yet educational learning environments can support or impede the development of children's imagination (Eckhoff & Urbach, 2008). The question is: What are the most important skills to consider when teaching young children creative writing? The study of creative writing within different disciplines has led to different perspectives and different instructional approaches, each emphasizing a different set of "key ingredients" (that is, essential skills) for optimal creative writing. Based on our related work (e.g., Tan et al., 2012), the goal of the research presented here is to study the convergence and divergence between these disciplines through the relative weights they attribute to the various skills involved in creative writing. We first (a) identify the domains of expertise that may provide useful perspectives on creative writing; and (b) highlight the skills that are thought to contribute to individual differences in creative writing.

### **2.30 Domains in Specific Perspectives on Creative Writing**

Creative writing constitutes a promising topic for interdisciplinary conversation (Doyle, 1998); it has been studied by various fields, providing complementary views in literary publications, psychological works on creativity, autobiographical essays by creative writers, linguistics research, and educational research, including the work from several sub-domains of education such as art education (Tan et al., 2012). While, psychological studies and portraits of writers often emphasize the

creative/cognitive processes and other individual factors that lead to successful writing, including creative writing. (e.g., Bereiter & Scardamalia, 1987; Flower & Hayes, 1981; McCutcheon, 2006; Torrance & Galbraith, 2006), writers themselves tend to focus on the broader themes, actions, and “inner forces” by which they live and write. (e.g., Bland, 2011; Olsen & Schaeffer, 2011; Pack & Parini, 1991; Perry, 2005, 2009;. While, linguists focus on the structural aspects of language that contributes to the development of writing (e.g., Tucha, Trumpp, & Lange, 2004). Educators are primarily concerned with writing instruction (rather than creative writing specifically), which varies a great deal among teachers (e.g., Graham, Harris, MacArthur, & Fink, 2002), but they generally value systematic skill instruction and information learning, and emphasize process over product. Finally, creative writing has become a somewhat unexpected focus in some art education programs (e.g., Danko-McGhee & Slutsky, 2007; Ehrenworth, 2003; Ernst, 1997; Mulcahey, 2009; Olsen, 1992; Olshansky, 1994), which build on skills such as observation and imagery as significant contributors to creative writing (Jampole, Konopak, Readence, & Moser, 1991; Long, Hiebert, Nules, & Lalik, 1985). For example, some museum education programs that capitalize on children’s visual literacy to improve creative writing outcomes have emerged internationally and yielded a new perspective on possible key factors that may contribute to the development of children’ creative writing skills. Examples of these programs at the Tate Britain and Tate Modern, respectively, London (Meecham, 2002); New Haven (Tan et al., 2012).

### **2.31 Skills for Creative Writing**

Among the numerous approaches to creative writing presented by each of the disciplines cited above, many skills thought to be involved in creative writing not always emphasized equally in the literature. In fact, creativity research in general now lists almost many components (skills, features, individual and

environmental factors) that may be involved in creativity (Treffinger, 2009). Yet, the “ingredients” of creative writing that are differentially underlined in each of the domains cited above belong thematically and conceptually to six broad categories of factors: (a) general knowledge and cognition, (b) creative cognition, (c) executive functioning, (d) motivation and other conative characteristics, (e) linguistic and literary, and (f) psychomotor. The latter may be especially relevant for young writers (and domains concerned with early stages of writing development) our focus here. However, the other categories deemed important across age, as often discussed in the literature on children, adults, and “expert” writers.

### **2.31.0 General knowledge and Cognition**

General knowledge and cognition factors are central to the development of writing skills. They include intelligence, particularly verbal intelligence (Berninger, Cartwright, Yates, Swanson, & Abbott, 1992; Coker, 2006). Working memory (e.g., Berninger et al., 1992; Coker, 2006; Harris, Graham, & Mason, 2006; Kellogg, 2008). Which, allows the recall of knowledge of a workable form; evidence-based on inferencing, the process of drawing logical conclusions. From factual details (e.g., Flower & Hayes, 1981); and knowledge, including topic knowledge (Stein, 1986) and knowledge on the writing process itself (e.g., Berninger et al., 1992; Kellogg, 2008;). Writers also demonstrate cognitive flexibility (Stein, 1986) and are able to integrate or synthesize what they know into a coherent composition (Flower & Hayes, 1981). As emphasized by art educators and writers themselves, observation, a cognitive skill that stimulates the use of mental imagery, is essential to descriptive writing (e.g., Berninger et al., 1992; Coker, 2006; Juel, 1988). Similarly, visualization is critical for representing nonverbal knowledge in written form and facilitating the recall or creation of mental images that may enhance written description (e.g., Berninger et al., 1992; Coker, 2006; Juel, 1988) and the originality of a piece of writing (Jampole et al., 1991; Long et al., 1985).

### **2.31.1 Creative Cognition**

Creative writing requires originality, or the ability to generate unique ideas (e.g., Ward, Smith, & Fink, 1999), and selective combination – the recombination of the elements of a problem to change its representation (e.g., Pretz, Naples, & Sternberg, 2003) to creatively solve problems related to the writing process, or to produce original story elements. Associative thinking brings together ideas that might not be typically associated with each other (as defined by Mednick, 1962) and can sometimes produce rare and valuable ideas. Finally, divergent thinking – the process of producing a broad range of ideas in response to a given stimulus – is a generative thinking skill often viewed as the cognitive essence of creativity (e.g., Guilford, 1967, 1977). These sub-level abilities, components of creative cognition, supported by a higher-order construct imagination. Imagination is a form of playful thinking that creates new patterns of meaning by drawing on previous experiences and combining them in unusual ways (Policastro & Gardner, 1999), forming the basis for creative cognition.

### **2.31.2 Motivational and Conative factors**

As often noted by creative writers themselves, intrinsic motivation appears to be one of the major conative dimensions involved in creative writing (Amabile, 1985; Coker, 2006; Kellogg, 2008). It reflects the personal desire to express one's knowledge or thoughts on a subject through compositional activity. Baer, McKool, and Schreiner (2009) suggest that under some conditions, extrinsic motivation is also useful in the writing process, to help students get through difficult writing assignments. For example, motivators such as school-related rewards may encourage students to commit effort to their writing, even if they do not initially show interest in the task (e.g., Coker, 2006). Correspondingly, Magnifico (2010) emphasized audience as an important external motivator for professional writers,

pointing out the evident role of a reward system for the creative process. Creative writing also requires intention, to monitor and direct actions (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2000; Hayes & Flower, 1980) or set goals that specify intended outcomes (Zimmerman & Risemberg, 1997), as well as perseverance, which enables individuals to weather adversity to accomplish their goals (Zimmerman & Kitsantas, 2002). As in other domains, creative work in writing involves risk taking and tolerance for ambiguity (e.g., Barron & Harrington, 1981; Golann, 1963; Sternberg & Lubart, 1995; Urban, Ambrose, Cohen, & Tannenbaum, 2003; Zenasni, Besancon, & Lubart, 2008), a personality trait that corresponds to the way in which an individual tends to perceive and deal with ambiguous situations or stimuli. These personality traits and other conative variables often described among eminent cases of creative individual, but they are also highly investigated in psychological studies of creativity in children, where generally viewed as enabling factors for the effective use of the cognitive factors involved in the creative process.

### **2.31.3 Executive function**

Executive functions, such as planning and organizing ideas, are central to the writing process (e.g., Graham & Harris, 2000). Without the ability to sequence ideas, students lose the structure of their narrative (Hayes & Flower, 1986). Writers also need concentration to focus for attention on managing the writing environment with constraints that may be inherent in the writing task (Graham & Harris, 2000).

### **2.31.4 Linguistic and Literacy factors**

Linguistic factors refer to the basic language skills that are involved in assembling words into meaningful sequences. Writing demands the translation of ideas. Thus involves a complex array of lower and higher level linguistic skills, such as the ability to build sentence structures and construct meaning using context, elaboration, generation of details. (Gardner, 1991). Description, the use of words to arouse



readers' visualization and imagination through imagery. (e.g., Sadoski, Kealy, Goetz, & Paivio, 1997); vocabulary, including metaphorical language, to achieve creative written expression. (Baker, Gersten, & Graham, 2003). Knowledge of the larger, organizing structures of language that support meaningful text, such as narrative framework (McKeough, Palmer, Jarvey & Bird, 2007), essentially the introduction of a problem, with setting, which includes a beginning, a middle and an end. Finally, reading comprehension, the receptive aspect of writing, is a basic linguistic skill highly related to the ability to write (e.g., Abbott & Berninger, 1993; Coker, 2006; Juel, 1988).

### **2.31.5 Psychomotor factors**

In addition to linguistic and literary skills, penmanship or handwriting is a lower level skill that may affect one's ability to write. Lack of mastery of low level transcription skills (i.e., spelling and handwriting) can impede writing development in novice and struggling writers because when these skills are not automatic, they demand attentional resources that otherwise would be devoted to higher level processes, such as planning and revising (Graham & Harris, 2000) or generating new ideas. Correspondingly, Juel (1988) indicated that mastery of spelling and handwriting contributes to writing development.

### **2.32 Present Study in Writing**

As reviewed above, there are numerous factors that concern with developing creative writing skills and writing abilities more generally – namely teachers, psychologists, writers, linguists and art educators – deem essential for creative writing. In this introduction and related reviews of the literature (e.g., Tan et al., 2012), emphasized that the areas of expertise bring attention to domain-related sets of skills, while often disregarding other skills that may be important for creative writing. This is consistent with Hoffman, Shadbolt, Burton, and Klein (1995), who note that “expertise” is not

a simple category: it is domain-specific and relies on automated thinking processes (Shanteau, 1992). The present study capitalizes on the different experts' knowledge according to the five domains above, to survey the relative weight given within on a set of factors contributing to creative writing. The main objective of this study was to elicit and interpret divergent experts' views on the importance of the various skills necessary for creative writing across relevant domains of expertise. (Hypothesizing that homogeneity of judgment observed within each domain). As a first step toward the integration of these, multiple domain-specific approaches into a unified perspective for the enhancement of writing instruction for young children.

### **2.33 Cohesive Devices in Written Discourse**

Discourse is essential in communicating thoughts and ideas. People around the world communicate their ideas through stretches of language. In order to understand any discourse, it must achieve cohesion. The cohesive devices based on the work of Halliday and Hasan (1976). It also aims to emphasize the necessity of using these devices by analyzing an English Language Assessment with a sample examination of a student's essay writing. The student's writing show clear evidence of cohesion and demonstrates the use of grammatical and lexical devices. It noticed that the most grammatical devices used are reference and conjunction. On the contrary, there is little evidence of using lexical devices. English considered the first language for the majority of the population in several countries and the second language for others. English is becoming the language of communication globally. Communication allows language users to interact with each other and in turn understand what others are trying to convey. In other words, language could understand differently depending on the situation and context the discourse occurs. Which includes verbal and nonverbal elements that are meaningful. An English native speaker can easily identify whether a set of sentences are unrelated or form a unified whole. The unity between these sentences achieved with cohesive devices.

## **2.33.0 Text and Texture**

In linguistics, any spoken or written discourse that forms a unified completely referred to as a text. A text is not a grammatical unit, but rather a semantic unit of language, i.e. a unit of meaning, not of form. Texture is what provides the text with unity and distinguishes it from a non-text. Therefore, the cohesive relation exists between units of a text.

### **2.33.1 Cohesion**

Cohesion is the semantic relation between one element and another in a text (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). A text is cohesive when the elements tied together and considered meaningful to the reader. Cohesion occurs when the interpretation of one item depends on the other, i.e. one item presupposes the other (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). For instance in the following text: Amy went to the party. She sat with Sara. The interpretation of the item *she* depends on the lexical item *Amy*. Therefore, the text is considered cohesive because we cannot understand the meaning of *she* unless *Amy* exists in the text. Cohesion is not only concerned with grammar, but also with vocabulary. Hence, it is divided into *grammatical* and *lexical* cohesion.

#### **2.33.1.0 Grammatical Cohesion**

Halliday and Hasan classify the categories of grammatical cohesion into four types: *reference*, *substitution*, *ellipsis*, and *conjunction*.

##### **2.33.1.1 Reference**

Reference identified as the situation in which one element cannot semantically interpreted unless it referred to another element in the text. Pronouns, articles, demonstratives, and comparatives used as referring devices to refer to items in linguistic or situational texts. Either reference may be *exophoric* or *endophoric*. Exophoric reference requires the reader to infer the interpreted referent by looking beyond the text in the immediate environment shared by the reader and writer. For

example in the sentence: That is a wonderful idea! To retrieve the meaning of *that*, the reader must look outside the situation. On the other hand, Endophoric reference lies within the text itself. It classified into two classes: *anaphoric* and *cataphoric*. “Anaphoric reference is where a word or phrase refers back to another word or phrase used earlier in the text” (p. 115). In the previous example: Amy went to the party. She sat with Sara. *She* refers back to *Amy*; therefore, *she* is an anaphoric reference. Cataphoric reference looks forward to another word or phrase mentioned later in the text. For instance in the following sentence, *he* is a cataphoric reference that looks forward to *Mike*. As soon as he arrived, Mike visited his parents.

### **2.33.1.2 Substitution**

Substitution occurs when an item replaced by another item in the text to avoid repetition. The difference between substitution and reference is that substitution lies in the relation between words, whereas reference between meanings. There are three types of substitution: *nominal*, *verbal*, and *clausal*. Nominal substitution is substituting a noun or a nominal group with another noun. Elements of this type are *one*, *ones*, and *same*. In the following example, *one* substitutes *car*. This car is old. I will buy a new one. Verbal substitution involves substituting a verb or a verbal group with another verb. The verb element used to replace items in this type is *do*. For example: I challenge you to win the game before I do! Here, *do* is the substitution for *win the game*. Clausal substitution is substituting clauses by *so* or *not*. This is illustrated by the following: A: Do you think the teacher is going to be absent tomorrow? B: No. I do not think so. In this example, *so* substitutes the clause *going to be absent*.

### **2.33.1.3 Ellipsis**

Ellipsis is the process of omitting an unnecessary item, which mentioned earlier in a text, and replacing it with nothing. It is similar to substitution because “Ellipsis is

simply substitution by zero” (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). Normally, it considered as an anaphoric relation because the omission takes place within a text. When ellipsis occurs, the item that omitted from the structure of the text can still understood. Alike substitution, ellipsis has three types: nominal, verbal, and clausal. In nominal ellipsis, the noun omitted. This exemplified by my brothers like sports. In fact, both [0] love football. [0: My brothers] In the second sentence, the nominal my brothers is omitted. Verbal ellipsis involves the omission of the verb. In the following example, the verb has been studying is left out in B. A: Have you been studying? B: Yes, I have[0]. [0: been studying] Clausal ellipsis occurs when the clause omitted. In the example mentioned below, the clause writing on the board excluded in B. A: Who is writing on the board? B: Alice is [0]. [0: writing on the board]

### **2.33.1.4 Conjunctions**

Conjunction words are linking devices between sentences or clauses in a text. Unlike the other grammatical devices, conjunctions express the ‘logical-semantic’ relation between sentences rather than between words and structures (Halliday & Hasan, 1976). In other words, they structure the text in a certain logical order that is meaningful to the reader or listener. Conjunctions divided into four types, namely *additive, adversative, causal, and temporal*. Additive conjunctions connect units that share semantic similarity. Examples of additive conjunctions are, *and, likewise, furthermore, in addition*, etc. Adversative conjunctions used to express contrasting results or opinions. This type of conjunction is expressed by words such as, *but in contrast, whereas*, etc. Causal conjunctions introduce results, reasons, or purposes. They are characterized by the use of items such as, *so, thus, therefore, because*, etc. Temporal conjunctions express the time order of events such as, *finally, then, soon, at the same time*, etc.

### **2.33.1.5 Lexical Cohesion**

Lexical cohesion involves the choice of vocabulary concerned with the relationship that exists between lexical items in a text such as words and phrases. Lexical cohesion includes two types, reiteration, collocation, synonyms and antonyms.

#### **2.33.1.5.0 Reiteration/Repetition**

Halliday and Hasan (1976) define reiteration as two items that share the same referent and could repeat or have similar meanings in a text. The forms of reiteration are *repetition*, *synonymy*, *antonymy*, and *superordination* (*hyponymy and meronymy*). Repetition is the restatement of the same lexical item. It is illustrated by the following: Anna ate the apple. The apple was fresh. Synonymy is used to refer to items of similar meaning just as, *attractive* and *beautiful*. Antonymy is the relation between items of opposite meanings such as, *hot* and *cold*. Hyponymy refers to items of ‘general-specific’ or ‘an example of’ relationship. For example, *vehicle* is the co-hyponym of *car*. Meronymy is a ‘whole-part’ relationship between items. For instance, *cover* and *page* are co-meronymy of the item *book*. In other words, *book* is the superordinate item of *cover* and *page*.

#### **2.33.1.5.1 Collocations**

Collocations are a part of communicative competence and defined as a group of words that “fit together” intuitively at syntagmatic and paradigmatic levels in many areas of linguistics, and lexicography. Linguists investigating collocations at the lexical level view collocations as the linear and syntagmatic co-occurrence of lexical items (Firth, 1957; Halliday, 1966, Sinclair, 1966). E.g. *putrid* and *rancid* are synonymous, but *putrid* collocates with *fish* and *rancid* with *butter*. Collocations at the syntactic level are argued as structural word phrases involving grammatical patterns syntactically restricted (Greenbaum, 1996; G Kjellmer, 1984; Mitchell, 1971;

Nation, 2001; Nesselhauf, 2005). Phrasal verbs like *make a mistake* cannot be replaced with *commit a mistake*. On the semantic level, collocations are language chunks with semantic restrictions to some degree, such as *Good morning* as a greeting, which cannot substitute *nice morning*.

### **2.33.1.5.2 Synonyms**

It is accepted that English has now become a lingua franca, a language used for international communication by people of different nations. It turns out that now English is so commonly used that native speakers are outnumbered by second or third language users (Harmer, 2007). Vocabulary is considered the most important element of English language learning, “without grammar very little can be conveyed, and without vocabulary nothing can be conveyed.” This implies that vocabulary is essential to communication. Without it, successful communication is impossible. However, to master English vocabulary usage is not easy because English vocabulary has a number of synonyms – words that have similar meanings. Synonymy is one of the difficulties learners always find in vocabulary learning (Laufer, 1990). The way synonyms can be distinguished is determined by dialects, styles or degrees of formality, connotations (Jackson & Amvela, 2000), and grammatical patterns (Phoocharoensil, 2010). Among countless words in sets of synonyms, three words – *appropriate*, *proper*, and *suitable* – appeal to our research interest. These words are listed in the most important 9000 words to learn and are in the top 3000 most frequent words (Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English, 2014). Moreover, from the researchers’ English teaching experience, questions regarding how to distinguish *appropriate*, *proper*, and *suitable* have often been raised during class. No concrete academic evidence is provided. For this reason, it would be worth studying these three synonyms systematically by using dictionaries and corpus data as the major data sources.

### **2.33.1.5.3 Antonyms**

To a greater degree than other paradigmatically related words, members of antonym pairs co-occur in discourse (e.g. Justeson and Katz, 1991, 1992; Fellbaum, 1995; Willners, 2001). Systematic co-occurrence has only recently begun, with Jones (2002) providing a number of functional categories of antonym co-occurrence (Jones, 2006) and English child speech and child-directed speech (Jones and Murphy, 2005; Murphy and Jones, 2008). However, there are reasons whether different cultures use antonyms. For instance, in Confucian philosophical systems, binary contrasts seem to be in an eternal cycle of reversal, (Chan, 1967), whereas in western traditions, the incompatibility between categories such as black and white is seen as permanent and irreconcilable. Even among European cultures, marked variations in approaches to conflict and difference, raising the question of whether such differences are reflected in the ways in which antonyms are used in the discourses of those cultures. Since antonyms represent extremes, the possibility exists that ‘*lagom* values’ encourage different trends in antonym use in Sweden as compared to Britain. We do this by replicating the methodology used in Jones (2002) in an investigation of a corpus of written Swedish. In the following section, we introduce the functional categories identified in Jones (2002) and subsequent works. In section, describes how Jones’ methodology is adjusted for application to Swedish. Section reports the overall trends in antonym function categorization and identifies the contrastive constructions that serve those functions in Swedish. Section looks more closely at particular sets of antonym pairs and how they affect the overall statistics. Section identifies the main differences between Swedish and English antonym use. Section discusses linguistic conventionalization and cultural values as possible sources of these differences. In the conclusion, we discuss the implications of our findings and identify several directions for further research.



## **Chapter Three**

### **Design and Methodology**

#### **3.0 Introduction**

The purpose of this chapter is to introduce the research methodology for this analytic study regarding what motivates students to know grammatical cohesion in writing essays in English Language and how to be professional in using the cohesion in writing essays. This approach is possible for a deeper understanding of students, experiences in working to learn a foreign language and to provide a way to develop their writing skills in order to be able to know what motivates them to understand the secrets of writing sound sentences in English language. The chapter also discussed in details the various stages of developing the methodology of the current study. This includes a detailed discussion of the fully background of the research method chosen to test the grammatical cohesion in students, writing. In addition to this, the chapter describes the data collection strategy including selection of research instrumentation and sampling. The chapter closes with a discussion on the analysis tools that used to analyze the data collected.

#### **3.1 Study Participants**

Fifty graduate and postgraduate students in English discipline chosen and did the both tests in different times. At University of Zalingei given two tests, pretest and posttest for aforementioned number of students. In addition twenty (20) PhD holders involved in giving information through teachers, questionnaire. The samples were drawn the population of different students who have studied in English field. learners skilled of English language and teachers, all participants were fluent in the English language speaking skill, to cope in writing using English grammatical Cohesion and coherence well regardless of their origin or have to be their native language they may be able to deal in responding such simple questions in this matter.

### **3.2 Sample of the Study**

The sample of the study are learners selected from the pool of 50 learners from University of Zalingei in addition to twenty University teachers. The learners are Sudanese who love learning English language in minimum way who have acquired some knowledge of eight to nine years. During the exposure of an experience in English language as an instruction at Primary, Secondary level and University or colleges in Sudan graduate and postgraduate learners who have received some sort of instruction in Secondary schools. In a prior knowledge up to their enrollment to the University and learned how to write a composition in English, and writing a composition is a compulsory skill was tested in Sudanese Secondary schools certificate examination, the English language exam includes a written section like (guided composition and/ or writing letters – formal and informal) in the BA programme. The learners whom have had enrolled in a work of doing a compulsory course on written English tasks. Learners have had the similar socio-economic status and the majority of their parents were farmers in the community, merchants, and some of them are Arabic teachers with a little percentage of other tribalism system or a clan among the different groups. While living together the number of students whom speak the English language are less than a quarter in the community plus twenty Ph.D. holders from the University especially the Faculty of Education English Department.

### **3.3 Methodology**

This analytic study is an appropriate way when the goal of research is to explain a phenomenon by relying on the perception of students, experience in a given situation when using grammatical cohesion and coherence in writing as outlined by the researcher and an analytic approach is an appropriate method when a researcher seeks to understand relationships between variables. Because the purpose of this

study is to examine the experiences and perceptions of graduate students, writing in English using grammatical cohesion and coherence so the analytic approach is appropriate option to use in the current research. In addition this study, illustrates the writer used descriptive qualitative research to give descriptions systematically to the facts of a certain population. Moreover, the descriptive qualitative research not generally directed toward hypothesis testing. The population in this research were students in University of Zalingei that consist of two classes; graduate 50 and 20 PhD holders with the total sample 70 respondents as the population. The researcher gave the descriptive paragraph with the blank transitional signals, conjunctions and prepositions for the students to complete and a questionnaire for teachers.

### **3.4 Role of the Researcher in Data Collection**

The researcher dealt with an educational field in teaching English language for more than ten years. Holder a Bachelor of English language, Master degree in linguistics. Moreover, worked in different levels primary, secondary and collaborating with University of Zalingei in Central Darfur State. No participant was related with a direct relationship with the researcher represented in the area of the interest, such as a reporting relationship, contract, or any relationship with the researcher that may have had imparted bias on the research study. The researcher trained well in the skills, which are necessary to carry out the designed study. The researcher should have gained multiple ways of knowledge from people with an intention to know the ways of writing creatively using coherence and cohesion ties in English language.

### **3.5 Materials**

Questionnaire for PhD holders conducted in the study. It consists of several English language grammatical cohesion ties writing items in English to check the language proficiency in teaching methods English cohesion and coherence in writing essays. In addition, teachers answered all points covering their viewpoints elicited the

information of background in grammatical cohesion ties in English Language teaching. Therefore, the both tests used to conduct the study (pretest and posttest) designed particularly with open questions for graduate students in University of Zalingei. Finally, information about the learners, writing experience for more details are available on the appendixes of the research.

**3.5.0 Pretest and posttest is results:** the researcher designed two tests each consist of different cohesion ties. Particularly the pretest formed of function, linking words and pronominal ties like articles and demonstrative pronouns. Through filling gaps, likewise the posttest is outlined with the same way filling the spaces using different types of cohesion like, additive, adversative, causal, continuative and temporal conjunctions to see that students comprehend the English essays arrangement of words using grammatical cohesion ties in writing or not.

**3.5.1 Questionnaire:** consists of one sections that contains grammatical cohesion in teaching English. Part one consists of three main parts indicating the following issues, evaluation of difficulties are in thirty lines explaining the importance of this issues for students on writing essays in English language using cohesion ties. The challenges of teaching grammatical cohesion in writing in the last point highlights the using of cohesion ties in writing to improve skills utilizing different ties. The second part is about the methods and procedure in fourteen items. Through these four following methods stylistics difficulties in four items, lexical items in four items, technical items in three issues and the last one is revising and affecting the practice on thirty items to evaluate the teaching methods for learning cohesion ties in English grammar.

**3.7 Procedure:** after the questionnaire and two tests designed and both these tools judged and verified by three University teachers. Then the permission letter issued to participants to collect the data.

### **3.8 Data Collection Techniques and Procedures**

As the research procedure, open-ended questionnaire was the first instrument that the researcher used to collect the data. In addition to pre and posttest for the students had finished answering the questions, the researcher conducted and addressed the all points to know the perspectives on teaching and writing challenges using grammatical cohesion for writing essays in English. The answers then transcribed for analysis. Several students' essays collected afterward as the supporting data to confirm the questions result. Moreover, this study used a pretest, posttest and questionnaire methods and these tools found in the appendixes where both the tests and the questionnaire questions were for the documentation use. Many captures used for research thoughts during and after each tool result. The tests resolved questions answered by students using cohesion and coherence including cohesion ties as well as linking words in English like substitution and references the questionnaire began with open-ended questions for the participants' initial interest in cohesion, coherence professionalism and their initial career interests in general. Finally, intensive questions were followed, with the intention to gather data with more depth on motivation the tests were concluded with more gaps filling questions, framed to invite more depth regarding the motivation of the participants to recognize different ties in Grammatical cohesion in English language. Questionnaire asked English teachers and Doctors from University of Zalingei to identify the items concerning cohesion words for linking sentence, then the tests dissolved to carryout students' answers and disclosed on an attachment found on the appendix. These tools mapped the priorities of the students, problems in using cohesion ties in writing. No test conducted without confirming the written and verbally informed on consent of the participants. Each participant's answer took place in a single way session and transcribed in a professional way.

### **3.9 Data Analysis**

In this study, the researcher classified sort of data findings for interpretation. The meaning-making action derived from events specifically, the researchers used qualitative data analysis proposed, explanation briefly. Analysis overview of data findings, condensation of the data overviewed, and summaries of the data, abridged. Details elaboration and comparison between the data findings and theories from experts as well as previous studies, interpretation to the data compared theories. Forming statement based on hermeneutic interpretation to the students' difficulties and needs in learning writing using grammatical cohesions. To analyse the open-ended questionnaire result, the researchers determined the themes to find the classification of students' difficulties of writing. Furthermore, the students' manuscript classified errors appeared. In the same way, the result of both tests analysed by identifying the challenges that the lecturer caught in teaching writing applying grammatical cohesion ties. Coding of transcripts were completed in the order of the results conducted, in batches of two tests at a time, allowed the researcher to reflect and edit the answers as ideas that emerged from the data. The perspectives of the participant's imagination, experiences created during the research process based on the data, configuration.

## Chapter Four

### Data Analysis Results and Discussion

#### 4.0 Introduction

This chapter is heading to analyze the data in tables to clarify the outcome according to the respondents, answers, in questionnaire, tests pre and post for students.

#### Discussion

##### 4.1 Table:1-How do you teach in each of the following procedures?

No	Item	Adverbs	Frequency	Percentage
1	Selecting appropriate materials of teaching	Always	18	90%
2	Students, prior knowledge of the topic	Usually	14	70%
3	Giving students oral feedback	Sometimes	14	70%
4	Class discussion to pinpoint the mistakes	Usually	16	80%
5	Encouraging group writing	Usually	18	90%
6	Assessing students, writing skills before starting the course	Sometimes	13	65%
7	Assessing students, written work during the course	Sometimes	19	95%
8	Marking students, written essays	Usually	18	90%
9	Writing comments on students, papers or notebooks	Always	16	80%
10	Asking students to assess their written essays	Always	13	65%
11	Correcting grammar mistakes	Usually	19	95%
12	Asking for more than one draft of an assignment	Always	17	85%
13	Allowing students to review each other's papers	Sometimes	11	55%
14	Integrate writing to emphasize the key writing features	Usually	15	75%

The above table shows the results of items from one to fourteen that 90% of the respondents chose the adverb (always). The selection of appropriate materials for students, writing essays. It states 70% of teachers agree (usually) to identify grammatical cohesion in writing through pinpointing students, prior knowledge of the topic. Moreover, 70% tick on an adverb (sometimes) confirms that giving feedback to students is a better way of training to learn writing using cohesively. In item four and five 80% and 90% of the respondents confirmed that discussing and encouraging group writing is very important to make students learn writing in team work activities. In addition the item six 65% of the respondents agree that assessing students, writing skills before starting the course is a nice way of making them to learn the spelling properly. Furthermore, in item seven and eight 95% to 90% of the respondents focused on assessing students, written work during the course, and marking students, written essays will help them to learn more easily. However, in item nine 80% of the teachers said that they write comments on students, papers or notebooks to correct mistakes. In addition, 65% said asking students to assess their written essays is possible to teach your students how to write. Finally, 95% depended on correcting grammar mistakes and 85% explained that asking for more than one draft of an assignment is one of the good ways to teach spelling. Thus, the few number of respondents 55% and 70% of them depended on allowing the students to review each other's papers to integrate writing to emphasize the key writing features in writing essays in English.

**4.2 Table:2-Stylistics difficulties: how difficult the following items in writing their essays in English language?**

No	Items	Adjectives	Frequency	Percentage
1	Writing in narrative style	Easy	18	90%
2	Writing in a descriptive style	Neither difficult or easy	16	80%
3	Writing in an argumentative style	Easy	13	65%
4	Writing in an expository style	Easy	19	95%



In table two 90% of the respondents made sure that it is easy to use writing in narrative style which helps the students to learn spelling. However, 80% of the teachers said that neither difficult nor easy to learn writing in a descriptive style nevertheless is one of the best ways in learning the spelling. Moreover, 65% of the respondents assured that it is easy to depend on writing in an argumentative style, which is a good for learning. Finally, 95% of the teachers explained that it is easy to depend on writing in an expository style because it is the way to depend on teaching the students to learn writing using cohesive device for learning cohesion ties.

**4.3 Table:** 3-Lexical difficulties: how difficult are the following items to students in writing the essays in English language with grammatical cohesion?

No	Items	Adjectives	Frequency	Percentage
1	Using the most appropriate vocabulary in writing	Easy	18	90%
2	Using word synonyms in writing	Neither difficult nor easy	14	70%
3	Using word antonyms in writing	Neither difficult nor easy	13	65%
4	Using idioms and word collocations in writing correctly	Very difficult	17	85%

In table three 90% of the respondents clarified that it is easy to use the most appropriate vocabulary it is a better way of teaching the students to learn writing selecting the best ways of cohesion. Moreover, 70% to 65% of them said that it is neither difficult nor easy to use synonyms, nor antonyms in writing it is fit for learning spelling and cohesion in grammar. Finally, 85% of them preferred the way of using idioms and collocations in writing cohesively is difficult for graduate students to understand idioms and collocations better.

**4.4 Table:** 4-Technical difficulties: how difficult are the following items to the students while writing essays in English?

No	Items	Adjectives	Frequency	Percentage
1	Writing grammatically correct sentences using good cohesion in sentences	Easy	13	65%
2	Applying the correct punctuation rules in writing essays with cohesion	Neither difficult nor easy	12	60%
3	Writing correctly spelled words to avoid committing grammatical mistakes	Neither difficult nor easy	15	75%

In table four 65% of the respondents verified that writing grammatically correct sentences using good cohesion is easy. Whereas, 60% of the teachers indicated that it is neither difficult nor easy to apply the correct punctuation rules in writing essays with cohesion. However, 75% of the respondents showed that it is neither difficult nor easy to depend on writing correct spelled words to avoid committing grammatical mistakes. Furthermore, applying the correct punctuation marks rules in writing essays with cohesion is not an easy way because the students will not become familiar with these small rules unless finding perfect teaching methods. In addition to, when students encounter problems of using punctuations is due to lack of practicing earlier in former stages. However, it needs to pick such ways as well as paying attention to English Language phonetics and phonology to know how words were read through transcription and how to put sentences according to their positions. To facilitate understanding students must apply English sounds rules, teachers also should be aware of every stage they teach their learners to make sure that spelling rules are applied in a suitable standard which suits the academic writing. Finally, reading over simple series of writing samples of best writers.

**4.5 Table:** 5-Revising and editing practices: How often do students do each of the following items in English?

No	Items	Adjectives	Frequency	Percentage
1	Revising the unity and cohesion of writing	Easy	17	85%
2	Revising the clarity of writing style	Neither difficult nor easy	16	80%
3	Revising the word choice of writing	Neither difficult nor easy	17	85%
4	Correcting grammatical mistakes in writing with cohesion	Neither difficult nor easy	17	85%
5	Spotting any punctuation errors and correcting them	Easy	16	80%
6	Correcting spelling mistakes	Very easy	20	100%

The last table, concerning the teachers, questionnaire in the first item of the table 85% of the respondents confirmed that the revising of the unity and cohesion of writing is easy to inform your students to learn writing using cohesion in a language. While 80% an 85% of the teachers explained that it is (neither difficult nor easy) to revise the clarity of writing style and revising. The word choice of writing, or correcting grammatical mistakes for writing with cohesively. Finally, 80% of the respondents agreed that it is easy to spot punctuation errors and correcting them immediately, but 100% of the teachers stated that correcting the spelling mistakes is the easiest way of learning writing in English language.

#### **4.6 Pretest for students**

In this section, the results of the tests explained in details according to the percentages given by the respondents below as following. However, the summary of the tables concerning the clarification of the data collection analyzed through

making notes around the complete method in each table. Finally, every test results analyzed according to answers of the respondents via these findings, which, confined and gathered in few blogs.

**4.7 Table: 1**

The students revised for their math's exams....., they wrote their history essay.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Besides	Although	
Frequency	27	23	50
Percentage	54%	46%	100%

In the table above answer sentence shows 54% of the respondents chose the conjunction (beside) as a suitable answer for the sentence. In addition, 46% of the students were not sure about this word was fit for the answer due to their lack of good visualization for the question itself and general conception of English grammar conjunction in writing during the learning process. Finally, the lack of the experience for practicing English language parts of the speech in Grammar and transitions signal words.

**4.8 Table: 2**

Ali always does his best .....help the people.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	In order to	So that	
Frequency	28	22	50
Percentage	58%	42%	100%

In this table, 58% of the respondents picked the exact answer of the expression above the table and 42% of the students were not able to guess the right answer. Therefore, in this case the students who were not true in pinpointing the right word to fill the gap, lack of practising the conjunctions meaning in English grammar. Finally, my

own view as a researcher sometimes students guess that easy parts of speech in grammar learned through their lifetime in different stages are the same in all levels.

**4.9 Table: 3**

-.....the thick fog, many cars were held up on the motorway.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Because of	Despite	
Frequency	26	24	50
Percentage	52%	48%	100%

In the table above, 52% of the respondents identified the conjunction word (because of) to complete the answer in the sentence as they guessed their selection to the word was an appropriate to fit the place, for instance there was no choice more than this. Therefore, many of the students were sure about the right answer, which fits the space. Therefore, the answer of this question is good relatively to the rest of the expressions. Finally, 48% of them were wrong.

**4.10 Table: 4**

The factory installed new devices,.....its emissions to the environment have dropped.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	As a result	Due to	
Frequency	17	33	50
Percentage	34%	66%	100%

This question is somehow questionable to the respondents because 34% of the students strongly enough were hesitant and unable to choose the most correct answer for the sentence. Finally, understanding the expressions was a bit complicated that is why many of them mixed up to know the route for a sentence smoothly as usual way of recognizing words.

**4.11 Table: 5**

Andy helps a lot at home,.....,his sister never tidies her room.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	On the contrary	As a result	
Frequency	14	36	50
Percentage	28%	72%	100%

According to 28% of the respondents for this table, it is the most difficult word for students to opt a right word for filling the gap, so only fourteen students were able to guess the meaning and use the correct conjunction to answer. Moreover, the respondents were not adapted to such conjunctions before in learning process in previous stages or had not exposed to such words before, in the above table the phrase; (on the contrary) it was a new word for them. Therefore, teachers supposed to expose many English grammar conjunctions with different types and uses for their students to improve their understanding in grammar.

**4.12 Table: 6**

You will not pass the exam.....you do your best			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Unless	Provide that	
Frequency	25	25	50
Percentage	50%	50%	100%

In this table, 50% of the respondents were aware of identifying the correct word to answer the question. Whereas, the same number failed to guess, the right answer due to the lack of their knowledge of conjunctions in English grammar. Therefore, teachers need to focus on restricted procedures to remedy such problems immediately.

**4.13 Table: 7**

Mary bought that black dress.....being too expensive for her.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	In spite of	Because of	
Frequency	23	27	50
Percentage	46%	54%	100%

In this question, 46% of the students were able to come up with the right word for filling the above gap owing to their awareness of grammatical words in English, but 54% of them confused to hold a suitable conjunction that fits the blank area due to their lack of their knowledge to English grammar functional words. Therefore, we as teachers need to make more efforts to make sure that our students understand the nature of such words and their use for creating correct sentences.

**4.14 Table: 8**

The new managing director runs the company quite efficiently.....,he is really nice to the employees.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Besides	On the contrary	
Frequency	18	32	50
Percentage	36%	64%	100%

In this table, only the 36% of the respondents were able to identify the correct answer, briefly it means that many students are unaware of conjunction words in English grammar. Whereas, 64% of the respondents were not able to pinpoint the right answer. Therefore, it is possible for English teachers to sacrifice their time to make their students fully aware of using conjunctions in writing and even speaking is one of things that students hesitated to specify the correct conjunction in filling gaps during their exams or tests.

**4.15 Table: 9**

My car had a puncture,.....i was late for the meeting yesterday			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	So	Because	
Frequency	24	26	50
Percentage	48%	52%	100%

The table above shows that 48% from the whole number of fifty respondents were able to demonstrate the right linking word for joining two clauses easily. Whereas more than a total number was unable to guess the word to fill the gap. Therefore, the lack of identifying the exact answer is a real obstacle that needs to be observed in the process of learning linking words in English grammar and to teach students how to recognize such forms in writing and speaking.

**4.16 Table: 10**

You would better wear warm clothes.....it gets colder tonight.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	In case	In case to	
Frequency	19	31	50
Percentage	38%	62%	100%

This result explains 38% of the students were capable to select the suitable answer. According to, their previous knowledge in English language to differentiate between the content and function words. While the biggest rest of the respondents were unaware to cope when joining sentences or clauses using grammatical cohesion. Therefore, the understanding of linking words in some areas. It is bit strange way of using functional words without guessing their meanings to recognize the right forms in learning process. Therefore, the students are in need to practise more.



**4.17 Table: 11**

-.....the company made a profit, the workers weren't given a pay rise.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Even though	Moreover	
Frequency	27	23	50
Percentage	54%	46%	100%

The table above shows 54% of the respondents were capable to cope with the right answer due to previous knowledge and 46% of the students chose the wrong word to answer the question, but good number of them were able to circle the best answer dealing with this simple point. Honestly, teachers must work very hard to solve this problem immediately. Finally, teachers should focus on creating a serious teaching work programme to implement the development for students to improve their knowledge of understanding grammar skills.

**4.18 Table: 12**

Peter complained.....the soup tasted awful.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Because	Because of	
Frequency	29	21	50
Percentage	58%	42%	100%

In this table, the answer by respondents to demonstrate the answer shows the 58% of informants chose the conjunction word (because) as the right selection for the space to fit both clauses. In the other hand, 42% of the respondents, background about was weak. Thus, teachers must review the English language-learning problem in Sudan especially in primary, secondary level and Universities to make sure that students are well equipped before their admission to colleges or graduation.

**4.19 Table: 13**

-.....the storm, most domestic flights were delayed.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Owing to	Despite of	
Frequency	23	27	50
Percentage	46%	54%	100%

The model 4.19 looks very strange to explain the weakest answer selected by only twenty-three students out of 50, which presents 46% of respondents, specified the right answer for the gap. Briefly, the result shows that the students even do not know some of the conjunctions at all to deal with them. Therefore, we must pay attention to solve this problem by informing the teachers immediately to guide strongly.

**4.20 Table: 14**

Miles doesn't earn a lot....., he goes on holiday every year.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Nevertheless	As a result	
Frequency	20	30	50
Percentage	40%	60%	100%

Here the 40% of the respondents selected the linking word (nevertheless) as the correct answer that fits the gap between two clauses. Whereas the 60% of the respondents failed to select a right answer for this simple case. Apparently, the weakness of Sudanese English students is not only from syllabus but it is general inherited problem of Sudanese students, declination in grammar. Therefore, government must be serious to pay good salaries for teachers to get rid of good teachers, migration. Finally, authorities must rethink about this issue seriously to keep the right track for teachers, payment.

**4.21 Table: 15**

John likes flying.....his wife hates it.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Whereas	Since	
Frequency	32	18	50
Percentage	64%	36%	100%

The table above expounds the result of question fifteen 64% of the respondents from major group of fifty students that were right and 36% were capable to guess the wrong meaning of linking word that completes the idea acting the point. However, students were good to decode the meaning of connection words in this point. Therefore, observing the process of acquiring and learning English especially the roots of the top areas in a language it will enhance students writing essays.

**4.22 Table: 16**

Why don't you phone James?.....he is free tonight.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	In case	In spite of	
Frequency	22	28	50
Percentage	44%	56%	100%

The diagram 4.22 shows the outcome of two sentence connected by a conjunction (in case). It is clear that the respondents were unknowledgeable about the answer, because only the few number of them were able to put the word, which places the gap. Generally, 44% of the students have answered the question fully, but most of them failed to visualize the right linking word to overcome the problem. Finally, the lack of students, awareness to linking words in English grammar made them to confuse the answers.

**4.23 Table: 17**

You would better get changes..... to be late for the party.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	So as not to	So that	
Frequency	29	21	50
Percentage	58%	42%	100%

The table above illustrates that the 58% of the respondents were eligible to convey the idea of dealing with conjunctions in grammar the respondents identified the connection word (so as not to) to complete the expression easily. Whereas, 42% of them were unaware of the right answer to finish the outcome. The weakness is clear through seeing this result it does not suit the graduate students, position. Therefore, they are still holding a big problem in recognizing linking words in grammar.

**4.24 Table: 18**

-.....complaining about the faulty mixer, we did not get a refund.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Despite	Although	
Frequency	16	34	50
Percentage	32%	68%	100%

Table 4.24 above elucidates that only 32% of the respondents were conversant with the exact word to fill the space in brief there were only few students from fifty students who answered the question eighteen on the test. While others acting 68% were not able to come up with it according to their unknown reason to treat the process. This the only question among those was vague for respondents to guess. Therefore, teachers must take it as a serious matter in teaching grammar parts from very early levels to avoid this dilemma. It means the government plays a weak role to facilitate the learning process in educational institutions.

**4.25 Table: 19**

Everybody got shocked .....the bomb explosion.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Due to	In spite of	
Frequency	18	32	50
Percentage	36%	64%	100%

The table above expounds the result of question nineteen 18 respondents from major group of fifty, that exposes 36% of the students were able to guess the exact linking word that completes the idea. While, 64% were not able to decode the meaning of connection words in this point. Therefore, teachers must observe the process of acquiring and learning English language where they see that students may commit mistakes in writing essays.

**4.26 Table: 20**

The bomb exploded.....,nobody was killed			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	However	Since	
Frequency	28	22	50
Percentage	56%	44%	100%

Table 4.26 above explains the percentage of the question twenty on the pretest that shows the 56% of the students were able to choose the suitable answer for this question to complete the idea. Whereas the biggest rest of 44%, the respondents were not able to choose the right answer in the sentence. It apparently indicates that more students were unaware of the linking word. Thus, teachers are asked to follow the sound steps to decide how to change their students, mind that English is not difficult it as is well as any other language. Therefore, should not be afraid of committing mistakes they must try hard to cope with this language.

**4.27 Table: 21**

Ahmed is such a talented boy. He can speak four languages ....., he plays the piano beautifully.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Moreover	However	
Frequency	20	30	50
Percentage	40%	60%	100%

Table 4.27 above shows the outcome of the question 21 in 40% as the total degree of 50 respondents, made efforts for the answer, it is obvious that the students were incapable to guess the process of the right track to complete the idea. Moreover, less than wanted number did not know the answer. Therefore, teachers wanted to make more efforts to facilitate the comprehension of functional words in English grammar. Therefore, function words can sometimes be understood contextually.

**4.28 Table: 22**

You will not be promoted .....you work harder.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Unless	Because	
Frequency	18	32	50
Percentage	36%	64%	100%

The table explains the result that 36% of the respondents were able to select the right answer for the question. In this table, it seems that the students were exactly unaware of the answer because many of them have selected the incorrect number to fix the gap. In addition to their lack of knowledge to this conjunction. The graduate and postgraduate students knew some linking words and their use well in grammar. However, are bad in some areas. Finally, we need to make efforts to overcome many problematic areas in grammar depending intensive reading, writing and speaking.

**4.29 Table: 23**

I could not send you a message.....i did not have your e-mail address.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	So that	Despite	
Frequency	25	25	50
Percentage	50%	50%	100%

Table 4.29 carries out the outcome of the question 23 and shows that 50% of the respondents were good to guess the true word to fit the answer by replacing the conjunction (so that) to complete the space linking. In addition to the students ability of understanding the word. Obviously, half of this result is better than the previous table above and it gives a sense that the respondents were clear in guessing to complete the idea. Therefore fifty, fifty is anyhow good.

**4.30 Table: 24**

Peter is always on a diet....., his sister can eat whatever she likes without putting on weight.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	On the contrary	Because of	
Frequency	16	34	50
Percentage	32%	68%	100%

In table, 4.30 the answer of the respondents was a bit confused because 32% of them from the aggregate number of 50 respondents only sixteen were able give a right answer to fill the gap. Moreover, some linking words in English seem to be vague for learners to guess their meaning in grammar. Therefore, it is possible for students to make more efforts to improve the understanding of English linking words. To save the learners teachers must try hard to discover what causes students retarding in learning foreign languages. Unless reviewing the syllabus or training the teachers to enhance all levels in the country students will lead to a big failure the future.

**4.31 Table: 25**

Most people go jogging.....keep fit.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	So as to	So that	
Frequency	33	17	50
Percentage	66%	34%	100%

This table tells the 66% of the respondents were able to take the right path to link the pieces of two sentences through selecting the right word for giving their share to solve the problem in connecting sentences using the grammatical words in filling gaps. However, the problem is only the few students were unknowledgeable for what they were giving to answer the question. Therefore, teacher need to make sure that all parts of speech in grammar that, taught to their students in early stages of learning English language transitional signals for writing.

**4.32 Table 26**

Adam has to make an appointment with Dr.Ali.....he has a bad cold.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	As	However	
Frequency	35	15	50
Percentage	70%	30%	100%

The table explains 70% of the answers. It is clear from the identification of the conjunction word that this word was not difficult to many of the respondents to give the correct word. Therefore, a recommendation for English teachers to regard the issue seriously for overcoming learners, problem is easy. By comparing the table above with other tables, it seems that some function words in English are familiar than others to the respondents to guess the meaning. The respondents did well in this table according to the percentage.



**4.33 Table: 27**

My sister paints really well.....his sister prefers reading.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	While	Because	
Frequency	23	27	50
Percentage	46%	54%	100%

The above table is a bit complicated than the previous one because, it elucidates that the 46% of the respondents were able to choose the true answer to fulfill the work smoothly without hesitation. However, the respondents did not know some conjunctions better than other conjunctions in English grammar according their little knowledge. Finally, many students just repeat the conjunctions in writing that is why they grow having complications of understanding English grammar words.

**4.34 Table: 28**

-.....Ali promised to phone us, he forgot.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Although	Since	
Frequency	24	26	50
Percentage	48%	52%	100%

The table shows the lowest statistics of the respondents, to the question 28 the majority of the students were not eligible to cope with a right answer to complete the idea of the sentence. In addition, their misunderstanding to linking word, that fits the gap. It does not mean the students have good qualifications in dealing with grammar words but sometimes they just repeat the only word that they know better without judging the rule. As a result, the respondents, answers in the above table show something unbelievable the students were unaware of the right answer because majority of them were unable to comprehend.

**4.35 Table: 29**

The interview to the candidate was a failure.....the interviewer interrupted him all the time.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Because	Because of	
Frequency	39	11	50
Percentage	78%	22%	100%

Table 4.35 clarifies the response of the respondents which shows 78% of the whole sample examiners of pretest in the research indicates that most of the students were capable to fill the gap with a suitable word where fits the place to solve the problem. Moreover, they knew the word well through their experience in learning English it goes back to their prior background for some conjunctions. Therefore, the students did a very great job in answering this question.

**4.36 Table: 30**

-.....Ali is young, he is wise.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Linking word	Although	Because of	
Frequency	37	13	50
Percentage	74%	26%	100%

The diagram shows 74% of the respondents dealt with special techniques to come up with the right answer to the last question of pretest of the research. Moreover, it seems that the students practice for learning a language facilitated the way to improve the knowledge in some areas of the language. Therefore, students need to pay more attention how to identify, obstacles in learning process. The last table of looks logical because only 26% of the respondents failed to cope with in this question, but through organizing several sessions of sensitization will help to solve the problem properly in universities, colleges and educational institutes.

### 4.37 Post test for students

**4.37 Table: 31**

John is a successful man. He works .....Wall Street			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	In	On	
Frequency	36	14	50
percentage	72%	28%	100%

The table expounds the result of the posttest regarding prepositions, comprehension here it is clear that the respondents know more about prepositions because the range of 72% is very high acts a good understanding of prepositions. Moreover, some prepositions are easy for learners to guess their meaning. Many prepositions are clear for students since the first stages of learning but some are difficult.

**4.38 Table: 32**

University convocations take place _____ May and _____ October.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	In	At	
Frequency	27	23	50
Percentage	54%	46%	100%

Table 4.38 elucidates the result of bifacial idea of 54% to 46%, in brief it means that 46% of the respondents were wrong in their answers because they have confused between the prepositions use, and how to use (in or at) and how that is the dilemma. Therefore, teachers need to inform their students that prepositions have specific nouns and verbs to go with some of the respondents hesitated which one to pick for the exact answer, which, fits, and precisely to be suitable. Therefore, their answer to the question was somehow hesitant to confirm this matter.

**4.39 Table: 33**

I missed the ending of the movie because my DVD player broke _____ the last scene.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	During	Under	
Frequency	23	27	50
Percentage	46%	54%	100%

The table above explains the degree of the respondents in question three of filling the gap so 46% of the students were aware of the answer. Whereas, most of the students were not capable to find the right answer. Therefore, some function words in grammar are not familiar to English learners for non-native speakers to guess the meaning easily. It was a bit confusion for students to imagine the right word. Because 54% of the respondents failed to answer the question.

**4.40 Table: 34**

I drink a lot of coffee because there is a coffee seller _____ from my house.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Across	In front of	
Frequency	24	26	50
Percentage	48%	52%	100%

The diagram above shows very little number of the respondents who were able to come up with a right answer that fits the blank space. Moreover, it means that the students were unaware with many types of prepositions in English language. Therefore, educational institutions must change planning to see appropriate strategies for improving the students, future in the processing of learning a foreign language. Finally, by good teaching to our children will help them to have a nice education.

**4.41 Table: 35**

I like all types of vegetables _____ green beans.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Except	For	
Frequency	34	16	50
Percentage	68%	32%	100%

The above table is a little bit clear to the respondents. Therefore, the majority of them acted a good result of 68% the answer fits well due to previous knowledge of conjunctions for joining sentences and phrases. However, the ambiguity is in 32% of the respondents failed to think about true word to put in the space. At last, the teachers must inform the ministry of education that graduate students should be equipped before going the highest levels in learning English language.

**4.42 Table: 36**

Classes were cancelled yesterday _____ the weather.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Because of	Out of	
Frequency	33	17	50
Percentage	66%	34%	100%

The table 4.42 expounds the aggregate degree of the question six and it shows that 66% of the students were capable to find a suitable answer. As that fits to be the choice of this conjunction in this place. Therefore, the choice was good according to their selection to that connection words in English language. However, the second answer looks a bit swerved and unsuitable to befit joining the both clauses in this question according to grammar rules. Finally, what helps students to improve the language is practicing all areas in the second language.

**4.43 Table: 37**

Have you ever been to Sudan? It is _____ the North of Africa.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	In	Inside	
Frequency	28	22	50
Percentage	56%	44%	100%

The answer of this question clarifies the result is better too like the previous table above it because 54% of the respondents were right in their answer. In addition to their familiarity to some of the conjunction words in English grammar. Therefore, teachers should be serious to make a right decision to remedy such problems of using prepositions in English grammar by teaching all types of prepositions and their use. Finally, graduate students are good at experiencing some preposition better.

**4.44 Table: 38**

It is very hard to take a math exam _____ a calculator.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Without	within	
Frequency	37	13	50
Percentage	74%	26%	100%

The table shows better answer than above one because 74% of the students were qualified to come up with the right answer and a little number fail to guess the word meaning which shows 26% only. Therefore, this is the best answer to this question according to the visualization of the respondents. Furthermore, students need to apply all transitional signals and function words to be familiar. Finally, when they practise applying different parts of the speech in grammar then they will be capable to understand all what happens in English grammar rules.

**4.45 Table: 39**

Adam will be up all night. He has to keep writing _____ his essay is finished.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Until	To	
Frequency	27	23	50
Percentage	54%	46%	100%

Here the answer shows that there is a complete ambiguity in solving the problem. As only 54% of the respondents were able to guess the right choice that fits the space. In addition, the respondents were unaware of selecting a suitable connection to fit the space. Therefore, some prepositions are very difficult in their use for many learners. Finally, it is incredible situation that creates the amazement for teachers to guess why some words in English grammar are difficult to be used by students.

**4.46 Table: 40**

We are meeting _____ 3:00 _____ Baladia Street.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	At/in	For	
Frequency	26	24	50
Percentage	52%	48%	100%

The table explains the two different answers for each preposition word as known in natural formation of expressions using (at and in) sometimes makes English learners to confuse between them, it is clear that people always use (at) before time expressions and (in/on) for places in general. The respondents used (at) before time expression this is true. Whereas, others used (on) before a place as they guessed the true answer may be. So, 52% of them are extremely right but also 48% are actually right in their choice to (on) before the noun.

**4.47 Table: 41**

She has trouble sleeping because the man in the apartment _____ her plays the drums.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Above	In	
Frequency	29	21	50
Percentage	58%	42%	100%

This table is quite good; it looks strange for students to judge the right answer to fix the sentence truly as normal. Therefore, 58% of the respondents were able to choose the suitable word to fill the space. The answer is clear even if the novice learners may guess it. Moreover, this point was not difficult for them to think about it. Finally, 42% of the students were out of the area to put sound word from the above sentence to complete the expression.

**4.48 Table: 42**

We wanted to be outside, so we went for a walk in the park _____ the cold.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Despite	Over	
Frequency	23	27	50
Percentage	46%	54%	100%

The table above shows the 46% of the students came up with right preposition to complete the idea and 54% of the respondents were totally, failed to choose the right word to place the space. In addition, students were hesitant to indicate the right point. Therefore, teachers wanted to decide either enhancing their teaching methods to make students cope differentiating the parts of the speech in grammar or try to search for an appropriate way to solve this problem. Finally, adapting the ways of direct methods of teaching is better than others are.



**4.49 Table: 43**

Fatima was late when she reached the meeting. It was further _____ of town than she expected.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Out	Out	
Frequency	28	22	50
Percentage	56%	44%	100%

The table shows a few number of the students were able to tick on the fit adverb to finish the expression due to their lack of experience in using adverb of place. However, 56% from the whole respondents are few to consider the exact satisfied number to know English adverbs. Therefore, 44% of them failed to choose a fit word. Finally, teachers must observe English learners, during the classes and give a lot of homework to make sure that learners learn and master their knowledge.

**4.50 Table: 44**

We decided to spend Saturday night at home with a movie _____ of going out.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	Instead of	From	
Frequency	37	13	50
Percentage	74%	26%	100%

In the above table, the percentage 74% acts the aggregate degree for a blank space in question fourteen of the posttest to graduate and postgraduate students in English department, the respondents, capability to answer this question was a good way to answer such question. Therefore 26% of them were unaware of the answer any way it is better number of them solved the problem. It looks easy but the students did not focus well to understand the meaning of each preposition to tick on the right word to complete the idea.

**4.51 Table: 45**

You cannot see him in the picture because somebody is standing _____ him.			
Answer	Correct	Incorrect	Total
Preposition	In front of	Over	
Frequency	42	8	50
Percentage	84%	16%	100%

The last table of the posttest for students clarifies that the best answer for the question fifteen, it means that the respondents were fully aware of choosing this preposition to complete idea of replacing a suitable word into a right position as needed. Moreover, the respondents seem to know the use of this preposition well because many of them were capable to guess the correct answer. Therefore, some function words in English grammar are complicated for English learners to deal with when writing or even speaking especially for non-natives because, it became problematic area, which impedes them to be professionals in using the language categories, but some are very easy to learn in general. Finally, the tests pre and post were suitable tools to test Sudanese graduate students to pinpoint the most important question that raises worries of foreign language learning. Why non-native English learners encounter obstacles of acquiring the foreign languages.

## **Chapter Five**

### **Suggestions and Recommendations**

#### **5.0 Introduction**

This chapter includes findings, suggestions, recommendations, and the conclusion in graduate students, writing and the respondents, answers analysis.

#### **5.1 Findings**

At the end, the researcher found the following findings. Questionnaire, pretest and posttest result.

1-Teachers, answers in all items in the questionnaire are clear generally they use the same and methods to teach their students. Moreover, applying the aforementioned teaching items will facilitate for students to know an English grammar. Finally, teachers have no problem in teaching, giving assignments to learners and informing for vocabulary in English during the classes. Finally, the point is good teachers, bad students, no progress to develop skills.

2- The results revealed that most of the students have problems that made them to misunderstand the linking words, forms while filling the both tests, gaps in pre and posttest for students. Therefore, they fail to identify the right answers in connecting the sentences or two clauses to fit the right place that satisfies the matter.

3- In some cases, the researcher found that many sentences of the test answers were wrong the majority of the students' classification with many mistakes in simple areas using conjunctions or connection words to fill the gaps of the both test.

4- Some questions were very clear to respondents so they did not face any problem to categorize and diagnose the functional words or identifying the word given due to their previous knowledge of grammar.

5- The misunderstanding of functional words, form in English writing essays proves that the misperception discussed in the theoretical part showed in details and patterns. Finally, the students, inability of breaking down the meaning of sentences.

6- In many cases, the students, unawareness to trace the right track of function and content words in English.

## **5.2 Recommendations**

According to findings and suggestions, the following recommendations for the importance of learning function or linking words in English language. Furthermore, to know how to form sound sentences using such words in English language.

1- There should be a support for non-native speakers of English language learners in applying accurate ways of learning English four skills to master the most important areas in it earlier as well as spelling, parts of speech in grammar typically functional words and their meanings.

2- In schools before students, admission to Universities there must be qualified teachers in all levels whom will strengthen the learners to familiarize the aspects of English language words system in writing essays and motivate students to learn the language main areas.

3-Students should apply the first skill of an English language to accustom using the words natural speech and writing through native speakers directly. Therefore, enhancement of knowledge to apply different parts of grammar is required.

## **5.3 Suggestions**

According to the research findings, the following suggestions for further studies in this field to facilitate the ways for non-native speakers of English language in process of learning, teaching and writing essays using grammatical cohesion with functional words.

1- Educational institutions should be responsible of implementing best programmes of teaching. Because in non-native English countries to encourage students of the non-native speakers in learning literature, short stories and forms of linking words in grammar to perceive writing essays. Therefore, using connection words that join sentences or clauses to accustom the native speakers, way of learning in the early stages.

2-It is better for an English teachers to avert code-switching during the class when explaining to students in order not interrupt the learners, minds from bi thinking to acquire a second language. Therefore, translating the meaning of some words in English we often find function or linking words in English have several meanings it is difficult to guess when writing essays in English language.

3- An English teachers should have good training to cope all aspects of a foreign language in teaching classes. Therefore, teaching needs good qualifications of conveying messages.

## **5.4 Conclusion**

A research dealt with the testing abilities of functional and content words concerning the neat writing of essays through the perception using grammatical cohesion. Testing grammatical functional words in natural way when connecting two clauses or sentences to explore the awareness of graduate students in writing essays. The significance behind the use of these words in writing process to make the students gain proper ways of learning English. In addition, the competence of knowing principles of using linking words. Also to enable the students to cope with such forms in writing paragraphs in English.

The results showed that the many students encountered difficulties in some areas to recognize function words due to lack of practising the language forms in appropriate way for learning and in some areas they have awareness and knowledge of linking words forms, use and meaning. The outcome also revealed that being aware is very

important for teachers in helping their students to cope with linking words in cohesive writing. However, other factors such as training, familiarity etc. It is the fact that writing comprehension as a language skill, as opposed to other language skills, has received very little attention for non-native learners. The fact that these skills are the most noticeable from the students' performance in the classroom has given them a kind of priority in both teaching and assessment. Whereas, among other reasons that imbedded nature of writing using grammatical cohesion has greatly contributed to its ignorance in language teaching in Sudan. Consequently, foreign language learners whose writing skills not adequately developed, undoubtedly, face difficulties in understanding some parts of the speech in grammar. This ignorance is also the result of wrong concepts about writing, especially the one that considers writing as a passive skill. They need to challenge such view is extremely important if communicative ways in language teaching are applied neat writing principles. Focusing on writing comprehension process, makes the students' to decode the forms of functional words in sentences through natural writing in English depending on the meaning of the linking word. Finally, the precise, piece of this research has been devoted to gain a thorough understanding an actual effects of students, awareness in the importance of learning writing, types of function words and their effect that make the students to perceive such words in writing using grammatical cohesion.

## Appendix

### Teaching grammatical cohesion in English language

How do you teach in each of the following procedures?

No	Items	Always	usually	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
1	Selecting appropriate materials of teaching					
2	Students, prior knowledge of the topic					
3	Giving students oral feedback					
4	Class discussion to pinpoint the mistakes					
5	Encouraging group writing					
6	Assessing students, writing skills before starting the course					
7	Assessing students, written work during the course					
8	Marking students, written essays					
9	Writing comments on students, papers or notebooks					
10	Asking students to assess their written essays					
11	Correcting grammar mistakes					
12	Asking for more than one draft of an assignments					
13	Allowing students to review each other is papers					
14	Integrate writing to emphasize the key writing features					

**Stylistic difficulties:** How difficult the following items to students in writing their essays in English language?

No	Items	Very easy	Easy	Neither difficult nor easy	difficult	Very difficult
1	Writing in a narrative style					
2	Writing in a descriptive style					
3	Writing in an argumentative style					
4	Writing in an expository style					

**Lexical difficulties:** How difficult are the following items to students in writing their essays in English with grammatical cohesions?

No	Items	Very easy	Easy	Neither difficult nor easy	difficult	Very difficult
1	Using the most appropriate vocabulary in writing					
2	Using word synonyms in writing					
3	Using word antonyms in writing					
4	Using idioms and word collocations in writing correctly					

**Technical difficulties:** How difficult are the following to students while writing their essays in English?

No	Items	Very easy	Easy	Neither difficult nor easy	difficult	Very difficult
1	Writing grammatically correct sentences using good cohesion in sentences					
2	Applying the correct punctuation rules in writing essays with cohesion					
3	Writing correctly spelled words to avoid committing grammatical mistakes					

**Revising and editing practices:** How often do students do each of the following items in English?

No	Items	Very easy	Easy	Neither difficult nor easy	difficult	Very difficult
1	Revising the unity and cohesion of writing					
2	Revising the clarity of writing style					
3	Revising the word choice of writing					



4	Correcting grammatical mistakes in writing with cohesion					
5	Spotting any punctuation errors and correcting them					
6	Correcting spelling mistakes after writing					

### Pretest

Choose the correct linking word to fill the gaps or a circle (a,b,c or d)

- The students revised for their math's exams....., they wrote their history essay.  
A-However B-Besides C-Although D-Yet
- Ali always does his best .....help the people  
A-So that B-In order to C- As for D-So
- .....the thick fog, lots of cars were held up on the motorway.  
A-Since B-Because of C- But D-Despite
- The factory installed new devices,.....its emissions to the environment have dropped.  
A-Due to B-Since C-As a result D- In addition
- Andy helps a lot at home,.....,his sister never tidies her room.  
A-When B-On the contrary C-As a result D-Since
- You will not pass the exam.....you do your best  
A-Unless B-If C-As long as D-provided that.
- Mary bought that black dress.....being too expensive for her  
A-Despite of B- in spite C- in spite of D-because of
- The new managing director runs the company quite efficiently.....,he is really nice to the employees.  
A-Besides B-on the contrary C-so D-As well as
- My car had a puncture,.....i was late for the meeting yesterday  
A-Whereas B-so C-Because D- As
- You would better wear warm clothes.....it gets colder tonight.  
A-In order to B-In case of C- In case D-in case to
- .....the company made a profit, the workers weren't given a pay rise.  
A-However B-Also C-Even though D-moreover
- Peter complained.....the soup tasted awful  
A-Due to B- Because C-Because of D- But
- .....the storm, most domestic flights were delayed.

- A-Because      B-Owing to      D-Although      D-Despite of
14. Miles doesn't earn a lot....., he goes on holiday every year.  
A-Although      B-Nevertheless      C-While      D- As a result
15. John likes flying.....his wife hates it.  
A-Since      B- So that      C-Whereas      D-despite
16. Why don't you phone James?.....he is free tonight.  
A-Unless      B- In case      C-in spite of      D-In order to
17. You would better get changes..... to be late for the party.  
A-As      B- So as not to      C-so that      D- Because
18. ....complaining about the faulty mixer, we did not get a refund.  
A-Although      B-Despite      C- Owing to      D-Since
19. Everybody got shocked .....the bomb explosion.  
A-In spite of      B- Due to      C- Despite      D-Because
20. The bomb exploded.....,nobody was killed  
A-However      B-Since      C- So      D-In spite of
21. Ahmed is such a talented boy. He can speak four languages ....., he plays the piano beautifully.  
A-However      B-Moreover      C-But      D-Owing to
22. You will not be promoted .....you work harder.  
A-Because      B-If      C- However      D-Unless
23. I couldn't send you a message.....i didn't have your e-mail address.  
A-Despite      B-Since      C-So that      D-Nevertheless
24. Peter is always on a diet....., his sister can eat whatever she likes without putting on weight.  
A-So      B-As a result      C-Because of      D-on the contrary
25. Most people go jogging.....keep fit  
A-So that      B- In order not to      C-So as to      D-Due to
26. Adam has to make an appointment with Dr.Ali.....he has a bad cold.  
A-Owing to      B-However      C-As      D-Because of
27. My sister paints really well.....my prefers reading.  
A-Because      B-Due to      C- While      D- Since
28. ....Ali promised to phone us, he forgot.  
A-Since      B-Although      C-However      D-Moreover
29. The interview to the candidate was a failure.....the interviewer interrupted him all the time.  
A-As a result      B-Because of      C- Despite      D- Because.
30. ....Ali is young, he is wise  
A-Although      B-Nevertheless      C-Nonetheless      D-In spite of

Use these prepositions to complete the idea.

**On- in and in- during- across- except- because of/due to- in- without- until- at and on-  
above- in spite of- out- instead of- in front of**

- 1) John is a successful man. He works \_\_\_\_\_ Wall Street.
- 2) University convocations take place \_\_\_\_\_ May and \_\_\_\_\_ October.
- 3) I missed the ending of the movie because my DVD player broke \_\_\_\_\_ the last scene.
- 4) I drink a lot of coffee because there is a coffee seller \_\_\_\_\_ from my house.
- 5) I like all types of vegetables \_\_\_\_\_ for green bean.
- 6) Classes were cancelled yesterday \_\_\_\_\_ the weather.
- 7) Have you ever been to Sudan? It is \_\_\_\_\_ the North of Africa.
- 8) It is very hard to take a math exam \_\_\_\_\_ a calculator.
- 9) Adam will be up all night. He has to keep writing \_\_\_\_\_ his essay is finished.
- 10) We are meeting \_\_\_\_\_ 3:00 \_\_\_\_\_ Baladia Street.
- 11) She has trouble sleeping because the man in the apartment \_\_\_\_\_ her plays the drums.
- 12) We wanted to be outside so we went for a walk in the park \_\_\_\_\_ the cold.
- 13) Fatima was late when she reached the meeting. It was further \_\_\_\_\_ of town than she expected.
- 14) We decided to spend Saturday night at home with a movie \_\_\_\_\_ of going out.
- 15) You cannot see him in the picture because somebody is standing \_\_\_\_\_ him.

## Bibliography

- A- Adams, C. (2002). Practioner Review: *The assessment of language pragmatics*, *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry* 43:8, 973-987.
- Adams-Smith, D. (1984). *Medical discourse: Aspects of author's comment*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 3 25-36.
  - Abbott, R., & Berninger, V. W. (1993). *Structural equation modeling of relationships among developmental skills and writing skills in primary-grade and intermediate-grade writers*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85(3), 478–508.
  - Aghbar, A. A. (1990). *Fixed expressions in written texts: Implications for assessing writing sophistication*. Pennsylvania: English Association of Pennsylvania State System Universities.
  - Al-Zahrani, M. S. (1998). *Knowledge of English lexical collocations among male*. Pennsylvania: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
  - Allerton, D. J. (1984). *Three (or four) levels of word co-occurrence restriction*. *Lingua*, 63:17-40.
  - Allen, R. (2002). *Punctuation: One step ahead*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
  - Amabile, T. M. (1985). *Motivation and creativity: Effects of motivational orientation on creative writers*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 48(2), 393–399.
  - Approach, T. L. (1993). Lewis, Michael. Hove: *Language Teaching Publications*.
  - Awad, A. (2012). *The Most Common Punctuation Errors Made by English and the TEFL majors at An-Najah National. University*. An-Najah University

Journal for Research Humanities, 10 (1), 211-233. Retrieved from <https://scholar.najah.edu/publication/journal>

- Azzouz, Bisma. (2009). *A discourse analysis of grammatical Cohesion in student's writing*. Algeria: Mentouri University-Constantine.
- B- Baaijen, Veerle; Galbraith, David; Smith-Spark, Jamie; Torrance, Mark (2008) *The effects of dyslexia on the writing processes of students in higher education*. Paper presented at the 11th EARLI SIG Writing conference, 11-13 June, Lund, Sweden.
- Baddeley, Alan (1986) *Working memory*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Baer, J., McKool, S., & Schreiner, C. S. (2009). *Assessing creativity using the consensual assessment technique*. In *Handbook of research on assessment technologies, methods, and applications in higher education*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global., pp. 65–77.
- Bahns, J. (1993). *Lexical collocations: a contrastive view*. *ELT Journal*, 47(1): 56-63.
- Bahns, J., & Eldaw, M. (1993). *Should we teach EFL students collocations?* *System*, 21(1):104-114.
- Bailey, S. (2011). *Academic Writing: A Handbook for International Students* (3rd ed.). Abingdon/New York, NY: Routledge.
- Bailey, S. (2003). *Academic Writing, a practical guide for students*, RoutledgeFalmer.
- Baker, M, 1992. In *Other Words: A Course Book on Translation*. London: Routledge.
- Baker, S., Gersten, R., & Graham, S. (2003). *Teaching expressive writing to students with learning disabilities: Research-based applications and examples*. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 36, 109–123.

- Bamberg, M. (1987). *The acquisition of narratives: Learning to use Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Bamberg, B. 1984. *Assessing coherence: a reanalysis of essays written for the national assessment of education progress, 1969 - 1979*. *Research in the Teaching of English*, 18(3), October: 305 - 319.
- Bamberg, B. 1983. *What makes a text coherent? College Composition and Communication*, 34(4): 417 - 429.
- Barron, F., & Harrington, D. M. (1981). *Creativity, intelligence, and personality*. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 32(1), 439–476.
- Becker, J. D. (1975). The Phrasal Lexicon. In B. Nash-Webber, & R. Schank, *Theoretical Issues in Natural Language Processing*. Cambridge: Bolt, Beranek and Newman Inc.
- Befi-Lopes, D.B., Bento, A.C.P. & Perissinoto, J. (2008). *Narration of stories by children with specific language impairment*. *Pro-Fono Revista de Atualizacao Cientifica*, **20**, 93-98.
- Benson, M. (1985). *Collocations and Idioms*. In R. Ilson, *Dictionaries, lexicography, and language learning* (pp. 61-68). Oxford: Pergamon.
- Benson, M., Benson, E., & Ilson, R. (1986). *The BBI combinatory dictionary of English: A guide to word combinations*. Philadelphia, PA: John Benjamins.
- Bentivogli, L., & Pianta, E. (2003). *Detecting Hidden Multiwords in Bilingual Dictionaries*. the Tenth EURALEX International Congress, EURALEX 2002 (pp. 785-793). Copenhagen, Denmark: August 13-17, 2002 .
- Bereiter, Carl; Scardamalia, Marlene (1987) *The psychology of written composition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Berninger, V. W., Cartwright, A., Yates, C., Swanson, L., & Abbott, R. (1992). *Lower-level developmental skills in beginning writing*. *Reading and Writing: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, 4(3), 258.

- Blankenstijn, C. & Scheper, A. (2003). *Language development in children with psychiatric impairment*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Bland, J. (2011). *Finding the words: Writers on inspiration, desire, war, celebrity, exile, and breaking the rules*. Toronto, Canada: McClelland & Stewart.
- Bloor, T., & Bloor, M. (2013). *The functional analysis of English: A Hallidayan approach* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Bonk, W. J. (2000). *Testing ESL Learners' Knowledge of Collocations*. ERIC no: 442 309, 1-69.
- Bonet, J. (2002). *La calidad de la traducción según sus objetivos*. In J. Palacios, & M. T. Morán, *Texto, terminología y traducción* (pp. 169–188). Salamanca: Ediciones Almar.
- Bourdin, Beatrice; Fayol, Michel (1994) Is written language production more difficult than oral language production? – *A working-memory approach*. *International Journal of Psychology* 29, 591-620.
- Bourdin, Beatrice; Fayol, Michel (1996) *Mode effects in a sentence production span task*. *Cahiers De Psychologie Cognitive – Current Psychology of Cognition* 15, 245-264.
- Bourdin, Beatrice; Fayol, Michel (2002) *Even in adults, written production is still more costly than oral production*. *International Journal of Psychology*, 37, 219-227.
- Brown & Yule. (1983) *Discourse analysis*. Cambridge University Press. New York: New Rochelle Melbourne Sydney.
- Brown, H. D. (2000). *Principles of language learning and teaching*. White Plains, NY: Longman
- Brown, D. F. (1974). *Advanced vocabulary teaching: the problem of collocation*. *RECL Journal*, 5:1-11.

- C- Carrell, P. L. (1982). *Cohesion is not coherence*. *Tesol Quarterly* 16 (4), pp 479-488.
- Castro, M. B., Martinez, S. M., & Faber, P. (2014). *Verb collocations and phraseology in EcoLexicon*. *DE GRUYTER MOUTON*, 5:57-94.
  - Celce-Murcia, M. and Larsen-Freeman, D. (1983). *The grammar book, an ESL/EFL teachers' course*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
  - Chan, Wing-tsit, 1967. The story of Chinese philosophy. In: Moore, Charles A. (Ed.), *The Chinese Mind*. East-West Center Press, Honolulu, pp. 31–76.
  - Chenoweth, Ann; Hayes, John (2001) *Fluency in writing: Generating text in L1 and L2*. *Written Communication* 18, 80-98.
  - Chenoweth, Ann; Hayes, John (2003) *The inner voice in writing*. *Written Communication*, 20, 99-118.
  - Chen, S., & Zhou, J. (2010). *Creative writing strategies of young children: Evidence from a study of Chinese emergent writing*. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 5(3), 138–149.
  - Chomsky, N. (1998). *Minimalist inquiries: The framework*. Cambridge, MA: Distributed by MIT Working Papers in Linguistics, MIT, Dept. of Linguistics.
  - Coker, D. (2006). *Impact of first-grade factors on the growth and outcomes of urban schoolchildren's primary grade writing*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(3), 471–473.
  - Colonna, M. & Gilbert, J. (2006). *Reasons to Write*, Oxford University Press.
  - Cook, G. (1989). *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
  - Cook G 1994 *Discourse and literature: the interplay of form and mind*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.



- Corder, S. P. (1981). *Error analysis and interlanguage*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Coulthard, Malcolm, 1997. *An Introduction to Discourse Analyses*. England: Longman.
- Coulthard, M. (ed.) 1994. *Advances in written text analysis*. London: Routledge.
- Cowie, A. (1994). Phraseology. In R. Asher, *The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics* (pp. 3168-3171). New York: Pergamon Press.
- Coxhead, A. (2000). *A new academic word list*. TESOL Quarterly, 34(2), 213-238.
- Craig, R.T. & Tracy, K. (1983). *Conversational Coherence: Form, Structure and Strategy*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Creswell, J.W. 1994. *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Crowley, Sh. (1994). *Ancient Rhetorics for contemporary studies*, Allyn and Bacon.
- Cruise, D. A. (1986). *Lexical semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cruise, D. A. (1990). *Language, meaning and sense: Semantics*. In N. E. (Ed.), *An encyclopedia of language* (pp. 139-172). New York: Routledge.
- D- Danko-McGhee, K., & Slutsky, R. (2007). *The impact of early art experiences on literacy development*. National Art Education Association. de Jong, J., & Linacre, M. (1993). *Rasch estimation methods, statistical independence and global fit*. Retrieved on 21 January 2010 from <http://www.rasch.org/rmt/rmt72n.htm>
- De Beaugrande, Rand Dressler, W. 1981. *Introduction to text linguistics*. London:Longman.

- Doyle, C. L. (1998). *The writer tells: The creative process in the writing of literary fiction*. *Creativity Research Journal*, 11(1), 29.
- Durrant, P., & Schmitt, N. (2009). *To what extent do native and non-native writers make use of collocations?* *IRAL*, 47:157-177, doi: 10.1515/iral.2009.007.
- E- Eckhoff, A., & Urbach, J. (2008). *Understanding imaginative thinking during childhood: Sociocultural conceptions of creativity and imaginative thought*. *Early Childhood Education Journal*, 36(2), 179–185.
- Egins, S. (2004). *Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*. A&C Black.
- Egins, S. (1994). *An Introduction to Systematic Functional Linguistic*. London: Pinter Publishers.
- Egins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics (2nd ed.)*, Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Egan, R.F. (1968). *Survey of the History of English Synonymy*. Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.
- Ehrenworth, M. (2003). *Looking to write: Students writing through the visual arts*. Heinemann.
- Eidian, F., Gorjian, B., & Aghvami, F. (2014). *The effect of lexical collocation awareness on Iranian EFL learners' writing skill*. *Academia Journal of Educational Research*, 2(1):1-6 doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15413/ajer.2013.0033>.
- Ellis, R. (1986). *The study of second language acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ernst, K. (1997). *Art goes to the classroom*. *Teaching PreK-8*, 27(4), 64–65.
- Essex, C. (1996). *Teaching creative writing in the elementary school*. ERIC Digest, June 17, 2008.

- Eun, H. & Jeon, B. (2009). *Reference and Substitution as Cohesion Devices in EFL writing*. *English Language & Literature Teaching* 15(4): 23-36.
- F- Fan, M. (2009). *An exploratory study of collocational use by ESL students: A task based approach*. *System*, 37:110-123.
- Fellbaum, Christiane, 1995. Co-occurrence and antonymy. *International Journal of Lexicography* 8, 281–303.
- Fillmore, J. C. (1979). On fluency. In C. Fillmore, D. Kempler, & W. Wang, *Individual differences in language ability and behavior* (pp. 85-101). New York: Academic Press.
- Firth, J. R. (1957). *Papers in Linguistics 1934-1952*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Flower, Linda; Hayes, John (1980a). *The cognition of discovery: Defining a rhetorical problem*. *College Composition and Communication* 31, 21-32.
- Flower, Linda; Hayes, John (1980b) *The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints*. In Gregg, Lee; Steinberg, Erwin (eds.) *Cognitive processes in writing*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 31-50.
- Flower, L., and Hayes. J. R. (1981). *A cognitive process theory of writing*. *College Composition and Communication*, 32(4), 365-387.
- Fontenelle, T. (1998). *Lexical functions in dictionary entries*. In A. P. Cowie, *Phraseology: theory, analysis, and applications* (pp. 189-207). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- G- Gabrys-Biskup, D. (1992). *L1 influence on learners' renderings of English collocation*. A Polish/German empirical study. In P. Arnauld, & H. Benjoint, *Vocabulary and applied linguistics* (pp. 85-93). London: Macmillan.

- Galbraith, David; Torrance, Mark; Hallam, Jenny (2006). *Effects of writing on conceptual coherence*. Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, 1340-1345.
- Galbraith, David (2009b) *Writing about what we know: Generating ideas in writing*. In Beard, Roger; Myhill, Debra; Riley, Jeni; Nystrand, Martin (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of writing development*. London: Sage Publications, 48-64.
- Galbraith, David (1999) *Writing as a knowledge-constituting process*. In Torrance, Mark;
- Galbraith, David (eds.) *Knowing What to Write*. Amsterdam, NL: Amsterdam University Press, 139-160
- Galbraith, David (2009a) *Writing as discovery*. *British Journal of Educational Psychology Monograph Series II* 6, 1-23.
- Galbraith, David (2009b) *Writing about what we know: Generating ideas in writing*. In Beard, Roger; Myhill, Debra; Riley, Jeni; Nystrand, Martin (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of writing development*. London: Sage Publications, 48-64.
- Galbraith, David (1992) *Conditions for discovery through writing*. *Instructional Science* 21, 45- 72.
- Galbraith, David; Torrance, Mark; Hallam, Jenny (2006). *Effects of writing on conceptual coherence*. Proceedings of the 28th Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society, 1340-1345.
- Gallas, K. (1994). *The language of learning: How children talk, write, dance, draw and sing their understanding of the world*. New York: Teachers College Press.
- Gardner, J. (1991). *The art of fiction: Notes on craft for young writers*. NY: Vintage Books.

- Golann, S. (1963). *Psychological study of creativity*. *Psychological Bulletin*, 60(6), 548–565.
- Graham, S., & Perin, D. (2007). *Writing next: Effective strategies to improve writing of adolescents in middle and high school*. Washington, DC: Alliance for Excellent Education.
- Graham, S., & Harris, K. R. (2000). *The role of self-regulation and transcription skills in writing and writing development*. *Educational Psychologist*, 35, 3–12.
- Graham, S., Harris, K. R., MacArthur, C., & Fink, B. (2002). *Primary grade teachers' theoretical orientations concerning writing instruction: Construct validation and a nationwide survey*. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 27(2), 147–166.
- Greenbaum, S. (1988), *Good English and the Grammar*. London: Longman.
- Gross, Derek, Fischer, Ute & Miller, George A. (1988). *Antonymy and the Representation of Adjectival Meanings*. Cognitive science laboratory report 13, Dept. of Psychology, Princeton University.
- Guilford, J. P. (1967). *The nature of human intelligence*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Guilford, J. P. (1977). *Way beyond the I.Q.* Buffalo, NY: Creative Education.
- H- Halliday, M. A. K., & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M.A. (1994) *functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1967), *Notes on transitivity and theme in English*. *Journal of Linguistics* 3.199-244.
- Halliday , M.A.K, 1985. *An introduction to functional grammar*. London Edward Arnold.

- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, c. (1999). *Construing Experience through Meaning*. London: Cassell.
- Halliday, M., & Matthiessen, C. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar* (3rd ed.). London: Arnold.
- Halliday, M. A. K. (1985). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Halliday, M.A.K. & Ruqaiya Hasan. 1985. *Language, Context and Text: Aspect of Language in Social Semiotic Perspective*. Melbourne: Deakin University.
- Halliday, M.A.K & Hasan, H. (1985). *Cohesion in English*. Longman.
- Halliday, M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. Hongkong: Longman.
- Halliday, M. A., McIntosh, A., & Stevens, P. (1964). *The linguistic sciences and language teaching*. London: Longman.
- Halliday, M. (1966). Lexis as a linguistic level. In C. Bazell, J. Catford, M. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 35- 53). Massachusetts, USA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Harada, T. (1994). *Kagakugijyutsu eigo no kakikata nyumon (Introduction to writing English in science and technology)*. Tokyo, Agune Technology Center.
- Harmer, J. (2004). Hyland, 2004 *How to Teach Writing*. Harlow: Longman.
- Harmer, J. (2007). *The practice of English language teaching*. Essex: Pearson Education.
- Harris, K. R., Graham, S., & Mason, L. (2006). *Improving the writing, knowledge, and motivation of struggling young writers; Effects of self-regulated strategy development with and without peer support*. American Educational Research Journal, 43, 295–340.

- Hasan, R. (1984). *Coherence and cohesive harmony*. In Flood, James (ed.) 1984: 181-218.
- Hasan, R. (1984). *Coherence and cohesive harmony*. In J. Flood (Ed) *Understanding Reading Comprehension: Cognition, Language, and the Structure of Prose*. Newark, DE: International Reading Association. pp. 181-219.
- Hatch, E. and Farhady, H. (1982). *Research design and statistics for applied linguistics*. Rowley: Newbury House.
- Hatch, E. (1992). *Discourse and Language Education*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayes, John; Flower, Linda (1986) *Writing research and the writer*. *American Psychologist* 41, 1106-1113.
- Hayes, John; Flower, Linda (1980) *Identifying the organization of writing processes*. In Gregg, Lee; Steinberg, Erwin (eds.) *Cognitive processes in writing: An interdisciplinary approach*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 3–30.
- Hayes, John; Flower, Linda; Schriver, Karen; Stratman, James; Carey, Linda (1987) *Cognitive processes in revision*. In Sheldon Rosenberg (ed.) *Advances in applied psycholinguistics: Vol. 2. reading, writing and language processing*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 176-240.
- Hayes, John (2009). From idea to text. In: Beard, Roger; Myhill, Debra; Riley, Jeni; Nystrand, Martin (eds.) *The SAGE Handbook of writing development*. London: Sage Publications, 65- 79.
- Hayes, John (1996) *A new framework for understanding cognition and affect in writing*. In Levy, Michael; Ransdell, Sarah (eds.) *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 1–27.

- Hewings, A., and M. Hewings. (2001). 'Anticipatory 'it' in Academic Writing: An Indicator of Disciplinary Difference and Developing Disciplinary Knowledge', in M. Hewings (eds.). *Academic Writing in Context*. Birmingham: The University of Birmingham Press.
- Hill, J. (2000). Revising priorities: *from grammatical failure to collocational success*. In M. Lewis, *Teaching Collocations: Further developments in the lexical approach* (pp. 47-69). Hove: Language Teaching Publications.
- Hinkel, E.(2001). *Matters of Cohesion in L2 Academic Texts*. Applied Language Learning 12: 111- 132.
- Hinkel, E. (2004). *Teaching Academic ESL Writing: Practical Techniques in Vocabulary and Grammar*. New York, NY/London: Routledge.
- Hinkel, E. (2011). What research on second language writing tells us and what it doesn't. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Handbook of Research in Second Language Teaching and Learning Volume 2* (pp. 523-538). New York: Routledge.
- Hoffman, R. R., Shadbolt, N. R., Burton, A. M., & Klein, G. (1995). *Eliciting knowledge from experts: A methodological analysis*. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 62(2), 129–158.
- Hoover, M. L. (1997). *Effects of textual and cohesive structure on discourse processing*. Discourse Process 23(2). pp. 193-220.
- Howarth, P. (1998). *Phraseology and second language proficiency*. Applied Linguistics, 19(1):24-44.
- I- Hsu, J.-y. (2007). *Lexical Collocations and their Relation to the Online Writing of Taiwanese College English Majors*. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching, 4(2):192-209.
- Hsu, J.-y., & Chiu, C.-y. (2008). *Lexical Collocations and their Relation to Speaking Proficiency of College EFL Learners in Taiwan*. The Asian EFL Journal, 10(1):181-226.



- Huddleston, R. D. (1971). *The sentence in writing English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hu, Zhuanglin. (2001). *Linguistics. A Course Book*. Beijing: Beijing University Press.
- Hyland, K. (1994). *Hedging in Academic Writing and EAP Textbooks*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13 (3), 239-256.
- Hyodo, S. (1993). *The art of scientific writing in English*. Tokyo: Tokyo University Press.
- Hyland, K. (2006). *English for Academic Purposes: An Advanced Resource Book*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- I- Irvin, L. L. (2010). *What is academic writing?* In C. Lowe and P. Zemliansky (Eds) *Writing Spaces: Readings on Writing volume 1*. Indiana: Parlor press. pp 3-17.
- J- Jansonius, K., & Borgers (Former Roelofs) M. (2009). *De Taalschalen van Renfrew voor Nederlandstalige kinderen*. Deel 3, de Bus Verhaal Test.
- Jackson, H. (1988). *Words and Their Meaning*. London: Longman Inc.
- Jackson, H., & Amvela, E. (2000). *Words, meaning and vocabulary: Meaning relations*. Great Britain: Athenaum Press.
- Jampole, E. S., Konopak, B. C., Readence, J. E., & Moser, E. B. (1991). *Using mental imagery to enhance gifted elementary students' creative writing*. *Reading Psychology*, 12, 183–197.
- Jespersen, O. (1964). *Essentials of English grammar*. Alabama: University of Alabama Press.
- Jin, L., & Cortazzi, M. (2006). *Changing practices in Chinese cultures of learning*. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 19(1), 5  
20.doi:10.1080/07908310608668751.

- Johns, A. M. (1986). *Coherence and academic writing: Some definitions and suggestions for teaching*. TESOL Quarterly, 20, 247-265.
- Jones, Steven, 2006. The discourse functions of antonymy in spoken English. Text and Talk 26, 191–216.
- Jones Steven ( 2002), *Antonymy: a Corpus-based Perspective*. London: Routledge
- Jones, Steven, Murphy, M. Lynne, 2005. Using corpora to investigate antonym acquisition. International Journal of Corpus Linguistics 10, 401–422.
- Jozsef, H. (2001). *Advanced writing in English as a foreign: A corpus-based study of processes and products*. France: The University of Pecs.
- Jurko, P. (2010). Slovene-English Contrastive Phraseology: *Lexical Collocations*. ELOPE, 12:57-73.
- Juel, C. (1988). *Learning to read and write: A longitudinal study of 54 children from first through fourth grades*. Journal of Educational Psychology, 80(4), 437–447.
- Justeson, John S. & Katz, Slava M. (1991). *Co-occurrences of Antonymous Adjectives and Their Contexts*. Computational Linguistics, 17, 1-19.
- Justeson, John S., Katz, Slava M., 1992. Redefining antonymy. Literary and Linguistic Computing 7, 176–184.
- K-Kagan. J (1984), *The Nature of the Child*. New York: Basic Books
- Kaufer, David; Hayes, John; Flower, Linda (1986) *Composing written sentences*. Research in the Teaching of English 20, 121-140.
- Kellogg, Ronald (1988) *Attentional overload and writing performance: Effects of rough draft and outline strategies*. Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory and Cognition 14, 355-365.

- Kellogg, R. T. (2008). *Training writing skills: A cognitive developmental perspective*. *Journal of Writing Research*, 1(1), 1–26.
- Kellogg, Ronald (1990) *Effectiveness of prewriting strategies as a function of task demands*. *American Journal of Psychology* 103, 327-342.
- Kellogg, Ronald (1996) *A model of working memory in writing*. In Levy, Michael; Ransdell, Sarah (eds.) *The Science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 57-72.
- Kennedy, G. D. (1990). *Collocations: Where grammar and vocabulary teaching meet*. In S. Anivan, *Language Teaching Methodology for the Nineties* (pp. 215-229). SEAMEO.
- Kennedy, R. (July 2006). *Guggenheim study suggests arts education benefits literacy skills*. *The New York Times*.
- Keshavarz, M., & Salimi, H. (2007). *Collocational competence and cloze test performance: a study of Iranian EFL learners*. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 17(1):81-92 doi:10.1111/j.1473-4192.2007.00134.x.
- Ketelaars, M.P. (2010). *The nature of Pragmatic Language Impairment*. Dissertation.
- Kirszner, L.G. & Mandell, S.R. (1999). *The Holt Handbook (5th Edition)*. Texas: Harcourt College Pub.
- Kjellmer, G. (1990). *A mint of phrases*. In K. Aijmer, & B. Altenberg, *English Corpus Linguistics: Studies in Honour of Jan Svartvik* (pp. 111-127). London: Longman.
- Kjellmer, G. (Ed.). (1984). *Some thoughts on collocational distinctiveness*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

- Koosha, M., & Jafarpour, A. (2006). *Data-driven Learning and Teaching Collocation of Prepositions: The Case of Iranian EFL Adult Learners*. *Asian EFL Journal*, 8(4):192-209.
- Korosadowicz-Struzynska, M. (1980). *Word collocations in FL vocabulary instruction*. *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia*, 12:109-120.
- Krashen, S., & Scarcella, R. (1980). *On Routines and Patterns in Language Acquisition and Performance*. *Language Learning*, 28(2):283-300.
- Koya, T. (2006). *What is the reality of collocation use by native speakers of English?* *Dialogue*, 5:1-18.
- L- Langacker, Ronald W. 1968. *Language and Its Structure: Some Fundamental Linguistic Concepts*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Larkin, S. (2009). *Socially mediated metacognition and learning to write*. *Thinking Skills and Creativity*, 4(3), 149–159.
- Laufer, B. (1990). Words you know: How they affect the words you learn. In J. Fisiak (Ed.), *Further insights into contrastive linguistics* (pp. 573–593). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lee, I. (2002a). *Helping students develop coherence in writing*. *English Teaching Forum*, 40, 32-39.
- Leech, Geoffrey. (1981). *Semantics (2nd edition)*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Levelt., W.J.M. (1989). *Speaking. From intention to articulation*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Lewis, M. Paul (ed.). (2009). *Ethnologue (16th Ed.): Languages of the World*. Dallas: SIL (Summer Institute of Linguistics) International. Web version: <http://www.ethnologue.com>
- Lewis, M. (2001). *Teaching collocation: Further developments in the lexical approach*. Hove, England: Thompson – Heinle Publications.

- Li, C.-C. (2005). *A study of collocational error types in ESL/EFL college learners' writing*. Taoyuan/Taiwan: Ming Chuan University.
- Lien, H.-Y. (2003). *The effects of collocation instruction on the reading comprehension of Taiwanese college students*. Pennsylvania: Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Liles, B.Z. (1985). *Cohesion in the narratives of normal and language-disordered children*. *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 28, 123-133.
- Long, S., Hiebert, E. H., Nules, J. A., & Lalik, R. (1985). *Effects of awareness and practice in mental imagery on creative writing of gifted children*. *Thirty-fourth yearbook of the national reading conference* (pp. 381–385). Rochester, NY: National Reading Conference.
- Longman Dictionary of Contemporary English*. (2014). Essex: Pearson Education.
- Lukeman, N. (2011). *The art of punctuation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Lyons, J. 1968. *Introduction to theoretical linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, J. 1981. *Language and linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons J. 1995. *Linguistic Semantics*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons John. (1977), *Semantics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Lyons, John. (1968). *An Introduction to Theoretical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- M-Ma, J. (2012). *Helping Chinese high school students make the transition to writing in a western academic style*. *English Teaching in China* (1), 23-26.
- Macmillan Publishing House. (1986). *Macmillan English* (third edition), New York.

- Magnifico, A. M. (2010). *Writing for whom? Cognition, motivation, and a writer's audience*. *Educational Psychologist*, 45(3), 167–184.
- Martn, J. R. (2001). *Cohesion and texture*. In D. Schiffrin, D. Tannen & H. E. Hamilton (Eds.), *The handbook of discourse analysis* (pp. 35- 53). Massachusetts, USA; Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Martin, JR, and D Rose. 2003. *Working with Discourse: meaning beyond the clause, 2nd ed*. London: Continuum [2nd revised edition 2007]
- Martin, J.R., Rose, D. 2003. *Working with discourse: meaning beyond the clause*. London & New York: Continuum.
- Martyńska, M. (2004). *Do English language learners know collocations?* *Investigations Linguisticae*, 11:1-12.
- McCarthy, M. (1991). *Discourse analysis for language teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McCarthy, M. (1988). *Some vocabulary patterns in conversation*; In R. Carter & M. McCarthy (Eds.), *Vocabulary and Language Teaching*. (pp. 181-200). London & New York: Longman.
- Mc Tear, M.F. & Conti-Ramsden, G. (1994). *Pragmatic disability in children*. London: Whurr Publishers Ltd.
- McCutcheon, D. (2006). *Cognitive factors in the development of children's writing*. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 115–130). New York: The Guilford Press.
- McCarthy, M.J. 1990. *Vocabulary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McArthur, T. (1992). *The Oxford companion to the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCarthy, M.J. 1984. *A new look at vocabulary in EFL*. *Applied Linguistics*, 5(1):13- 22.

- McKeough, A., Palmer, J., Jarvey, M., & Bird, S. (2007). *Best narrative writing practices when teaching from a developmental framework*. In S. Graham, C.
- Mednick, S. (1962). *The associative basis of the creative process*. *Psychological Review*, 69(3), 220–232.
- Meecham, P. (2002). *Picturing relationships: Working with words and pictures in the gallery*. *Book Art*. Summer 2002.
- MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Best practices in writing instruction* (pp. 50–71). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Mitchell, T. (1971). Linguistics 'going on': collocations and other lexical matters arising on the syntactic record. In *In Archivum Linguisticum* (Vol. 2 (new series) pp. 35-69): Menston: Scolar Press. (SDSU library
- Mertelli, A. (2006). *A corpus based description of English lexical collocations used by Italian advanced learners*. *Atti del XII Congresso Internazionale di Lessicografia*, (pp. 1005-1011). Torino.
- Montero, M., Silvia, P. A., & Mercedes, G. d. (2001). *The translator as "Language Planner": Syntactic Calquing in an English-Spanish Translation of Chemical Engineering*. *META*, 46:687–698.
- Montero, M., Silvia, M. G., & Pedro, A. F. (2002). *Terminological Phrases in OntoTerm: A new Theoretical and Practical Approach*. *Terminology*, 8(2):177-206.
- Morgan, J. L., & Sellner, M. B. (1980). *Discourse and linguistic theory*. In R. J. Spiro and W. F. Brewer (Eds) *Theoretical Issues in Reading Comprehension: Perspectives from Cognitive Psychology, Linguistics, Artificial Intelligence, and Education*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum. Pp 165-200.
- Mulcahey, C. (2009). *The story in the picture: Inquiry and art making with young children*. New York: Teachers College Press.

- Murray, Donald M. (2009). *The Essential Don Murray: Lessons from America's greatest writing teacher*. Portsmouth: Boynton/Cook Publishers Heinemann.
- Murray, R. (2005). *Writing for academic journals*. New York: OUP.
- Murphy, M. Lynne, Jones, Steven, 2008. Antonymy in childhood. *First Language* 28 (4), 403–430.
- N- -Nadell, J. (1997). *The Macmillan Writer, Rhetoric, Reader, Handbook*, Allyn & Bacon.
- Naeem, M. A. R. (2007) *A suggested CALL program to develop EFL college learners' mechanics of writing*. Faculty of Education, Kafr El-Sheikh University. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED499569>.
- Nation, I. S. (2006). *Second Language Vocabulary. Encyclopaedia of Language and Linguistics*, Elsevier.
- Nation, I. S. (2001). *Learning vocabulary in another language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nattinger, J. R. (1980). *A lexical phrase grammar for ESL*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 16(3), 337-344.
- Nettle, D. (2009). *The evolution of creative writing*. In S. B. Kaufman, & J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *The psychology of creative writing* (pp. 101–116). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Newell, G. E. (2006). *Writing to learn: How alternative theories of school writing account for student performance*. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 235–247). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Nizonkiza, D. (2011). *The relationship between lexical competence, collocational competence, and second language proficiency*. *English Text Construction*, 4(1):113-146.



- Norbury, C.F. & Bishop, D.V.M. (2003). *Narrative skills of children with communication impairments*. *International Journal of Communication Disorders* 23, 287-313.
- Norris, C. B. (2014). *Academic Writing in English*, University of Helsinki.
- Nunan, D. (1993). *Introducing discourse analysis*. London: Penguin.
- Nunan, D. 1992. *Research methods in language learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- O- Olson, C. B., Scarcella, R., & Matuchniak, T. (2013). *Best Practices in Teaching Writing to English Learners*. In S. Graham, C. A. MacArthur, & J. Fitzgerald, *Best Practices in Writing Instruction (2nd Edition)* (p. 381). New York: Guilford Press.
- Olshansky, B. (1994). *Image-making within the writing process*. *Language Arts*, 71, 350–356.
- Olsen, E., & Schaeffer, G. (2011). *We wanted to be writers: Life, love, and literature at the Iowa Writers' Workshop*. New York: Skyhorse Publishing.
- Olsen, J. (1992). *Envisioning writing: Toward an integration of drawing and writing*. Heinemann.
- Oshima A, and Hague A 1999 *Writing Academic English*. London: Longman Academic Writing Series.
- Oshima, A and Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing* (Second Ed.). New York: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Oshima, A. & Hague, A. (1999). *Writing Academic English*, 3 rd Ed. White Plains, NY: Longman. *Oxford Advanced Learners Dictionary*. (2000). Oxford University Press.
- Oshima, A. & Hague, A. (2007). *Introduction to academic writing* (3rded). USA: Longman.

- Oshima, A., and Hogue, A. (2007). *Introduction to Academic Writing* (3rd ed.). White Plains, NY: Pearson Education.
- Oxford advanced learner`s dictionary (2000). *Oxford*: Oxford University Press
- P- Palmer, F.R. (1965), *A Linguistic Study of the English Verb*. London: Longman.
- Palmer, H. (1933). *Second Interim Report on English Collocations*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.
- Palmer, J C 1999 *Coherence and Cohesion in the English Language Classroom: the Use of Lexical Reiteration and Pronominalisation*. RELC Journal. 30 2 pp61-85.
- Pack, R., & Parini, J. (Eds.). (1991). *Writers on writing*. Hanover, NH: Middlebury College Press.
- Partington, A. (1998). *Patterns and meanings: Using corpora for English language research and teaching*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Paul, R. & Smith, R.L. (1993). *Narrative skills in 4-year-olds with normal, impaired, and late-developing language*, *Journal of Speech and Hearing Research* 36, 592-598.
- Paul, C. and Arthur, O.S.(1969), *An Advanced English Grammar*. London : The University of Chicago press.
- Pawley, A., & Syder, F. (1983). *Two puzzles for linguistic theory: Native-like selection and native like fluency*. In J. Richards, & R. Schmidth, *Language and Communication* (pp. 191-225). London: Longman.
- Perry, S. K. (2005). *Flow and the art of fiction*. In J. C. Kaufman, & J. Baer (Eds.), *Creativity across domains: Faces of the muse* (pp. 23–40). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

- Perry, S. K. (2009). *Writing in flow*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Peterson, C. & McCabe, A. (1983). *Three ways of looking at a child's narrative*, *Developmental Psycholinguistics, Cognition and Language*, a series in psycholinguistics. New York/London: Plenum Press.
- Phoocharoensil, S. (2010). A corpus-based study of English synonyms. *International Journal of Arts and Sciences*, 3(10), 227-245.
- Policastro, E., & Gardner, H. (1999). From case studies to robust generalizations: *An approach to the study of creativity*. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 213–225). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Pyles, Thomas & Algeo, John. (1970). *English: An Introduction to Language*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Pretz, J. E., Naples, A. J., & Sternberg, R. J. (2003). *Recognizing, defining, and representing problems*. In J. E. Davidson, & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), *The psychology of problem solving* (pp. 3–30). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Prodromou, L. (2003). *Idiomaticity and the non-native speaker*. *English Today*, 42-48, doi:10.1017/S0266078403002086.
- Q- Quirk, R. et al (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.
- Quirk, R. Greenbaum. S, Leech, G and Svatic, J. (1989). *A Grammar of Contemporary English*. Longman. London.
- Quirk, R. 1978. Focus, scope, and lyrical beginnings. *Language and Style*, 11: 30 -39.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Savartivik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. New York: Longman.

- R- Rapin, I. & Allen, D.A. (1983). Developmental language disorders: *nosological consideration*. In: Kirk U. (ed), *Neuropsychology of language, reading and spelling*. New York: Academic press.
- Rahimi, m., & Momeni, G. (2012). *The effect of teaching collocations on English language proficiency*. *WCLTA 2011* (pp. 31:37-42 doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.013). *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*.
- Reid, W. (1991), *Verb and Noun Number: A Functional Explanation*. London: Longman.
- Reid, J. (1992). *A Computer Text Analysis of Four Cohesion Devices in English Discourse by Native and Nonnative Writers*. *Journal of Second Language Writing* 1(2): 79-107
- Richards, J. C. (1976). *The role of vocabulary teaching*. *TESOL Quarterly*, 10:77-89.
- Roelofs, M. (1998). *'Hoe bedoel je?' De verwerving van pragmatische vaardigheden*. Utrecht: LOT.
- Robins, R. H. (1967). *A short history of linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Root, R., & Steinberg, M. (1999). *The fourth genre: Contemporary writers of/on creative nonfiction*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Rundell, M. (2010). *Macmillan Collocations Dictionary for Learners of English*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers Ltd.
- Runco, M. A. (2009). *Writing as an interaction with ideas*. In S. B. Kaufman, & J. C. Kaufman (Eds.), *The psychology of creative writing* (pp. 180–195). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Roberts, J., Mitchell, B., & Zubrinich, R. (2002). *Writers on writing*. Victoria. Australia: Penguin Books.

- S- Sadeghi, K. (2009). *Collocational differences between L1 and L2: Implications for EFL learners and teachers*. *TESL Canada Journal*, 26(2):100-124.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1992). *A Text-Type and Move Analysis Study of Verb Tense and Modality Distribution in Medical English Abstracts*. *English for Specific Purposes*, 11, 93-113.
- Sadoski, M., Kealy, W. A., Goetz, E. T., & Paivio, A. (1997). *Concreteness and imagery effects in the written composition of definitions*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89(3), 518–526.
- Schmitt, N. (2000). *Vocabulary in Language Teaching*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Shanahan, T. (2006). *Relations among oral language, reading, and writing development*. In C. A. MacArthur, S. Graham, & J. Fitzgerald (Eds.), *Handbook of writing research* (pp. 171–183). New York: Guilford Press.
- Shanteau, J. (1992). *The psychology of experts: An alternative view*. In G. Wright, & F. Bolger (Eds.), *Expertise and decision support*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Sharples, M. (1996). *An account of writing as creative design*. In C. M. Levy, & S. Ransdell (Eds.), *The science of writing: Theories, methods, individual differences, and applications* (pp. 127–148). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Shatil, E., Share, D. C., & Levin, I. (2000). *On the contribution of kindergarten writing to grade one literacy: A longitudinal study in Hebrew*. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 21, 1–21.
- Sinclair, J. (1966). *Beginning the study of lexis*. In J. C. C. Bazell, M. A. K. Halliday, and R. H. Robins: (Ed.), *In Memory of J. R. Firth*: Longman.

- Smadja, F. (1989). *Lexical co-occurrence: The missing link*. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 4(3):163-168.
- Sonbul, S., & Schmitt, N. (2013). *Explicit and Implicit Lexical Knowledge: Acquisition of Collocations under Different Input Conditions*. *Language Learning*, 63(1): 121-159.
- Stageberg, N. C (1981). *An Introduction to English Grammar New York*: Holt, Rinechart & Winston.
- Stein, N. L. (1986). *Knowledge and process in the acquisition of writing skills*. *Review of Research in Education*, 13(1), 255–258.
- Sternberg, R. J., & Lubart, T. I. (1995). *Defying the crowd: Cultivating creativity in a culture of conformity*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Sternberg, R. J., Kaufman, S. B., & Kaufman, J. C. (2009). Foreword. *In The psychology of creative writing*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. (pp. xv–xvii).
- Stubbs, M. (2001). *Words and Phrases*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Sung, J. (2003). *English Lexical Collocations and Their Relation to Spoken Fluency of Adult Nonnative Speakers*. Pennsylvania: Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Swales, J. M. and Feak, C. B. (2012). *Academic Writing for Graduate Students: Essential Tasks and Skills*. 3rd ed. Michigan: Michigan UP.
- T- Taboada, T, M. (2004) “*Building Coherence and Cohesion*.” Online document. Retrieved 18th January 2016 from.
- Taboada, M. T. (2004). *Building coherence and cohesion: Task-oriented dialogue in English and Spanish*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tan, M., Randi, J., Barbot, B., Levenson, C., Friedlaender, L. K., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2012). *Seeing, connecting, and writing: Developing*

*creativity and narrative writing in children*. In E. L. Grigorenko, E. Mambrino, & D. Preiss (Eds.), *Writing: A mosaic of new perspectives* (pp. 275–291). New York: Psychology Press.

-Tanskanen S K 2006 *Collaborating towards Coherence: Lexical Cohesion in English Discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamin Publishing.

-Telia, V., Bragina, N., Oparina, E., & Sandomirskaya, I. (1994). *Lexical Collocations: Denominative and Cognitive Aspects*. International Congress on Lexicography (pp. 369-377). Amsterdam: Euralex.

-Tekingül, B. (2012). *Collocation teaching effect on reading comprehension in advanced EFL setting*. Akdeniz Language Studies Conference (pp. 1078-1089 doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.01.161). Antalya: Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences.

-Tompkins, G. E. (1982). *Seven reasons why children should write stories*. *Language Arts*, 59(7), 718–721.

-Thornbury, S. (2005). *Beyond the sentence: Introducing discourse analysis*. Oxford: Macmillan. *Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary* (6th Edition) (1995).

-Thompson, G. (2004). *Introducing Functional Grammar (Second edition)*. New York: Oxford University Press.

-Torrance, Mark; Galbraith, David (2006). *The processing demands of writing*. In. MacArthur, Charles; Graham, Steve; Fitzgerald, Jill (eds.) *Handbook of writing research*. New York: The Guilford Press, 67-80.

-Treffinger, D. J. (2009). *Myth 5: Creativity is too difficult to measure*. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 53, 245–247.

-Tsareva, A. (2010). *Grammatical Cohesion in Argumentative Essays by Norwegian and Russian Learners*. Oslo: The University of Oslo.

- Truss, L. (2003). *Eats, shoots and leaves: the zero tolerance approach to Punctuation*. London: Profile Books.( citation ).
- Tucha, O., Trumpp, C., & Lange, K. W. (2004). *Limitations of the dual-process-theory regarding the writing of words and non-words to dictation*. *Brain and language*, 91(3), 267–273.
- Turner, J. (2004). *Language as academic purpose*. *Journal of English for Academic Purposes*, 3:95-109 doi:10.1016/S1475-1585(03)00054-7.
- Tuttle, H.G. (2009). *Successful student writing through formative assessment*. Routledge.
- U- Urban, K. K., Ambrose, D., Cohen, L. M., & Tannenbaum, A. J. (2003). *Toward a componential model of creativity*. In *Creative intelligence: Toward theoretic integration*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press Inc.
- W-Ward, T., Smith, S. M., & Fink, R. A. (1999). *Creative cognition*. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Handbook of creativity* (pp. 189–212). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Watson, Owen. (1976). *Longman Modern English Dictionary*. London: Longman Group Limited.
- Watson, Robert W. (2006). *Studies in Poetry*. Georgia: Smarr Publishers.
- Wei, Y., & Lei, L. (2011). *Lexical Bundles in the Academic Writing Advanced Chinese EFL Learners*. *RECL Journal*, 42(2): 155-166.
- Widdowson, H. (1978). *Teaching language as communication*. Oxford: OUP.
- Widdowson. (1985). *the practice of communicative teaching*. pergamon press in association with the British Council: Oxford.
- Wigglesworth, G. (1997). *Children's individual approaches to the organization of narrative*. *Journal of Child Language* 24, 279-309.



- Willners, Caroline, 2001. *Antonyms in Context: A Corpus-based Semantic Analysis of Swedish Descriptive Adjectives*. Lund University, Lund.
- Zetterberg, Hans L., 1984. The rational humanitarians. *Daedalus* 113 (1), 75–92.
- Woods, G. (2006). *Punctuation: Simplified and applied*. Canada: Wiley, Hoboken, NJ. [www.teachingpacks.co.uk](http://www.teachingpacks.co.uk)
- Wouden, T. V. (1997). *Negative contexts: Collection, polarity, and multiple negation*. New York: Routledge.
- Wray, A. (2002). *Formulaic Language and the Lexicon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Wu, W.-S. (1996). *Lexical collocations: One way to make passive vocabulary active*. *The Proceedings of the 11th Conference on English Teaching and Learning*, (pp. 461-480). China.
- X- Xu, Yiyun. (2009). *The Analysis of English Antonymy in Features and Functions*. *Journal of Jiangxi Normal University*, 42, 136-141.
- Y- Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language* (3rd. ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Yule, G. (2008). *The study of language*. (3rd ed). New Delhi: CUP.
- Z- Zemach, D. E. & Rumisek, L. A.(2003). *College Writing: From Paragraph to Essay*. Oxford: Macmillan Publishers.
- Zhang, X. (1993). *English collocations and their effect on the writing of native and nonnative college freshmen*. Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation: Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- Zareva, A., Schwanenflugel, P., & Nikolova, Y. (2005). *Relationship between lexical competence and language proficiency*. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27(04): 567-595.

- Zenasni, F., Besancon, M., & Lubart, T. I. (2008). *Creativity and tolerance of ambiguity: An empirical study*. *Journal of Creative Behavior*, 42(1), 61–73.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Risemberg, R. (1997). *Becoming a self-regulated writer: A social cognitive perspective*. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 22, 73–101.
- Zimmerman, B. J., & Kitsantas, A. (2002). *Acquiring writing revision and self-regulatory skill through observation and emulation*. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 94, 660–668.