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Abstract

This study aims at investigating students' problems in using coherent and cohesive devices from discourse analysis perspective. The corpus consists of 23 argumentative essays that were analyzed on the basis of Halliday and Hassan (1976) cohesion framework. The corpus was evaluated manually by undertaking two main steps. Firstly, all the types and the subtypes of both grammatical and lexical cohesive devices are calculated. Secondly, there was focus on the appropriate and inappropriate use of the cohesive ties employed by the students. The data obtained shows that the students used all the types of the grammatical and lexical cohesive devices along with their subtypes. The students relied heavily on the grammatical cohesive devices (GCDs) by employing 1003 items, regardless of the significant difference between the frequencies of its subtypes. They used referential items 56%, tailed by conjunctive ties 35%, while substitutional and elliptical ones stand for 6% and 3%. On the other hand, lexical cohesive devices (LCDs) were employed 341 times. Reiteration items represent 94%, whereas collocation exemplifies only 6% from the total use of the LCDs. The outcomes of the analysis also showed the problems that the students encountered; they were mostly misuse, overuse and ambiguity.
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Introduction

Undoubtedly, writing, as one of the foreign language skills, is really difficult. The difficulty comes from generating and organizing the ideas then translating these ideas into well-comprehended text. Cohesion and coherence are two vital elements in producing good writing. To produce a coherent and cohesive text, EFL learners should keep in mind that readers will not be able to follow their ideas unless they signal the connection between the previous and the coming ideas through contextual clues.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) believe that the context of texture displays the features of being a text. Obviously, all languages have texts and also have certain linguistic features to create a texture. So, we can conclude that a texture is made of two different levels: the sentential and textual. Firstly, on the sentential level, we have grammatical features of syntax at the surface level representing semantics at the deep structure. Secondly, on the textual level the functional features of cohesion at the surface level lead to coherence at the deep structure. According to Grabe and Kaplan (1996), cohesion and coherence are on the textual level. This level is the underlying structure of the surface structure which is achieved through the use of grammatical elements to form sentences at first then the formulation of text through coherent and cohesion devices. The interrelation between sentences plays a vital role in achieving coherence.

1. Statement of The Problem

Based on a simple observation, most of EFL learners have problems in writing, especially in producing a coherent and cohesive text. Coherent and cohesive devices are often misused or overused by learners in their attempt to rectify their writing production.
Most of them seem to have a vague conception about coherent and cohesive devices and they are not well rounded with the strategies that may help them to improve their writing production. EFL learners tend to focus on the verb-subject agreement at the level of sentences and fail to produce a coherent and cohesive piece of writing which makes them unable to communicate effectively by means of writing.

2. Aim of The study

The main aim of this study:

To identify the problems that EFL learners face while using coherent and cohesive devices.

3. Research Questions

1- What are the problems that EFL learners face using coherent and cohesive devices?
2- Why do EFL learners have such problems?

4. Research Hypothesis

On the basis of the research questions raised above, the following hypotheses have been formulated:

EFL learners' problems in using coherent and cohesive devices are due to the poor knowledge of the linguistic features.

5. Significance of the study

The results of this study will make the following significance. Most of the researchers at Larbi Ben M'Hidi university studied EFL learners written production by applying error analysis. This study tends to be the first to examine written essays from discourse analysis perspective by focusing on both grammatical and lexical cohesive ties. The findings will make the learners more mindful about the problems that they may encounter in using coherent and cohesive devices. Moreover, it will provide them with the reasons that underlay behind these problems and how to avoid it.
6. Limitation of the Study

There are some limitations that restricted this work. Firstly, the analysis was carried out manually because we could not have access to the software, mainly, the web-based program Wmatrix3. Secondly, the sample was small, where it consists of 23 subjects. So, the results of this study cannot be generalized. Finally, we do not pretend that this work will give us all the problems encountered by the EFL learners in using coherent and cohesive ties.

7. Methodology of the Research

From the instruments mentioned later, this study will be corpus analysis.

7.1. Participants

The participants of this study was first year Master students. The choice of this sample was motivated by two factors. The first factor is that they have been studying the English language as a major for three years. Therefore, their written communication is at a higher level. The second factor is that they satisfied the condition of the study of being EFL learners. The number of the M1 students who participated is 23, and they were asked to write an essay on one of three argumentative topics that were introduced to them.

7.2. Instruments

This study aims at investigating the students' problems in using coherent and cohesive devices. It is going to be carried out by means of diagnostic test that will be given to the participants in the study. The diagnostic test will involve writing an essay on one of the argumentative topics that will be introduced to the participants. The goal of the diagnostic test is to identify students' problems in using coherent and cohesive devices. The output of the test was analyzed in search of problems in the field of interest.
7.3. Structure of the Study

The present study is divided into two chapters. In the first chapter, the concept of discourse analysis is introduced. This is because discourse analysis is taken as an approach that would help us identify the problems in using coherent and cohesive devices. The second chapter discusses the methodology. It describes the research design, the data collection, and the interpretation of the collected data.
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Section One: Discourse Analysis

Introduction

The main interest of this study is related to the field of discourse analyses. It investigates the problems that students encounter in using coherent and cohesive ties. This chapter contains two sections. The first one will discuss the notion of discourse analysis as well as its different modes and the difference between text and discourse and more, whereas the second one will discuss the writing skill with its components and the relation between writing quality and the use of cohesive devices.

1.1.1. Definition of Discourse Analysis

It is a difficult task to define the term discourse analysis because it means different things and aspects to different researchers and linguists. For Van Dijk (1997), it is related to three different dimensions which are: language, communication, and interaction. i.e., DA is a form of language in use. It is used in communication and interaction with people. To researchers like Leech (1983) and Schiffrin (1994), DA is the study of the language beyond the sentence. In other words, DA is above the sentence. According to McCarthy (1991), DA is the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used. That is to say, DA is related to social life which means that it is guided by both social and cultural life. The question that should be asked in this case is: why did researchers and linguists define DA differently?

The answers to the question mentioned earlier are based on the fact that researchers and linguists belong to different domains or different fields of research. For many years, linguists' main concern was to analyze single sentences. The American structuralist Zellig Harris in 1952 was the first to introduce the term DA when he published an article titled "Discourse Analysis". His aims from publishing
such an article were to try to find language rules that would explain how sentences were connected within a text by the extended grammar (Cook, 1989). The emergence of this new approach influenced different researchers such as Leech (1983) and Schiffnn (1994) who belong to different research domains. Particularly, formalism and functionalism defined it as the study of the language beyond the sentence. It is obvious that language is a part of the society where it is used, a society where people have social, cultural, and personal identities, knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, feelings, goals and wants (Schiffrin, as cited in Alba-juez, 2009). This new view has influenced many researchers like McCarthy (1991), Fairclough (1989) and Focault (1980) to define DA as the study of the relationship between language and the context in which it is used and the study of the way people use language to fulfill certain communicative objectives. There are, for sure, other definitions of DA as it is stated by Allen and Corder (1974, p.200), "discourse analysis is taken to be the investigation into the formal devices used to connect sentences together."

Undoubtedly, All the researchers mentioned above have different domains or fields of interest, but all of them are interested in language. Some of them defined DA as language in use. Others defined it as the study of language beyond the sentence. In this study, the main concern is the investigation of the problems that English foreign learners encounter while using coherent and cohesive devices. For the purpose of this study, the following definition provided by Allen and Corder (1974) will be adopted: DA is the study of how formal devices used to connect sentences together. This definition will help us track the misuse or the overuse of the coherent and the cohesive devices.
1.1.2. Text Vs Discourse

When dealing with DA, you come across these two main terms which are text and discourse. It is not easy to identify the similarities and differences between these two terms. Some researchers use these terms interchangeably, while others make a clear cut between them. Moreover, definitions have been found in different studies for both terms are almost identical. "a text is a unit of language in use" (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p.1) and "the analysis of discourse is, necessarily, the analysis of language in use" (Brown & Yule, 1983, p.4).

When both of the terms text and discourse are mentioned in the same study, a clear distinction would be made between them. Some researchers identify the difference through the mode. The text is usually made up of sentences, whereas discourse is usually made up of utterances (1985).

Nunan (1993) defines text as any written production of the communicative event. Nunan (1993) explains the term even by stating that it may need oral language or written one. He also said that text can be found in different length, as short as a single word such like GO!, but it should convey a meaning. Nunan (1993) defined discourse as "the interpretation of the communicative event in context" (p.6). So, he emphasizes the context of the discourse where the act of communication is taking place.

In the same vain, Cook (1989) stated the difference between the two notions clearly when he defined discourse as stretches of language perceived to be meaningful, unified, and purposeful, while a text is a stretch of language interpreted formally, without context (as cited in Nunan 1993).
1.1.3. Texture and Textually

Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined text as:

A text is a unit of language in use, it is not a grammatical unit, like a clause or a sentence; and it is not defined by its size. A text sometimes envisaged to be some kind of super-sentence, a grammatical unit that it is larger than a sentence but it is related to a sentence in some way that a sentence is related to a clause, a clause to a group and so on: by CONSTITUENCY, the composition of larger units out of smaller ones. But this is misleading. A text is not something that like a sentence, only bigger; it is something that differs from a sentence in kind. (p. 1-2)

That is to say, a text is related to function and situation. It is identified neither by its grammatical function nor by its length. It is, in fact, defined by the connections and the relationships between its sentences which are called cohesive relationships. Cohesive relationships are the principals in connecting utterances or sentences to one another. Therefore, Halliday and Hasan stress the constituency in language production. There should be signals and sequences that connect each line to the other, which hopefully will create a meaningful and comprehensive text.

Also, Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that:

A text is best regarded as a SEMANTIC unit: a unit not of form but of meaning. Thus it is related to clause or sentences not by size but by RELAZATION, the coding of one symbolic system in another. A text does not CONSIST of sentences; it is RELIZED, or encoded in, sentences. (p. 2)
In other words, a text is made up of clauses and sentences that are connected. Text should have a specific format which will give its overall purpose. We cannot say that a group of random clauses, sentences, and paragraphs are texts. Because they lack the feature of being a text. This feature is called texture or textuality.

The concept of TEXTURE is entirely appropriate to express the property of 'being a text'. A text has a texture, and this is what distinguishes it from something that is not a text. It derives this texture from the fact that is functions as a unity with respect to its environment. (Halliday & Hasan, 1976, p. 2).

so, what gives a text its property of being a text is its texture. If a paragraph in English consists of more than one sentence and it is featured of being a text. There will be a linguistic feature which will give a text its unity. Cohesive devices play a major role in creating a text. They link a text together and give a text its continuity. This continuity between the sentences creates a text meaning.

Texture otherwise refers to as textuality, which means the feature of being a text where cohesion plays a major role in contributing to both texture and textuality. De beaugrande and Dessler (1981) defined textuality in terms of communication function that the text is supposed to realize. They stated seven factors of texture in order to meet the communicative function of any text. These standards are:

-Cohesion is the first standard of textuality. It is concerned with the surface elements and how they are connected to create a text. The formal surface elements of a text depend on each other according to grammatical relations between these elements which hopefully will make the reader/ hearer get a gist of its meaning and usage.
Coherence is the second standard of textuality, and it refers to the elements and how they are related to one another in a sense.

Intentionality is the third standard of textuality. It refers to the text producer's attitudes which are linguistic features, namely cohesive and coherent text devices to fulfill the producer's intentions and convey the messages successfully.

Acceptability is the fourth standard of textuality. It refers to the text receiver's attitudes that are linguistic features that should make the receiver able to perceive the relevance of a text.

Informativity is the fifth standard of textuality. It is concerned with the amount of the extent of the presence information known or unknown to the text receiver.

Situationality is the sixth standard of textuality, and it is concerned with the factors which make a test relevance to a situation of occurrence.

Intertextuality is the seventh standard of textuality. This standard refers to the factors which make the use of one text depends on the knowledge of the previous one.

1.1.4. Discourse Analysis and Grammar

There is a connection between DA and grammar. This connection appears from the relationship between the grammatical form of sentences and contexts, where it counts on the intersection of syntax and DA. Thus, Cohesion plays a major role in this relation, where we should include these two main terms: theme and rhyme. These two notions are vital for the progression of DA.

EFL students acquire the structures of sentences in many ways such as repetition with intensity and the analysis of the grammar structure. Discourse analysts are interested in the different implications and options of these structures in
creating a text. The English language has a kind of restricted and fixed way in the word order of a sentence, namely "SVOA". i.e, Subject + Verb + Objective + Adverbia. That is to say, any declarative statement in the English language must carry the subject at the beginning of the sentence, followed by a verb and objective or adverbial at the bottom of the sentence. However, McCarthy (1991) declared that there are different ways in the English language in which we can reorder the main units of a sentence by changing different elements at the front of the sentence. This movement is "fronting devices". This is illustrated in the examples below:

E.g. Sometimes Mary reads Inferno.

A S V O

E.g. What Mary reads is Inferno.

Wh S V O

E.g. It's Inferno Mary reads.

O S V

The writer resolves how to start and what linguistic element to choose and begin with the sentence. The linguistic element at the beginning of the sentence is its theme. The rest of the sentence tells the reader more details about the theme. i.e, the rhyme. The theme is the theoretical account of the point of the expiration of the message, whereas the rhyme is what the addresser would like to tell about the theme McCarthy (1991).

Halliday (1944) keys out the theme-rhyme dichotomy as: firstly, the theme is regarded mostly in the intonation as it has a special tone unit, and it is proceeded by a pause. Secondly, themes must be the basic elements of the structure. That is to say, the process (main verb), the participants (subject and object) and the circumstantial factor (adverbia). There have been found only three possibilities for the theme in the
English language which are: Textual theme related to discourse markers and conjunctions. The interpersonal theme, it is related to the vocative. That is to say, it is used when the referent of the noun is being addressed. A topic theme means the SVOA elements which were explained earlier.

The addressee employs the theme and the rhyme in order to shed light on a specific piece of information within the sentence, as it will appear in the next quote:

In spoken narrative and anecdotes, speakers will often front place key orientational features for their listeners. These are the most obviously time and place markers ('ones upon a time', 'one day', 'then, suddenly', 'at the corner', 'not far from here' etc), but may also be foregrounding of a key participants and information about them felt to be important to the listener. (McCarthy & Carter 1994, p. 54)

The theme and the rhyme also employed to arrange the information in the text. That means that the rhyme of one sentence is constantly going to be the theme of the one that follows it. As widdowson (2007) stated: "Theme/rhyme assignment is a general way of organizing information and carrying reference." (p.43). They are used in the thematic organization of the paragraph. The theme plays the role of the topic sentence. Whereas the rhematic value is played by the rhyme, which will eventually support the theme and provide it with more arguments.

1.1.5. Written Vs Spoken Discourse

The importance of studying written and spoken discourse on an individual basis by discourse specialists has increase gradually. So, a distinction has been made between these two notions. In order to clarify the differences and the similarities, we will review some of researchers' and linguists' opinions under the subject of interest.
Davies and Widdowson (1974) declared that spoken and written language have specific characteristics. They asserted that speaking involves two phenomena: the use of paralinguistic elements, i.e., the use of gestures, body movements and voice tone, and the feedback which is generated by the listener through his reaction. That is to say, the addresser (the speaker) can alter what he is going to say on the basis of the addressee's (the listener) reaction, who is supposed to be present during the speech. Moreover, Davies and Widdowson (1974) manifest that written discourse is grounded in linguistic elements. They support this view by the existence of graphological tools in writing which alternate the paralinguistic one's such as punctuation.

Brown and Yule (1983) had also noted the difference between written and spoken discourse in terms of function, they stated:

A natural language utterance would be used to fulfill only one function, to the total exclusion of the other. That function which language serves in the expression of 'content' we will describe as transactional, and that function involves in expressing social relations and personal attitudes we will describe as interactional. (p.1)

In other words, written language has a transactional function because the writer's objective is to provide the reader with information, and to convey specific thoughts and messages. On the other hand, spoken language has an interactional function because the speaker wants to make relationships between people in society.

Dubin and Olshtain (1986) distinguished these two modes in terms of its planning. They said: "written discourse is usually planned, while spoken discourse can be planned or unplanned" (p. 93-4).
According to Schiffrin (1994), the objective of any text producer either spoken or written is to produce his text according to the needs of the receivers. Moreover, he identified the differences between these two modes by stating that: 'spoken discourse is more fragmented and written discourse is more integrated' (p. 189). He means by the term fragmentation the quickness of moving from one idea to the other. This process is more rapid in speaking than writing. By the term integration, he meant the ideas that are organized well in terms of complexity of the structure and the length of the sentences because the write has a great time in creating that.

However, Spoken and written texts share many characteristics. According to Tribble (1996), a writer may opt to write in a speaking-like style by employing plenty of verbs in multi-clauses sentences. In the same vain, a speaker may opt to speak in a writing-like style by applying a nominalization process. i.e, exchanging the verbs with its nouns in the clauses. These options that the writer does either to write in writing-like style or speaking-like style are governed by many factors like the aim for which the writer from the beginning and the social context, and the same thing can be applied to the speaker.

To sum up, it is important to writers, particularly for FL students to know more about the differences of spoken and written discourse. This knowledge will enable them to arrange and organize their ideas and sentences cautiously so as to make their meaning as explicit as possible to the reader without direct feedback (Bryne,1988). Moreover, it will make them able to write in different styles. i.e, speaking-like style and writing-like style on the basis of social context and the overall objective for which they write.
1.1.6. Coherence

As we discussed earlier in this section, a text is viewed as a text only if it has a texture, and only if it makes sense and unified as a whole. Coherence is a debatable subject up till now because it was defined differently by different linguists and researchers and approached from varied angles. Widdowson (1978) believed that coherence is a pragmatic concept and it is connected to discourse analysis and speech act theory to give the relationship between the aspects of speech act. On the other hand, Brown and Yule (1983) concentrated more on the way of examining written discourse. They concluded that coherence is the outcome of the interaction between discourse and its receivers.

As it is remarked, coherence is a vague concept and it is not a well-defined concept. According to McCarthy (1991), the vagueness of its definitions may come from the fact that coherence is an interpretive process made by the reader while reading the text. That is to say, the writer should always try to foretell the reader's response to his text. Despite the fact of its vagueness in definitions, Johns (1986) viewed coherence in two aspects: reader-based and text-based coherence. The former is related to the writer-reader or speaker-listener interaction. The latter is related to the inner structure of the text itself. Reader-based coherence is mostly used in discussing the issues of comprehending a text. However, text-based coherence is mostly used to say either a text is coherent or not.

1.1.7. Cohesion

A great number of works were published concerning cohesion. Many researchers like Hatch (1992) and Jonstone (2002) admitted that the publication of Cohesion in English Halliday and Hasan (1976) is the stone corner of cohesion theory. They discussed the topic in details with some illustrations of its types. In the
same vain, Celce-Murcia and Olshtain (2000) as well noted that cohesion as a field is under the umbrella of DA along with other fields (coherence, information structure, conversation and critical discourse analysis). They showed that cohesive ties are seen as the clearest structural features that relate and connect discourse (2000).

Halliday and Hasan (1976) define cohesion as:

Cohesion, therefore, is a part of the text forming components in the linguistic system. It is the means whereby elements that are structurally unrelated to one another linked together, through the dependence of one on the other for its interpretation. (p. 27)

That is to say, the notion "cohesion" is considered as a part of the linguistic system. Through cohesion, the feature of being a text is achieved, in other words texture, by relating the elements to one another. It is crucial to creating a text, but it is added through other text formatting components. The continuity that exists between the elements of a text is well expressed through the major role of cohesion. As it is mentioned by Halliday and Hasan (1976), "the cohesive relation themselves are relations in meanings, and the continuity which they bring about is semantic continuity" (p. 303).

It is obvious that the sentences in any given text are not organized in a random way, but the sentences are related and unified as a whole. Moreover, it is easy to notice that there are linguistic elements within the text that make the sentences stand as a whole. These linguistic elements are described by Nunan (1993) as cohesive devices or text-forming devices. These cohesive devices have types. These types will be discussed below.

1.1.8. Types of Cohesion
Cohesion is showed through both grammar and vocabulary. For this reason, cohesion has two types, namely, lexical cohesion and grammatical cohesion.

1.1.8.1. Lexical cohesion is the first type of cohesion. It is used to accomplish the cohesive relations between sentences in a text. Lexical cohesion is used by vocabulary. Halliday and Hasan (1976) divided it into two main categories. They summarized it as follow:

Table 01. The General Concept of General Cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of lexical cohesion</th>
<th>Referential relation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Retiation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a) same word (repetition)</td>
<td>(i) same referent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) synonym (or near-synonym)</td>
<td>(ii) inclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) superordinate</td>
<td>(iii) exclusive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(general word)</td>
<td>(iv) unrelated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Collocation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Halliday & Hasan, 1997, p. 288

1. Retiation is the first type of lexical cohesion. This type is not only limited to the repetition of the lexical items. However, it is connected to other elements like synonyms, near-synonyms, superordinate and general word. These different classes of reiteration will be defined and illustrated by Halliday and Hasan (1976, p. 279-80)

a- Repetition: it is the repetition of the same lexical item in later parts of the written production.

b- Synonym: it is the use of the equivalent words that have the same meanings.

c- Superordinate: this type means the use of the same word class which contains the same meaning of the other word.
**d-General word:** this kind of words are used to refer back to the original lexical item used before. These words involve people, objects ..etc.

Examples:

- There's a boy climbing that tree.

  a- *The boy's* going to fall if he doesn't take care. a= the repetition is achieved by (boy, boy).

  b- *The lad's* going to fall if he doesn't take care. b= the synonym is showed by (lad, boy).

  c- *The child's* going to fall if he doesn't take care. c= the superordinate is expressed through the noun (child, boy).

  d- *the idiot's* going to fall if he doesn't take care. d= the group word is stated by (idiot, boy).

**2. Collocation:** is the second type of lexical cohesion. As it is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976), collocation is achieved through the association made by habitually co-occurring lexical items. These items appear in identical situations because they appeared earlier in identical environments.

**1.1.8.2. Grammatical cohesion:** is the second type of cohesion. McCarthy (1991) stated that it is the surface making of semantic connections within clauses and sentences in written discourse, and within utterances and turns in speech. This type of cohesion focuses on the use of grammar to create cohesion between one sentence and another. Grammatical cohesion includes devices as reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction. We address these types in details below.
1. Reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976) stated that reference has to do with semantic relationship by replacing items in sentences with new ones that refer to them. A reference always deals with grammar relations. This kind of grammatical cohesion work in two different ways: exophoric and endophoric. In other words, the reader can recognize the referent in a given discourse by searching the referent item in that discourse. Hence, exophoric reference has to do with the context of the situation, i.e., beyond the text. On the other hand, the endophoric reference includes both anaphoric and cataphoric. The former can be interpreted by searching backward on the antecedent item. The latter can only be interpreted by searching forward in the discourse in order to know the referent item.

a-Personal Reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined it as "reference by means of function in the speech situation, through the category of person" (p. 37). That is to say, personal reference is mostly expressed through personal pronouns (I, you, he, she, it, they, we) or possessive (mine, yours, hers) and by possessive determiners (my, you, our). For example:

- Mary has got a new car, she bought it lately. (she is personal pronoun).

- Mary's car is awesome, her kids must be happy. (her is possessive determiner).

- That car is Mary's. I didn't know it was hers. (hers is possessive).

b-Demonstrative reference: Demonstrative references are items which can be near as this, these, here or far as there, that, those. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), demonstrative reference is a class of verbal pointing, in which the speaker
recognizes the referent by locating it on the scale of proximity, i.e., how close and how far the item is. For example,

-They went to the cinema last night. That was their first time outgoing in months.

-They are going to the cinema tonight. This will be their first time outgoing in months.

c-Comparative reference

Halliday and Hasan (1976) divided comparative reference into two main types: general comparison and particular comparison. Firstly, a general comparison is employed to show the similarities and the differences between items. The similarities are showed by the use of adjectives like: same and identical and by the use of adverbs like similarly and likewise. For instance, *it is the same Mastunge that saw yesterday.* Secondly, the particular comparison is employed by concentrating on the property of either quality or quantity. It is achieved through the use of enumerative like fewer, less, more ..etc. and it can be expressed by comparatives and adverbs like: better, more … than. For example, *the leather jacket is more attractive than the wool one.*

*But the wool jacket is warmer than the leather one.*

2. Substitution

Halliday and Hasan (1976) defined substitution as "a grammatical relation, a relation is wording rather than meaning" (p.90). In other words, it is the alternative or the replacement of one element by the other, under one condition which is that the substitute of one element must belong to the same grammatical class. There are three types of substitution. Each one of them will be discussed and illustrated below.

a-Nominal substitution: the substitute elements are one, ones and same.

-There are some new tennis balls in the bag. These ones have lost their balance.

b-Verbal substitution: it is achieved through the use of the verb do.
-A: Annie says you drink too much.
-B: So do you!

**c-Clausal substitution:** it is created by the use of items like so, not.

-A: Is it going to rain?
-B: think so.


**3-Ellipsis**

It is defined by Nunan (1993) as the omission of some items from a sentence and these items can only be retrieved by mentioning an item in the preceding text. That is to say, the ellipsis is the operation of omitting the predictable items from sentences. It involves three different types: nominal, verbal and clausal.

**a-Nominal Ellipsis:** is deleting a nominal group.

-Ronaldo and Messi are football players, both of them are talented.

It is easy to notice that the nouns Ronaldo and Messi are deleted and replaced by both in the other clause.

**b-Verbal Ellipsis** is deleting a verbal group.

-Were you crying? No, I wasn't.

Here, we can remark that the verb crying was omitted by the second speaker because it was known.

**c-Clausal Ellipsis** is ellipsis among the verbal group.

-I don't know how to drive a car. I'll have to learn how (to drive a car).

**4-Conjunction**

As Nunan (1993) argues, it is different from other cohesive devices (reference, substitution and ellipsis) in the way that reminds the reader of previously stated items and highlights relations that can only be grasped via reference to other
parts of the text. The conjunction was classified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) into four different types. They are additive, adversative, causal and temporal.

**a-Additive**

This kind of conjunction has five different types. Firstly, the additive is carried through the use of *and, moreover, further*. …etc. Secondly, negative whereby is employed via cohesive devices as *nor, not, either*. …etc. Thirdly, the alternative is employed by the use of *or*. Fourthly, comparative is expressed via using expressions as *in the same vain, on the other hand*. .. etc. Finally, the appositive is used for illustrating and explaining. This can be achieved through the use of the following ties: *for instance …* etc. For example, he is intelligent. *And* he is a reliable person.

**b-Adversative**

This type is employed by the use of the coming cohesive devices: *yet, however, but, only* … etc.

For example, he didn't get what he wanted, however, he did his best.

**c-Casual**

This type includes the use of conditions that involve the different ties that express reason as *for this reason*, results as consequently, purposes as *for this purpose* and conditionals as *in that case*. For example, he failed his exams because he didn't prepare well.

**d-Temporal**

This type has to do with the description of the action that took certain place at the certain time. It is employed by the use of conjunctions like at the same time, after all, at the end .. etc. For example: at the end, they've got married.
Conclusion

We discussed in the section above the notion of discourse analysis. We can say that discourse is language in use. Furthermore, discourse analysis has two different modes: spoken and written discourse. Each one of these modes has its features. Spoken discourse is built upon the use of paralinguistic elements. It can be planned or unplanned. On the other hand, written discourse is built upon linguistic elements. It is usually planned. We also discussed the different views concerning text and discourse, and we concluded that they may be used interchangeably or in completely different ways. Moreover, we tackled the notion of texture, and we said it is the feature of being a text. The texture is achieved through the use of different cohesive devices. At last, we discussed the different aspects of the notion cohesion and its role in achieving comprehensive discourse.
Section Two: Writing Skill

Introduction

EFL learners’ writing always comes across many problems. These problems are mostly connected to the necessities that this skill makes on EFL learners.

In order to understand the necessities that writing make on EFL learners, we need to look at it from two different views. The first one is Chomsky’s (1965) view that has to do with competence and performance in a language. Competence means the knowledge of grammar as well as lexis of a language. Performance is the knowledge of the use of the grammatical and lexical items in real life situations. From this view, we can notice that EFL learners are required to achieve a great level of both grammar and lexis to overcome the problems that are related to writing. The second one is related to the shortcoming of the above view. According to Hymes (1972), competence does not only require the grammar knowledge and lexis of a certain language, but also it requires the knowledge of the features of the society where the language is played. Performance requires the ability to connect the grammatical and lexical knowledge with the sociocultural knowledge when communicating (as cited in Cook & Seildholfer, 1995). From this view, we conclude that EFL learners have to master not only grammar and lexis but also the aspects of the society to avoid socially and culturally related problems.

1.2.1. Definition of the Writing Skill

It is believed that writing is an art that needs consciously focused effort and thoughtful choice in language. That is to say, writing skill needs a lot of energy and concentration on the part of the writer because it is one of the productive skills. Writing skill is considered as a mean of communication that uses both signs and
symbols. Nunan (1989) claims that writing is not just a pen on paper. In fact, it is a highly sophisticated mental process.

Therefore, writing process in the field of language learning and teaching. It requires a great mastery of grammar and lexis, then the ability to generate and organize ideas in a readable text.

1.2.2. Components of the Writing Skill

No doubt that writing is not an easy task because of the effort that the learners have to do to produce an effective piece of writing. They should follow certain criteria to achieve that. According to Starkey (2004), in order to produce an efficient piece of writing, the following criteria must exist: organization, coherence, clarity and word choice.

1.2.2.1. Organization

Earlier, we talked about some linguistic elements that connect sentences with one another to formulate coherent and comprehensive text. These elements were described by Nunan (1993) as cohesive devices, these devices have two main categories, grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion. We discussed these categories in details in the section above as well as the way that should be used to formulate a coherent text. Now, we will shift our attention to the problems that the writer faces while using cohesive devices. According to Hedge (2005), writers face numerous problems while trying to connect their sentences using cohesive devices. These problems are caused by the wrong use of the cohesive devices. Hedge (2005) explains these problems with the following examples:

- A writer may employ ill-defined cohesive device. That is to say, a writer may use an unclear cohesive device that makes the sentence ambiguous.

E.g. three times daily for seven days only, except condition deteriorates.
A writer may use a suitable cohesive device but he does not recognize the syntactic problems and put it in the wrong place in the sentence, use it too often, or fail to employ the right punctuation.

E.g. people who live in the country, whereas, have a pleasant environment. On the contrary, town dwellers suffer from noise and furthermore cramped conditions.

To sum up, the problems that the writer faces while writing are a lot, especially when it comes to organizing and arranging sentences. Mostly and far most, these problems are related to cohesive devices. A writer may use it wrongly or overuse it. Moreover, cohesive devices might be used in an ambiguous way.

1.2.2.2. Clarity

The use of accurate language is very important in writing. The learners' writing must be readable, comprehensive and clear to make their readers understand what they mean. Starkey (2004) stated that the essential element that makes any piece of writing easy to read is clarity. He argues that learners writing should include the following elements to be clear. Firstly, the writer should eliminate ambiguity. It means that a writer should stay clear from unclear words that have more than one interpretation to help his readers grasp what he means. Secondly, he should use powerful and accurate vocabulary; this will help him convey his message in clear and accurate manner. Thirdly, the writer should be concise. In order to achieve conciseness, the writer must eliminate unneeded words or phrases along with the use of active voice when it is possible. Fourthly, the writer should avoid wordiness which means that the writer should avoid repetition of information and ideas.
1.2.3. The Relationship between the Use of Cohesive Devices and the Quality of Writing

The relationship between the use of cohesive devices in a text has shown to be crucial for the quality of writing. Numerous studies have been conducted on this relationship between writing quality and its dependency on the use of cohesive devices (Fitzgerald & Spiegel, 1986; Zhang, 2000; Lee, 2002).

Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1986) conducted a study where they examined the relationship between cohesion and coherence and to which degree it will affect the quality of writing and grade level. They analyzed 27 third grade and 22 sixth grade students' writing. Each one of these students has been required to write two different essays in two days. That is to say, the students will produce two essays in four days. The students have 30 minutes for planning and writing. Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1986) employed Halliday and Hasan's (1976) system in grading cohesion. They concluded that there was a proof of implication that relates cohesion and coherence in learners' writing. This relationship was different to the content of the text but it did not differ to the grade.

Zhang (2000) examined the use of cohesive devices in 50 argumentative essays written by Chinese undergraduate students from different majors. He concluded among the different types of cohesive devices that the lexical ones were used too often, along with the use of references and conjunctions. The number of lexical devices employed by the students affected the quality of writing significantly.

Lee (2002) also investigated how Chinese undergraduate students employ cohesive devices in their writing. He examined 107 essays that were written by them. According to his study, the students use LCDs too often. On the other hand, they use
references and conjunctions less often. He also found that there is a misuse, overuse of conjunctions and ambiguity in the use of reference. Lee (2002) conducted another study with 16 ESL students to examine whether the explicit teaching of cohesive devices may or may not affect the quality of writing. The results showed that there is a positive effect between the pedagogical tools used to teach cohesive devices and the improvement of writing.

**Conclusion**

In the section above, we discussed the writing skill. We can say that writing is an art that needs concentration and respectable choice of words. Moreover, the production of well-organized piece of writing needs the following standards to exist: organization, coherence, clarity and word choice. Then, the relation between the use of cohesive devices and the quality of writing was under the scope by mentioning a number of studies that were carried on the subject of the interest. Particularly, Fitzgerald and Spiegel (1986) Zhang (2000) and Lee (2002), these studies were described above in details.
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Introduction

This chapter discusses whether to confirm or refute our hypothesis. This is done through the analysis of the data collected. The data was collected by means of diagnostic. Then the test was analyzed by calculating the frequencies of the coherent and cohesive devices. After that, we searched for the problems in using coherent and cohesive ties.

2.1. The Population

This study's sample represents the 1st-year master students in language sciences and TEFL at Larbi Ben M'Hidi University, Oum Bouaghi. The test was placed at a normal tutorial class. The number of the participants was 23. They were asked to write a coherent and cohesive essay on one of the three topics given to them. The sample is representative to some extent because they have been taught how to write a coherent and cohesive essay as well the appropriate use of cohesive devices.

2.2. Methodology

The research question belongs to a descriptive, quantitative and qualitative study. This study was carried by means of a diagnostic test. The participants were asked to write an argumentative essay. Through this, we drew some conclusions about the different types of coherent and cohesive devices employed by the students and the problems they encountered in employing them.

The diagnostic test was based on the following principles:

- In order not to feel restricted, they were given the choice to choose one of the three topics.
- They were given some instructions so they can understand the task at hand and not get lost.
They were given an hour and a half to write and they did not know about the subject of the study.

2.3. Analysis of the Results

A detailed examination of coherent and cohesive devices was done on 23 argumentative essays. Two steps are undertaken in carrying the analysis of the learner's argumentative essays. The first step sheds light on the general use of both grammatical and LCDs and their frequency. The second step focuses on the appropriate use and the inappropriate use of the cohesive devices. It also provided us with the different kinds of problems encountered by the students. This analysis was based on Halliday and Hassan's (1976) framework of coherence and cohesion.

2.3.1. The Occurrence and Frequency of GCDs

In this section, we will know how frequent the learners of language science and TEFL at Larbi Ben M'Hidi used all the types of coherent and cohesive devices. The main target will be on the use of GCDs that links and connects the sentences together.

Chart 1. Numbers and Percentages of GCDs
Chart 1 shows the number and the percentage of the GCDs with its sub-types which occurred in 23 argumentative essays. The total number of the GCDs is 1003, the learners employed all four types of the GCDs, despite the significant difference among them. The learners depend mostly on the use of reference, as it represents 56% of the total cohesive devices. After that, conjunction appeared in the second place where it represents 35%. Then, substitution comes in the third place with 6%, while ellipsis comes in the fourth place with 2%.

2.3.2. Numbers and Percentages of the Sub-types of The GCDs

In this sense, we discussed all the sub-types of the GCDs in details.

2.3.2.1. Reference

Chart 1 shows that the total number of reference used by the learners is 566, which illustrates 56% of the total number of GCDs. Chart 2 exemplifies the number and percentage of all three sub-types of reference.
Chart 2 shows that the learners employed 380 personal reference, which represents 67% of the total cohesive devices. This shows that this kind of sub-type is very well-known because learners had an early exposure to it. The demonstrative reference comes in the second place with 143, which presents 25%. Likely, because it is very easy to employ and the students’ familiarity with demonstrative reference. Demonstrative reference is often overused by EFL learners. As for comparative reference comes last with a number of 43 item and percentage of 8%.

2.3.2.2. Conjunction

The total number of conjunctions used by the learners is 353 as it is shown in chart 1, which indicates 35% of the total number of GCDs. Chart 3 shows the number and percentage of the different subtypes of this category.

Chart 3. Numbers and Percentage of Sub-types of Conjunction

Chart 3 above shows that learners employed 196 additive conjunctions, which represents 56% from the total number of the conjunctions used in the learners’ essays.
Both adversative and temporal conjunctions were employed equally with 16%, while the total number of comparative conjunctions used by the learners is 44 item with 12%.

### 2.3.2.3. Substitution

The total number of substitution used by the learners is 61 as it is shown in chart 1, which indicates 6% of the total number of GCDs. Chart 4 shows the number and percentage of the different subtypes of this category.

**Chart 4. Numbers and Percentage of Sub-types of Substitution**

Chart 4 shows that learners generated 25 nominal substitutions, which stands for 41%. In the second place comes clausal substitution with a total number of 21 item and 34%, and at last comes verbal substitution with 15 item and 25%.
2.3.2.4. Ellipsis

The total number of Ellipsis used by the learners is 23 as it is shown in chart 1, which indicates 3% of the total number of GCDs. Chart 5 shows the number and percentage of the different subtypes of this category.

![Chart 5: Numbers and Percentage of Sub-types of Ellipsis](chart.png)

**Chart 5. Numbers and Percentage of Sub-types of Ellipsis**

Based on the results showed in chart 5, The learners used 22 nominal ellipsis with a dominant percentage of 96%. Only one item was produced in the verbal ellipsis which stands for 4%, and no clausal ellipsis was produced by the learners.

2.3.3. The Problems Encountered by the Learners in Using GCDs

In this section, we will answer the main question of the study, which is what are the problems that EFL learners face using coherent and cohesive devices? The coming chart below indicates the frequencies and percentages of both appropriate and inappropriate use of GCDs.
Chart 6. Appropriate Vs Inappropriate Use of GCDs

Chart 6 shows that learners are able to use GCDs appropriately with 84%. On the other hand, they have considerable problems in using this type of cohesive devices and it represents 16%. The following table will show the problems that the learners faced in each sub-type of the grammatical cohesive ties.

Table 2.

Problems Encountered by Learners in Using GCDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GCDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Appropriate use</th>
<th>Inappropriate use</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td></td>
<td>484</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td></td>
<td>272</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>840</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 2 shows 86% of the appropriate use of reference and only 14% of the inappropriate use of reference. It is worth mentioning that all substitution and ellipsis were used in an appropriate way, probably because of its little occurrence in the essays. Concerning conjunction, it was generated with 77% of appropriate use and 23% of inappropriate use.

### 2.3.3.1. The Problems Encountered in Using Reference

The following table shows the different types of problems in using reference along with its examples. This provides us with insights about the problems faced by EFL learners.

**Table 3. Problems Encountered in Using Reference**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misuse</td>
<td>Many psychologists make our researchers on the child mental and physical development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse</td>
<td>He feels that violence is the best solution for all problems, and of course, he will grow up having already bad thinking and ideas in his mind, he will think about revenge and tools that are dangerous to protect himself from violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use</td>
<td>They seek for violence as a solution, in their minds violence equals violence. No way, this can lead to the emergence of weak generation which encourages violence to solve the problems of violence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>There are plenty of violence effects, we mention two of them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Run on</td>
<td>Violence has become the major worry of this century, people those</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
sentences days aren't even aware that they are acting violently especially with the children, and think that it's the best way to teach them discipline, but what they don't know is the major effects of it on the small scale and on the large one.

Pronoun shift When children get exposure to violence in their early ages, they will develop a psychotic disorder that lead him in two different ways.

On the basis of the qualitative analysis, the students encountered numerous problems in using reference devices. Table 3 illustrates that they missed some items, like our in the first example, where it should be their. This lack of agreement between the subject and the possessive pronoun is due to confusion and lack of concentration. Moreover, the qualitative analysis also exposed that the second problem that EFL learners face is overuse. It is proved in some essays, like he in the second example which was overused and redundant, making the text dull. Similarly, the third problem is limited use. It is obvious that the word violence was repeated many times, where it could be interchanged with the appropriate pronoun. The fourth problem is ambiguity. The pronoun them in the fourth example was used in an ambiguous way to the point that we cannot notice its referent. The fifth problem is run-on sentences. In the example provided, four sentences were linked with a comma, where it could be linked to many other choices. Pronoun shift is the last problem. The writer used the pronoun they to refer back to children, then he changes to him. This may cause confusion to the reader as he may think that the writer is referring to two different groups, where in fact he is not.
2.3.3.2. The Problems Encountered in Using Conjunction

The following table shows the different types of problems in using conjunction along with its examples. This provides us with insights about the problems faced by EFL learners.

Table 4.

Problems Encountered in Using Conjunction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misuse</td>
<td>At the past, and to be more precise before the innovation of internet…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse</td>
<td>Some parents ignore and neglect their children, because of their point view, children do not understand, and they forget that children in the age of 2 they need interaction with parents and they start understand some aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use</td>
<td>This thing was to entertain, to communicate with those who are living abroad, to know what is happening in different parts of the world etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambiguity</td>
<td>The criminal who kidnap kids are not the only ones guilties but parents also…</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As table 4 shows, the learners face many problems in adapting conjunction in the written essays. And, in the first example was misused because the sentence cannot be practiced in the English language. This also can be attributed to the interlanguage interference, as a direct translation from L1 to L2. Concerning the second problem, we noticed some overuse of some sub-types of conjunction in the essays. As it is illustrated in the second example, the additive conjunction and was used excessively and repeated several times. This may be due to the lack of knowledge of the writer.
with all of the additive conjunction. Regarding the third problem which is limited use, the style of the writer in the third example shows that he/she has a limited use of the GCDs. In the last problem, ambiguity, the write used the conjunction but in an ambiguous way, where it can confuse the reader by making him think that he has read an argument and then objecting this argument at the same time.

2.3.4. Summary

The results of the qualitative analysis revealed that learners employed all the four types of GCDs, despite the fact that those devices were used indifferently concerning their frequency in the essays. Referential, conjunctive and substitutional GCDs came first, second, and third respectively, where elliptical ones were rarely used. With regards to the sub-types of GCDs, the learners counted on the most popular ones in the English language, and those were adopted mostly in the argumentative essays. The results show that learners are able to use the GCDs appropriately 84%, yet they still have some problems in using them, as illustrated by 16% of inappropriate use. These were due to the interlanguage interference and the lack of knowledge of some aspects of the GCDs.

2.3.5. The Occurrence and Frequency of LCDs

This section discusses how frequent the students of language science and TEFL at Larbi Ben M'Hidi used all the types of coherent and cohesive devices. The main target will be on the use of LCDs that link and connect the sentences together.
Chart 7. Numbers and Percentages of LCDs

Chart 7 shows the number and the percentage of the LCDs with its sub-types which occurred in 23 argumentative essays. The total number of the LCDs is 341, the learners employed all two types of the LCDs despite the significant difference among them. The learners depend mostly on the use of reiteration, as it represents 94% of the total cohesive devices. After that, collocation appeared in the second place where it represents 6%.

2.3.6. Numbers and Percentages of the Sub-types of The LCDs

In this section, we discuss the sub-types of the LCDs, mainly reiteration.

2.3.6.1. Reiteration

Chart 7 shows that the total number of reiteration used by the learners is 319 items, which illustrates 94% of the total number of LCDs. Chart 8 exemplifies the number and percentage of all four sub-types of reiteration.
The chart 8 above illustrates that the learners employed 244 repetitions of the same word, which represents 76% of the total LCDs. This shows that this kind of sub-type is widely used by learners because it is very easy to adopt. The subordinate comes in the second place with 36, which presents 11%. A synonym is in the third place, it was used 21 times and represents 7%. In the last place comes general word. It was adopted by the learners 18 times and it represents only 6% of the total number of the LCDs.

2.3.7. The problems encountered by the Learners in Using LCDs

In this section, we discuss the problems that EFL learners face using LCDs. The coming chart indicates the frequencies and percentages of both appropriate and inappropriate use of LCDs.
Chart 9. Appropriate Vs Inappropriate Use of LCDs

As chart 9 illustrates, the students are able to use LCDs appropriately with 85%. On the other hand, they have considerable problems in using this type of cohesive devices and it represents 15%. The following table shows the problems that the students faced in each sub-type of the LCDs.

Table 5.

Problems Encountered by Learners in LCDs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LCDs</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Appropriate use</th>
<th>Inappropriate use</th>
<th>Total N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reiteration</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collocation</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table 5 shows 86% of the appropriate use of reiteration, while only 14% represents the inappropriate use of it. Regarding collocation, it was generated with 85% of appropriate use and 15% of inappropriate use.

2.3.7.1. The Problems Encountered in Using Reiteration

The following table will show the different types of problems in using reiteration along with its examples. This will provide us with insights about the problems faced by EFL learners.

Table 6.

Problems Encountered in Using Reiteration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reiteration</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Misuse</td>
<td>Parents and teachers cannot control or make do well at school, so bad results are the result.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overuse</td>
<td>So the effects of violence on children are so many and various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limited use</td>
<td>Actually this phenomenon is considered as the major problem that the governments should resolve in any way. The most effected category from violence are small children, who are supposed to be free and protected from any damage. However, the release of this phenomenon in its different types does not give them the chance to be more free and comfortable in doing anything.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the problems faced by the students in using reiteration involved repetition. The excessive use of the same word did not haze over the meaning, but it did corrupt the flow of ideas and it developed boredom to the reader. As it is illustrated in the table above, misuse is one of the problems encountered by the students. In the first
example, the word *result* was misused, because of the lack of lexical repertoire of the students that force them to use the same redundant words which effect the meaning of the sentence. Overuse of synonyms is another problem which corrupts the meaning of the sentence. As it is presented in the second example, the student used the words *so many* and *various* at the same context which make the sentence so dull. The reason behind this problem is probably caused by the lack of awareness of the student that the words related in meaning cannot be used interchangeably. Moreover, the influence of L1 on L2 is a major reason in such error. The last problem is limited use of the same words. In the third example, the word *this phenomenon* was repeated twice with a significance distance between them. This is due to the lack of vocabulary and students do not seem mindful about the features of the English language.

### 2.3.7.2. The Problems Encountered in Using Collocation

The following table will show the only type of problems in using collocation along with its example.

**Table 7.**

**Problems Encountered in Using Collocation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collocation</th>
<th>Example</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Miss-ordered collocation</td>
<td>Such psychiatric problems and <em>mental disorders</em> leads them to live in loneliness, and their inability to judge reality from fantasy leads them to be considered by people as abnormal ones.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All of the problems faced by students in using collocation are miss-ordered collocation. In the example above, the student miss-order the collocation mental disorder due to lack of knowledge of collocational restrictions.
2.3.8. Summary

The results of the analysis revealed that students applied both types of LCDs, regardless of the fact that those devices were used indifferently concerning their frequency in the essays. Reiteration comes in the first place, then collocation comes in the second place. The learners relied on the most popular ones in the English language, and those were adopted mostly in the argumentative essays. The results illustrate that learners are able to use the LCDs appropriately 85%, but they still have some problems in using them, as presented by 15% of inappropriate use. These were due to the lack of the lexical competence and the students' unfamiliarity written English features.
General Conclusion

This study aims at investigating students' problems in using coherent and cohesive devices; both grammatical and lexical cohesive devices were under the scope of analysis. This analysis was carried by undertaking two main steps. Firstly, we investigated the general use of both grammatical and lexical cohesive devices and their frequencies. Secondly, we did identify both the appropriate and inappropriate use of the after mentioned cohesive devices.

The analysis revealed that the students employed all the types and the subtypes of the cohesive devices. It also shows the students' mastery on both grammatical and lexical cohesive devices. Yet, they have some serious issues in adopting some items of grammatical and lexical cohesive devices. The results indicate that the students encounter numerous problems such as miss-use and overuse of some cohesive ties, for example, and and but. Moreover, the students used some cohesive ties in an ambiguous way and they did lack the unity between the sentences.

Finally, we conclude that EFL students at Larbi Ben M'Hidi university face some problems in using coherent and cohesive devices due to the lack of the linguistic competence, which confirms our hypothesis.

Recommendations

On the basis of the findings, we formulated the following recommendations:

- Teachers should stress reading activities and combine them with writing activities to increase students' awareness with the features of good writing.
- Students should be taught clearly about the cohesive ties, namely, grammatical and lexical cohesive devices. This will help to get better understanding and multiple choices to connect their written production.
• The teachers should provide their students with detailed feedback about the errors committed and they should provide them with solutions to avoid making them again.

• Students should have excessive writing production activities to develop their writing skill.

• Students should be exposed to different topics; this will give them opportunities to practice different cohesive ties to build cohesion.
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Appendix A

Diagnostic Test

Write a coherent and cohesive essay on ONE of the following topics:

1- What are the effects of violence on children?

2- Could you live without internet?

3- Do criminals who kidnap kids deserve death penalty?
Appendix B

Sample Essays

Diagnostic Test

Write a coherent and cohesive essay on ONE of the following topics:
1- What are the effects of violence on children?
2- Could you live without internet?
3- Do criminals who kidnap kids deserve death penalty?

First, let’s talk about violence. It is a serious issue that affects children in many ways. From physical to emotional abuse, violence can have long-lasting effects on a child’s development. It can lead to anxiety, depression, and even post-traumatic stress disorder.

Next, what about internet? While it has its benefits, it can also be detrimental to one’s health. Addiction to social media can lead to a sedentary lifestyle, which can result in obesity and other health issues.

Finally, the issue of kidnapping. This is a severe crime that has caused immense pain and suffering for many families. The death penalty, while a controversial topic, may be the only way to deter such heinous acts.

In conclusion, these are just a few of the many topics that we could discuss. It is important to address these issues and work towards finding solutions that will benefit all of us.
Diagnostic Test

Write a coherent and cohesive essay on ONE of the following topics:
1. What are the effects of violence on children?
2. Could you live without internet?
3. Do criminals who kidnap kids deserve death penalty?

Thank you!
Diagnostic Test

Write a coherent and cohesive essay on ONE of the following topics:
1. What are the effects of violence on children?
2. Could you live without internet?
3. Do criminals who kidnap kids deserve death penalty?

Firstly, in my opinion, it helps a graduate for us to make a photocopier not only because they faced many problems before they were written and lost their work of time in writing by them. However, it becomes so easy to print, the graduates needed in work. Secondly, the student views.

Finally, in my opinion, it used as a way of communication with our friends in the outside world. This leads to know more about the other cultures and made you well-informed. Also, there is a lot of games and play with them from the friends without going outside.

From my point of view, the Internet is very important. Life is like that. We can't imagine living without it. Because of its advantages, the Internet makes the world small.
Résumé

Cette étude vise à étudier les problèmes des élèves en utilisant des dispositifs cohérents et cohérents à partir de la perspective de l'analyse du discours. Le corpus se compose de 23 essais argumentatifs qui ont été analysés sur la base du cadre de cohésion de Halliday et Hassan (1976). Le corpus a été évalué manuellement en procédant à deux étapes. Tout d'abord, tous les types et sous-types de dispositifs cohésifs grammaticaux et lexicaux sont calculés. Deuxièmement, on s'est concentré sur l'utilisation appropriée et inappropriée des liens cohésifs employés par les étudiants. Les données obtenues montrent que les élèves ont utilisé tous les types de dispositifs cohérents grammaticaux et lexicaux avec leurs sous-types. Les étudiants s'appuyaient fortement sur les dispositifs grammaticaux cohérents en employant 1003 éléments, quelle que soit la différence significative entre les fréquences de ses sous-types. Ils ont utilisé des éléments référentiels de 56%, liés par des liens conjugués 35%, tandis que les substituts et les elliptique représentent 6% et 3%. D'autre part, les liens cohésifs lexiques ont été employés 341 fois. Les éléments de réélection représentent 94%, alors que la collocation ne représente que 6% de l'utilisation totale des dispositifs cohésifs lexicaux. Les résultats de l'analyse ont également montré les problèmes rencontrés par les élèves ; Ils étaient principalement des abus, des abus et de l'ambiguïté.

Mots clés : Analyse du discours, Dispositifs Cohésifs, Dispositifs Cohésifs Grammaticaux, Dispositifs Cohésifs Lexicaux.
ملخص

تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على المشاكل التي يواجهها الطلاب في استخدام أدوات الترابط والتنسيق من منظور تحليل الخطاب. تتكون العينة من 23 مقالا جديدا تم تحليلها على أساس إطار الربط النحوي المقدم من طرف الباحثين هاليدياي وحسن (1976). وقد تم تقييمها بدءاً من خلال الخطوات التالية. أولاً، تم حساب جميع الأنواع الرسمية والفرعية لكل من أدوات الربط النحوي واللغوية. ثانياً، قام الباحث بالتركيز على الاستخدام الصحيح وغير الصحيح للروابط المستخدمة من طرف الطلاب. وتشير البيانات التي تم الحصول عليها أن الطلاب استخدموا جميع أنواع أدوات الربط النحوي واللغوية بالتوازي مع أنواعهم الفرعية. حيث اعتمد الطلاب بشكل هائل على أدوات الربط النحوي من خلال توظيف 1003 أداة، وهذا يعكس التطور في المعرفة بين تكرارات أنواعها الفرعية. وقد استخدم الطلاب الإشارة بنسبة تقدر ب 56٪، وأدوات الربط بنسبة 35٪، بينما أدوات البدل والحرف استخدمها على الترتيب بنسبة 6٪ و 3٪. ومن ناحية أخرى، تم استخدام أدوات إعادة التأكيد 341 مرة. حيث تمثل نسبة 94٪، في حين أن استخدام المتلازمات اللغوية يمثل 6٪ فقط من إجمالي استخدام أدوات الربط اللغوي. كما أظهرت نتائج التحليل أيضا أن المشاكل التي واجهها الطلاب كانت في الغالب سوء أو إفراط في الاستخدام مع وجود بعض الغموض في أدوات الربط المستخدمة من طرف الطلاب.

الكلمات المفتاحية: تحليل الخطاب، أدوات الترابط والتنسيق، أدوات الربط النحوي، أدوات الربط اللغوية.