Teaching Cohesive Devices To Enhance Students’ Profeciency In English Foreign Language Writing Paragraph

The Case of First Year LMD Students at Larbi Ben M'Hidi University, Oum- El Bouaghi

A Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts in English Sciences and Teaching English as a Foreign Language

By: Mostefa HOUAM

Supervisor: Mr. Hadj BOURI

Examiner: Mr. Hamza MERABET

2016-2017
DEDICATION

In the name of Allah, Most Gracious, Most Merciful

I DEDICATE THIS WORK TO:

My parents, brothers and sisters.

To All my family, relatives, friends and classmates

My teachers.
Acknowledgements

First and foremost, a profound debt of gratitude is owed to my supervisor Mr. Hadj BOURI for his patience, Guidance and support.

My sincere thanks are to my examiner “Mr. Hamza MERABT” For kindly accepting to read my Dissertation and to be the examiner.

I owe much to my parents, brothers and my sisters for their encouragements and help.

Also I dedicate my work to my teachers in the Primary, Secondary and Middle Schools.

I would also thank my friend Khadidja Benberrah for the precious time she has devoted to help me.

My friends whom I shall never forget their sense of humor: Abderrahmen, Ahmed Baddereddine, Hassan, Zakariya,

Special Thanks to all my family and persons who gave me a boost to accomplish my work.
Abstract

Cohesive devices are a way to achieve a cohesive writing which is considered as an important element for learners to improve their writing and making their meaning comprehensible to the receiver. It is an aspect that enables learners to have a crystal clear language. The purpose of present inquiry is to investigate the relationship between CDs and quality of EFL student writing paragraphs. The problem lies in the lack of using an appropriate CD, we hypothesize that there is a relationship between using CDs and writing proficiency. To confirm and prove this hypothesis, an experiment design has been conducted. Both groups: an experimental group and a control one. This research based on the students’ production (pretest and posttest) in which the experimental group received a period of treatment while the control group has no interference. This study showed that: even though students are sensitized toward the appropriate use of CDs, and on top of that they still have facing the problem of varying the implementation of CDs, the T-test: independent t-test between control and experimental group (comparison of results) and Dependent t-test within the experimental group (pre results and post results) have been processed by assessing students’ first and second writing production. Based on the finding, first year LMD students have difficulty when it comes to the use of CDs and this confirmed by the rejection of alternative hypothesis in the favor of null hypothesis.
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Résumé

ملخص
General Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Most students of first year of English are unable to write in flow way means how to put sentences and connect them together in a way of meaningful passage (Halliday Hasan,1976). Thus the research problem lies on the failure of the students in writing paragraphs due to the lack of understanding how to write cohesively.

Aim of the Study

This study aims at investigating the relationship between the comprehension of cohesive devices and the proficiency of writing English paragraph.

Research Questions and Hypothesis

Research Questions

Q1. To what extent does the knowledge of cohesive devices influence students’ writing paragraph?

Q2. What if students are not aware or sensitized about cohesive devices will this affect their writing paragraph.

Research Hypothesis

H1: We hypothesize that:

Understanding cohesive devices for first year LMD students of English at L’arbi Ben M’Hidi University - Oum El Bouaghi would enhance their proficiency in writing paragraph
H0: Understanding cohesive devices for first year LMD students of English at L’arbi Ben M’Hidi University - Oum El Bouaghi would enhance their proficiency in writing paragraph

Research Methodology

In order to examine to what extent cohesive devices effect the quality of writing a paragraph we will conduct an experimental method at L’arbi Ben M’hidi University, Oum El Bouaghi. In this study, we have two intact classrooms. at the beginning of thesis both groups (experimental and control groups) took the same pretest and having at the end the same posttest in which the experimental group will receive an intensive teaching of cohesive devices teaching. Thus, through this experimental work we will concentrate on the student’s production of paragraphs so that we can confirm or refute the hypothesis.

T-test: independent t-test between control and experimental group (comparison of results)

Dependent t-test within the experimental group (pre results and post results)

Structure of the Study

This piece of research is divided into two main chapters; the first chapter is theoretical contains two sections one that represents literature review, cohesion and cohesive devices. While the second section deals with writing English paragraph. And the second chapter tackles with the practical part, so the comparison and analysis of students production.
Chapter One: Theoretical part

Section one: Cohesive devices

Introduction

1.1. Definition of Cohesion

1.2. Definition of Cohesive Devices

1.3. Types of Cohesive Devices

1.3.1. Lexical Cohesive Device

1.3.1.1. Reiteration

1.3.1.2. Collocations

1.3.1. Grammatical Cohesive Devises

1.3.1.1. Reference

1.3.1.2. Substitution

1.3.1.3. Ellipsis

1.3.1.4. Conjunctions

1.4. Difference between Cohesion and Coherence

1.5. The Impact of Cohesive Devices in Student’s Writing Proficiency

1.6. Conclusion
Introduction

Undoubtedly; cohesive devices are tools that hold writing paragraph together and which assist to have a readable and comprehensible text. Thus, CDs considered as a crucial element for learners to signal the interconnectedness of their ideas to generate a well cohesive piece of writing. So, the following chapter will tackle with concepts and definitions for both cohesive devices and writing English paragraphs.

1.1. Definition of Cohesion

The term “cohesion” was identified by Halliday and Hasan’s view (1976) for the first time as ‘a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text, and that define it as a text” (p.4), that is to say, a cohesive text is recognized well when the elements are interrelated in a given text. However, Cook (1989) defined cohesion as “formal links between sentences and between clauses” (p.156). That mean cohesion is considered with the connection between sentences and clauses in order to create a meaningful text.

1.2. Definition of Cohesive Devices:

In order to improve writing skill, many EFL learners focus on the use of cohesive devices as an essential mechanism while writing their paragraphs or a piece of writing. According to Hedge(2005,p:83) cohesive devices “ are the means by which parts of text are linked as logically related sequence, they signal the relationship between ideas in such a way that the writer intentions are made clear”. Meanwhile, the reader can comprehend the meaning of any text if there is a clear connectedness between sentences as Halliday and Hasan (1985) as declared by Zmrzlà (2013, p: 46) indicates that:
Cohesive devices are linguistic means of various nature that create the formal connectedness of text, concretely they are the expression that are bound together by relations described a cohesive tie, and which form cohesive chains in the text there are structural an non-structural cohesive devices the lexical and grammatical cohesion discussed here belong to non-structural cohesion, which in structural cohesion includes parallelism, theme- rheme development organization. (P: 82)

Cohesive ties are implemented as glue that keeps a paragraph held together, also create meaningful passage with a good style and help the reader to follow easily the ideas that run through in a given text.

3.1. Types of Cohesive Device

3.1.1. Lexical Cohesion

There are two main categories of cohesive devices that make a text bound together through the use of lexical and grammatical devices.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) pointed that lexical cohesion is how the structure of lexis and vocabulary establish cohesion and semantic relationship through the use of words, items in order to do that, there are two types of lexical cohesion “reiteration” and “collocation». And this can be understood through the Osisanwo’s diagram (p.34)
Lexical cohesion

- Reiteration
- Collocation

**Complimentaries**

- Repetition
- Converse
- Superordinate/Hyponym
- Antony
- Synonym or Near Synonym
- Part/whole
- Part/part
- Co-hyponyms
- Links

**Figure (01):** Lexical Cohesion (Osisanwo, 2005:34)

### 1.3.1.2. Reiteration

Reiteration is considered as the repetition of the main terms in which the common words co-exist by using synonyms, superordinate, or general word.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), reiteration involves the repetition of lexical item (…) the use of general word to refer to lexical items, at the other end of the scale, and a number of things between the uses of synonym, near-synonym, or superordinate. (p.178)

### 1.3.1.3. Collocation:

It is another type of lexical cohesion, and it is a difficult type to be understood:
“… a sequence of two or more consecutive words, that has characteristics of syntactic and semantic unit, and whose exact unambiguous meaning or connotation cannot be derived directly from the meaning or connotation of its components” (Choueka,Y,1988,p.609).

Collocation is the occurrences of two words bound together in a given context( text, speech…), it is the way words combine in language to produce natural- sounding speech and writing.( Oxford collocation dictionary,2002,p.VII), for example, fast food, give up, bright colour.

1.3.2. Grammatical Cohesion

As it is represented by Osisnwo (2005) grammatical subtypes are: references, substitution, ellipsis, and conjunction. (p: 38)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grammatical Devices</th>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>Substitution</th>
<th>Ellipsis</th>
<th>Conjunction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Anaphora</td>
<td>Nominal</td>
<td>Coordinating Con.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Cataphora</td>
<td>Verbal</td>
<td>Subordinating Conj.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb+ Object</td>
<td>Clausal</td>
<td></td>
<td>Compound Adv.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Verb+Adv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Continuatives</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure (2): Grammatical Cohesion (Osisanwo, 2005:38)**

1.3.2.1. Reference

When the reference is used in the text, the repetition can be avoided like Akindeli (2011)”referring expression help to unify the text and create economy because they save writers from unnecessary repetition” (p: 102).so when you use a reference this means that
you are pointing to something within the text, Halliday and Hasan (1976) provided two terms that categorize the reference into ‘endophora’ and ‘exophora’.

1.3.2.1.1. Endophora

The term endophora refers to individuals, things or objects to form a cohesive tie within the text whether through anaphoric relations, that means there is no ambiguity in which the elements of reference are clear for both sender and receiver, it helps to avoid repetition by replacing it with something else such as pronouns (he, his, it, they, their …) or cataphori ally, by referring to something later and draws the receiver attention to look forward to the text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976).

1.3.2.1.2. Exophora

As it is stated by Halliday and Hasan (1976) “…in a situation where the interpretation of the text lies outside the text, in the context of situation, the relationship is exophoric”. In other word, exophoric relations play no part in textual cohesion”. (Cited in Akindeli, 2011, P:101) So, the reference remains outside of the text and has no textual role as a tie in a given text or paragraph, the following figure will summarize the types of reference by Halliday and Hasan.

```
Reference:

[situational]            [textual]

exophora                endophora

[to preceding text]     [to following text]

anaphora                 cataphora

Figure 3: Types of Reference (Halliday and Hassan, 1976, p. 33)
```
Here again they provided that reference can be divided or fallen into three subtypes: personal reference to identify individuals, things, object by using pronouns (personal pronouns, possessive determiner, possessive pronouns) and another subtypes which is demonstrative reference “is indirect reference by means of location, on scale of proximity” Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.37). That is, demonstrative reference is used to express a verbal point through determiners (this, these, that, those), adverb (now, here, there...) for example, this the museum that we were looking for (“this” is a demonstrative reference used to mention the word “museum” / that is a demonstrative backward reference to the word museum again)

The final subtypes which are the comparative reference, Nunan (1993) stated that whenever an identity or similarity takes place the comparative reference can be applicable. In order to do that, comparison may have two sides. On one hand, general which doesn’t take particular aspect as a focal point but focus on the likeness or the unlikeness, similarity, identity. Also, we can use other comparative references to show the deference (otherwise, differently...). On the other hand, particular comparison is how to compare between things relying on quantity (more, few, less) and quality like comparative adjectives, adverb of comparison.

**Table 1:** Halliday and Hasan’s Examples of General and Particular Comparison (1976, p.78.81)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Comparison</th>
<th>Particular comparison</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It’s the same cat as the one we saw yesterday</td>
<td>a. Take some more tea,’ the March Hayer said to Alice, very earnestly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. It’s a similar cat to the one we saw yesterday</td>
<td>b. ‘I’ve had nothing yet, Alice replied in an offended tone, ‘so I can’t take more.’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. It’s a different cat from the one we saw yesterday</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3.2.2. Substitution

Instead of repeating certain linguistic categories within the text, a substitution is a form to create cohesion by relating and linking sentences together in which an item can be replaced by another (Halliday and Hasan, 1976) substitution defers from reference in the sense that the former insists on how linguistic items and wording are connected. For example, Anna adores chocolate ice cream. She has one daily (“one” substitutes chocolate ice cream). And the latter (reference) emphasis on the meaning “in term of linguistic system, reference is relation on systematic level, whereas substitution is relation on grammatical level, the level of grammar and vocabulary or linguistic into form” (p: 89)

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976) there are three subtypes of substitution: Nominal, verbal and clausal.

1.3.2.2.1. Nominal Substitution

The substitute items express nominal substitution through the use of: one, ones, some to replace one item with another one.

a. These biscuits are stale,—get some fresh ones. (Halliday and Hasan ,1976,p.92)

(“Ones” presupposes “biscuits”)

1.3.2.2.2. Verbal Substitution

To create economy within a text and avoid unnecessary repetition is by using the verbal substitution “do” as the following examples show how long wined sentence can be avoided.

a. “…the words didn’t come the same as they used to do”
b. “I don’t know the meaning of half those long words, and, what’s more, I don’t believe you either!” (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p. 112)

As shown in the above example, (a) “do” presupposes or substitutes ”come”, also in the item (b) “do” presupposes “know the meaning of half those long words”.

1.3.2.2.3. Clausal Substitution

To get a text more unified and much more economic is not by referring each time to the “entire clause” like in this example:

A: is it going to be a rainy day?

B: I think so. (“So” presupposes the whole underlined clause)

1.3.2.3. Ellipsis

Ellipsis is when certain items or linguistic categories are replaced by ‘zero’ form, typically Hamer (2004) stated that words are intentionally omitted of sentence when the meaning still understandable.

Ellipsis is a kind of cohesive devices that leads to get rid of repetition and keeps the rhythm and the flow of ideas and thoughts to be continued in given piece of writing or in a conversation, additionally ellipsis has three types, Kennedy (2003) stated “ellipsis is the process by which noun phrase, verb phrase, clauses are delete or understood when they are absent” (p: 324). (Cited in Azzouz, 2009).

The following examples are taken from (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.149.167.198)
a) Nominal Ellipsis

E.g.  

a. How did you enjoy the exhibition? – A lot (of the exhibition) was very good, though not all. (the omission “of the exhibition”).

b. How did you enjoy the paintings? - a lot (of the paintings) were very good, though not all. (the omission” of the paintings”).

b) Verbal Ellipsis

E.g.  

a. Have you been swimming? - yes, I have.

b. What have you been doing? - swimming.

- The verb (swimming/been swimming) is omitted.

c) Clausal Ellipsis

E.g. who was going to plant a row of poplars in the park? - The duke was. (no need to repeat the whole clause again “was going to plant a row of poplars in the park”).

1.3.2.4. Conjunction

Conjunction is the last type of grammatical cohesion that promotes a combination or link between sentences and clauses, Mather and Jaff (2002)”conjunction represents semantic relation that express how a clause or statement is signalled by specific connecting word or phrase”(P:01) So, conjunctions help even the reader to understand the parts of text and how they are interrelated “single the relationship that can be fully understood through reference to other parts of the text as it is stated by Nunan (1993,p.26).
Conjunctive cohesion is fallen into five types or subdomains: *additive, adversative, causal, Temporal* and *continuative*. The following sentence-pairs give an illustration how the sentence could be extended by a conjunctive device to promote a clear meaning.

(13) No one wants to be rejected.

(14) *And* to prevent rejection we change our behaviour often. *(Additive)*

(15) Small children usually change their behaviour because they want something they don’t have.

(16) Carol, *however*, changed her behaviour because she wanted to become part of a new group. *(Adversative)*

(17) Today’s society sets the standards.

(18) The people more or less follow it.

(19) *Consequently*, there exists the right behaviour for the specific situation at hand. *(Causal)*

(20) A friend of mine went to an out-of-state college.

(21) *Before* she left, she expressed her feelings about playing roles to win new friends.

*(Temporal)*

(22) Different social situations call different behaviours.

(23) This is something we learn as children and we, *of course*, also learn which behaviours are right for which situations. *(Continuative)* *(Witte & Lester, 1981, pp.191-192)*
1.4. Difference between Cohesion and Coherence

Halliday and Hasan (1976) introduced the term “cohesion” to give an insight how sentences flow to form a paragraph through which all parts are connected by implementing cohesive devices whether lexical or grammatical. Also, they claimed that cohesion plays a great role in shaping and constructing the meaning that the writer wants to convey, in which the receiver finds himself exposed to well-connected and related sentences “cohesion doesn’t concern what a text means; it concerns how the text is constructed as a semantic edifice” (p: 26). So, cohesion is an internal organisation, logical linking of sentences and how smaller parts of a given paragraph are correctly interrelated. In other word, how you can follow your thought step by step and presenting your ideas painlessly.

“cohesion occurs when the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discoursis dependent on that of another the one PRESUPPOSES the other , in the sense that it can’t be effectively decoded except by recourse to it when this happens a relation of cohesion is set up and two elements , the presupposing and the presupposed , are there by at least potentially integrated into a text (Halliday and Hasan, 1976, p.4).

Coherence is the structure of the whole and complete piece of writing that has an interpretation from the receiver. Greme and Lea (2008) asserted that coherence has to do with the overall meaning of written piece and not only looking to the words or sentences but how the connectedness of smaller parts unburden the reader to apprehend the meaning without any efforts.

The coherence that has a relationship with a longer text relies on the coherence within each paragraph or section of the text. (Celce-Murcia and Olshtain, 2000). Coherence is a crucial feature that combines ideas; information in different parts of the text. The reader
can grasp the whole text effortlessly. Each sentence in this type of writing is related to both old and new sentences tying together to have a progression and create a logical link through the connectedness among the propositions and how they are presented and expressed in the paragraph. Coherence “the quality that makes a text conform to a consistent world picture and is therefore summarisable and interpretable” according to (Enkvist, 1990.p.14)

There is another view taken by carrel (1982) who sees that cohesion is just an additional element in a text that can just simplify the meaning to the receiver while there is a certain types of reader (schemata) who can understand a passage even if there is no cohesive devices within a text.

We can have a cohesive text but not coherent and vice versa as we can have both a cohesive and a coherent text.

Examples taken from ( Tangkiengsirisn,2013)

(1) Have you met Virasuda Sribayak? She was here yesterday. (cohesive and coherent)

This example (1) shows that there is a semantic relationship between the two sentences linked by the pronoun she.

(2) Liverpool shot a goal. The whistle blew. (Coherent but not cohesive)

Item (2) presents two sentences which are semantically coherent, in which there is no cohesive device

(3) My grandfather died. I shall see him tomorrow. (Cohesive but not coherent)

Item (3) provides clear view that we may have cohesive sentences interrelated with a cohesive through the use of pronoun him but it is not pragmatically appropriate.
Halliday and Hasan (1976) carried out taxonomy of categories and subcategories of cohesive ties and these ones can be summarized in the following table.

**Table 2: Categories and Subcategories of Cohesive Devices**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Sub categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Pronouns, Demonstratives, Comparatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substitution</td>
<td>Nominal Substitution, Verbal Substitution, Clausal substitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellipsis</td>
<td>Nominal Ellipsis, Verbal Ellipsis, Clausal Ellipsis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conjunction</td>
<td>Additive, Adversative, Causal, Temporal, Continuative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexical cohesion</td>
<td>Reiteration, Collocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.5. **The Impact of Cohesive Devices in Student's writing Proficiency**

Learners should always keep in their mind when it comes to write a piece of writing they have to make sure that readers would be able to follow the thread of ideas that means how logically interconnected if not they will be astray in grasping the old and new pieces of message through contextual clues. Hulkova (2005) assumed that cohesive devices (CDs) are significant in the academic setting since it supports the writer to link his ideas and to convey information, figuring out facts and so on and so forth. Besides, she asserted that to attain an effective academic writing; “it is important to use the cohesive links that contribute to link the different parts of the whole text together” (As cited in Sanzyk, 2010, p.31).
Maurer (2003, p.151) as indicated in this quotation “… the coloration between number of ties and coherence ranking was very high” there is a strong positive combination and connection between the frequency of the cohesive devices used in piece of writing and its quality (cited in Benaoun, D. & Litime, S, 2014, p. 29).

By contrast, Carrell (1982, p.482) claimed that “processing a text is an interactive process between the text and the prior background knowledge or memory schemata of the listener or reader”. He points out that the process that the reader combines a textual information with his knowledge brought to the text. Therefore, the existing knowledge of the text should be fathomable alongside with readers’ preexisting knowledge to extract meaning. Thus, depending only on the presence of CDs within a text will not lead the reader to understand and comprehend the message behind the passage.

**Conclusion**

On the whole, Writing must show the writers ideas in a readable text and to ensure this we have hinted in this chapter that cohesive devices i used one way to reach a clear and logical flow of ideas in order to achieve a cohesive writing. Though, cohesive ties is a process that supply fruitful results and contrives transitional words and connectors whether lexical or grammatical that help in organizing and linking sentences, paragraph and sections in a coherent way. Hence, learners should be sensitized towards the significance of these organizational tools that unburden their writing.
Section Two:
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Introduction

For students who study English as a foreign language, effective writing is a skill of crucial importance to have a success in academic setting, to master this skill you have to bear in mind that combining or clinging sentences grammatically together is not enough whether to empower or to persuade your reader to have a good interpretation, typically how to signal the interconnectedness between the ideas. Yet, many students emphasis on the grammar level and forget to pave their writing with a thread that connects parts into unified piece of writing by Knowing how to parallel the structure and the content to have a basic unit such as paragraph, in the following section we try to deal with writing (definition, stages, mechanism) proceeding by paragraph (definition, organization, characteristics).

1.2.1. Definition of Writing

Writing is a difficult task for EFL learners to express their ideas smoothly without having any jump or shifts. That is ,how to make it sings, the problem lies in the ability how to say it “writing is progressive activity, this means that when you first write something down, you have already thinking about what you going to say, how you are going to say it” (Obsima and Hogue,1997, p.2).Furthermore, it is required that students have to demonstrate their knowledge proficiently for both native and non-native learners in which they have to master it in piece of writing( paragraph, essay ,project, thesis…) .Similarly, Nunan (1988) considers proficiency is what to “do with the language”. (P: 34).for this students lack the knowledge of choosing the righteous words that reflect their “brainstorm” to form correct expressions. In this sense, writing is an efficient skill that necessitates the writer to explicit the train of his ideas clearly so that the reader finds himself exposed to well linked and coherent work as Chakraverty(2000) defined writing activity is “a
reflective activity that requires enough time to think about the specific topic and to analysis and classify any background knowledge, then writers need a suitable language to structure these ideas in the form of a coherent discourse” cited in Ahmed(2010,p:211).

Moreover, when it comes to writing a composition or whatever kind of passage students should set their words right not just by putting them on paper but the ability to form a clear sentences linked together to keep clarity and get rid of ambiguity, Tribble (as cited in Frith, J, 2009: 1) discusses that: “It is through the mastery of writing that the individual comes to be fully effective in intellectual organization, not only in the management of everyday affairs, but also in the expression of ideas and arguments”. Therefore, l2 learners are making great efforts to write correctly since they confront many obstacles and difficulties toward a accurate English writing composition, it is obliged that students should know how to maintain and follow the grammar rules, lexis and vocabulary. In brief sense, Writing skill is a process any writer needs to go along with to make their production sounds good.

1.2.2. Stages of Writing

Researchers think that the process of writing goes through stages wile student tries to compose or generate a piece of writing. Thus, this writing process entails several stages which make the work more manageable and organizational the following figure illustrates the steps that students pass through to present their final work.
1.2.2.1. Pre-writing

This stage is considered as the first step when the writer gets his ideas, thoughts or whatever comes in his /her mind down on paper according to Richard and Rennadya (2002) defined pre writing as: “pre writing is an activity in the classroom that encourages students to write, it stimulates though for getting started. In fact, it moves students away from having to face a blank pose towards generating tentative idea and gathering information for writing” (p:316). It comforts the brain by just focusing on the central point, topic and main ideas. In order to develop an idea there are many ways or techniques that can be useful and helpful. Firstly, brainstorming and therefore thoughts and ideas are running deep if the writer didn’t profit the moment when he can write a word or phrase probably he can’t start at all just write whatever happens in mind (Kalamdaza, 2007). Then, jot list that can be a beneficial technique in the first step in which the writer sets the topic clearly on paper then as quickly as possible enlist words or phrases that has a relationship with your topic by leaving the task easier. (Alice and Ann, 2007) as cited in (Benaoun, D. & Litime, S, 2014, p, 19). Then, comes “free writing and mapping” that saves time and efforts in relating ideas together, without giving much significance round the sentence structure. Rumsek and Zemach (2005).
The aim of this technique is “to free the writer's mind, allowing it to organize the ideas” (Kalamdaza, 2007, p.5). Still, another technique that can be useful to have writing task be prepared such asking wh question (what, where, when, how, why, and who). “…Through this question s/he will see the topic from different points of view.” (P: 5) as a result all techniques operate to write and construct first composition without any exception.

1.2.2.2. Drafting

Drafting is the second stage when the writer starts to put all his ideas and brainstorming into a paragraph more over Writing a draft is a relationship with pervious outline that the writer has already delineated the topic in which he is about to write as Brown and Hood (1989) asserted when it comes to write On drafting paper students should not pay full attention to spelling mistakes, grammar and punctuation or how to say words righteously in the context. Hence, this stage is required and essential step for commencing writing so the writer should repeat his writing at many times to support his final draft through right words and ideas. In other word, to “evaluate her/ his outline, take out ideas that do not support her/ his argument, add clarifications or examples, check her/ his work to make sure that her/ his writing is clear and accomplishes the goals of the assignment” (Savage and Mayer, 2005, p.160)( cited in Benaoun, D. &., Litime, S, 2014,p, 19 ).Also, drafting is considered as an effective technique to found a paragraph and prevailing the difficulties that the writer may face in his writing.

1.2.2.3. Revising

In this stage the writer has to check whether there is a logical link of ideas or if the content fits the topic according to Zemach and Rumsek (2005) Revising stage is how to improve your writing by communicating the ideas efficiently and plainly. Throughout this stage the writer verify his final draft paper by having some modifications or changes if it is
necessary to facilitate the task Galko (2001) “suggests some steps that the writer can
follow in order to revise his paper, in the first thing, he should read the paper carefully as
he is one of the intended audiences, then he decides what must be done to his draft and in
the last, makes important changes to the draft”. Cited in (Loucif, 2012), revising stage
gives a clear sight and full attention of the ideas and the objective to be clear understood
for the reader.

1.2.2.4. Editing

This stage is the final one in the writing process when the writer jot down what he
wrote in previous stage (revising), Hedge (2005) states that “editing process makes the
final readjustment and check accuracy so that, the text is maximally accessible to the
reader” (p: 54), where the writer should be cautious towards the mechanics of writing to
reach a correct format so that the reader will face a real academic paper.

1.2.3. The Main Mechanics of Writing

The term mechanics is implemented to give a clear definition for the writer to use an
appropriate structure to build a convincing writing by making the meaning clear and
understandable for the reader to ‘decode’ the intentional meaning. According to Kane
(2000) “mechanics refers to the appearance of words to how they are spelled or arranged in
paper, the fact that the first word of paragraph is usually intended is a matter of mechanics.
Convention of writing requires that as Sentence begin with capital and ends with period,
question marks and soon” (p: 15). Therefore, if the writer doesn’t ‘encode’ his passage with
the correct mechanics surely he is at risk of being misinterpreted. And to succeed in
producing a professional work or getting an effective message the students should know
how to combine words or part of speech to have a meaningful clauses and sentence guided
by grammar, Smith (2003) emphasized that you have to be cautious and careful towards the
use of rules, and how properly parts of speech are combined to have a comprehensible piece of writing and he adds that punctuation and capitalization also help in writing sentences bound together by having clear boundaries when these sentences begin, end and operate in flow way likewise Ashby (2005) clarified that punctuation organizes the text and direct the reader toward an interpretation of well-structured sentences. In order to unburden the reader to read not again through the writer’s application of various tools such as: full stop, period, comma, semi colon. In addition to “capitalization” that reveals the transition from one sentence to another, So as to the reader can’t be confused.

1.2.4. Definition of Paragraph

A Paragraph is a group of sentences that are combined together to develop and express one main idea. The topic sentence which conveys the idea usually found at the beginning of the paragraph with an indentation and capitalization according to Scott and Denny (1909) “paragraph is a unit of discourse developing a single idea, it consists of group or series devoted like the sentence to the development of one topic, a good paragraph is also, like a good essay, a complete treatment in itself”. (Cited in Nordquist, 2014),. Furthermore, the paragraph should be complete and unified to reach coherence and unity similar to Conor (1993, p: 02) points that “a paragraph is group of sentences set off as a unit that focuses on single section, by coherence that links together in logical manner, besides to by development that refer to supporting sentences provide specific information to the main idea” .cited in (Hampton, 2005), as stated above it can be concluded that the paragraph is a related sentences which communicate and explain the single topic or a core idea where coherence and unit are attainable.
1.2.5. Characteristics of Good Writing English Paragraph

Writing English paragraph is merely a skill that needs a full attention from both L1 and L2 students to achieve a high degree of quality by having their words flow with ease to bring froth information, and details to develop the topic sentence or the subject with clarity and with interconnected stretches of words, clauses (cohesions and completeness), which consists of multiple and well organized sentences (coherence), that together express a complete thought (unity).

1.2.5.1. Unity

A paragraph should contain a unity. That is to say, how sentences are stuck and discuss the central idea to make it easier for the reader to trace your topic sentence simply by putting it (dominant idea) at the beginning of the paragraph or near to it according to Alkhaul (2006) a paragraph is unified when a collection of sentences function the same aim and focus round the topic sentence, means the central idea is clarified by supporting ideas or sentences in which these latter can be also reinforced by supporting sentences. At this point the writer must talk about a topic in a one section to form a complete paragraph where ideas are interwoven together to have a good interpretation reached by the reader.

1.2.5.2. Coherence

Unity is not sufficient in a paragraph, even if the clauses are linked whether to the main idea or to the topic sentence because sentences may interconnect but this connection can be muddled and bad organized to cohere your sentence Trimmer (1995), he asserted that: “A paragraph is coherent when the sentences are woven together in such a way that readers move easily from one sentence to the next and read the paragraph as an integrated discussion rather than a series of separate sentences” (p.169). Moreover, coherence can be reached through the use of organizational tools or linguistic signs within sentences.
transitions to progress an idea with an adequate development of details as it is affirmed by both De Beaugrand and Dressler (1981) indicated that “The notion of coherence is intricately linked to the notion of text, which arises out of the observation that a sequence of linguistic signs can display a continuity of sense” (p. 84). They view coherence as an indispensable element that assists the reader to follow a given sequence of ideas and information in clear and well-constructed paragraph.

1.2.5.3. Cohesion and Completeness

Writers sometimes find themselves are not providing a full and complete piece of writing like a paragraph for example in case of how to prove and show the topic sentence with clear distinction of other statements or padding and repetitious sentences, in order to get rid of random collection of sentences, ideas and to achieve a cohesion paragraph Price and Maier (2007) explained that “signal words are words and phrases that prepare the reader for what is come do that an example, a comparison with what went before, a contrast, a continuing description” (p:333-334). Here the writer uses certain linguistic devices like the grammatical and lexical cohesive ties to show continuity and smooth transition of ideas likewise Harmer (2004) cohesion is reached through grammatical tool to put the reader in a comprehensive context like reference, tense agreement, connectives, ellipsis and substitution in addition to the lexical ones that means how to use vocabulary to chain your sentences referring back to the main idea, Freedenberg and Boardman (2002) holds that when a piece of writing is thoroughly complete this means that the main supporting sentences are contributing directly to the topic sentence. Besides, all the details or the minor sentences that shield the major supporting sentence must be also relevant and stressed to the theme so, by the term completeness the writer be must proficient enough to develop his writing paragraph by the exclusion of undesirable
supporting sentences that don’t fit the main idea and this may result in having poor and inadequate production as a final work.

1.2.6. Organization of a Paragraph

Undeniably, most paragraphs includes a topic sentence that discusses the main idea that later on can be expanded by both supporting sentences and supporting details and followed by a concluding sentence to show the completeness of the paragraph. Robinson.L (2004) confirmed that “one logical way to organize paragraph is to explain the major points that support, state all points in the topic sentence, then develop each point into sentences” (p:14). As well, he provided a structure for a well-organized and developed a paragraph to illustrate how the organization takes place.

1.2.6.1. Topic Sentence

Topic sentence is considered as the most crucial element in a paragraph in which it discusses the main idea and it gives the reader a preparation for coming supporting sentences as it is clarified by Zemach and Rumsek (2005) topic sentence is useful for both the write and the reader by letting the former to choose the relevant information to be included, and it allows latter to apprehend the main idea and the predicts for what comes next.

To state the position of the topic sentence, it is usually positioned whether at the beginning, middle of the paragraph or at the end according to Obsima and Hogue (1997) shows that the topic is limited and bound together when the writer control the major idea. In fact, any paragraph contains only a single topic sentence which is regarded as a rudimentary element to make the reader knows what are you going to write about.
1.2.6.2. Supporting Sentences

The other important part or element in writing a paragraph is the support sentences that give an explanation and develop the topic sentence or a controlling idea. Hogue (2008) affirmed that the topic sentence can be explained and proved by supporting sentences which are considered as the biggest part and elements of paragraph. Noticeably, there is a tight relationship between the main idea and supporting sentences in developing and expanding arguments to construct a complete paragraph.

1.2.6.3. Concluding Sentence

The concluding sentence is the final statement or section to summarize what have been discussed as arguments, ideas and information in a given body of a paragraph to remind and keep the reader’s involvement according to Zemach and Rumsek (2005) the end of a paragraph can have two sides whether through repetitious words or by having a recapitulation the thread of what has been mentioned or discussed round a topic sentence in a full and complete concluding sentence to catch the reader attention to the subject without presenting any other idea. To bear in mind, concluding sentence the restatement of the whole paragraph in precise and concise wordiness.

Conclusion

All in all, we have attempted to introduce how the process of writing paragraph may proceed by defining what is first writing and narrowing it into a paragraph construction. That means how to organize and characterize your paragraph to promote a well mechanical and organizational piece of writing.
Chapter Two: The Practical Framework

Introduction

2.1. The Choice of the Method

2.2. Population and Sample

2.3. Research Design

2.4. The Experiment
   
   2.4.1. Pre-testing
   
   2.4.2 The Treatment
   
   2.4.3. Post-testing

2.5. Statistical Analysis

2.5.1. Data Description
   
   2.5.1.1. Scores Frequency Distribution
   
   2.5.1.2. Control Group versus Experimental Group Scores on the Pre-test
   
   2.5.1.3. Control Group Pre-test/ Post-test Scores
   
   2.5.1.4. Experimental Group Pre-test versus Post-test
   
   2.5.2. Data Analysis (The T−Test Analysis)
   
   2.5.2.1. Paired-Sample T−Test
   
   2.5.2.2. The independent sample t-test
2.6. General Discussion

Conclusion
INTRODUCTION

This study is devoted to discuss the implementation of students’ cohesive devices as an organizational tools in writing paragraphs, this chapter shows to what extent the hypothesis is confirmed or refuted. This is accomplished through the students' analysis of their writing paragraphs. That means, the quantity of cohesive devices is analyzed to see the impact on paragraph writing quality.

To begin with, the choice of the method pursuing this by the population and the sample, and the research design. This study provides also an explanation and procedure to be followed. Then, describing and analyzing the collected data, lastly, the discussion and interpretation of the result.

2.1. Choice of the Method

To fulfill the purpose of this study and meet our objectives, a specific method is conducted. To investigate the relationship between cohesive devices and writing proficiency, experimental design was adopted regarded the topic of our study, research aims and question, and hypothesis.

2.2. Population and sample

2.2.1. Population

The current inquiry was carried out in the Department of English at L’arbi Ben M’hidi, Oum El Bouaghi University. The whole population is considered of 370 first year LMD students of all streams. The reason behind picking this population is that student normally should have a superficial knowledge with the use of cohesive devices.
2.2.2. Sample

Two intact groups were chosen from seven ones. Furthermore, the sample is composed of two groups “control group and an experimental one”. Both of them contain 20 students.

2.3. Research Design

This study is conducted an experimental design to test the effectiveness, of the assumed hypothesis and finding answers to the following research questions and research hypotheses.

Q1. To what extent does the knowledge of cohesive devices influence students’ writing paragraph?

Q2. What if students are not aware or sensitized about cohesive devices will this affects their writing paragraph?

H1: We hypothesize that:

Understanding cohesive devices for first year LMD students of English at the University of Oum El Bouaghi would enhance their proficiency in writing paragraph.

2.4. The Experiment

2.4.1. Pre-testing

A test was submitted to gather the data about the implementation of cohesive devices. In order to assess the students’ writing paragraph; the test was given to both groups to answer in a period of 30 minutes.
2.4.2. The Treatment

The period treatment was divided into five (5) sessions where the participants of the experimental group were exposed to different types of cohesive devices to enhance their writing production, while the control group did not receive any treatment.

The following table shows the experimental design used with the experimental group during the treatment period.

**Table 3:** Schedule of the Experimental Sessions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Pre-test (writing paragraph)</td>
<td>20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Teaching Introduction to cohesive</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Teaching types of Grammatical</td>
<td>30min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>cohesive devices types of Lexical cohesive device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Training exercises(sorting/arranging the CDs)</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Writing a paragraph using cohesive devices</td>
<td>30 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Post-test(writing a paragraph)</td>
<td>30min</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4.3. Post-test

In this test students of both groups are asked to write a cohesive and coherent paragraph using the cohesive devices that are already familiar with them by having the sufficient time to write (30min) a different topic to get rid of topic ‘familiarity, thus from this conclusion we can draw if there is any relationship between the quantity of using cohesive devices and the quality of paragraph writing production.

The students’ assessments (pre-test and the post-test) is out of ten (10) points. In which their writing followed a certain rubric to be evaluated. Language (2 points), content (2 points), forms of the paragraph (2 points), cohesion (2 points), and the coherence (2 points).

2.5. Instrumentation:

To compute our statistical data, we have used the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) for saving time and having accurate and exact results.

2.5.1. Data Description

The results of the study should be first organized and described. So, The description of the statistical procedures are followed.

2.5.1.1. Scores Frequency Distribution

This section shows the statistical analysis of study. That means, the students results of the writing production in pretest and posttest, and proceeds with the discussion and the research findings, starting with the table below (Table 2) that presents the frequency of students’ scores in the pretest and the posttest for both groups (control group and experimental group).
Table 4: The Experimental and the Control Group Scores in the Pre-test and Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Pre-test E</th>
<th>Post-test E</th>
<th>Pre-test C</th>
<th>Post-test C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2.1.5.2. Control Group vs. Experimental Group Scores on the Pre-test and the Post-test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pre-test C.G</th>
<th>Post-TEST C.</th>
<th>Pre-test E.G</th>
<th>Post-test E.G</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6,0750</td>
<td>5,2800</td>
<td>5,3750</td>
<td>5,8250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>6,0000</td>
<td>5,2500</td>
<td>5,0000</td>
<td>6,0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mode</td>
<td>4,00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5,00</td>
<td>5,00&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>6,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>1,59996</td>
<td>1,28743</td>
<td>1,82724</td>
<td>1,19511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>2,560</td>
<td>1,657</td>
<td>3,339</td>
<td>1,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>3,00</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>2,00</td>
<td>3,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>8,50</td>
<td>7,50</td>
<td>8,50</td>
<td>8,00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum</td>
<td>121,50</td>
<td>105,60</td>
<td>107,50</td>
<td>116,50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As it is shown above, we notice that there is no big deference between the mean of both groups (experimental and the control groups) in the pre-test. The mean of the experimental group was 5.3750. Whereas the mean of the control group was 6.0750. This according to the total number of the students in both groups (control group and in the experimental group), the following figure provides a clear presentation about the number of the students who get the average and below the average in both groups:

**The Control Group Pre-test:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Experimental Group Pre-test:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5: The Control and the Experimental Groups’ Scores Pre-test.

From this polygon, it is noticeable that the scores frequencies of the control group and the experimental one are approximately the same. Furthermore, the control group’s frequency is 3 as the lowest score, and 8, 5 as the almost highest score with 4 as the most frequent score. While, the experimental group frequency is 2 as the lowest score and 4 as the almost frequent score with 5 and 7 as the most frequent score. Remarkably, it can be noticed that both groups are having almost the same level.

To reach the reliability of results, that is to say to confirm the control group scoring in the pretest. We used the independent sample T test. And compare the means of test (pretest) of both groups the experimental group and the control group. In order to see if this difference is only due to the chance. So, we get the following table.
Table 5: The Independent Sample T-test (Pre-test vs. Pre-test).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F Sig. T df Sig. Mean Std. Error Difference 95% Confidence interval of the Difference Lower Upper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-test-cg</td>
<td>.400 .531</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cg</td>
<td>9 37,34 .205</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pre-test_eg</td>
<td>1.28 9 38 38</td>
<td>,7000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>test_eg</td>
<td>9 0 0 9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table shows the pretest scores of both control and experimental groups. The control group has a mean of 6.0750 and the experimental group has a mean of 5.3750. And we notice that P value = 0.205 it is higher than 0.05. So, we conclude that there is no significance and difference between the experimental and the control group concerning the pretest that shows any kind of improvement.
2.5.1.3. Control Group Pretest / Posttest score

![Graph showing control group pretest and posttest scores](image)

Figure 6: The Control Group’s Scores (Pre-test and the Post-test)

From the above figure(6), in the control group pre-rest, the most noticeable frequent score is 8 with 3 students who have scored this mark, whereas the post-test, the most frequent score is 5 with 5 students who have scored it. Into the bargain, the highest score in the pre-test is 8.5 scored by only one student. However, the different point value is attained or achieved by one student in the post-test. Also, the total number of the participants who have marks equal or above the average (05) was 14 participants with the scores from 5 to 8, 5, which is considered as the highest score in the post-test. Therefore, the change in the control group (pre-test and post-test) can be showed as the following (table 6) and figure (7) and their differences for every participant scores.
**Pre-test Control Group:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>Scores</th>
<th>Percentages %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>≥ 5</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>&lt; 5</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6: Control Group Pretest and Posttest Scores with their Differences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>pre-test C.G</th>
<th>post-test C.G</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>-1,4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-3,5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>6,075</td>
<td>( \bar{X} )</td>
<td>5,28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table shows the control group’s results, the mean of the pre-test \( \bar{X}_{\text{pre}} \) is \( 6,075 \), and mean of the post-test \( \bar{X}_{\text{post}} \) is \( 5,28 \). The difference \( \bar{d} \) is \( 0,795 \) between the mean of the pre-test and the post-test is not significant, yet the pre-test mean is more than the one in the post-test. All in all, there is no improvement on the students’ writing paragraphs proficiency or quality.
Figure 7: Control Group Pre-test and Post-test Scores with their Differences

From the figure (7) and table (6) we notice that there are differences between each student’s scores in the pre-test and the post-test in the control group. Most of students’ scores decreased in the post-test. But these differences in the posttest have no significance. That is to say they didn’t show any enhancement. In addition to that, we need a T-Test sample to have a comparison between the control group scores in the pretest and post-test.

Table 7:

Paired Samples T-Test of the Control Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.(2tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Std. Deviation Mean</td>
<td>Std. Error Mean</td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-cg - post-cg</td>
<td>.79500</td>
<td>1.59884</td>
<td>.35751</td>
<td>.04672</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This table (7) demonstrates that the P value (which is 0.38 > 0.05), which means there is no significance between the means and there is no substantial improvement occurred.

2.5.1.4. Experimental Group Pre-test /Post-test

![Figure 8: The Experimental Group Pre and Post-test Scores](image)

From this figure, the experimental group shows slight improvement in the post-test in comparison with the pre-test scores. Also, it is noticed that there is a slight difference between the two tests. In the pre–test, students who score equally to or above the average have shown increase from 12 to 14. And the students’ score in the pre-test start from 3 as the lowest score to 8,5 as the highest score, while the scores in the post-test start from 3 as the lowest score to 8 as the highest score. The most frequent score in the pre-test is 5 and 7 per 3 participants for each mark, compared with the post-test it is 6 by 5 students or participants.

As a conclusion, the treatment period was not significant enough to have a positive effect on enhancing students’ writing in terms of proficiency. For better understanding the following data can be summarized in table (8) and the figure (9) data.
Table 8:

*The Experimental Group Score in the Pre and Post-test with their Differences.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Students</th>
<th>pre-test E.G</th>
<th>post-test E.G</th>
<th>Differences</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figure 9: Experimental Group Pre-test and Post-test Scores with their Differences

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5,5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>2,5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- $\bar{X} = 5.375$
- $\bar{X} = 5.825$
- $d = 0.45$
2.5.2. Data Analysis

2.5.2.1. Paired-Sample T–Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>Lower</th>
<th>Upper</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 pre_eg - post_eg</td>
<td>.45000</td>
<td>1.58031</td>
<td>.35337</td>
<td>-1.18961</td>
<td>.28961</td>
<td>-1.273</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>.218</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Results as showed above that P value is 0.218 it is more than 0.05. So, we accept the null hypotheses and we reject the alternative one which means that there is a significant difference between the means. So, we can confirm that the treatment was not really effective to enhance the students writing proficiency.

Table 9:

*Independent Sample T test between the control and experimental group post- test*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variances</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-test E.G</td>
<td>.124</td>
<td>.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.G</td>
<td>-1.387</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this table, the P value (sig 2-tailed) is more than the significant level 0.05. This shows that there is no significant improvement in the experimental group’s results. As a result, the null hypothesis is accepted, and the alternative one is rejected.

Consequently, we conclude that cohesive devices have no significant effect on enhancing first year LMD students writing paragraphs quality.

2.6. Discussion

The current study aims at testing the effectiveness of cohesive devices on enhancing students writing proficiency or quality; language, content, form, cohesion and coherence, also to investigate the hypothesis mentioned above.

An experimental design was conducted to test the hypothesis by comparing the two groups’ scores. The results indicated that the experimental group did not perform well as it was expected compared with the control group, where the experimental group scored 5,825 as a mean, while in the control group scored 5,375. However, we can notice a slight deference within the experimental group pre-test and the post-test. Furthermore, the mean of the experimental group in the pre-test was 5, 28, and it was 5, 82 in the post-test. That means, there is no great significance or any development has occurred. And concerning the control group who have scored 6,07 as a mean in the pre-test to be decreased to 5, 3750 in the post-test which reflects a negative results. Then, based on the independent sample T-test and the paired sample T-test. We can infer that the use of the CDs have no remarkable effect on enhancing first year LMD students writing at L’arbi Ben M’hidi University. So, we accept the null hypothesis, and reject the alternative one.

To answer the research questions, the implementation of CDS have no significant effect on enhancing students proficiency writing paragraphs.
Conclusion

In this chapter we tried to investigate the effect of CDs on enhancing first year LMD students at L’arbi Ben M’hidi University writing paragraphs in terms of proficiency. So, the obtained results were analyzed through an experimental design whether to accept or reject the research hypothesis. The gathered results show that students in the experimental group did not show any improvement in their writing performance compared with the control group. Therefore, the implementation of CDS has no positive effect on students writing paragraph depending on this, the alternative hypothesis is rejected and the null hypothesis is accepted.
General Conclusion

The current inquiry tried to investigate the effectiveness of CDs on improving students’ proficiency in writing paragraphs. Besides, it aimed at evaluating first year LMD students writing paragraphs proficiency to check their writing problems and how it can be improved. To meet the research objectives, it was hypothesized above that Understanding cohesive devices for first year LMD students of English at the University of Oum El Bouaghi would enhance their proficiency in writing paragraph. The testing hypothesis was put after dealing with the theoretical. In which the first chapter is fallen into two section, the first one was devoted to cohesion and CDs and the second one tackled writing English paragraph, while the second chapter is dealt with the practical part to examine the data and get reliable results. Based on the findings it can be concluded that the experimental group who is exposed to the use or the implementation of CDs had no performance improved in writing a competent text or a paragraph.

Pedagogical Implication

The present study reveals some hidden remarks that can be beneficial for both EFL/ESL learners. Firstly, the rarity of CDs does not always mean that the student paragraph is not coherent. However, student should bear in mind how to use these organizational tools (CDs) appropriately to get rid of their weaknesses. Secondly, teachers should raise the students awareness through engaging them in different types of activities like using games by associating words to enlarge students repertoire and not keeping them chained with traditional way of teaching. Thirdly, there are other factors that may affect paragraph writing skill like punctuation, grammar mistakes, content that necessitate the teachers assistance in teaching quality.
Limitations of the Study

There are some limitations in this research. The first one is the students’ L1 interference that hurts their writing production (negative transfer), and affects their language in use. In addition to the time concise that does not give validity to the study. Another limitation is the students’ absence that leads to picking only (20) participants.

Suggestions for Further Research

Based on the students assessments papers we say that students are still incompetent in making a meaningful written passage. That is to say, they are not yet reaching native English proficiency due to the insufficient supply of feedback. Thus, from this perspective teachers should be aware that practice makes perfect to develop student’s implementation of cohesive devices through integrating reading with writing to have students exposed to real language use.
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Appendices

Appendix A: The Pre-test.

Appendix B: The Treatment Period

Appendix C: The Treatment Period

Appendix D: The Post-test
Appendix A: The Pre-test

Task: Should teacher give students much home works?

GOOD LUCK.
Appendix B: The Treatment Period

Task: write a paragraph about the benefits of using technology

Good Luck
Appendix C: Treatment Period

Task: Classify the different types of cohesive devices in the following paragraph according to their categories: reference, substitution, ellipsis, conjunction, reiteration, collocation.

Her achievement made her elated, but left had her exhausted. When she had read the title of the task, she knew it was not again to be just another essay, not an easy one at all. Finally, the complete work lay on the counter of the reception and was beautifully bound. She would sleep easy at night and she would be no longer troubled by thoughts of its accusing blank pages –the nightmare was over!
Appendix C: The Post-test

Task: In a paragraph (no more than 10 lines) illustrate the effect/impact of watching English movies on enhancing the pronunciation skill.

Good Luck
Résumé

Le dispositif cohérent est un moyen pour rédiger un paragraphe cohérent qui se considère comme un élément très important pour améliorer leurs rédactions et de rendre leur sens compréhensible par le lecteur. C’est le domaine qui permet aux apprenants d’avoir une langue claire. L’objectif de cette étude est d’investiguer dans la relation entre le dispositif cohérent et la qualité des paragraphes en anglais Pour les apprenants. Le problème qui réside dans le manque de l’utilisation des moyens convenables. Et nous estimons l’existence d’une relation entre l’emploie de ces moyens et la compétence de la rédaction. Pour confirmer cette hypothèse et la prouver. On s’est basé sur la méthode expérimentale qui s’appuie sur la méthode pour la résolution des problèmes et l’essai dans les classes ou ailleurs et on a basé notre étude sur un échantillon ciblé (40 participants) Parce que notre domaine de recherche est vaste et il est difficile d’aboutir à chaque participant d’une manière isolée Cette étude est basée sur des résultats d’étudiants (un test antérieur et postérieur ) Donc le groupe expérimentale a subi un moment de remédiation au moment où le groupe de contrôle a été laissé sans intervention .Cette étude a montré que malgré la sensibilisation des étudiants à l’utilisation des outils de cohérence linguistiques convenables et à travers l’évaluation des résultats de la première et la deuxième rédaction on comprend bien que les étudiants de la première année trouvent une difficulté concernant l’utilisation des outils de cohérence Et cela est prouvé par le refus de l’hypothèse alternative à l’égard de l’hypothèse nulle.
منخفض

أدوات الاتساق والانسجام هي وسيلة لإنجاز قطعة متماسكة التي تعتبر عنصر هاما للمتعلمين لتحسين كتاباتهم وجعل معناها مفهوم للمستقبل، بل هو الجانب الذي يتيح للمتعلمين أن يكون لهم لغة واضحة. و الفروض من هذه الدراسة هو التحقق في العلاقة بين أدوات الاتساق والانسجام وجودة كتابة فقرات اللغة الإنجليزية للمتعلمين. المشكلة تكمن في عدم استخدام الأدوات المناسبة، و لتأكيده هذه الفرضية، و اثبتها تم الاعتماد على المنهج التجريبة الذي يعتمد على الطريقة العلمية في حل المشكلات، سواء في قاعة الدراسة أو غيرها، و نحن نفترض وجود علاقة في توظيف هذه الأدوات و كفاءة الكتابة. إن اعتمادنا على العينة القصيرة (40) مفردة لأن مجتمع بحثنا واسع يصعب الوصول إلى كل مفردة على حدى. اعتمدت هذه الدراسة على نتائج الطلاب (الاختيار القبلي والبعدي) الذي تلقت فيه المجموعة التجريبية فترة من العلاج في حين تم إبقاء المجموعة الضابطة على حالها. اظهرت هذه الدراسة على الرغم من توعية الطلاب (المجموعة التجريبية) باستخدام وسائل الربط اللغوية المناسبة و تقوم النتائج الكتابية الأولى و الثانية نستنتج أن الطلاب السنة الأولى يواجهون صعوبة عندما يتعلق الأمر باستخدام وسائل الربط. هذا ما يؤكده رفض الفرضية البديئة لصالح فرضية أخرى.