

Ministry of Higher Education and Scientific Research
Mouloud MAMMERY University of Tizi-Ouzou
Faculty of Letters and Humanities
Department of English



**Dissertation Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Magister in English**

Speciality: English
Option: Didactics

Presented by:

Mr. YACINE Djamal

Subject:

***Analysis of Conjunctive Cohesion Errors in Students'
Compositions: The Case of the Department of English at
Tizi-Ouzou University.***

Panel of Examiners:

M. BAHOUS Abbas ; Professeur; U/ Mostaganem; Président.
M. RICHE Bouteldja; Professeur; U/ Tizi-Ouzou; Rapporteur.
M. BEN ALI Mohammed Rachid; MC-Classe A; U/ Oran; Examineur.
Mme. NEDJAI Fatma-Zohra; Dr- MC- Classe B; U/ Tizi-Ouzou; Examinatrice.
M. TITOUCHE Rachid; Dr- MC- Classe B; U/ Tizi-Ouzou; Examineur.

Academic Year: 2009/2010

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this study to my parents,

To my brothers and sisters,

And to all my friends.

Table of Contents

Table of contents.....	II
Acknowledgements.....	VI
List of Tables.....	VII
Abstract	VIII
General introduction.....	1
References.....	8
Chapter One: Literature review and Methodology	9
Introduction.....	9
Section one: Literature review.....	10
1. Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis.....	10
1.1 The strong version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis.....	11
1.2. The weak version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis.....	12
2. Error Analysis and Interlanguage.....	13
3. Implications for the study	13
3.1. Error Analysis	14
3.2. Interlanguage.....	18
4. Cohesion	19
4.1. Cohesion and Coherence	20
4.2. Cohesion and Text.....	21
4.3. Conjunctive cohesion	23
4.3.1. Additive category of conjunctive cohesion.....	24
4.3.2 Adversative category of conjunctive cohesion.....	26
4.3.3 Causal category of conjunctive cohesion	27

4.3.4. Temporal category of conjunctive cohesion.....	28
Section two: Methodology	32
Introduction	32
1. Sample of the study.....	32
2. Subjects.....	33
3. Data analysis.....	34
3.1. Establishing a unit of analysis:	34
3.1.1. The T-unit:	34
3.1.2. The functional unit:	35
3.1.3. The orthographic sentence:	36
3.2. Conjunctive cohesion elements.....	37
3.2.1. Additive elements.....	38
3.2.2. Adversative elements	39
3.2.3 Causal elements	40
3.2.4. Temporal elements	41
3.3. Error analysis procedures.....	42
Conclusion.....	43
References	44
Chapter Two: Results and discussion	46
Introduction.....	46
A recapitulative table of conjunctive cohesion errors.....	47
1. Misuse of connectors.....	49
1.1. Misuse of additive connectors.....	50
1.1.1. The use of an additive connector instead of an adversative one.....	50

1.1.2. The use of an additive connector instead of a causal one.....	53
1.1.3. The use of an additive connector instead of a temporal one.....	54
1.2. Misuse of adversative connectors.....	58
1.2.1. The use of an adversative connector instead of an additive one.....	59
1.2.2. The use of an adversative connector instead of a causal one.....	61
1.2.3. The use of an adversative connector instead of a temporal one.....	62
1.3. Misuse of temporal connectors.....	64
1.3.1. The use of a temporal connector instead of an additive one.....	65
1.3.2. The use of a temporal connector instead of an adversative one.....	67
1.3.3. The use of a temporal connector instead of a causal one.....	70
1.4. Misuse of causal connectors.....	71
1.4.1 The use of a causal connector instead of an additive one.....	72
1.4.2. The use of a causal connector instead of an adversative one.....	73
1.4.3. The use of a causal connector instead of a temporal one.....	76
2. Superfluous use of connectors.....	77
2.1 The use of an additive connector when one is not required.....	78
2.2. The use of an adversative connector when one is not required.....	79
3. Omission of connectors.....	81
3.1. Absence of an additive connector when one is required	83
3.2. Absence of an adversative connector when one is required	85
3.3. Absence of a causal connector when one is required.....	86
3.4. Absence of a temporal connector when one is required	88
4. The overuse of connectors.....	89
4.1. The overuse of additive connectors	91
4.2. The overuse of causal connectors	92

4.3. The overuse of adversative connectors.....	94
4.4. The overuse of temporal connectors	95
5. The effect of conjunctive cohesion errors on coherence.....	96
Conclusion	101
References.....	101
General conclusion	103
Pedagogical implications:	104
Suggestions for further research.	109
Bibliography	111
Appendix.....	
Abstract in French	
Abstract in Arabic	

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank my teacher and supervisor, Pr. RICHE Bouteldja for his guidance and help in the realization of this work. I would like also to express my deep gratitude for all those who have contributed to the achievement of the present work.

List of tables

Table 1: The totality of conjunctive cohesion errors.	48
Table 2: Confusion between additive connectors and adversative, causal or temporal ones..	49
Table 3: Confusion between adversative connectors and additive, causal or temporal ones..	58
Table 4: Confusion between causal connectors and additive, adversative or temporal ones..	65
Table 5: Confusion between temporal connectors and additive, adversative or causal ones..	71
Table 6: The use of an additive or an adversative connector when they are not required.....	78
Table 7: Absence of additive, adversative, causal or temporal connectors when one is required.....	82
Table 8: The overuse of connectors.....	90

Abstract

Cohesion in writing is widely explored by different researchers. However, to date, cohesive errors in writing, according to our knowledge, have not been investigated thoroughly. Hence, this study is an attempt to analyse conjunctive cohesion errors in students' compositions. It seeks mainly to analyse one hundred expository essays written by third year students of the Department of English at the University of Tizi-Ouzou during the academic year 2007/2008. In analyzing these essays, we aim mainly to identify conjunctive cohesion errors that these students have made in their compositions and the impact of these errors on the coherence of their essays. To achieve these goals, particular reference is made to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of conjunctive cohesion and to error analysis procedures. To identify these errors, students' essays were segmented into orthographic sentences. Then, they were analyzed. The results of the present study showed that these students have made 135 conjunctive cohesion errors in their compositions. These errors are classified into four major categories. The first category comprises errors deriving from the misuse of conjunctive connectors. This one is divided into four minor categories and twelve sub-categories. The second major type includes errors resulting from the superfluous use of connectors; the use of connectors when they are not required. The third category deals with conjunctive cohesion errors deriving from the omission of connectors when they are needed. The last major category deals with the overuse of connectors. In addition, this study revealed that these errors have an impact on the coherence of the analysed essays. Therefore, according to these results, students of the Department of English at the University of Tizi-Ouzou need an explicit teaching and learning of the use of connectors appropriately.

General introduction

Writing is among the most important skills that students need to acquire, because it is through writing that students display their abilities in different examinations. However, it is a difficult skill to acquire and to master. Unlike other skills, writing requires a greater degree of formal accuracy. Everything should be arranged according to a system of rules and into an integrated whole. Hence, this skill requires an extensive instruction even for native speakers of any particular language. In this sense, Hyland (2003) argues that even the native speakers of English need to follow a specific instruction on how to write efficiently. As he says

Learning how to write [...] is one of the most challenging aspects of second language learning. Perhaps this is not surprising in view of the fact that even for those who speak English as a first language, the ability to write effectively is something that requires an extensive and specialized instruction [...].

(2003: xiii).

This specialized instruction helps learners to improve their writing quality. It consists mainly in helping students to learn how to organize effectively their writing by considering the reader. To achieve writing quality, according to some linguists, coherence and cohesion should be considered. These two textual features have been given a particular importance in different studies that have been conducted in the field of text linguistics.

This importance is clearly shown in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion in the sense that they devote the whole book to the classification and to the explanation of the concept of cohesion. According to this work, there is a relationship between cohesion and coherence in the sense that the former refers to the linguistic means through which the latter is achieved. As they say: *'The concept of cohesion [...] refers to the linguistic means whereby texture is achieved'*. (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 293). This view of cohesion is shared by David Nunan (1993:21) who says: *'Coherent*

texts- that is, sequences of sentences or utterances which seem to 'hang together'- contain what are called text-forming devices.' These textual devices are cohesive ties. Another important work on cohesion is the study conducted by Hasan (1984). In her work, she has developed a concept of cohesive harmony which is an extending work of her and Halliday's (1976) taxonomy of cohesive devices.

Hasan's (1984) cohesive harmony has been used in Gerald Parsons' (1991) work as a method of measurement of cohesion in students' compositions. This work aims to investigate whether grading texts on a cline of 'good' to 'poor' is a function of cohesion of the analysed texts. His findings shows that this grading is a function of cohesion of those texts as measured by the chain interaction method proposed by Hasan (1984).

Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion has been used as a reference by some linguists who aimed at bringing insights into students' writings. Among these linguists, one can cite Gunnel Kallgren (1979) Smith and Frawley (1983) and Duane Roen (1984). The works that are conducted by these linguists differ in their focus and their findings.

Kallgren (1979) has conducted a research work on reference cohesion. He has focused only on two sub-categories of reference cohesion, namely identity and inference. The author aimed to discuss some properties of reference cohesion relations and their effects on texts produced by students. His findings shows that identity does not add any new content to the text. It is just a repetition of old content. Therefore, it has a weak cohesive effect on the text. However, inferential cohesion can add a lot of content to the text.

Unlike Kallgren's (1979) work, Smith and Frawley (1983) have conducted a research work on the use of conjunctive cohesion in four different English genres:

fiction, journalism, religion, and science. Their aim was to see whether conjunctions contribute to the connectivity of a text or not, and if different genres connect similarly or differently. They have found that fiction and religion have similarities between them in the amount and the kinds of conjunctives that have been used in generating these genres, whereas in journalism and science, conjunctives are not frequent. For instance, in fiction and religion, adversatives and additives are highly used in comparison to causals and temporals. The conclusion that can be drawn in this work is that there are differences in the amount and the type of conjunctive cohesion elements that are used in the genres investigated.

If Smith and Frawley (1983) work centers on the use of conjunctive cohesion elements in different genres, the one conducted by Roen (1984) focuses mainly on the contribution of conjunctive cohesion to discourse comprehension. Unlike Smith and Frawley's (1983) work, Roen's one focuses on the expository texts produced by students. To reach his purpose, Roen has changed the number of cohesive conjunctions that are used in the original versions of these texts. In some versions, he has included a 'normal' number of conjunctives to connect sentences and paragraphs. In other ones, he has removed all the conjunctives. In the still other ones, he has added almost twice 'a normal' number of conjunctions. He has given these texts to different students to read. When he has asked them to tell him what they had understood, he has found that 'a normal' number of cohesive conjunctions is no better than no conjunctions. In other words, students who have read passages with 'a normal' number of conjunctions have read at about the same rate and have recalled about the same amount of information as students who have read passages with no conjunctions. Students who have read passages with twice as many cohesive conjunctions as 'normal' have read more slowly and have recalled less information than students of the other two groups.

Almost all previous works have been focused on the analysis of cohesion in writing and its contribution to coherence. In other words, the different cohesive categories that were identified by Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work were only explored, in some previous mentioned works, from the standpoint of their contribution to the creation of coherence in students' compositions.

To the best of our knowledge, to date, no thorough investigation has been conducted on cohesive errors in students' compositions, especially with reference to Algerian students of English. Moreover, the works that have been mentioned above are conducted almost in countries in which English is either a first or a second language of the speakers. In Algeria, for instance, in which English is considered as a foreign language, so far only Pr. Bensemmane (1993) has attempted to conduct research on lexical cohesion and pragmatic coherence in relation to EFL reading. Her aim was to try to explain the nature of inferences that students make in their reading process and to find out whether these inferences have a linguistic explanation. That is to say, there has been no systematic work on cohesive and coherence problems in students' compositions.

To address this gap, the present work attempts to study conjunctive cohesion errors in students' compositions. It aims mainly to analyse one hundred expository essays, written by third year students of the English Department at Tizi-Ouzou University. By analyzing these essays, we aim at identifying the types of conjunctive cohesion errors made by these students in their compositions. In so doing, particular reference will be made to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of conjunctive cohesion and to error analysis. The effect of these errors on coherence will also be the focus of the present study. This investigation will include the pedagogical implications of the findings in the teaching of composition.

The aims that have been formulated above are motivated by the fact that in the English Department at Tizi-Ouzou University, there has been a growing concern among teachers over students' poor performances in writing. According to them, through informal interviews, their students have serious difficulties in their written compositions. The assessment of the written assignments set to these students usually reveals that they have difficulties in producing cohesive and coherent essays. As a result, many students fail to perform well in their examinations, especially in the modules in which they are required to answer exam questions in written essays. For instance, according to the statistics of this English Department, after second-term examinations, only 18, 71% of the students manage to have the average mark in the module of American Literature. In addition, according to the statistics of the same department, the admission rate of third-year students for the academic year 2007/ 2008 was 33.16 % only.

After having observed this low admission rate, we have taken all third-year students' first term exam papers of the written expression module and have recounted only the marks of the essays; the essays have been marked out of 15. We have found that only 62 students out of 187 scored 7.5 or more out of 15. Next, after having examined third-year exam papers of the module of written expression, we have noticed that they have made many errors both at the sentence and at the discourse levels: grammatical errors, the misuse of cohesive devices, lack of coherence, lack of discourse structure and lack of paragraph unity. Most of these remarks were written by teachers on some students' exam papers. Therefore, we have come up to consider that these errors were the main reason for this low performance, knowing that teachers, when correcting their students' papers take into account the form, the content and the whole structure of the essay.

The present study is not concerned with all the errors mentioned above, but only with those of conjunctive cohesion. The choice of investigating these errors over other types of errors is motivated by the fact they are in relation with the objectives and the research questions that are formulated for this study. The main reason for this choice is that conjunctive cohesion, as it is defined by Halliday and Hasan's (1976), is an important textual feature as far as semantic relationship at the extra-sentential level is concerned. The importance of this category of cohesion lies in the fact that its elements *'are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings'* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 226). According to the same linguists, this type of cohesion expresses semantic relations that specify *'the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before'* (Ibid, 1976: 227). Moreover, another important reason for this choice is that conjunctive cohesion contributes to the creation of coherence and to discourse comprehension, (Frawley, 1983: 347 and Bamberg, 1983: 420).

Investigating students' conjunctive cohesion errors can be significant to both students and teachers. It is crucial for students to know the kind of cohesive problems they have in their compositions in order to avoid them later. It is also essential for teachers to understand the nature of their students' errors, because this can help them to find out solutions to these errors. Indeed, the investigation of students' conjunctive cohesion errors can be, at the same time, diagnostic and prognostic. It is diagnostic because it can tell us the learner's state of the language at a given point during the learning process and prognostic because it can help course designers to orient language-learning materials on the basis of the learners' current problems (Corder, 1967).

In line with the aims of the present study, it is necessary to try to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the different conjunctive cohesion errors do third year students of the English Department at Tizi-Ouzou University make in their compositions?
2. What are the possible effects of these errors on coherence in students' compositions?
3. What are the possible pedagogical implications of these errors?

The present paper is divided into two chapters. The first one is divided into two sections. The first section reviews the required aspects that are related to the present study. This section includes a review of previous literature on theories of second/foreign language acquisition, namely Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage. It comprises, also, the definition of conjunctive cohesion and other main concepts that are used in the present study. The second section deals with the appropriate research methodology that is needed to achieve the aims of the present study. The second chapter presents the results and their discussions. This chapter includes all categories and subcategories of conjunctive cohesion errors that have been identified in students' compositions. These errors are categorized, exemplified, and then discussed. The discussion follows each subcategory of errors.

References

- Bamberg, B. 'What Makes a Text Coherent?' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, 1983, pp. 417-429.
- Bensemmane, F. 'Lexical Cohesion, Pragmatic Coherence and EFL Reader' in *Publication of the Moroccan Association of Teachers of English (MATE), Proceedings of the 13th (MATE) Annual Conference*, March 29-April 2, 1993, pp. 75-81
- Corder, S.P. 'The Significance of Learners' Errors' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Vol.04, November 1967, pp. 162-170.
- Duane, H. R. 'Coherence in Writing' in *The English Journal*, Vol. 73, No. 5, September 1984, pp. 35-36.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
- Hasan, R. 'Cohesion and Cohesive Harmony' in *Understanding reading comprehension, International Reading Association*. 1984, pp. 181-219.
- Hyland, K. *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Kallgren, G. 'Some Types of Textual Cohesion and their Effects on Texts' in N E Enkvist, and J Wiksell (eds), *Papers from the fifth Scandinavia Conference in Linguistics*. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press, 1979, pp.136-145.
- Nunan, D. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Parson, G. 'Cohesion Coherence: Scientific texts' in *Functional Linguistics: Approaches and uses*. Germany: Houton De Gruyter, 1991, pp. 414-429.
- Smith, R. N. and Frawley, W. J. 'Conjunctive cohesion in Four English Genre' in *British Library*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1983, pp. 347-373.

Chapter one:

Literature review and Methodology

Introduction

This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section reviews the three theories that have contributed to the analysis of learners' errors in the field of second/foreign language acquisition. These theories are Contrastive Analysis, Error Analysis and Interlanguage. As our study aims to analyse conjunctive cohesion errors, we have reviewed this category of cohesion with particular reference to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification. When speaking about cohesion, we have included subtitles in which we have highlighted the relationship between cohesion, coherence and text. The second section is devoted to the explanation of the methodology that is followed in the present study. It includes the description of the sample of the study and the subjects. It comprises data analysis as a general heading, orthographic sentence, conjunctive cohesion elements and Error Analysis procedures as subtitles. To identify students' conjunctive cohesion errors, orthographic sentence is used as a unit of analysis through which students' essays are segmented. The conjunctive cohesion elements are used as reference to this identification. Finally, this section deals with the procedures of Error Analysis that are adopted in the present study.

Section one: Literature review

1. Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis was first developed by Charles Fries (1945) and expanded by Robert Lado (1957). It is an approach to language acquisition. This approach maintains that errors made by L2 learners are due to the transfer of patterns from their native languages. This view is supported by Robert Lado (1957: 2) when he says: *'The individual tends to transfer the forms and meanings and the distribution of forms and meanings of their native language and culture to the foreign language and culture.'* (Lado, 1957: 2). In this statement, Lado (1957) argues that when learners perform in a foreign language, they have a tendency to transfer both the forms and meanings of their language and culture to the foreign ones. In other words, foreign language learners make grammatical, syntactic, morphological, phonological and semantic errors that are due to the transfer of their native language rules and meanings to the second and foreign languages. According to the supporters of this approach, the principal barrier to second and foreign languages acquisition is the interference of the native language system of learners with the systems of their target language. In this sense, Connor (1996: 12) says

The theory of the second language learning suggested that L1 interfered with L2 acquisition. The dominant modal of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis emphasized the negative, interfering effects of the first language on the second language acquisition, which were considered harmful.

(1996: 12).

The idea that is expressed in this statement is that Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis focuses mainly on the negative transfer from the native language of the learner to his/her second or foreign languages. Finally, Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is divided into two versions: the strong and weak versions. They are explained in the following.

1.1. The strong version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

The strong version of the Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis claims that:

(a) Interference from the learner's native language is the main obstacle to the second language learning;

(b) The greater the difference between the native language and the target language, the greater the difficulty is;

(c) These difficulties can be predicted with the help of a systematic and scientific analysis;

(d) The result of Contrastive Analysis can be used as a reliable source in the preparation of teaching materials, course planning and the improvement of classroom techniques.

In line with what has been said before, Contrastive Analysts focus on a scientific and a structural comparison of the two languages in question in order to provide teachers with efficient teaching materials. This idea is supported by Charles Fries (1945:9) when he says: *'The most efficient materials are those that are based upon a scientific description of the language to be learned, carefully compared with a parallel description of the native language of the learner.'* (Cited in Wardhaugh, 1970: 124). The importance of this scientific description and contrast between learners' native language and the second or foreign languages is to predict the possible difficulties that learners may find in learning other languages. This scientific work helps the teacher to overcome learners' difficulties as it is stated in Roselind (2009): *'The ability to predict errors will equip teachers to help students minimize or overcome their language learning problems.'* (2009: 351) In other words, if a teacher can predict some errors that his/her learners may make, he/she can avoid these errors by suggesting solutions.

However, this strong version has a lot of shortcoming. The major criticism of this version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is that the assumption that whatever is similar between native language of the learner and the language s/he wants to learn is easy, or whatever is different between these languages is difficult, proved to be wrong. Therefore, the interest of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is shifted from the predictive power of errors to the explanatory one of the observable errors. The absence of the explanation of observed errors in the strong version leads to the development of this version into the weak one.

1.2. The weak version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis

Unlike the strong version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, this one suggests that linguists are able to use the best linguistic knowledge available to them in order to account for the observed difficulties in second language learning (Wardhaugh, 1970: 126). As an attempt to improve the strong version often criticized to be too intuitive, Wardhaugh (1970) advocated a weak version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis in which the emphasis of the hypothesis has shifted from the predictive power of the relative difficulty to the explanatory one of the observable errors (Ibid, 1970: 126). In other words, it is indeed necessary to have a comparison between two language systems to predict some learning difficulties, but these predictions can only become useful after they are empirically checked with actual data of learners' errors. This idea is supported by Wardhaugh (1970: 126) in saying that the weak version *'starts with the evidence provided by linguistic interference and uses such evidence to explain the similarities and differences between systems'*. Thus, the weak version of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis leads to an approach that makes less demands of contrastive theory than does the strong version.

Despite its usefulness, the weak version is unable to explain all errors made by language learners. Like the strong version, the weak one assumes that all errors are due to the native language interference which is not always true. Hence, neither the prediction in the strong version nor the explanation in the weak one can provide efficient solutions to the difficulties that learners encounter in their learning process. These weaknesses lead some linguists to think about another theory that can improve this weak version. In this way, it is developed into error analysis.

2. Error Analysis and Interlanguage

Error Analysis is not limited to the interlingual explanation of errors. That is, unlike Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, Error Analysis provides explanation to both interlingual and intralingual errors. It supplies teachers with techniques for analysing errors of students in their production of texts. Errors are no longer seen as problems to be solved, but they are seen as part of the process of language acquisition. They provide insights into the strategies of a particular language user at a particular point in his/her acquisition of a target language (Bartholomae, 1980:256). In this way, learners are seen as active participants in the process of second and foreign language acquisition rather than as passive ones. They form and test hypotheses in the process of creating an internalized system of how the target language works. Moreover, Error Analysis evolved into the study of 'Interlanguage'. It is defined by Selinker, Swain and Dumas (1975) as a 'system' that is 'distinct from both the native language and the target language' (Cited in Connor, 1996: 13).

3. Implications for the study

Having reviewed different theories about the study of learners' errors in their language acquisition process, we think it is worth selecting the suited ones to the aim of the present study. It consists of the study of students' conjunctive cohesion errors in

their compositions. To achieve this aim, reference is made only to Error Analysis and Interlanguage. In other words, Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis is beyond the scope of our study. Thus, these suited theories to the present study are developed in the following.

3.1. Error Analysis

In line with what has been said before, Error Analysis is not limited to the interference explanation of learners' errors. Hence, the predictive and the explanatory powers of Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis are challenged. They are challenged by some studies which show that significant learning difficulties are not necessary due to the differences between L1 and L2. According to Schachter and Celce-Murcia (1977) supporters of Error Analysis criticize the effectiveness of Contrastive Analysis both at theoretical and at practical levels. As they say

EA proponents [...] have challenged the usefulness of CA both on theoretical and practical grounds. Their counterclaim is that a careful study of a large corpus of errors committed by speakers of the source language attempting to express themselves in the target language provides factual empirical data rather than theoretical speculation for developing a syllabus or a model of second language acquisition. Furthermore, they point out that the analysis of production errors shows quite clearly that not all systematic errors produced by the learner can be attributed to interference from the source language.
(1977: 441-442).

The idea expressed in this statement is that unlike Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis, learners' performances provide empirical data for error analysis. The importance of doing this is that a syllabus is developed on the basis of the findings of Error Analysis rather than on the basis of theoretical assumptions. Another important idea stated in this quotation is that the mother tongue of learners is not considered as the main source of learners' errors. That is, there are errors that are due to the lack of learners' knowledge of the nature of the target language. These errors are beyond the scope of Contrastive Analysis. Unlike Contrastive Analysis which is based on a behaviourist view of

language acquisition, Error Analysis is based on a mentalist one. In fact, mentalists have a different view of language acquisition in comparison to behaviourists. According to them, it is naturally determined. This consists mainly of the innate capacities with which human beings are endowed. In this sense, Chomsky (1965) says

Human mind is equipped with a faculty for learning language, referred to as Language Acquisition Device. This is separated from the faculties responsible for other kinds of cognitive activity (for example, logical reasoning). This faculty is the primary determinant of language acquisition.

(Cited in Ellis, 1997: 32).

In other words, human beings have natural capacities that allow them to acquire languages disregarding the environment in which language acquisition takes place. In their acquisition process, learners tend to test their hypothesis about the nature of the language that they are going to learn. In so doing, they make errors. These errors, according to Chomsky (1965), can be classified into competence and performance ones. According to him, competence is *'the speaker-hearer's knowledge of his language'*, while performance is *'the actual use of language in concrete situations'* (Chomsky, 1965: 4).

The distinction between competence and performance requires the distinction between mistakes and errors. According to Corder (1981), as in first language acquisition, some of the errors that learners of second language make in their process of learning are due to physical or psychological reasons. These errors, according to him, are non-systematic. They are called *'lapses'* or *'slips of the tongue'*. Some, on the other hand, occur regularly and show the misunderstandings of the second language system. These are called errors. In addition, the clear distinction between what Corder calls mistakes and errors is to be found in his work on applied linguistics published in 1993. When referring to the definition of mistakes, he states

We are all subjectively aware that the likelihood of our making mistakes [...] increases when we are tired, nervous, or in some sort of situation of stress or uncertainty, or when our attention is divided, or we are absorbed in some non-linguistic activity. We should therefore expect that someone trying to communicate in a foreign language or under the sometimes stressful situation in, and outside, the classroom would be particularly liable to such failures in performance.
(Corder, 1993: 258).

The above quote claims that mistakes are due to the physical or mental failures of the learners. They are not systematic. On the other hand, according to Corder (1993), errors are due to the lack of learners' competence of the language that they are learning, as he states: *'They are not physical failures but the sign of an imperfect knowledge of the code. The learners have not yet internalized the formation rules of the second language'* (Ibid, 1993: 259). In this statement, Corder refers to the definition of errors. According to this definition, unlike mistakes, errors are not due to the physical failures. They reflect learners' deficiencies in the target language. Thus, they are systematic.

The fact that error analysts consider the cognitive aspect of learners, this involves viewing them as those who interact actively with the new language. They develop new hypotheses about the structure of the language they are learning as well as modifying and discarding earlier formed ones. In fact, with the publication of Corder's article, The Significance of Learner Errors in (1967), Error Analysis took a new turn. That is, learners are no longer viewed as passive participants in the process of learning, but as active ones. Corder (1967) presented a completely different attitude towards learners' errors. In other words, instead of viewing errors as *'flaws'* that need to be eradicated, he viewed them as *'indispensable'* for learners themselves in their learning process. According to him, making errors can be regarded as a device used by learners in order to learn. By paying attention to the learners' errors, Corder (1967) believes that it's better to understand their needs and stop assuming that we know what they should learn and when they should learn it. In line with Corder (1967), Schachter and Celce-

Murcia (1977: 442) say: *'Errors provide evidence for a much more complex view of the learning process, one in which the learner is seen as an active participant in the formation of and revision of hypotheses regarding the rules of the target language.'*

The idea expressed in this statement is that learners' errors are necessary in their learning process. They reflect their hypotheses making about the rules of the target language.

The importance of studying errors, according to Corder (1967: 161) is that they tell the teacher what learners have learned and what they should learn. They provide the researcher with an indication of the strategies and the procedures that learners have adopted in their process of learning. Moreover, according to him, systematic analyses of errors can provide useful insights into the processes of language acquisition. Because errors are signals that actual learning is taking place, they can indicate students' progress and success in language learning. In line with Corder (1967), Kroll and Schafer (1978: 243) argue that the value of Error Analysis for the composition teacher is the perspective it offers to the learner since it allows us to see errors *'as clues to inner processes, as windows into the mind'*. In other words, if composition teachers investigate the patterns of errors in learners' performances, they can better understand the nature of those errors. According to Corder (1993), the study of learners' errors does not only permit to teachers to understand the nature of their errors, but also they provide them with evidence on the effectiveness of their teaching materials. For him, these errors may serve as a basis for a possible modification in the syllabus they have followed. As he says

Errors provide feedback, they tell the teacher something about the effectiveness of his teaching materials and his teaching techniques, and show him what parts of the syllabus he has been following have been inadequately learned or taught and need further attention. They enable him to decide whether he must devote more time to the item he has been working on. This is the day-to-day value of errors. But in

terms of broader planning and with a new group of learners they provide the information for designing a remedial syllabus or a programme of reteaching.

(1993:265).

The meaning of this quotation is that learners' errors provide teachers with pieces of information about the extent to which the program is understood by their learners. They know which item (s) in the syllable is (are) assimilated by their learners. This gives them the information about what item (s) that should be taken into consideration in the remedial syllabus and what should not.

3.2. Interlanguage

Interlanguage is a term that Selinker (1972) has adopted from 'interlingual'. She defines it as '*a separate linguistic system based on the observable output which results from a learner's attempted production of a target language norm*' (1972:210). In other words, Interlanguage refers to the learners' linguistic system that has a structurally intermediate status between the system of their native language and the one of the target language. This linguistic system is not correct from the standpoint of the target language, but a valid one in the sense that it permits learners to convey their messages successfully. That is, even if learners make errors from the standpoint of the target language, they are able to communicate and understand each other. As it is stated by Kutz that: '*Although interlanguage is not correct from the point of view of the target language, it is a valid linguistic system and allows its user to communicate competently [...]*' (1986: 393). In addition, it is described differently by different linguists. While Nemser (1971) has referred to it as an '*approximate system*', Corder (1967) has called it an '*idiosyncratic dialect*' or '*language learners' language*'. According to Nemser (1971), approximate system means the deviant linguistic system created by the learner in his/her attempt to use the target language. He has stressed the successive approximation to the target language. In line with Nemser (1971), Corder (1967) has

used this term to connote the idea that the learner's language is unique to a particular individual and that the rules of the learners' language are peculiar to the language of that individual alone. Although each of these appellations emphasizes a particular notion, they share the idea that second language learners form their own language system. This is neither the system of the learner's mother tongue nor the one of the target language, but falls between the two. Moreover, the most important characteristic of Interlanguage is that it has its own legitimate system where learners are no longer considered as producers of malformed language, but as creative beings proceeding through logical and systematic stages of acquisition creatively acting upon their linguistic environment. At this stage of language acquisition, learners' errors are necessary. They are cues of learners' hypothesis testing about the nature of target language. This idea is supported by Kutz (1986) when speaking about learners' errors. He says: *'While some features represent errors, they are a necessary part of constructing and testing hypotheses about the new language.'* (1986: 393). The second characteristic is that this system is dynamic which is based on the attempt of learners to produce order and structure to the linguistic stimuli surrounding them.

As far as the relationship between Interlanguage and Error Analysis is concerned, the former constitutes the source for data analysis of the latter. In this sense, XIE and JIANG (2007:11) state it: *'[...] interlanguage [...] has become the basis of error analysis'*. It is considered a basis for Error Analysis because it focuses on the study of errors that learners make at their interlingual stage.

4. Cohesion

The concept of cohesion is defined by Halliday and Hasan (1976) as a semantic relationship between different elements of the text. As they say: *'The concept of cohesion is a semantic one; it refers to relations of meaning that exist within the text,*

and that define it as a text.' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 4). Cohesion occurs when the presupposed element cannot be interpreted without reference to the presupposing one, as they argue

Cohesion occurs where the INTERPRETATION of some element in the discourse is dependent on that of another. The one PRESUPPOSES the other, in the sense that it cannot be effectively decoded except by recourse to it. When this happens, a relation of cohesion is set up, and the two elements, the presupposing and the presupposed, are thereby at least potentially integrated into a text.'
(Ibid.p.04).

The meaning expressed in this statement is that cohesion occurs when an element in the text cannot be interpreted if reference is not made to another element present within the text. For instance, *take the **books** that are on the table. Put **them** on the shelves.* In this example, the meaning of *them* cannot be interpreted without reference to *books*.

According to these linguists, cohesion is considered as a 'non-structural relation'. In other words, it is a semantic relationship that can be achieved at the inter-sentential level and not a grammatical one. As Halliday and Hasan (1976:14) say : '*Cohesion as we said is not a structural relation; hence it is unrestricted by sentence boundaries; and in its most normal form it is simply the presupposition of something that has gone before, whether in the preceding sentence or not.*' The meaning expressed in this statement is that cohesion is not a grammatical relation between different elements at the intra-sentential level, but a semantic one that can be achieved at the extra-sentential level. Finally, the concept of cohesion as it is conceived by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is considered as linguistic means whereby text functions as a single meaningful unit. As they say: '*Cohesion does not concern what a text means; it concerns how the text is constructed as a semantic edifice.*' (Ibid.p.26). in this way, cohesion contributes to the creation of coherence in the text.

4.1. Cohesion and Coherence

Halliday and Hasan (1976) consider coherence from the linguistic point of view. According to them, coherence or as they call it, texture, is created by the linguistic recourses of the language. In other words, if text has texture, it will be due to certain linguistic features that are present in the text. As they point out

What we are investigating in this book are the resources that English has for creating texture. If a passage of English containing more than one sentence is perceived as a text, there will be certain linguistic features present in that passage which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 2).

In this statement, Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue that cohesion is considered as linguistic means through which coherence is achieved. According to them, coherence refers to a total unity of the text. This is a unity of meaning. In this way, cohesion is seen as a measure of coherence of a text. In other words, it is seen as an index of textual coherence. According to Carrell (1982), Halliday and Hasan (1976) consider coherence as a textual feature and not a contextual one. As she states : '*Halliday and Hasan (1976) encourage the belief that coherence is located in the text and can be defined as a configuration of textual features*' (Carrel, 1982: 479). In other words, unlike the process view of coherence which is based on the role of context in creating coherence, the product one considers coherence in terms of features identifiable in the textual product itself. Among these features, one can find cohesion.

4.2. Cohesion and Text

By text is meant any passage that consists of meaning as a whole, but not as just a collection of unrelated sentences. It is used in linguistics '*to refer to any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form a unified whole*' (Op. Cit. Halliday and Hasan: 01). In other words, a text is defined by these linguists as a semantic unit which is created by the semantic relations that exist between its

components. As they say: *'A text is best regarded as a SEMANTIC unit: a unit not of form but of meaning [...] a text does not CONSIST OF sentences; it is REALIZED BY, or encoded in, sentences.'* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 02). The meaning expressed in this statement is that the semantic relations that exist between different sentences constitute a text and these relations are achieved by cohesion. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), the cohesion of different sentences that generate a text can function as a unified whole and it is considered as the linguistic means through which a text is built. In this sense, they say: *'When we consider cohesion [...] we are investigating the linguistic means whereby a text is enabled to function as a single meaningful unit.'* (Ibid,p.30). In the same context, they have added further in saying

The expression of the semantic unity of the text lies in the cohesion among the sentences of which it is composed [...] typically, in any text, every sentence except the first exhibits some form of cohesion with a preceding sentence, usually with the one immediately preceding.

(Ibid.p.293).

In this statement, these linguists want to stress the importance of cohesion in the creation of text. This importance lies in the fact that each sentence of the text, except the first one, shows its cohesion with other sentences of the text. This relation can be either with adjacent sentences or with remote ones.

The definition of text, according to Halliday and Hasan (1976), is not only considered as a product of cohesion, but of a register too. As they say: *'A text is a passage of discourse which is coherent [...] with respect to the context of situation, and therefore consistent in register; and it is coherent with respect to itself, and therefore cohesive.'* (Ibid.p.23). In fact, the present study will focus only on the latter definition of a text. That is, the relation of text to its situational context is beyond the scope of our study.

Finally, the concepts of cohesion, text and coherence have an intrinsic relationship, as Halliday and Hasan (1976: 298) argue: *'The general meaning of cohesion is embodied in the concept of text. By its role in providing "texture", cohesion helps to create text.'* In this statement, these linguists have revealed the important relationship between these three concepts. According to them, cohesion contributes to the creation of coherence and text.

4.3. Conjunctive cohesion

Conjunctive cohesion expresses semantic relation that exist between sentences and paragraphs of the text in the sense that it shows the semantic relationships between what has gone before and what follows. In this sense, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 227) argue that conjunctive cohesion expresses semantic relations that specify *'the way in which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before'*. In fact, the cohesive relation of one sentence to the one immediately preceding can be expressed either by an overt conjunctive element or only by the semantic relation of adjacent sentences. As Halliday and Hasan (1976) point out

[...] We are often prepared to recognize the presence of a relation of this kind even when it is not expressed overtly at all. We are prepared to supply it for ourselves, and thus to assume that there is cohesion even though it has not been explicitly demonstrated.

(1976: 229).

For instance, *He arrives late .He misses the first lecture.* In this example, one can understand that the second sentence expresses a result of the first one even though there is no overt conjunctive element, like *'so'*, *'as a result'*, *'consequently'* or so on.

To achieve cohesive relations by overt conjunctive elements, they should occur in the initial position of the sentences since cohesion is a relation between sentences, not a relation within sentences. When the conjunctive element occurs in the first position of the sentence, its meaning extends over the whole sentence. As Halliday and Hasan

(1976: 232) say: *'A conjunctive adjunct normally has first position in the sentence [...], and has as its domain the whole of the sentence in which it occurs: that is to say, its meaning extends over the entire sentence'*.

It is worth noting that we focus only on the use of overt conjunctive elements that are identified and classified in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion. The cohesive relations that can be achieved without using any overt conjunctive element are beyond the scope of our study. Finally, in the following, the semantic categories of conjunctive cohesion: additive, causal, adversative and temporal are explained and exemplified. The conjunctive elements that are used in the analysis of students' essays are identified in the second section.

4.3.1. Additive category of conjunctive cohesion

This category of cohesion involves the additive relation between adjacent sentences. This semantic relation can be expressed in the simple form of cohesion by additive elements, *'and'*, *'or'* and *'nor'*. To achieve cohesion, these conjunctive elements should function cohesively. That is to say, they should have an initial position in the sentence. For instance, *maybe he has changed his mind. Or, he missed the bus and isn't coming.* In this example, the semantic relationship, alternative, between the first and the second sentence is expressed by the conjunction, *'or'*. In fact, the conjunctive functions of these items differ from the coordination one. While the conjunctive function of *'and'*, is cohesive, the coordination one is structural. This idea is supported by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 234) when they say

Compared with its scope as a structure, the scope of the 'and' relation as a form of conjunction is somewhat modified and extended. We shall refer to the conjunctive 'and' by the more general term ADDITIVE to suggest something rather looser and less structural than is meant by COORDINATE. Thus, the coordinate relation is structural, whereas the additive relation is cohesive. The additive is a generalized semantic relation in the text-forming component of the semantic system, that is based on the logical notion of 'and'.

The meaning expressed in this statement is that the coordinate relation is limited to the grammatical relationship between different elements at the sentence level. However, the additive relation is a semantic one which occurs at the inter-sentential level. It is based on the additional meaning which can be expressed by conjunction 'and' or similar additive connectors occurring at the beginning of a new sentence. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 246), there are many conjunctive expressions that have the same function as additive 'and' like 'furthermore', 'also', 'moreover', 'besides', 'in addition', and so on. These connectors help the reader to understand the semantic relationship between sentences in the sense that they announce to him/her the type of the relationship.

The additive category includes the semantic similarity that holds between sentences. This relation of meaning can be expressed by conjunctions, like 'similarly', 'in the same way'. In this sense, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 247) say

Under the heading ADDITIVE we may include a related pattern, that of semantic SIMILARITY, in which the source of cohesion is the comparison of what is being said with what has gone before. Forms such as similarly, likewise, in the same way, are used by the speaker to assert that a point is being reinforced or a new one added to the same effect; the relevance of the presupposing sentence is its similarity of import to the presupposed one.

As it is expressed by the above quotation that the additive elements which express similarity serves to reinforce a point in composition or to add a piece of information. For instance, *treating students as active ones brings out the best in them. In the same way, if you treat them as passive ones, they behave as such.* This example highlights the reinforcement function of the above conjunctives in the sense that the second sentence reinforces the meaning of the first one. In other terms, students' behaviour depends on the way that we treat them. Moreover, cohesion can be achieved by negative comparison. The meaning of this latter is generally dissimilarity. According to Halliday

and Hasan (1976), the contrastive relationship between sentences can be expressed by conjunctions, like *'by contrast'*, *'as opposed to this'*, *'unlike'*, and so on. For instance, *John likes reading books. While, Peter likes watching films.* In this example, the contrastive relationship between these adjacent sentences is explicitly expressed by the connector, *'by contrast'*.

The additive category comprises also forms that express exposition or exemplification. This corresponds mainly to apposition. In the expository sense, some conjunctive elements such as *'I mean'*, *'that is'*, *'in other words'*, are used in writing to explain ideas or opinions. Exemplification is expressed by conjunctive elements such as *'for instance'* and *'for example'*. These elements are used in composition for illustration.

4.3.2 Adversative category of conjunctive cohesion

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 250), the basic meaning of the adversative relation is *'contrary to expectation'*. In other words, expectation expressed by the content of the first sentence, in adjacent sentences, is reversed by the meaning of the second one. For instance, *the social and economic conditions are improved in the countryside. Yet, the inhabitants continue to flee it.* In reading the first sentence, one can expect that the inhabitants of the countryside will not flee it, but this expectation is reversed in the second one. Cohesion, in this subcategory, is expressed in its simple form by the word *'yet'* occurring in the initial position of any given sentence. Adversative connectors, *'but'*, *'however'*, and *'though'* are similar to *'yet'*. There is a slight difference between *'but'* and *'yet'*. The connector, *'but'* comprises the element *'and'* as one of its meaning components, whereas *'yet'* does not; for this, we can find sentences which start with *'and yet'*, but never with *'and but'*. (Halliday and Hasan 1976: 250). In addition, the adversative connector, *'on the other hand'*, has relatively

the same function as *'but'* and *'however'*. This connector does not have the same function as the correlative form, *'on the one hand' [...] 'on the other hand'* in the sense that the latter form is only used in comparative.

There is another form of the adversative relation, which conveys clearly the contrastive sense. This meaning is expressed by adversative item such as *'as against'*, *'in fact'*, *'as a matter of fact'*. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 254), the meaning of these items is still *'contrary to expectation'*, but the only difference is that these items have a special sense which is *'as against what has just been said'*. In other words, the adversative connectors such as *'however'* can express contrast of something that is said earlier in text.

4.3.3 Causal category of conjunctive cohesion

The simple causal relation is expressed by connectors *'so'*, *'thus'*, *'hence'*, *'therefore'*, *'consequently'*, *'as a result'*, and so on. Like other cohesive relations, causal elements need to have initial positions in sentences in order to express cohesion. In this category, the semantic relationship between adjacent sentences is dominated by the result of one phenomenon or event as arising from another phenomenon or event. That is, this semantic relation is expressed by reason-result. For instance, *he dislikes living in the city. So, he is preparing to leave it.* In this example, the first sentence expresses the cause of leaving, and the second one the result. As far as cohesion is concerned, the precedence of cause over effect is reflected in the typical sequence in which sentences related in this way tend to occur. The reversed form of causal relation in which the presupposing sentence expresses the cause is not really a form of cohesion. In addition, unlike the cause-effect relation that can be expressed at the sentence level, in the cohesive relation the cause precedes always the effect. In this sense, Halliday and Hasan (1976:257-258) say

Within the sentence, it is natural to find the structural expression of cause going in either direction; a structure functions as a whole, and the sequence 'b, because a' is no less acceptable- in fact considerably more frequent than 'because a, b'. Within the cohesive relation between sentences, however, in which the text unfolds one sentence after another, the logical precedence of cause over effect is reflected in the typical sequence in which sentences related in this way tend to occur'.

The general heading of causal relations comprises also conditional type of relation. Linguistically speaking, causal and conditional relations are closely related in the sense that causal relation means '*a, therefore b*', conditional one means '*possibly a; if so, then b*'. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 258), these types of relations are interchangeable as cohesive forms. Generally, the simple form of conditional is expressed by '*if*' which is a hypothetical type of relation. The negative form of conditional is expressed cohesively by '*otherwise*'. For instance, *you should drive fast. Otherwise, you will arrive late.*

4.3.4. Temporal category of conjunctive cohesion

The temporal relation involves the succession of events in time between sentences. This simple form of temporal relation is expressed by conjunctive '*then*'. When this connector relates two sentences, the second sentence adds new meaning to the first one and the succession in time too. As Halliday and Hasan (1976: 261) point out: '*The temporal relation may be made more specific by the presence of an additional component in the meaning, as well as that of succession in time*'. For instance, *she revised her lessons. Then, she prepared dinner*'. In this example, '*then*' shows a succession in time between the first and the second events. The second event adds the information to the first one. The cohesive relation, in this example, is expressed by the fact that the second sentence shows the end of the action in time and the beginning of a new one.

Temporal cohesion can be achieved by indication of simultaneity of events in time, or an event precedes another in time; the sense of previous. In the simultaneous relation, cohesion is not achieved by the sequence of sentences: the second sentence refers to a later event, but the second sentence may be related to the first one by indication of simultaneity of events in time. This type of temporal relation is expressed by conjunctive expressions such as '*at the same time*' or '*simultaneously*'. For instance, *the teacher is explaining the lesson. At the same time, the students are taking notes.* As far as the sense of previous is concerned, cohesion can be achieved by using conjunctive items that express this type of cohesive relation such as '*earlier*', '*before that*', and '*previously*'. For instance, *he ate an apple. Before that, he had eaten two bananas.*

Temporal cohesion is not only achieved by the sense of simultaneity and previous, but also by the sense of conclusiveness. In other words, the sense of conclusiveness contributes to the creation of cohesion between presupposed sentence and the presupposing one, because it marks the end of process or series of processes. In this sense, Halliday and Hasan (1976: 263) argue: '*The presupposing sentence may be temporally cohesive not because it stands in some particular time relation to the presupposed sentence but because it marks the end of some process or series of processes*'. According to these linguists, this type of temporal relation is expressed by conjunctions like '*finally*', '*at last*', '*in the end*', and so on.

Unlike other types of conjunctive relations, the temporal one can occur in correlative form. This form may indicate a cataphoric expression in one sentence anticipating the anaphoric one. In other words, when a sentence is introduced by '*secondly*', for instance, this presupposes that an event is already happened and there is another one to be added. This cohesive relation is expressed by temporal items such as '*first*', '*first of all*', '*to begin with*', '*second*', and so on.

Temporal cohesion is not only achieved in the successiveness of events in the external world, but also in the successiveness of items within the communicative process. This is expressed by the meaning *'next in the course of the discussion'* (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 263). This form of temporal cohesion also is achieved by conjunctions, like *'next', 'secondly', 'finally', 'in conclusion'*. When listing arguments, the list of temporal successiveness is expressed in the enumeration of points. This type of relation can be achieved by the anticipation of a sequence of points by the use of cataphoric conjunctive items such as *'first'* and *'second'*. Similarly, the *'here'* and *'now'* of the discourse constitute a temporal relation. This relation is achieved by the link of what is said to the particular stage which the communication process has reached. This may take a past, present or future forms. Each tense has its own expressions. For instance, the past tense can be expressed by the conjunctive items such as *'up to now', 'up to this point'*; present, *'at this point'*, future, *'from now on'*. These conjunctive items express temporal relations in the sense that they refer to the time that is included within the communication process. This point is supported by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 265) when they say

These internal aspects of the temporal relations are 'temporal' in the sense that they refer to the time dimension that is present in the communication process. The communication process is certainly a process in real time; but it is at one remove from the time dimension of the processes of the external world that form the content of communication.

Finally, the last temporal relation can be found in the sense of resumption. This relation expresses the sense *'to return to the point'*. The speaker/writer, in this case, indicates that s/he is summarizing the main purpose of the most important ideas in communication. This type of relation can be expressed by conjunctive items such as *'to resume', 'to come back to the point'*, and so on.

Section two: Methodology

Introduction

The aim of this section is to clarify the methodology that is followed in the present study. It includes the description of the sample of the study and the subjects. It deals with data analysis as a general heading. This heading comprises units of analysis; the textual unit, the functional unit and the orthographic sentence. It includes, also, the conjunctive cohesion elements that are classified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) and Error Analysis procedures. To identify students' conjunctive cohesion errors, orthographic sentence is used as a unit of analysis through which students' essays are segmented and the conjunctive cohesion elements are used as reference to this identification. Finally, this chapter deals with Error Analysis procedures. That is, it explains the procedures of Error Analysis that are adopted in the present study.

1. Sample of the study

In this paper, we have selected a representative sample of the population under study. That is, the size of the sample is 100 papers out of 187 which represent 53.47% of the entire population of third year students of the English Department at Tizi-Ouzou University in the academic year 2007/2008. For the requirements of our research, we have opted for random sampling so as to give each copy, in the whole population, an equal chance of being selected. Gender is not considered in this selection. These papers have been the result of timed expository writing test written by these third year students. This test has lasted for one hour and a half. It has been administered under exam conditions. The students have been asked to write an expository essay in which they compare and contrast between life in a village and the one in the city without being informed about the purpose of this composition. These essays have been subjects to our analyses. In other words, the needed data for the present study are selected from these essays.

The reason why we have chosen an expository text, particularly an expository one which is developed by comparison/contrast, for study is that this kind of expository text requires the use of clear conjunctive elements. The aim of using them in the expository text is to help the reader to shift from one item to another without being lost. This idea is supported by Hamdi (1990) when she says

In a development by comparison/contrast, pay particular attention to the transition: between the paragraphs, essentially, but also within the paragraphs. The reader needs clear signals to follow the shift from one item to another, from one idea to another.

(1990: 176).

The idea expressed in the above quotation is that conjunctions are important in writing, especially with texts that are developed with comparison and contrast. This importance lies in the fact that these connectors help the reader to shift from one sentence or paragraph to another without being lost.

2. Subjects

The subjects of our study are third year university students from the English Department at Tizi-Ouzou University in the academic year 2007/2008. The essays that constitute the sample of our research study have been written by these students. Their ages range from 22 to 24 years. In other words, they are adult learners. The rationale for choosing third-year students as a population of our study is that they have studied the module of written expression for three years at the university level. This presupposes that they are able to use conjunctive cohesion elements appropriately so as to achieve cohesion and coherence in their compositions.

3. Data analysis

To identify students' conjunctive cohesion errors, it is significant to establish a unit of analysis through which students' essays should be segmented. To achieve this purpose, orthographic sentence is chosen. The aim of segmenting students' essays into orthographic sentences is to identify their conjunctive cohesion errors. In so doing, particular reference is made to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of conjunctive cohesion elements. Finally, in analysing these errors, procedures of Error Analysis are followed.

3.1. Establishing a unit of analysis

The establishment of a unit of analysis in order to identify and to analyse the students' conjunctive cohesion errors is required. Before establishing this unit, it is significant to mention and to explain the units of analysis that are generally used in the field of text linguistics analysis. These units are named T-unit, the functional unit and orthographic sentence.

3.1.1. The T-unit

The T-unit or Minimal Terminable Unit consists of one main clause together with whatever dependent clauses are attached to it. For example, the sentence *after he had finished his work, he went to bed* would be described as containing one T-Unit. In other words, in this example, there is one main clause; *he went to bed* and one dependent clause, *after he had finished his work*.

Although the T-unit has been used in a number of studies, it is not suitable in the identification of students' conjunctive cohesion errors in the sense that cohesion is a semantic relation at the extra-sentential level not a relation within the sentence level.

3.1.2. The functional unit

The F-unit is derived from Lieber (1981: 93: 96). It includes clauses, and certain phrase structures such as appositives that are equivalent to clauses. It also includes non-restrictive relatives, which are generally analysed as root sentences. For instance: the head master declares that football, *which is the most popular sport*, must be exercised in the school.

In line with Lieber (1981) and Hubbard (1989), the following criteria have been used to characterize f-units:

1. Clauses joined by coordinate conjunctions form-units:

Example [1]: He woke up early, / but he missed the bus.

2. Clauses showing gapping in a non-initial member constitute separate f-units:

Example [2]: The mother grabbed the thief, / and the police the child

3. Clauses having conjoined verbal structures will be segmented into more than one f-unit.

Example [3]: He stayed with me at home, / and he helped me in doing my home work.

4. Conjoined non-verbal elements within a clause will be considered as separate f-units when an overt signal pointing to a change in rhetorical function occurs (for example, but, except, or an adverbial marker or prepositional phrase):

Example [4]: Everybody succeeded in his studies, / *except Peter*.

5. The following subordinate structures are regarded as f-units:

- a) Adverbial subordinate clauses and clause equivalents:

Example [5]: There is a high death rate in the countryside, / because the majority of people are poor.

- b) Non-restrictive relative clauses:

Example [6]: The supervisor gives instructions to pupils, / which should be obeyed.

- c) Reduced non-restrictive clauses (Non restrictive clauses):

Example [7]: The famous American novel, *Huckleberry Fin*, was written by Mark Twain.

- d) Non-restrictive appositives of exemplification, identification, and renaming:

Example [8]: A well-educated child can develop good habits, / like respecting adults.

- e) Absolute constructions related to adverbial clauses or non-restrictive relatives:

Example [9]: Having been conducted an investigation about a crime, / the police avoided to answer journalists' questions.

Even though f-unit is considered as an important unit in text linguistics analysis, it does not fit the objectives that are set for the present study. In other words, to identify conjunctive cohesion errors, a unit that extends beyond the clause level is required.

3.1.3. The orthographic sentence

By orthographic sentence is meant the series of words which represent a complete thought. It is defined by David Crystal (1994) as

The largest structural unit in terms of which the grammar of a language is organized. It is an independent unit which can be given both a formal and a functional classification [...]. Formal classifications recognize such types as declarative, interrogative, imperative, and exclamative; functional classifications recognize such types as statement, question, and command [...].

(1994: 349).

To achieve the aims of the present study, the orthographic sentence is chosen as a unit of analysis over the T-unit and the functional unit. The rationale for this choice is that Halliday and Hasan (1976) claim that the orthographic sentence, whatever occurs between full stops, provides a good basis for defining cohesion. According to them,

cohesion is achieved clearly across the sentence boundaries. In other words, within the sentence boundaries, there are structural relations that can be confused with cohesive ones. Therefore, according to them, to avoid this confusion, cohesive relations that are achieved at the inter-sentential levels are clear-cut. As they say

Cohesive ties between sentences stand out more clearly because they are the ONLY source of texture, whereas within the sentence there are the structural relations as well. In the description of a text, it is the intersentence cohesion that is significant, because that represents the variable aspect of cohesion, distinguishing one text from another.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 09).

They have added further when they say: *'We have to show how sentences, which are structurally independent of one another, may be linked together through particular features of their interpretation; and it is for this that the concept of cohesion is required.'* (Ibid.p.10). In line with what has been said before, the idea expressed in this statement is that cohesion is achieved clearly at the intersentential level by particular features. Among these textual features, one can find conjunctive cohesion elements. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 232), to achieve cohesion, these elements should take the initial position in the sentences they introduce.

3.2. Conjunctive cohesion elements

Conjunctive cohesion expresses a semantic relation that exists between adjacent sentences and paragraphs. This semantic relationship is achieved by conjunctive cohesion elements such as *'in addition'*, *'moreover'*, *'however'* and so on. These elements are considered as *'transitional devices'*. Unlike other cohesive relations, conjunctive cohesion does not need a specific element in a text for its interpretation. Thus, it has its own intrinsic meaning. As Halliday and Hasan (1976: 226) say

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express

certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse .

The meaning expressed in this quotation is that conjunctive cohesion elements assume the semantic relationship between sentences and/ or paragraphs. That is, they show the direction of meaning. For instance, *he is a very clever student. But, he does not succeed in his exams.* The conjunctive element '*but*' in this example, shows that the meaning will take the direction contrary to what is expected in the first sentence.

As we have said in our review of the literature, we focus only on the analysis of conjunctive cohesion errors that are expressed by overt conjunctive cohesion elements. To achieve this aim, we think it is necessary to identify the four semantic subcategories of conjunctives and the elements that are classified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) within each subcategory. Hence, additive, causal, adversative and temporal elements are identified in the following.

3.2.1. Additive elements:

Conjunctive cohesion elements that are classified under the heading of '*additive*' are mentioned in the following:

Simple additive relations (External and internal)

Additive: and; and also; and...too.

Negative: nor; and...not, not...either, neither.

Alternative: *or; or else.*

Complex additive relations (internal): emphatic

Additive: further (more), moreover, additionally, besides that, add to this, in addition, and another thing.

Alternative: alternatively.

Complex additive relations (internal): de-emphatic.

Afterthought: incidentally, by the way.

Comparative relations (internal).

Similar: likewise, similarly, in the same way, in (just) this way.

Dissimilar: on the other hand, by contrast, conversely.

Appositive relations (internal).

Exposition: that is, I mean, in other words, to put it another way.

Exemplificatory: for instance, for example, thus.

(Halliday and Hasan 1976, 249-250)

3.2.2. Adversative elements

Conjunctive cohesion elements that are classified under the heading of '*adversative*' are mentioned in the following:

Adversative relations 'proper' ('in spite of') (external and internal)

Simple: yet; though; only

Containing 'and': *but*

Emphatic: however, nevertheless, despite this, all the same

Contrastive relations ('as against') (external)

Simple: *but, and*

Emphatic: however, on the other hand, at the same time, as against that

Contrastive relations ('as against') (internal)

Avowal: in fact, as a matter of that, to tell the truth, actually, in point of that

Corrective relations ('not...but') (internal)

Correction of meaning: *instead, rather, on the contrary*

Correction of wording: at least, rather, I mean

Dismissive (generalized adversative) relations ('no matter..., still') (external and internal)

Dismissal, closed: in any/either case/event, any/either way, whichever...

Dismissal, open-ended: anyhow, at any rate, in any case, however that may be
(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 255-256).

3.2.3. Causal elements

Conjunctive cohesion elements that are classified under the heading of '*causal*' are mentioned in the following:

Causal relations, general ('because...', 'so') (external and internal)

Simple: so, thus, hence, therefore

Emphatic: consequently, accordingly, because of this

Causal relations, specific

Reason: (mainly external) *for this reason, on account of this*

(internal) it follows (from this), on this basis

Result: (mainly external) as a result (of this), in consequence (of this)

(internal) arising out of this

Purpose: (mainly external) for this purpose, with this in mind/view, with this intention (internal) *to this end*

Reversed causal relations, general

Simple: *for, because*

Conditional relations ('if...', 'then') (external and internal)

Simple: *then*

Emphatic: in that case, that being the case, in such an event, under those circumstances

Respective relations ('with respect to') (internal)

Direct: in this respect/connection, with regard to this; here

Reversed polarity: otherwise, in other respects; aside/apart from this

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976:260-261)

3.2.4. Temporal elements

Conjunctive cohesion elements that are classified under the heading of '*temporal*' are mentioned in the following:

Simple temporal relations (external)

Sequential: (and) then, next, afterwards, after that, subsequently

Simultaneous: (just) then, at the same time, simultaneously

Preceding: earlier, before then/that, previously

Complex temporal relations (external)

Immediate: at once, thereupon, on which; just before

Interrupted: soon, presently, later, after a time; some time earlier, formerly

Repetitive: next time, on another occasion, this time, on this occasion; the last time, on a previous occasion

Specific: next day, five minutes later, five minutes later

Durative: meanwhile, all this time

Terminal: by this time; up till that time, until then

Punctiliar: next moment; at this point/moment; the previous moment

Conclusive relations (external)

Simple: finally, at last, in the end, eventually

Sequential and conclusive relations (external): correlative forms

Sequential: first...then, first...next, first...second...

Conclusive: at first...finally, at first...in the end

Temporal relations (internal)

Sequential: *then, next, secondly...*

Conclusive: *finally, as a final point, in conclusion*

Temporal relations (internal): correlative forms

Sequential: first...next, first...then, first...secondly...

in the first place...; to begin with...

Conclusive: ...finally; ...to conclude with

‘Here and now’ relations (internal)

Past: up to now, up to this point, hitherto, heretofore

Present: at this point, here

Future: from now on, henceforward

Summary relations (internal)

Cumulative: to sum up, in short, briefly

Resumptive: to resume, to get back to the point, anyway

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 266-267).

3.3. Error Analysis Procedures

In analysing students’ conjunctive cohesion errors, procedures of Error Analysis are followed except the explanation one. In other words, the explanation process, in terms of the origin of the errors, is beyond the scope of the present study. The procedures that are followed in the present study are: identification, classification, and description of errors. In line with what has been said before, we have first identified different cohesive errors made by third year students in their compositions. Next, these errors are classified into four major types. The first type comprises errors deriving from the misuse of conjunctive connectors. This one includes four minor types and twelve sub-categories. The second major type deals with unnecessary use of connectors when they are not required. The third one includes conjunctive cohesion errors resulting from the omission of connectors when they are needed. The last major category deals with the overuse of connectors. The last step of these procedures is description. In the descriptive process, we have discussed the students’ errors according to the semantic

relationships at the paragraph and/or at the inter-paragraph levels. In some cases, the contrast of learners' sentences with the corrected ones is provided. Besides, these procedures are inter-independent in the sense that each procedure depends on another. For instance, it is not possible to classify or describe an error without its identification.

In addition, in the analysis of these errors, particular reference is made to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) classification of conjunctive cohesion. The choice of this classification is motivated by the fact that the classification of conjunctives is based on the semantic expression of different elements rather than on the syntactic one, as it is the case in the traditional classification of conjunctives. These semantic categories consist of additive, adversative, causal and temporal ones. They have shown clearly how the initial position of these conjunctives are important as far as cohesion is concerned. In this sense, Smith and Frawley (1983) say

Halliday and Hasan classify the conjunctions into four semantic categories- additives, adversatives, causals, and temporals. It is clear that they do not follow the traditional classification of coordinating vs. subordinating, but that is because such a classification is syntactically motivated and Halliday and Hasan's research is centered on semantics. It also shows why sentence initial conjunction is their principal focus.

(1983: 357).

Conclusion

It follows from the above that the best theory for the analysis of our corpus is Error Analysis. As it is said before, the present study will follow some procedures of this theory. The selection of these procedures is determined by the objectives that are already set for this work. Another point which seems crucial to this study is the classification of conjunctive cohesion by Halliday and Hasan (1976). The categorization of the identified errors, in this study, is done with reference to this classification. The next chapter will deal with the presentation of the results and their discussion.

References

- Bartholomae, D. 'The Study of Error' in *College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 31, No. 3, October 1980, pp. 253-269.
- Carrell, P.L. 'Cohesion is not Coherence' in *TESOL QUARTERLY*, Vol.16, No.4, 1982, pp. 479-488.
- Charles, F. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.
- Chomsky, N. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1965.
- Connor, U. *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Corder, S. P. (1973). *Introducing Applied linguistics*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1981.
- 'The Significance of Learners' Errors' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*. Vol.04, November 1967, pp. 162-170.
- Crystal, D. *Dictionary of language and languages*. London: Penguin books, 1994.
- Ellis, R. *Second Langue Acquisition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Fang, X and JIANG, X. 'Error Analysis and the EFL Classroom Teaching' in *US-China Education Review*, Vol. 04, No. 09 Sep. 2007.
- Hamdi, M. *Writing*. Algiers: ENAL, 1990.
- Hubbard, E.H. *Reference Cohesion, Conjunctive Cohesion and Relational Coherence in Student Academic Writing*. Doctorate thesis, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1989.
- Kroll, B. and M. and Schafer, J. C. 'Error-Analysis and the Teaching of Composition' in *College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 29, No. 3, October, 1978, pp. 242-248
- Kutz , E. 'Between Students' Language and Academic Discourse: Interlanguage as Middle Ground' in *College English, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 48, No. 4, April 1986, pp. 385-396.

Lado, R. *Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1957.

Lieber, P. E. *Cohesion in ESL Students' Expository Writing. A Descriptive Study*. Doctorate thesis. New York University. Ann Arbor. University Microfilms International, 1981.

Nemser, W. 'Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, Vol. 9, 1971, pp.115-123.

Roselind, W. 'Sources of Errors: An Interplay of Interlingual Influence and Intralingual Factors' in *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2009, pp. 349-359.

Schachter, J. and Celce-Murcia, M. 'Some Reservations concerning Error Analysis in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 4, December, 1977, pp. 441-451.

Selinker L. 'Interlanguage' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* Vol.10, 1972, pp. 209-231.

Smith, R. N. and Frawley, W. J. '*Conjunctive cohesion in Four English Genre*' in *British Library*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1983, pp. 347-373.

Wardhaugh, R. 'The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis' in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 2, June 1970, pp. 123-130.

Chapter Two:

Results and discussion

Introduction

This chapter presents the results of the study and their discussion. The results of our research show that coherence remains a major problem for students even after three years of study at university. The coherence problem is detected at the level of the use of connectors. What we have found is that students commit four major types of errors. The most serious one is the misuse of the connectors often confused one for another. Within this category, four minor types and twelve sub-categories are identified. The second type is the superfluous use of connectors in cases where they are not needed. The third type relates the omission of connectors when they are required. The last type is linked to the overuse of connectors.

Conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified in students' compositions are presented in the form of tables. Each type is quantified, illustrated and then discussed. The examples that are analysed in this chapter are selected from the corpus under study. They are discussed with particular reference to Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion; they are discussed in relation to the semantic relationships between sentences and/ or paragraphs. Besides, whether the error is that of the misuse, superfluous use, omission or overuse, it creates problems of incoherence that reduces the quality of the students' writings. In order to highlight this idea, by the end of this chapter, the effect of the identified conjunctive cohesion errors on coherence is elaborated. In discussing the results of the present study, we shall start with the misuse of connectors.

A recapitulative table of conjunctive cohesion errors

The following table is presented in the beginning of this chapter in order to give the reader the general overview about the results of the present study. It includes the total categories and sub-categories of conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified in the corpus. It shows also the frequency of the errors and their percentage representations.

	Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
1.1. Misuse of additive connectors:	1.1.1. The use of an additive connector instead of an adversative one	13	9.62%
	1.1.2. The use of an additive connector instead of a causal one	5	3.70%
	1.1.3. The use of an additive connector instead of a temporal one	9	6.66%
1.2. Misuse of adversative connectors	1.2.1. The use of an adversative connector instead of an additive one	10	7.40%
	1.2.2. The use of an adversative connector instead of a causal one	3	2.22%
	1.2.3. The use of an adversative connector instead of a temporal one	6	4.44%
1.3. Misuse of temporal connectors	1.3.1. The use of a temporal connector instead of an additive one	8	5.92%
	1.3.2. The use of a temporal connector instead of an adversative one	11	8.14%
	1.3.3. The use of a temporal connector instead of a causal one	4	2.96%
1.4. Misuse of causal	1.4.1. The use of a causal connector instead of an additive one	4	2.96%

connectors	1.4.2.The use of a causal connector instead of an adversative one	7	5.18%
	1.4.3.The use of a causal connector instead of a temporal one	3	2.22%
2. Superfluous use of connectors	2.1. The use of an additive connector when it is not required	5	3.70%
	2.2. The use of an adversative connector when it is not required	8	5.92%
3. Omission of connectors	3.1. Absence of an additive connector when one is required	5	3.70%
	3.2. Absence of an adversative connector when one is required	7	5.18%
	3.3. Absence of a causal connector when one is required	6	4.44%
	3.4. Absence of a temporal connector when one is required	4	2.96%
4. The overuse of connectors	4.1. The overuse of additive connectors.	7	5.18%
	4.2. The overuse of causal connectors.	5	3.70%
	4.3. The overuse of adversative connectors.	3	2.22%
	4.4. The overuse of temporal connectors.	2	1.48%
Total		135	100%

Table 1: The totality of conjunctive cohesion errors.

The above table shows the classification of conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified in the students' compositions. As it can be noted, these errors are classified into four major types. The first type deals with the misuse of conjunctive connectors. This one includes four minor types and twelve sub-categories. The second major type deals with superfluous use of connectors when they are not required. The third one

comprises conjunctive cohesion errors that are derived from the omission of connectors when they are needed. The last major category deals with the overuse of connectors. This table displays also the frequency of the errors and their percentage in relation to the total number of errors.

1. Misuse of connectors

1.1. Misuse of additive connectors

This minor category of the misuse of connectors deals with conjunctive cohesion errors deriving from the confusion between additive connectors and other conjunctive cohesion relations. Within this category, three subcategories are identified: the use of an additive connector instead of an adversative one; the use of an additive connector instead of a causal one; and the use of an additive connector instead of a temporal one. The results of the errors that are identified in each subcategory are shown in the table below. In this category, the identified errors are illustrated and discussed.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
1.1.1. The use of an additive connector instead of an adversative one	13	48.14%
1.1.2. The use of an additive connector instead of a causal one	5	18.51%
1.1.3. The use of an additive connector instead of a temporal one	9	33.33%
Total	27	100%

Table 2: Confusion between additive connectors and adversative, causal or temporal ones

As it can be noticed in Table 2, the number of additive errors that are made by students is different from one conjunctive relation to another. As it is shown in the above table, the students confuse more often between additive connectors and adversative ones than between additive connectors and causal or temporal ones. For example, in the first subcategory of the misuse of additive connectors, students have made 13 errors which represent 48.14% within this category. On the other hand, in the second subcategory, the number of errors that are identified is 5 and 9 in the last one. They represent respectively 18.51% for the former and 33.33% for the latter.

1.1.1 The use of an additive connector instead of an adversative one

We should start the discussion of our results by illustrating cases of using additive connectors instead of adversatives. This misuse is the most important one.

*01/ In the city the gazs thrown by factories and cars, and the rabbish existing everywhere makes life of people in danger. **Moreover**, the inhabitant in countryside lives in animate and pure atmosphere thanks to the limited number of cars and the inexistence of factories.*

*02/ The village is a rural place where people can grow farms, life in village seems to be calm and secure. **In addition**, the city consists of the different buildings and infrastructures that enable to do the different industrial activities.*

*03/ The village is a small area where live a small number of people in simple houses in peace without a big noise. **Besides**, city is provided by high building and the different public places like zoos, libraries, hospitals, magazins and everything you want.*

04/ However, the city is a noisy and a polluted place because of the smoke of factories and vehicles. People of the city became more selfish and interested in their

own business. **Also**, the city gives the opportunity to work in factories, industry, business and commerce.

05/ However, in the village, the air is fresh, pure and healthy. The village is less crowded and calm and these make it the best place in which people can have a rest after a long hard day of work. **Furthermore**, people have less opportunities for an easy life like the opportunity to get a job.

This first subcategory of the misuse of additive connectors includes conjunctive cohesion errors resulting from confusion between additive connectors and adversative ones. As it is said in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work: *'The additive is a generalized semantic relation in the text-forming component in the semantic system, that is based on the logical notion of 'and' [...]'* (1976: 234). In other words, different additive connectors link sentences and/or paragraphs that have additional meaning. However, the adversative connectors, according to the same linguists (Ibid.p.250), signal *'a contrary to expectation'* relation. This relation may be deduced from the content of what is being said, or from the communication process. In other words, adversative devices link sentences and/or paragraphs that are opposite in meaning. Therefore, if a student confuses between these two different types of semantic relations, s/he creates ambiguity in the semantic relationships of sentences and/or paragraphs, as is the case in examples from (01) to (05).

It has to be observed that the conjunctions in (01), (02), (03), (04) and (05) are used haphazardly. The students do not pay attention to the meaning in the relationship between sentences. For instance, in example (01), the student contrasts between life in the city and the one in countryside. The first sentence deals with disadvantages of living in the city, whereas the second one deals with advantages of living in the countryside.

Thus, these sentences need to be connected with an adversative device, such as *'by contrast'*, *'on the contrary'*, *'however'* and so on. This contrast in meaning makes the additive connector, *'moreover'*, ineffective. A linking device, *'however'*, makes the adversative relationships of these adjacent sentences clear-cut. Similar cohesive problem has been found in example (04). The fact that this paragraph is introduced by an adversative connector, *'however'*, this presupposes that the student has already spoken about the advantages of living in the village. This implies that in this paragraph, the student speaks about disadvantages in living in the city. Nevertheless, the last sentence has a contrastive relationship with the previous ones in the sense that it deals with advantages in living in the city. Therefore, it should be introduced by an adversative connector in order to help the reader to draw the underlying meaning of the last sentence and the previous ones. That is, the reader may have difficulties in making the link between the first two sentences and the last one. In order to overcome this cohesive error, it is better to use an adversative connector. The use of *'but'* instead of *'also'* to link this last sentence to its preceding ones makes their semantic relationship clear.

Similarly, in the remaining cases, the use of additive connectors instead of adversative ones is inappropriate. Conjunctive connectors that express adversative relation are to the point. For instance, in example (05), similar semantic problem as example (04) arises. This paragraph is introduced with an adversative connector, *'however'*. It deals with advantages in living in countryside. This presupposes that the student has already spoken about disadvantages in living in the city or in the village. However, the meaning of the last sentence contrasts its previous ones in the sense that it deals with the disadvantages of living in the village. Thus, it involves to be introduced

by an adversative connector, such as *'however'* in order to clarify this contrastive relationship between the last sentence of this paragraph and its previous ones.

1.1.2. The use of an additive connector instead of a causal one

We shall continue the illustration of the misuse of connectors with a case involving the substitution of an additive connector for a causal one, as it is shown by the example (06) below.

06/ In a village there are lot of trees which provide the Oxygen which is a source of health and vitality. Similarly, this latter contribute to reduce many illnesses such as 'bronchitis' and 'Lung cancer'.

Unlike the previous subcategory of the misuse of additive connectors, this one includes conjunctive cohesion errors deriving from the confusion between additive connectors and causal ones. If additive connectors link sentences that have additional meaning, causal ones link sentences that have a cause-effect relationship. In other words, causal conjunctives express relations that show the result of one phenomenon or event as arising from another phenomenon or event, and vice versa (Halliday and Hasan,1976:257). Therefore, if the student confuses between these two different conjunctive types of relations, the semantic relationship between sentences or paragraphs will be opaque.

The use of an additive connector, *'similarly'*, in example (06), makes the semantic relationship of the first sentence and the second one unclear. In reading this paragraph, one understands that the first and the second sentences have a cause-effect relationship. In the first sentence, the student speaks about the reasons why there is no pollution in the village. In the second one, s/he speaks about the result of the availability

of trees and the oxygen in the village on its inhabitants' health. Therefore, the use of 'similarly' as a connector between these adjacent sentences is inefficient. To achieve cohesion in clarifying the cause-effect relationship of these sentences, a causal connector should be used as a linker between them. This type of connector is required in the sense that the cause precedes the effect, as it is the case in this example. This idea is supported by Halliday and Hasan (1976) when they state: '*With the cohesive relation between sentences [...] in which the text unfolds one sentence after another, the logical precedence of cause over effect is reflected in the typical sequence in which sentences related in this way tend to occur*' (1976:258). In order to overcome this conjunctive cohesion error, a causal connector, such as 'as a result' need to be used as a linker of these adjacent sentences.

1.1.3. The use of an additive connector instead of a temporal one

The third case of misuse of additive connectors deals with the replacement of a temporal connector by an additive one. This case is also prominent among the other cases that we have detected in our analysis. Examples (07), (08), (09) and (10) below are selected in the corpus as an illustration of this case.

07/ The life in the city and life in the village are quite different; each one has its own characteristics.

*First, life in the village is very calm, and quiet. There is a contact with nature, but in the city there is a noise which is made by cars and factories. **Furthermore**, in the village people know each others, whereas, in the city there is less relations between inhabitants, each one live alone. Third, in the village it is difficult to find a job. Unlike the city which gives more opportunity to work with the existence of factories and institutions.*

08/ *It is well known today that most of people lived in city rather in village. This is due to many factors. Firstly, living in city is better than village. The city encourages communication among people and exchanges ideas. Secondly, to live in city there are many opportunities for finding a job, whereas, in the village people seldom find a good job. Moreover, in city people are able to practice many activities, whereas, in village, people do not practice these activities.*

09/ *On the other hand, the countryside is the best area to live a beautiful life because of the nature and the calme. In the countryside people can relax morally and fell free. In addition, in village people are like one family and each one help the other in his work; however, in countryside these one lack of means of transportation and technology.*

Moreover, we can say that both of the city and countryside have advantages and disadvantages, and each one prefer to live where he wants.

10/ *In the village, the air is fresh, pure and healthy. The village is less crowded and calm and these make it the best place in which people can have a rest after a long hard day of work. Furthermore, people have less opportunities for an easy life like the opportunity to get a job.*

Besides, although the life in the city is different from the one in the village, both are places where people can live.

In this last subcategory of misuse of additive connectors, the focus is on conjunctive cohesion errors resulting from the use of an additive connector instead of a temporal one. As it is said above, an additive connector links between sentences that have an additional meaning (see the sub-title 1.1.1), whereas a temporal one marks the succession in the enumeration of items (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 264). Thus, the use

of an additive device instead of a temporal one may affect the cohesion between adjacent sentences or paragraphs.

What can be noticed in examples (07) to (10) is the irrelevant use of the additive conjunctions. In these cases, the students confuse between temporal connectors and additive ones, ignoring that these different connectors serve different functions. In example (07), for instance, if a conjunctive has to be used, it would rather be a temporal connector, '*second*', since the first sentence starts with '*first*'. This temporal connector signals a listing or enumerating of reasons where '*second*' would be more appropriate. In other terms, the fact that the student starts his/her paragraph with '*first*', and s/he is listing the differences between life in the city and life in the countryside, the use of '*second*' in the second sentence seems to be obvious. However, the use of the additive connector, '*furthermore*', to link the first and the second sentence of this paragraph, the listing process is interrupted. The fact that the second and the third sentences are linked with a temporal connector, '*third*', this presupposes that the first and the second sentences should be linked with a temporal connector, '*secondly*'. This cohesive function of temporal elements is to be found in Halliday and Hasan (1976:263) when they say: '*The meaning 'next in the course of discussion' is typically expressed by the words next or then, or by secondly, thirdly, etc...*' In fact, the cohesive problem that is raised in this example is that this cohesive function of temporal connectors is not respected in the sense that the student uses an additive connector instead of a temporal one. To overcome this problem, '*furthermore*' need to be substituted for '*secondly*'.

The same cohesive problem is identified in example (08). In this paragraph, the student lists the reasons why people prefer living in the city rather than in the village. In each sentence, the student gives one reason. These different reasons are linked with temporal devices except the last one. This one is linked with an additive

connector instead of a temporal one. Thus, the last sentence seems to be out of the paragraph unity. In order to make the semantic relationship of the last sentence and its previous ones explicit, the additive connector, *'moreover'*, should be substituted by a temporal one, *'finally'*. In so doing, the enumeration of these reasons becomes more explicit. The use of this temporal connector anticipates that it is the last reason that the student is going to list. In fact, in composition developed by the listing technique, the use of temporal connectors is crucial. Generally, the first signpost word is *'first'* or its equivalents like *'to begin'*, *'to start with'*. The list is closed with a temporal connector like *'in conclusion'* *'to conclude with'* or just *'finally'* to indicate to the reader that the listing is over. These temporal connectors have a cataphoric function in enumerating points. In this sense, Halliday and Hasan's (1976: 264) say: *'The sense of temporal succesivity in the enumeration of points in an argument is clearly shown by the strong tendency to anticipate a sequence of points by the use of the cataphoric conjunctive first, or related expressions [...].'* In other words, when enumerating arguments, the student should use temporal elements such as *'first'*, *'second'*, *'third'*, to show succession of arguments in composition.

In examples (09) and (10), a different cohesive problem is raised. In these cases, we note a problem in paragraphs indications. In these essays, the students introduce the conclusions with additive devices instead of temporal ones. This is a conjunctive cohesion error in the sense that according to Halliday and Hasan (1976: 263), the temporal cohesion that is achieved in the culmination of the discussion is indicated by expressions such as *'finally'*, *'as a final point'*, *'in conclusion'*, etc.. To overcome this semantic problem, these additive connectors should be substituted by temporal ones. The introduction of the conclusion in the case (09) with *'finally'* or *'in conclusion'* and the replacement of *'besides'*, in the example (10) by *'to sum up'* the

semantic relationships between these paragraphs may be clearcut. In other terms, if the conclusion of these paragraphs are introduced by the temporal connectors that are mentioned above, the reader may understand easily that the student is going to close his/her essay.

1.2. Misuse of adversative connectors

The second category of misuse involves adversative connectors. Unlike additive errors, adversative ones result from the confusion between adversative connectors and additive, causal or temporal ones. Errors committed in this category are classified into three different subcategories: the use of an adversative connector instead of an additive one; the use of an adversative connector instead of a causal one and the use of an adversative connector instead of a temporal one. These errors are shown in table 3. Errors that are identified in each subcategory are illustrated and discussed in the following.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
1.2.1. The use of an adversative connector instead of an additive one	10	52.63%
1.2.2. The use of an adversative connector instead of a causal one	3	15.78%
1.2.3. The use of an adversative connector instead of a temporal one	6	31.57%
Total	19	100%

Table 3: Confusion between adversative connectors and additive, causal or temporal ones.

This table shows the total errors identified within the category of misuse of adversative connectors. According to these results, the students confuse more between

adversative connectors and additive ones than between adversative connectors and other conjunctive relations. In other terms, according to the corpus of this study, students have made 10 errors in the first subcategory of adversative errors. This represents 52.63% of the total errors made within this category. In the second subcategory, the number of errors that are identified is 3 and 6 for the last one. They represent respectively 15.78% for the former and 31.57 % for the latter.

1.2.1. The use of an adversative connector instead of an additive one

Among examples involving the use of adversative connectors instead of additive ones, we have selected 3 cases to illustrate our point.

*11/ Countryside is small, and the conditions in it are bad. There is a lack of schools, water, gaz, clubs, stadium, hospitals, etc. People in the country side suffer from this situation. They use primitive means such as ox for cultivating the earth, dankies for bringing water and gaz. **On the other hand**, we find children who try to go far in order to have education despite of the like of means of transportation.*

*12/ Finally, I think that life in two places is comfort, we can live when we find our self in peace. There are calm and fresh air in the country side which give the choice to passe the holliday in it. **But**, the comfort life in the city permit to live an easy life.*

*13/ Life in city requires many conditions: a lot of money, rent and funds. So life is so demanding. The city is unhealthy. **In contrast**, the polluted air and areas that cause a lot of diseases.*

Unlike the first subcategory of the misuse of additive connectors, this one focuses on the conjunctive cohesion errors deriving from the use of an adversative connector instead of an additive one (see the subtitle 1.1.1). As it is shown in table 3,

students have more difficulties in this subcategory of adversative errors than the two remaining ones. The analyzed corpus reveals that students have made ten errors in this subcategory.

In the examples that illustrate the misuse of adversative connectors, the students have not taken into account the text type they are writing in. The argument is first supported by adducing one reason or another. When students support further the first argument, we expect them to use a connector indicating emphasis of the first argument. They, instead, use adversative connectors. Apart from not responding to the reader's expectations, we can account for the misuse of connectors by seeming not to be aware that there are two techniques for comparing and contrasting, the block-by-block technique and the item-by-item technique. So, the adversative connectors misused in examples (11), (12) and (13) might have been the point if the students provide a counterargument for life in the city, by balancing the positive points of living in the countryside against the drawbacks of life in the city.

The confusion between adversative connectors and additive ones gives raise to 'opacification' of meaning. For instance, in example (11), the student uses an adversative device, '*on the other hand*', in order to contrast the last sentence of the paragraph and the previous sentences. However, semantically speaking, this sentence has an additive meaning with the previous ones in the sense that the student speaks about the hard life in the countryside in all the sentences of this paragraph. Thus, this adversative connector should be substituted by an additive one, in order to clarify the additive relationship between the last sentence and its preceding ones. The same cohesive problem arises in examples (12) and (13). In example (12), for instance, the last sentence adds meaning to the previous ones instead of contrasting them. In this case, a careful reader understands that the student fails to communicate the message adequately

in the sense that s/he uses an adversative connector, 'but', to compare between advantages in living in both the city and the village. The semantic relationship of these sentences is that the student speaks about comfort in living in both the city and the village. Therefore, if it is necessary to use a connector to clarify this semantic relationship it would be an additive one such as 'similarly' to link the last sentence and the rest of the conclusion. It is an appropriate additive device because there is a comparative relationship between these adjacent sentences. This idea is argued in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work. According to them, when there is a comparison between what is being said and what has gone before, additive devices such as 'similarly', 'likewise', 'in the same way' should be used. As they say

Under the heading additive we may include a related pattern, that of semantic similarity, in which the source of cohesion is the comparison of what is being said with what has gone before. Forms such as similarly, likewise, in the same way, are used [...] to assert that a point is being reinforced or a new one added to the same effect; the relevance of the presupposing sentence is its similarity of import to the presupposed one.

(Halliday and Hasan, 1976 : 247).

1.2.2. The use of an adversative connector instead of a causal one

Apart from the confusion between the adversative and additive connectors, there are also cases where students confuse between adversative and causal ones. The example below is an illustration of this case of cohesive error.

*14/ We witness climate in city is more related to pollution because of the growth of means of transportation, industry and advanced machinery. **Though**, it causes the rise of CO2 and more consummation of our oxygen.*

According to the results of the present study, only three errors are identified within this subcategory. Unlike the previous subcategory of adversative errors, in this

one the confusion is between adversative and causal connectors. Example (14) illustrates clearly this confusion. In the first sentence, the student speaks about pollution and its causes in the city, whereas in the second one, s/he speaks about the consequences of this pollution. Therefore, these adjacent sentences should be linked by a causal connector and not by an adversative one. The substitution of the adversative connector, 'though', by the causal one, such as 'therefore' may solve the cohesive problem that results from the confusion that is mentioned above in the sense that this connector indicates to the reader that the second sentence is the result of the first one.

1.2.3. The use of an adversative connector instead of a temporal one

The examples below illustrate the case of conjunctive cohesion errors in which students tend to confuse between adversative connectors and temporal ones.

*15/ However, life in the city is different from that of the village. Firstly, the city is larger than the village because the city contains a number of villages, while the village is part of the city. Secondly, the city is less cleaner than the village because in the town there are more productions that include industry and manufacturing and which leads to the air pollution. Thirdly, the city provides all the necessary needs such as transportation and amusements means; Whereas, the village is poor from these living conditions. **But**, the city is full of noises because of the sounds that are produced from machines, means of transportations (buses, cars, airplanes...etc), whereas, the village is calm.*

*16/ Nowadays, people are different and this difference is seen in their choices. Among them, there are those who prefer to live in the village and who prefer to live in a city. **But**, what is the difference between life in the village and life in the city?*

Firstly, life in a village is quiet and calm, whereas, life in a city is more noisy. However, life in a village is healthy with breathing fresh air, in contrast, the life in the city is more polluted and unhealthy because of the manufacturing. Thirdly, the life in the village gives the people less depenses, whereas in the city people have more depenses.

This last subcategory of adversative errors represents 31.57% of the total errors of this subcategory. Semantically speaking, these two different types of relations have nothing in common. While adversative devices express a semantic relation based on 'contrary to expectation' (Halliday and Hasan, 1976: 250), temporal ones express a succession of events in time or of items (Ibid.p.239). Therefore, the use of adversative connectors instead of temporal ones creates problems of understanding of the semantic relationship between adjacent sentences or paragraphs.

If we look at example (15), we can note that it is a paragraph which comes after a paragraph dealing with life in the countryside. This is signaled by the use of the conjunction 'however' at the beginning of the example (15). The latter, through the thesis statement announces that it will deal with the differences between city and countryside life. The first signpost word is 'firstly', so we expect that the student will proceed with listing differences one by one before coming to the last item which is noise. However, instead of using a listing conjunctive like 'finally', the student employs the linking word 'but' which expresses contrast without due regard to meaning relation between the previous sentences and the concluding sentence. The use of an adversative connector, 'but', in this example to link the last sentence and the previous ones is an inappropriate one. This inappropriateness makes it difficult to the reader to establish the semantic link between these sentences. As it is suggested above that the last sentence should be introduced with a temporal connector, 'finally', in order to make it clear to the

reader that it is the last difference between life in the city and in the village that the student is going to list.

The same cohesive error has been raised in example (16). In this one, the student develops this paragraph by listing the differences between life in the city and life in the countryside. The enumeration of these differences starts with the use of temporal connector, '*firstly*'. This presupposes that the student will use a temporal connector, '*secondly*', when adding the second difference between life in the village and life in the city. But, the student, in this example, uses the connector '*however*' mechanically without paying attention to the semantic relations within this paragraph. Thus, the cohesive error occurs between these two adjacent sentences. To avoid this error and to make the semantic relationship between these adjacent sentences clear, a temporal connector, '*secondly*', need to be used to replace the adversative connector, '*however*'.

1.3. Misuse of temporal connectors

In addition to case of confusing additive, adversative for other connectors, we have the cases of the misuse of temporal connectors. The errors that are identified within this minor type of misuse of connectors are classified into three different subcategories: the use of a temporal connector instead of an additive one; the use of a temporal connector instead of an adversative one; the use of a temporal connector instead of a causal one. In the next table, the number and the percentage of these errors are shown. The exemplification and the discussion of these errors are provided just after this table.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
1.3.1. The use of a temporal connector instead of an additive one	8	34.78%
1.3.2. The use of a temporal connector instead of an adversative one	11	47.82%
1.3.3. The use of a temporal connector instead of a causal one	4	17.39%
Total	23	100%

Table 4: Confusion between temporal connectors and additive, adversative or causal ones

Table 5 shows the number of conjunctive cohesion errors and their percentage representation within the category of temporal errors. As we can see, students confuse more between temporal and adversative connectors than between temporal and additive or causal ones. The number of errors identified within the second subcategory is 11 which represents respectively 47.82% of the total errors identified within this category. The first subcategory comes at the second place with 8 errors which represents 34.78%. The subcategory in which students have less problems is the last one. That is, students confuse less between temporal connectors and causal ones than between temporal and adversative or additive ones.

1.3.1. The use of a temporal connector instead of an additive one

The misuse of a temporal for an additive connector is one of the most important errors we have detected in our analysis of errors related to the use of temporal connectors. This case is illustrated by examples (17), (18) and (19).

17/ *In the world there are two different ways of life; life in city or town, in the other hand, life in villages. There is a category of people who like to live in city or town. Another category prefer live in village. **Then** each one is motivated by the characteristics of the village or city.*

18/ *Unlike the village in which there is a lack of means of transportation, man in the city does not suffer from isolation. **Then**, in free time, man in the city can go to shopping, restaurant or cinema, whereas in the village man promenade either in forest or in mountain.*

19/ *Similar to village, city's inhabitants have water, houses, and they take their education from schools. Both of them are belonged to the same government. The inhabitants of cities and villages have similar rights and duties.*

*However, life in city is different from life in village. Villages are silent, and have clean air, whereas cities are noisy and dirty. **Next**, life in village is lacked the means of technology, **But** in city, the means of education and modern technology are available.*

In this first subcategory of temporal errors, the focus is on the use of temporal connectors instead of additive ones. This misuse of temporal connectors creates cohesive problems which may affect the meaning of the text. In example (17), for instance, the student speaks about the choice of people about the place where they want to live. The last sentence of the paragraph has an explanatory relationship to the sentences that precedes it. Therefore, it needs to be connected by an additive connector which expresses explanation. That is, if this sentence is linked with a connector '*in other words*' the semantic relationship between the last sentence and its preceding ones will be explicit. In addition, in example (18), the student contrasts between life in the

village and the one in the city. In the second sentence, the student adds another characteristic in which life in the village is different from the one in the city. Hence, the second sentence requires to be linked with an additive device such as 'also', 'besides', instead of a temporal one. Moreover, as it is shown in example (19), the confusion is clear between temporal and additive connectors. The student in the second paragraph speaks about the differences between the city and the village. In this paragraph, the student uses item-by-item technique of contrast. In other terms, in each sentence, the student contrasts between life in the village and in the city. In the second sentence of the second paragraph, s/he contrasts between quietness and cleanness in both places. In the third sentence, s/he contrasts between the availability of technological means in both the city and the village. Therefore, these sentences need to be related with an additive connector instead of a temporal one in the sense that they have an additive meaning since the student adds another point that shows the difference between these two different places.

1.3.2. The use of a temporal connector instead of an adversative one

In this second subcategory, temporal connectors are used to express adversative relations. The following examples provide clarifications.

20/ Both life in a city and in a village as it differs each other, they also share characteristics. Similarly, City and Village ensure human's life. Indeed, both City and Village possess an available conditions of life to the inhabitants (water, electricity and gas).

Firstly, unlike the life in a village which is calm, City is full of noise. In fact, in City, because of air pollution, many diseases are marked.

21/ *To live in city is similar to live in village because the city and village are places where human being can live. Both in city and in village people can work.*

Finally, the village has a fresh air, a beautiful nature and a pure oxigin, but The city is the place of industrial zone which caused The pollution of air and place consequently there's spread of illness.

22/ *Life in city and life in the countryside are different in many aspects and similar in many others. Like life in city, life in the countryside is very different and people have to work hard in order to survive or to achieve their aim for a better life. People in cities suffer from many diseases which result from pollution. Similarly in countryside, peoples' lives and healths are in danger due to the lack of sanitation institutions.*

First, as far as differences are concerned, cities have large buildings and factories, whereas in villages have small houses and there are no factories. Villages are quiet, whereas cities are noisy.

23/ *Life in the village is completely quite and comfortable. After, in the city, life is noisy and uncomfortable*

Unlike the third subcategory of the adversative errors, in this one, the confusion is between temporal connectors and adversative ones (see 1.2.3). What has to be observed is that most of the errors in the use of connectors, in the examples above, occur at the inter-paragraph level. It is the relationship of meaning between paragraphs that is not grasped by the students. For instance, in example (20), the use of a temporal connector, *'firstly'*, to link the second paragraph to the first one is a conjunctive cohesion error in the sense that in this paragraph there is no chronological order and no succession of events. In fact, the semantic relationship between these adjacent

paragraphs requires an adversative connector, such as *'however'*, *'on the other hand'* and so on. This is motivated by the fact that in the first paragraph, the student speaks about similarities between life in the village and the one in the city, whereas in the second one s/he speaks about the differences between them.

In example (21), the same problem occurs. The student has finished dealing with the similarities between city and country life, but instead of moving to a transition where s/he will announce to the reader that s/he speaks about the differences between these two areas s/he takes the differences for a conclusion. At this point, it is essay formation by comparison and contrast that the student does not master. The student is not aware that before synthesizing, the similarities and differences in a concluding paragraph, s/he has first to make known the differences in a separate paragraph linked up with the adversative connector such as *'however'*. The same cohesive error is identified in the example (22). These errors pose problems of coherence with reference to the use of comparison (additive) and contrast (adversative) connectors.

Unlike previous conjunctive cohesion errors in which students have misused temporal connectors at the inter-paragraph level, the example (23) presents a cohesive error within the paragraph level. In this case, the student uses a temporal connector, *'after'*, to link between these adjacent sentences even though there is no temporal relationship between them. Semantically speaking, these two sentences have an adversative relationship in the sense that the first sentence deals with characteristics of life in village, whereas the second one deals with characteristics of life in the city. Hence, these sentences require to be linked with an adversative connector, like *'but'* in order to clarify their adversative relationship.

1.3.3. The use of a temporal connector instead of a causal one

The confusion between temporal connectors and causal ones also pose problems since four errors are identified within this subcategory. This confusion is clearly illustrated in example (24) below.

24/ On the other hand, the village and city differ from each other in many aspects. Unlike the fresh air of the village, in the city people suffer from the polluted air which is polluted by the smoke of factories. People of next e in the village work in agriculture, whereas in the city they work in factories and other places like schools and hospitals. In contrast to the village where most of the inhabitants are illiterate, people in the city are educated. Next, the rate of education in the city is higher than the one in the village.

This last subcategory of misuse of temporal connectors deals with conjunctive cohesion errors deriving from the confusion between temporal and causal connectors. The use of connector 'next', in example (24), to link the last sentence and the penultimate one is inefficient in the sense that there is no temporal relationship between these adjacent sentences. In this case, the semantic relationship involves the last sentence to be introduced by a causal connector such as 'so'. This is motivated by the fact that the last sentence is a logical result of the penultimate one. That is, if the inhabitants of the village are illiterate and the ones of the city are literate, the number of the educated people will be without doubt higher in the city.

The problem of the misuse of the causal connectors, in this case, can be traced to the fact that the student is not paying attention to the cause-effect relation peculiar to the expository writing. Expository writing demands either deductive or inductive thought. In deductive patterning, we give the general or topic idea and substantiate with example, whereas in the inductive one we generally give illustration items before

drawing a conclusion that stands for a topic sentence. Being aware about the function of causal connectors and about these ways of developing and expository writing, students may avoid this kind of errors.

1.4. Misuse of causal connectors:

In this category, the focus is on another type of conjunctive cohesion errors: the use of causal connectors instead of other types of conjunctive cohesion relations. In this case, three subcategories of cohesive errors are identified: the use of a causal connector instead of an additive one; the use of a causal connector instead of an adversative one; the use of a causal connector instead of a temporal one. These errors are summarized in the following table.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
1.4.1. The use of a causal connector instead of an additive one	4	28.57%
1.4.2. The use of a causal connector instead of an adversative one	7	50%
1.4.3. The use of a causal connector instead of a temporal one	3	21.42%
Total	14	100%

Table 5: Confusion between causal connectors and additive, adversative or temporal ones.

According to the results that are shown in this table, students have made 14 errors within the category of causal errors. The subcategory in which students have made many conjunctive cohesion errors is the second one: the use of a causal connector instead of an adversative one. In this subcategory, students have made 7 errors which

represent 50% of the total of errors made in this category. But, in the first subcategory, we have identified 4 errors and 3 ones in the third one. They represent respectively 28.57% for the former and 21.42% for the latter.

1.4.1. The use of a causal connector instead of an additive one

The first case of misuse of causal connectors in our list is the one where a causal connector is used instead of an additive one, as it is shown in the following example.

25/ On the other hand, unlike the country, in the city the air is polluted by the fumer of the industry and by the different factories. In a village, people live in isolating so their cultural background is limited, but people in city live in contact with the external world. They are aware about the different cultures, customs and news. So, in village people suffere from the lack of public buildings like hospitals, factories and school, whereas in the city everything is available. They don't need to move outside to buy their needs.

Unlike the second subcategory of misuse of additive connectors, in this one the confusion arises in the use of a causal connector instead of an additive one (see the subtitle 1.1.2). Semantically speaking, the former and the latter have different types of semantic relations. While the causal connectors relate two sentences that have a cause-effect relationship (see the subtitle 1.1.2), additive ones relate sentences that have additive relations (see the subtitle 1.1.1). If the student confuses between these cohesive relations, this will create a cohesive problem. For instance, in example (25), the student misuses a causal connector for an additive one. In other terms, the use of a causal connector, 'so', to relate the fourth sentence to its previous ones is erroneous in the sense that this sentence has an additive relationship to them and not a causal one. A

careful reader understands that this paragraph deals with contrast between life in the city and life in the village. The correction of this conjunctive cohesion error demands the use of an additive connector, like 'also' or 'in addition'. In this way, the reader can understand easily that in the fourth sentence, the student adds another point in which life in the city and the one in the village are different.

As a whole, the student's paragraph is very confusing. Its awkwardness is most probably due to the fact that the student himself/ herself is also confused. Logically the paragraph exposes facts and evidence to convince the reader that the air in the city, unlike that of the countryside is polluted. Once this opinion is supported by an example or illustration, the reader expects the student to give another illustration to strengthen further the different argument announced in the topic sentence. We know well that for the purpose of emphasizing a point we need an additive conjunction like 'furthermore', 'moreover', 'in addition' instead of the result conjunction as it is the case in this example.

1.4.2. The use of a causal connector instead of an adversative one

Causal connectors are also mistaken for adversative ones. Examples (26), (27) and (28) are supported to illustrate this confusion. It occurs both at the sentence and paragraph levels.

26/ Those who are in favour city life claimed that city life is easier than village life. This partly owing to social factors which are so available such as education and transportation and partly owing to social factors such as security, organization. As a result, those who are in favour of village life advanced a set of arguments in which they are explaining their tendency. They started with the atmosphere in villages which according to them is more clean and calm than this of cities.

27/ *To start with, the life in the city, people find respiratory problems because of the polluted air. In addition, the city is restless; it is crowded by people, and noisy by the traffic jam. **Therefore**, the city has many amenities and advantages which facilitates life.*

28/ *City and village are similar. Both town and village are places in which people find their suitable conditions for living. Like the city, the village contains public places like schools, clinics and each of them has its specific landscape.*

***So**, the village and city are different. The number of people who live in city are more than those who live in the village. The sort of activities that people practice in the village are different from the activities that they practice in the city. In city people generally work in commerce and industry, whereas in the village people practice small activities like farming, and agriculture.*

In this second subcategory of misuse of causal connectors, the confusion is between adversative connectors and causal ones. That is, instead of using adversative connectors, the students have used causal ones. The examples (26), (27) and (28) show that students are not aware of the text type that they are required to write. To write an essay by comparison and contrast, logically the predominant type of connectors required by this genre of text can be, '*in the same way*', '*likewise*', '*similarly*' for comparison and '*by contrast*', '*however*', '*yet*', '*but*', '*on the other hand*', for contrast and so on. By confusing between causal and adversative relationships, students seem not to have taken into account the formal schemata corresponding to the writing production required. The examples denote that students are just putting one sentence after another as if they are in the pre-writing phase of the task. Instead of proceeding to

the correction of the drafts, they have just jotted in connectors for decorative purposes without caring for their real function.

The second remark to be made in relation with the comparison and contrast technique that they are required to use is that student make errors both at the inter-sentential and inter-paragraph levels. Students just compare and contrast in a random way without being conscious that there are two ways of comparison, the block technique and the item-by-item technique. This ignorance of these two ways of comparing has significantly affected the use of connectors and the semantic relationship either at the paragraph or at the inter-paragraph levels. In examples (26) and (27), for instance, the confusion between causal and adversative types of conjunctive relations creates cohesive problems at the paragraph level. In example (27), the student speaks about disadvantages of living in the city, in the two first sentences, and about the advantages in living in this latter, in the last sentence. Thus, in order to show the contrast in meaning between this sentence and its preceding ones, the last sentence should be introduced by an adversative connector such as *'but'*. Similarly, in example (26), the student speaks about both supporters of life in both the city and the village. This implies that their claims should be separated by an adversative connector in order to show their contrastive views about life in these two different living areas. But, the fact that the student has separated these views by a causal device instead of an adversative one makes this semantic relationship difficult to the reader to understand it. To overcome this cohesive problem, an adversative connector, *'in contrast'*, need to be used instead of the causal one, *'as a result'*, that has been used by the student.

In example (28), another cohesive problem arises. Unlike the previous ones, in this example, the contrast is between two adjacent paragraphs. In other words, the student uses a causal connector, *'so'*, instead of an adversative one to link between two

paragraphs that are opposite in meaning. In the first paragraph, the student speaks about similarities between life in the village and the one in the city, whereas in the second one s/he speaks about the differences between the former and the latter. Therefore, this paragraph should be introduced by an adversative connector to clarify this contrastive relationship between them. In this case, the reader can shift easily from the first paragraph to the second one without being lost.

1.4.3. The use of a causal connector instead of a temporal one

This third subcategory of causal errors deals with the confusion between causal connectors and temporal ones. Example (29) provides the best illustration for this case.

*29/ Some people claim that the life in the village is better than that of the city for several reasons. Firstly, the countryside is quieter than the city. Secondly, the landscapes and the environment are more beautiful and cleaner in the countryside than in the city that is just an amount of large buildings. **Therefore**, in the village the people are friendly and live as one family, whereas in city people are living alone.*

In this last subcategory of causal errors, another cohesive problem is raised. That is, the confusion is not between causal and additive or adversative connectors, but it is between causal and temporal ones. The use of the former instead of the latter to link sentences that have temporal relations, this may create cohesive problems. The illustration of this kind of cohesive error is to be found in example (29). That is, the student, in this example, lists the reasons that make life in the village better than that of the city. Thus, these different reasons need to be linked with temporal connectors, as it is the case for the first two reasons that are mentioned in this example. They are connected with temporal devices, *'firstly'* and *'secondly'*. But, the fact that the student

uses a causal connector, *therefore*, instead of a temporal one to link the last sentence to the sentences preceding it, the semantic relationship between them is ambiguous.

In this example, we note that the student do not pay attention to text type announced by his/her topic sentence. Indeed, the thesis statement announces clearly that the paragraph is developed according to the listing technique like *‘firstly’*, *‘secondly’*, *‘in the first place’*, *‘to begin with’*, and so on. The order to be observed is *‘serial’* instead of that, the student has just jotted in the causal connector *‘therefore’*. So, the use of a temporal connector such as *‘finally’* instead of *‘therefore’* seems to be more appropriate in the sense that it introduces a last difference between the life in the village and the one in the city. In addition, instead of *‘serial orders’*, the student can observe the order of importance, so instead of using *‘firstly’* or *‘secondly’* s/he could have started with the most important and ended with the least important reason in the list of reason adduced to support the idea claimed in the topic sentence.

2. Superfluous use of connectors

The superfluous use of connectors is another category of cohesive errors. Unlike the previous categories of conjunctive cohesion errors, this one deals with the use of conjunctive connectors when they are not required. The errors that are identified within this category are classified into two subcategories. The first one consists of the use of an additive connector when it is not required. The second one deals with the use of adversative connector when it is not required. The next table shows the results of these errors. In this category, they are illustrated and discussed.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
2.1. The use of an additive connector when it is not required	5	38.46%
2.2. The use of an adversative connector when it is not required	8	61.53%
Total	13	100%

Table 6: The use of an additive or an adversative connector when they are not required

As we can observe in table 6 that students have more difficulties in the use of adversative connectors than in the use of additive ones. This is shown clearly in the number of conjunctive cohesion errors identified within each subcategory. That is to say, in the first one 5 errors are identified, whereas in the second one 8 errors are detected. According to these numbers of errors, the latter represents 61.53% and the former 38.46% of the total errors made within this category.

2.1. The use of an additive connector when it is not require

The first case of superfluous use of conjunctions involves additive connectors. Examples (30) and (31) below are cases in point.

*30/ The villages in our days are not too much different from cities. **In addition**, we can find in both of them schools, religious buildings like mosques and the living conditions are mainly the same.*

*31/ Living in a city and living in a village is different. **And**, in our essay, we compare and contrast between the two situations.*

This subcategory of conjunctive cohesion errors deals mainly with the use of additive connectors when they are not required. Examples above show that the use of these connectors is not necessary. They are inefficient in the sense that the reader can understand the semantic relationship between these sentences without their presence. In this sense, Halliday and Hasan (1976) argue

[...] we are often prepared to recognize the presence of a relation of this kind [conjunctive] even when it is not expressed overtly at all. We are prepared to supply it for ourselves, and thus assume that there is cohesion even though it has not been explicitly demonstrated.

(1976: 229).

To put it another way, the reader can understand the semantic relationship between adjacent sentences without the presence of any connector. In this case, cohesion can be achieved only by this semantic relation among sentences.

In example (30), the presence of the additive connector, *'in addition'*, does not add meaning to the semantic relationship of these adjacent sentences. In other words, the reader can understand that the second sentence adds new information about the similarities between the village and the city without the presence of any additive connector. The same thing is true with the example (31). In this example, the use of additive connector, *'and'*, is irrelevant in the sense that it does not assume its conjunctive function. Thus, these additive connectors should be omitted.

2.2. The use of an adversative connector when it is not required

Another case of unnecessary use involves adversative connectors. This case is illustrated by examples (32), (33) and (34) below. They show really that this use of adversative connectors is irrelevant.

32/ *People living in the city see that life is more easy and we can find everything you want; all technological and cultural aspects are there. **Whereas**, they believed that jobs are more available in large cities.*

33/ *People as human being live together in a community in areas like the country and the city. **Despite this**, these two places are characterised by similar and different features.*

34/ *On the one hand, the life in the city, people find respiratory problems because of the polluted air. The city is restless; it is crowded by people, and noisy by the traffic jam.*

*On the other hand, life in the village is not difficult. The village's air is pure, fresh and healthy. **However**, it is known for its calm, peaceful life, and beautiful landscape.*

Unlike the previous subcategory of conjunctive cohesion errors, this one deals with the use of an adversative connector when it is not necessary. This kind of error may create cohesive problems in the sense that meaning expressed by an adversative device does not correspond to the one expressed by adjacent sentences or paragraphs. For instance, the use of an adversative connector '*whereas*', in example (32), makes the semantic link of these adjacent sentences unclear. It is not clear because these sentences do not express any contrastive relationship. Therefore, it is erroneous to link these sentences with an adversative device in the sense that in both sentences the student speaks about advantages in living in the city. This meaning may be understood without any conjunctive device.

The same cohesive problem is identified in example (33). In this example, the student uses an adversative connector even though there is no contrast between the first

and the second sentence of this introduction. This connector is not used to assume its contrastive function as it is explained in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion. According to these linguists, contrastive connectors should be used in order to clarify the contrastive relationship that exists between sentences or paragraphs (1976:250). The solution to this conjunctive error is to reformulate these sentences without using any connector. In this way, the semantic relationship of these sentences can be understood clearly.

In example (34), the student contrasts between life in the city and the one in the village. The use of an adversative connector, '*on the other hand*', to separate the first and the second paragraphs is enough to understand the contrastive relationship of these paragraphs. That is, the use of '*however*' in the second paragraph to link the second and the third sentences of the same paragraph makes the semantic relationship of these adjacent sentences unclear. It makes the last sentence as an irrelevant one in the sense that it is introduced with an adversative connector, whereas it has an additive relation with the two preceding sentences. The contrast, in this example, is between the first and the second paragraphs in the sense that the student speaks about the disadvantages in living in the city in the first one and about the advantages in living in the village in the second one. The omission of this adversative connector, '*however*', and the reformulation of this example makes the semantic integration of the second paragraph easy for the reader.

3. Omission of connectors

While the previous category of errors deals with the use of conjunctive connectors when they are not required, this one deals with the absence of these signposts when they are required. The next table shows the four different subcategories

to which the identified errors of this category are classified. It denotes the number of occurrence of these errors in each subcategory and the percentage representation for each one in the whole number of their occurrences. Like previous categories of errors, the sample of these errors and their discussion are provided.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
3.1. Absence of an additive connector when one is required	5	22.72%
3.2. Absence of an adversative connector when one is required	7	31.81%
3.3. Absence of a causal connector when one is required	6	27.27%
3.4. Absence of a temporal connector when one is required	4	18.18%
Total	22	100%

Table 7: Absence of additive, adversative, causal or temporal connectors when one is required.

As it can be noticed from the above table, the number of errors that are identified in these subcategories is relatively the same. This number ranges from 4 to 7 errors. This means that according to this result, students have almost the same problems in omitting the connectors of four categories of conjunctive cohesion when they are required.

3.1. Absence of an additive connector when one is required

Examples (35) and (36) below provide an illustration to this case of omitting additive conjunctives when they are necessary. The selection of these two examples is not at random in the sense that the first case illustrates the absence of a connector at the inter-paragraph level, whereas the second one exemplifies this case at the paragraph level.

35/ Life in the village has both advantages and disadvantages. Village is characterized by quietness and peace. People in village help each other in any work and they can live with the agriculture with the good land. But living in village has disadvantages. Like failed of means of communication, transport, and less of hospitals.

[...]Life in city has advantages and disadvantages. City contains different means of communication, transport and hospitals. But in the city, we find pollution and bad living condition like less of peace and quietness.

36/ Despite the similarities they have in common, life in a village differs from that of a city.

On the one hand, life in a village is harmonious, calm and peaceful, whereas, life in a city is noisy. [...] Life in a village is still encouraged by a beautiful nature and fields that surround their houses, whereas, in city there is a lack of green spaces.

Unlike the first subcategory of conjunctive cohesion errors that deals with the use of additive connectors when they are not required, in this one the focus is on the absence of these connectors when they are required. This absence makes the additive link between sentences and/or paragraphs difficult for the reader to understand their semantic relationships. To put it in another way, without the presence of additive elements, in

some cases, an unskilled reader may have difficulties in making this semantic link. For instance, in example (35), the additive relationship of these paragraphs is not explicitly expressed in the sense that there is no conjunctive connector that signals their relationship. In fact, the student speaks about both advantages and disadvantages of living in village, in the first paragraph, as he does the same thing for living in the city, in the second paragraph. If the student has introduced the second paragraph with an additive connector that expresses similarity, like '*similarly*', the reader can understand easily their semantic relationships.

In example (36), the focus is on another type of conjunctive cohesion error. Unlike example (35), this one shows the effect of the absence of an additive connector when it is required at the paragraph level. In this example, the student contrasts between life in the city and the one in the village. This contrast is shown in each sentence. That is, in each sentence, the student contrasts one aspect of life in the city and the one in the village. Therefore, in order to clarify the additive link of these adjacent sentences this involves the use of an overt additive connector. For instance, if the student has used the connector '*in addition*', '*also*' and so on in the initial position of the last sentence of this paragraph, this will make it clear that the student is going to add another aspect that makes life in the village different from the one in the city.

In addition, in these examples the function of missing additives is of comparing and strengthening or reinforcing ideas. In these cases, they are necessary for signaling a reinforcement of an idea in example (36), and in making a smooth transition in paragraphing in example (35). The last remark to be more in connection with the omission of these connectors is that students do not attend to the reader's need for an easy read. In compliance with the students' culture, the readers are expected to supply the connectors themselves.

3.2. Absence of an adversative connector when one is required

Our corpus also presents case wherein adversative connectors are missing. We have selected two examples to illustrate this point.

37/ The life in the city is more easier than the life in the village, because the city has many means which facilitate the life of people like means of transportation, entertainment. In addition, the people who live in the city has more opportunity to work in the offices than the people who live in villages. [...] The life in the city has some negatives aspects. For instance, in the city there are much noises, the environment is polluted by the gazes of the cars.

38/ City and village are two places where people live. In spite of their differences they share some similarities.

Both of them are places where people live and find their stability. The two places share many things like; schools, shops, mosque and others. In these places we find people act according to their traditions. [...] The city is larger than the village. City is a polluted place than village.

Unlike the subcategory of conjunctive cohesion errors that deals with the use of an adversative connector when one is not required (see 2.2), this one is related to the absence of an adversative connector when one is required. In this case, the semantic relationship between the sentences is left implicit where it must be explicit. This absence of adversative connectors breaks the flow of the prose and makes it difficult to the reader to understand the embedding of the sentences. We would argue that students need to learn when and when not these connectors are necessary, especially when they are involved in writing. They should be aware, for instance, about the effect of the

absence of adversative connectors on the writing quality, as it is illustrated by examples (37) and (38) above.

In the case of example (37), the absence of an explicit adversative connector makes the semantic link between sentences difficult. The student speaks about the advantages of living in city, in the first two sentences, and about the disadvantages in living in this latter, in the two last ones. But, this contrast is not mentioned with an explicit adversative connector. Hence, it may be difficult to the reader to understand that the two last sentences of this paragraph contrast in meaning with their previous ones. To avoid this cohesive problem, an adversative connector such as '*nonetheless*' need to be used to link these last sentences to the rest of the paragraph.

In example (38), the student compares and contrasts between life in the city and the one in the countryside. In the first sentences, the student speaks about similarities between the former and the latter, whereas in the last ones s/he contrasts the two. In order to clarify the contrastive relationship of these sentences, the last ones of this paragraph should be introduced with an adversative connector such as '*nevertheless*'. The use of this adversative connector helps the reader to shift from the first sentences to the last ones without any difficulty. However, the fact that the student does not use any adversative device to show this contrast this makes it difficult to the reader to understand this contrastive relationship of these sentences.

3.3. Absence of a causal connector when one is required

The absence of causal connectors when they are required for explicitly semantic relations for readers is the third subcategory of these kinds of errors. Indeed, native writers of the language, as many researchers have demonstrated, tend to use connectors less often than non-native speakers. But, there are cases where semantic

relationships have to be explicated even among native speakers. Leaving them implicit can lead to misunderstandings. Two examples of unacceptable implicitness in causal relations are provided below.

39/ Even though life in the city and life in the countryside share many aspects in common, they are also different in other aspects. Firstly, life in countryside is healthier than the one in city. Secondly, in countryside we can find pure and fresh air, whereas city is full of the smoke of cars. Thirdly, living in countryside is pleasant to eyes, where we can find beautiful green space, where one can find also calm and peace rather than living in a city, where there are only buildings and pollution. Fourthly, the sense of solidarity we find it only in a countryside, where everyone cares about the others. In contrast, people in a city look only for their own interests. [...] People prefer to live in the countryside rather than in the city.

40/ Concerning disadvantages, in city there are many factories and cars which cause the pollution of the air.[...] Many diseases are appeared such as asthma.

The focus in this subcategory is on the absence of a causal connector when one is required. As it is said by Halliday and Hasan (1976: 258) that this type of semantic relationship is dominated by reason-result. Therefore, if this semantic relationship is not explicitly expressed, in some case, this may be difficult for the reader to make the link between reason and result or vice-versa. Overt causal connectors need to be inserted particularly in paragraphs composed with an inductive process. We note that the student in the example (39) is not decided whether to develop the idea of preference for living in the countryside by following the idea of deductive or inductive reasoning. S/he starts by speaking about the differences between country and city life, the reader is left unprepared to the checklist of differences in favor of the former. The

checklist is generally compatible with the deductive reasoning. It is only at the end that the reader realizes that what the student has about to do is to argue in favour of country life by drawing the conclusion necessitating a connector such as *'for all these reasons'*. The importance of this connector is to signal that the process of reasoning is over and that the student is on the point of taking a position in favour of life in the country. According to the meaning of this paragraph, it is clear that people prefer to live in the countryside rather than in the city in the sense that the student has spoken about the advantages of living in the village and the disadvantages of living in the city.

The similar cohesive problem has been found in example (40) in the fact that the causal relationship of these adjacent sentences is not explicitly expressed. That is, without any causal connector between these adjacent sentences such as *'consequently'*, or *'as a result'*, it is not easy to understand that the second sentence is the result of the first one. The correction of this error requires the reformulation of these sentences and the use of an adversative connector as it is shown in the following: *As far as disadvantages are concerned, in the city the smoke from factories and cars pollutes the atmosphere. **Consequently**, many people suffer from diseases, such as asthma.*

3.4. Absence of a temporal connector when one is required

It is not only the comparison and the contrast technique development that demands the overt use of connectors when inductive reasoning is followed. As the example below shows, there are also cases where chronological order has to be made explicit by the insertion of a connector.

41/ Nowadays, people prefer to live in village rather than in city. What are the reasons of this?

Firstly, the life in the village is better because in village all people necessities come from nature, whereas in a city all things is related to industry. Secondly, most of people are healthy in a village because we find the most important element in people's life which is CO2. While in a city, people breathe polluted air. [...] People in village are very polite, they respect each other and each one help the other, but in the city there is no familiarity.

In this last subcategory of the omission of connectors, another cohesive problem is identified. It consists of the absence of a temporal connector when one is required, as it is illustrated in example (41). In fact, in expository writing, explicitness is mostly needed in paragraphs developed on the basis of deduction. The rhetorical question that comes at the beginning of the paragraph with reference to the reasons that make the student prefer one way of life over another makes the reader expect a listing of those reasons. It is what the student does by using the connectors *'firstly'*, *'secondly'*, but then the reader expects the student to go on with the listing until the end. By leaving the listing implicit, the reader is misled to think that there are only two reasons for the preference of country life over city life. The process of deductive reasoning is cut short by not making it explicit that the last and third reason for this preference. In other words, the fact that the last sentence is not connected with a temporal device such as *'thirdly'* or *'finally'*, it is difficult to the reader to understand that the last sentence presents another reason of this choice. The correction of this error involves the use of one of the temporal connectors that are mentioned above.

4. The overuse of connectors

This last category of conjunctive cohesion errors deals with the errors deriving from the overuse of connectors. These errors are the result of the use of the connectors

more than what is required in order to achieve cohesion in students' essays. It comprises the overuse of additive, causal, adversative and temporal connectors.

It is one of the common places in linguistics that language use is primarily determined by the principle of economy. The analysis of the sample of papers in our corpus shows that students often overuse the conjunctions, where native speakers will use more economically. So, the overuse of conjunctions is considered as erroneous. We have classified the overuse of these conjunctions according to the previous categories.

Error type	Number of errors	Errors' percentage
4.1. The overuse of additive connectors.	7	41.17%
4.2. The overuse of causal connectors.	5	29.41%
4.3. The overuse of adversative connectors.	3	17.64%
4.4. The overuse of temporal connectors.	2	11.76%
Total	17	100%

Table 8: The overuse of connectors

The above table shows that the students overuse more the additive connectors than other ones. In other words, the frequency of additive errors takes the first position with 7 errors which represents 41.17% of the total occurrence of the overuse of connectors. Causal errors take the second position with 5 errors which represent 29.41%. The adversative errors take the penultimate position with 3 errors which

represent 17.64%. The last subcategory is the temporal one with only 2 errors which represents 11.76%.

4.1. The overuse of additive connectors

As it is shown in table 8, the most overused connectors are the additive ones. This overuse of additive connectors is shown by the examples (42), (43) and (44) below.

42/ *In contrast to life in countryside, life in city is a stressful one; it is not easy to get a rest after a hard work. **In addition**, you can never find peace of mind because of heavy traffic and noise. **Also**, pollution is a big problem especially to old and young people. **Moreover**, the inhabitants of city live in insecurity.*

43/ *Those supporting of the idea of living in countryside stressed on the quietness, safety and the simple means of life. **Furthermore**, the countryside is well known by its healthy and fresh air. **In addition**, we can consider it the place of the spiritual life: emotion, imagination and inspiration. **Moreover**, it is a good place with a beautiful landscape.*

44/ *Countryside is a beautiful place. **In addition**, it is a peaceful place. **Moreover**, its inhabitants help each other in their daily lives. **Besides**, they are very kind and sociable.*

This first subcategory of the overuse of connectors contains the errors that are due to the overuse of additive connectors. This overuse creates problems of cohesion in students' compositions. What is problematic in the use of the additives, in the above examples, is that one additive comes after another without separation. We note the students' paragraphs do not develop or elaborate the thesis idea. For them, one sentence

is just enough to develop the thought without thinking about fully fleshing it out. They do not provide further information and signal the development of other ideas. For instance, in example (42), the use of three additive connectors, *'in addition'*, *'also'*, and *'moreover'*, successively gives the impression that the student uses these connectors not on the purpose of facilitating the semantic integration of these sentences, but only for decoration (Raimes, 1979 cited in Zamel, 1984: 117). This idea is supported by Rutherford (1987) in saying that the exaggerated use of the cohesive devices is simply ornamental rather than functional; it leads to artificiality and inappropriateness of usage, (Rutherford, 1987:51-52, cited in Farghal, 1992: 46). In other words, if the student exaggerates in the use of conjunctive cohesion devices, his/her essay will lack cohesion.

The same can be said about examples (43) and (44). For instance, in example (44), the student uses three additive connectors to link between four sentences of this paragraph. That is, each sentence, except the first one, is introduced by an additive connector. This is an exaggerated use of these connectors. The solution that we can propose in order to avoid this overuse is the reformulation of these paragraphs by using as less as possible additive connectors or with no connector at all. In this way, the reader may feel that these paragraphs are fluent in comparison to their original forms. For instance, the example (44) can be reformulated as follows: *the countryside is a beautiful and a peaceful place. Its inhabitants are very kind and sociable; they help each other in their daily lives.*

4.2. The overuse of causal connectors

The overuse of connectors is also observed in the case of causal ones, the following examples illustrate our point.

45. *City is a modern place where people can live. They think that it offers all the means that human beings need in order to live a better life. These can be means of transportation, communication, etc...**Therefore**; people prefer to live in city rather than in countryside. **So**, the inhabitants of city feel at ease.*

46. *Countryside is a place where people can live in peace, they can breathe a fresh air. In village, people live in safety. **So**, they think that it's a suitable place for people who like quietness. **Hence**, people dislike living in a city.*

In this subcategory, another cohesive problem arises. Unlike the previous subcategory, this one deals with the conjunctive cohesion errors that are due to the overuse of causal devices. As it is illustrated in examples (45) and (46) that students tend to overuse causal elements. This overuse creates problems of cohesion in the sense that instead of using these elements in order to help the reader to understand the semantic relationships between sentences, they are used to make this relationship more complex. For instance, in example (45), the student uses two causal connectors, 'therefore' and 'so' successively without clarifying the cause-effect relationships. That is, the use of the second causal connector, 'so', does not help the reader to understand the relationship of the last sentence and the previous ones, because the conclusion of this paragraph is already expressed by the connector, 'therefore'. To overcome this cohesive problem, it is better to reformulate this paragraph and to use only one causal connector which can clarify better the semantic relationship of the concluding sentence to its previous ones. This example can be read as follows: *The city is a modern place where people can live. They think that all means that facilitate their lives, such as means of transportation, and communication are available there. **Hence**, they feel at ease in the city and they prefer to live in it.* In this reformulation, the use of the causal

device, 'hence', clarifies that the last sentence is a result of what is already said in this paragraph.

The same cohesive problem is identified in example (46). The use of causal connectors 'so' and 'hence' successively create the same cohesive problem as example (45). This problem consists of the difficulty for the reader to integrate the meaning of the two last sentences in the sense that they are introduced by causal devices. Also, the last sentence is irrelevant, because the student uses this sentence as a result of something that is not mentioned before. Like the correction of the example (45), the cause-effect relationships may be clear by reformulating this example and by using only one causal connector.

4.3. The overuse of adversative connectors

As it is shown in the table 8 that we have identified 3 errors within this subcategory. We have selected one suitable example to illustrate this point, as it is shown in example (47).

*47. Life in village seems to be calm and secure. **But, on the contrary,** in the city, life is much harder; it is the center of many social problems such as robbery and criminality. In village there are no means of communication. **However, in contrast,** in the city there are many facilities of life like: internet and other mass media.*

Unlike the two previous subcategories, this one presents another case of the overuse of connectors. It consists of the overuse of adversative connectors, as it is illustrated in example (47). The student, in this example, exaggerates in the use of these connectors in the sense that s/he uses four adversative devices in this paragraph that contains only four sentences. The fact that s/he overuses these devices, this makes this

paragraph ‘unnatural’. This idea is expressed in Müller (2005:13) when he says: *‘It has been realized that there is a certain acceptable frequency and distribution of these items in each language. Any overuse [...] of these expressions renders the text unnatural or non-native like’*. The meaning expressed in this statement is that the overuse of conjunctive connectors makes the text artificial in the sense that it becomes heavy to the reader to read and to understand it.

To overcome the cohesive problem that is shown in the example (47), this overuse of adversative connectors should be avoided. The aim of doing this is to make the semantic relationships of these sentences explicit and to make this paragraph fluent as it is shown in the following: *While life in the village is calm and secure, life in the city is hard; it is the center of many social phenomena, such as robbery and criminality. However, unlike the village, in the city there are many means of communication like internet and other media which facilitate life there.* The use of only one adversative connector, ‘*however*’, as it is shown in the correction of this example, it is enough to express the differences that exist between life in city and life in the countryside.

4.4. The overuse of temporal connectors

The cohesive problem that is identified in this last subcategory of the overuse of connectors is that students tend to overuse temporal connectors. Example (48) provides a clear illustration.

48. *Finally, city is a better place for life thanks to all the means it offers to human beings. To sum up, people prefer to live in city rather than in village.*

In this example, the student uses two temporal connectors that express conclusiveness to link the two sentences of this conclusion. In fact, the use of the

temporal connector, *finally*, in the initial position of this paragraph is sufficient to the reader to understand that it is a conclusion of the essay. In other words, this concluding part does not require the use of two temporal connectors that express conclusiveness in order to show the end of the essay. This cohesive problem can be solved by the use of only one temporal connector and by the reformulation of this conclusion as it is shown in the the following correction: ***Finally***, *people prefer living in the city rather than in the village, because they can find all the means that facilitate their lives there.*

The overuse of the temporal connectors in this example also shows that students have not managed to go beyond grammar when they compose their essays. For them, every two sentences have to be connected just as in the exercises they are usually involved in grammar. Overusing the connectors is just one way of saying that they master the grammar. These cases of overuse demands that the grammar course needs to be oriented towards what is called grammar in context which pays more attention to the relationship of meaning within text.

5. The effect of conjunctive cohesion errors on coherence

Unlike other cohesive categories, conjunctive cohesion elements express cohesion differently. In other words, ellipsis, reference, substitution and lexical cohesion are achieved when an element in the text cannot be understood without reference to another one in the text, but conjunctives express cohesion indirectly. As Halliday and Hasan (1976) say

Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meanings; they are not primarily devices for reaching out into the preceding (or following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse.

(1976: 226).

They added in saying : *'With conjunction [...] we move into a different type of semantic relation, one which is no longer any kind of a search instruction, but a specification of the way of which what is to follow is systematically connected to what has gone before.'* (Ibid.p.227). According to this definition, conjunctives function as a semantic bridge between sentences and/ or paragraphs. In other words, they help the reader to understand the semantic link between them in the sense that they show the direction of meaning. Therefore, if conjunctive cohesion devices are not appropriately used, the cohesion between adjacent sentences and/or paragraphs cannot be achieved. For instance, in example (05) the student does not use an appropriate conjunctive device to link between the last sentence and the rest of the paragraph. In this case, the student confuses between an additive connector and an adversative one. Thus, conjunctive cohesion is not achieved.

In other conjunctive cohesion errors that are due to the confusion between different types of semantic relations, similar cohesive problems are found. The difference between them is only the type of confusion. In other words, it depends on which type of confusion students have made. In addition, the findings of the present study revealed that even the use of a conjunctive connector when it is not required or the absence of a conjunctive connector when one is required affect textual cohesion. For instance, in example (37), the adversative relationship between the two last sentences and what has gone before is not easy to be understood since it is not explicitly expressed. The absence of an adversative connector when it is required affects the comprehension of the semantic link of adjacent sentences and/ or paragraphs in the sense that the adversative relations are not really expected. In this sense, Jeanne Fahnestock (1983), argued that the adversative relations, or as she calls them discontinuatives, should be explicitly expressed. As she says

[...] The discontinuatives are less expected, often surprising, and therefore some-what less readily comprehended. Thus, these discontinuatives are usually signaled by an explicit transition word to help a reader across an unexpected synapse or turn in the meaning.
(Fahnestock, 1983: 406).

As far as coherence is concerned, the conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified within the corpus under study have an impact on the coherence of the whole essays in the sense that cohesion is the foundation of coherence within text. As Halliday and Hasan, (1989: 94) imply that cohesion is an essential feature of a text if it is judged to be coherent when they say: *'Cohesion is the foundation upon which the edifice of coherence is built'. If the foundation is not present the edifice cannot be built.'* (Cited in Parson, 1991: 415). According to Halliday and Hasan (1989), if cohesion is not achieved within text, coherence too. To put it another way, conjunctive cohesion errors have an impact on the achievement of coherence within text. This impact is due to the important contribution of conjunctive devices on discourse comprehension. According to William (1983), conjunctive devices or as he calls them 'discourse markers' are important in text in the sense that they help the reader to understand the different types of semantic relationships between sentences and /or paragraphs. They help the reader to understand the direction of meaning. That is, if there is an additive, adversative, causal or temporal relationship of sentences and/or paragraphs of the text. As he says

Discourse markers are very important in text, as they operate as a map reference: they tell the reader where he is going in relation to where he has just come from. Thus, they operate like signposts on a road, giving the reader advance notice of

- . going straight on (additive) e.g. furthermore*
- . changing direction (adversative) e.g. however*
- . the consequence of the part of the journey just completed (causal) e.g. hence*
- . the time sequence and ratio of part of the content of the text (temporal) e.g. in short .*

(William, 1983: 47).

Therefore, if these 'signposts' are not used appropriately, the reader may have difficulties in integrating different parts of the text into a coherent whole. For instance, in example (28), the contrast between the two adjacent paragraphs is not explicitly expressed in the sense that the student uses a causal connector instead of an adversative one to link these two paragraphs that are opposite in meaning. This conjunctive error may mislead the reader to understand the semantic relationship of these adjacent paragraphs. Thus, coherence is failed to be achieved, in this text. In this sense, Louise Phelps argues: *'Failures in coherence occur either because writers undercue-provide too few cues for readers to let them perceive the relationships between parts of a text-or because they miscue -give conflicting or misleading cues.'* (Cited in Bamberg, 1983: 420). That is, if a student, for instance, misuses any conjunctive element, this can mislead the reader to understand the relationship between different elements of the text.

Considering discourse continuity, conjunctive cohesion errors have an effect on it in the sense that cohesion contributes to the semantic continuity of the text and to its interpretation. As Halliday and Hasan (1976) say

[...] the cohesive relations themselves are relations in meaning, and the continuity which they bring about is a semantic continuity. This is what makes it possible for cohesive patterns to play the part they do in the processing of text by a listener or a reader, not merely signaling the presence and extent of text but actually enabling him to interpret it and determining how he does so.

(1976: 303).

The meaning expressed in this quotation is that the continuity that cohesive relations achieve is a continuity of meaning. In this way, they play an important role as far as text interpretation is concerned. This is made possible by the presence of cohesive relations within text that help the reader to understand the type of semantic relationship between different elements of the text. In fact, the continuity that is expressed by cohesive

relations is an essential element in the interpretation of text. That is, this continuity is not only an important aspect of text, but a necessary one. As Halliday and Hasan (1976: 300) added: *'The continuity is not merely an interesting feature that is associated with text; it is a necessary element in the interpretation of text'*. Therefore, if cohesion is not achieved, the reader may have difficulties in understanding the semantic continuity of the text and in integrating the different segments of it into a unified whole.

These coherence problems occur when larger segments of text are not integrated into a unified whole. Indeed, this integration can be achieved either at the paragraph level or at the level of text. According to (Bamberg, 1983), coherence can be achieved at the paragraph level when the reader can move from one sentence to another one without finding difficulty of understanding their semantic relationships. As she argues: *'[...] A paragraph is coherent when the reader can move easily from one sentence to the next and read the paragraph as an integrated whole, rather than a series of separate sentences.'* (Bamberg, 1983: 417). As far as coherence at the level of text is concerned, the meaning of sentences and paragraphs of the text should form a unified whole. That is, coherence is the effect of the successive integrations of adjacent sentences and paragraphs. In order to say that coherence is achieved at the level of text, this integration of meaning into a unified whole should be perceived by the reader. In this sense, Fahnestock (1983) says

At higher levels of understanding, involving longer segments of discourse, a sense of coherence is the result of successive integrations of successively larger groups of sentences of the reader's seeing relationships not only between contiguous sentences but also between groups of sentences and even paragraphs.

(1983: 401).

However, if there are conjunctive cohesion errors within text, this integration cannot be possible in the sense that the successive integration of sentences and/ or

paragraphs is interrupted. Consequently, conjunctive cohesion errors affect the achievement of coherence at both paragraph and text levels.

Conclusion

This last chapter highlights the results of this study and their discussions. As it is shown in this chapter, the different conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified in students' compositions are classified into different categories and sub categories. They are exemplified and discussed. These procedures are followed in each category of errors. These findings allow us to draw the conclusion that students of the Department of English at the University of Tizi-Ouzou need to be helped on the appropriate use of conjunctive elements. This is motivated by different types of conjunctive cohesion errors that they have made in their compositions and by their effects on their essays' coherence. Therefore, the pedagogical implications of these findings seem inevitable.

References

- Bamberg, B. 'What Makes a Text Coherent?' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, 1983, pp. 417-429.
- Fahnestock, J. 'Semantic and Lexical Coherence' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, December 1983, pp. 400-416.
- Farghal, M. 'Naturalness and the Notion of Cohesion in ESL Writing Classes', in *IRAL*, Vol. xxx, 1992, pp.45-50.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
-(1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Müller, S. *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.

Parson, G. 'Cohesion Coherence: Scientific texts' in *Functional Linguistics: Approaches and uses*. Germany: Houton De Gruyter, 1991, pp. 414-429.

Williams, R. 'Teaching the Recognition of Cohesive Ties in Reading a Foreign Language' in *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Vol.1 No.1, March 1983, pp 35-52.

Zamel, V. 'Teaching those Missing Links' in S Mackay (ed.), *Composition in Second Language*. Rowley: Newbury House, 1984, pp. 110-122.

General conclusion

This part summarizes the results of the present study and highlights the conclusions that one can draw from them. Another main concern of this part is the pedagogical implications of the findings and the suggestion of directions for further research works. This study of cohesion errors in a sample of students' compositions leads us to some provisional conclusions. We say provisional because the work is a case study and so the results cannot be generalized neither to all Algerian students of English nor to EFL students as a whole.

The findings reveal that third year students of the Department of English at the University of Tizi-Ouzou make many conjunctive cohesion errors in their compositions. The total conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified within the corpus under study is 135 errors. They are classified into four main categories. The first main category deals with the misuse of conjunctives: the conjunctive cohesion errors that are identified within this category are derived from the confusion between the different conjunctive relations. This type of errors is considered as the most serious one in the sense that four minor categories and twelve sub-categories are identified and classified within this category. The second category contains the superfluous or the unnecessary use of connectors in cases where they are not needed. The third type comprises errors resulting from the omission of connectors when they are required. The last one deals with the overuse of conjunctive connectors.

The results also demonstrate that conjunctive cohesion errors made by these students in their compositions have an impact on the coherence of their essays. This impact is due to the relationship between cohesion and coherence. In other words, textual coherence depends on the cohesive relationships between different sentences and paragraphs that constitute a text. Hence, the identified errors interrupt the flow of ideas

and hinder the semantic integration in the students' essays. Therefore, they affect the coherence of the students' essays.

We also observe that the students of the Department of English at the University of Tizi-Ouzou have problems in using appropriately conjunctive cohesion elements. They often confuse and are confused when they use them. Sometimes, they use them when they are not necessary as they do not utilize them when they are required. This allows us to draw the conclusion that these students do not know either the significance of these elements or their correct use. In addition, these findings imply that explicit teaching of the appropriate use of conjunctive cohesion elements at composition level is required. This teaching is motivated by the importance of these elements in the discourse and by the possible negative effect that these errors may have on the coherence of the whole text. This importance lies also in the fact that these items create cohesion within the text that help the reader to understand the semantic relationships between the sentences and the paragraphs of the text that they are going to read. In other words, if these items are not correctly used, they may affect directly the coherence of the whole text. So, some pedagogical solutions should be suggested in order to avoid these errors.

Pedagogical implications

The findings of the present study imply that particular consideration should be given to the teaching of conjunctives to EFL students, in the sense that they confuse in the use of conjunctive elements; they use them when they are not required and vice versa, as they do not use them appropriately. The teaching of conjunctives may help them to understand the types of semantic relations they signal. That is, students need to be made aware of the semantic signalization of conjunctives that can create successful

semantic relations in terms of temporal, causal, additive and adversative. This importance of teaching conjunctives is supported by Roen (1984) in saying

Teachers of writing need to devote small periods of class time to the use of cohesive conjunctions [...] students need to participate in discussions in which they argue that one particular conjunction is the best one in a particular context. They need to understand why and how individual conjunctions work.

(1984: 36).

The meaning expressed in this quotation is that particular consideration needs to be given to the teaching of conjunctives to students. The importance of this teaching is to help them use conjunctives appropriately. According to him, students do not only need to understand the semantic signalization of conjunctives, but also to learn how to use them carefully (Ibid.p.36).

Presently, conjunctions are taught at the level of the grammar modules for two years. This means that students meet conjunctions as structural items to be used in linking clauses. The link-type exercises seem not to have a deep impact as students do not pay attention to meaning. We believe that the use of conjunctions is a matter of cognition and so need to be taught at the level of the reading and writing modules, first in the form of recognition of their functions in authentic texts and then in their use in composition.

To help students to identify and to use conjunctives appropriately, this involves the use of practical exercises. These exercises should not be used only to help students to identify the role of conjunctives as lexical terms in semantic relational realizations, but they should also be set to help them to use conjunctives appropriately. As far as the recognition of the semantic realization signaled by conjunctives is concerned, students need to be provided with exercises that enhance the identification of the role of conjunctives in discourse. According to William (1983), to help students recognizing

the role of different connectors within discourse, the system of symbols need to be used. The importance of using this system is to give graphic reality to the abstract concepts expressed by different conjunctive relations. As he says

It follows that in teaching the foreign learner of English to recognize and interpret discourse markers, we should aim to draw as near as possible to the efficient reader's subskills. A major problem is that a discourse marker represents an abstract concept, so that it is difficult for the learner to form a mental image of the underlying proposition being expressed. One way of overcoming that problem is the use of a system of symbols (and abbreviations) to give graphic reality to the abstract concepts being expressed.

(William, 1983: 47).

For instance, the additive conjunction 'moreover' can be represented with a symbol (+) which signals that there is an additive meaning (ibid, 47). Moreover, Ray William (1983) suggests some practical exercises in order to teach the recognition of conjunctive cohesion relation in discourse. According to him, at the first stage, students are provided with texts that contain discourse markers. They need to be accompanied with their appropriate symbols. In the second stage, as students assimilate the function of discourse markers, those symbols can be dropped from commonly-occurring items, such as 'however', 'moreover' and 'therefore'. But, their use would be maintained for: rarer items (e.g. 'despite this' and 'on account of this') for discourse markers which also have an alternative, non-conjunctive function. (e.g. 'yet', 'rather', 'then', 'at the same time'); and for discourse markers inconspicuously cited (e.g. in the middle of a sentence and/or not signaled by punctuation (Ibid.pp.48-49)). In the third stage, students are provided with texts in which discourse markers are marked with a dot. For instance, *he fought bravely in the battle. •Thus, he was regarded as a hero.* Working in small groups, students discuss the function of these discourse markers in relation to other ones they are familiar with and mark the text with appropriate symbols. According to Ray William (1983: 49), the purpose of this task is to accelerate the foreign reader's

recognition of discourse markers and the understanding of their functions and their family relationships. In the fourth stage, students work on texts that are not marked at all. Their task is to find instances of discourse markers, decide their function, and indicate that function with an appropriate symbol (William; 1983:49). In the fifth and the last stage, students should be provided with texts containing different discourse markers. These texts should be cut up into sentences. These sentences ought to be desequenced. Working in pairs, students should reorder the sentences into their original sequence and mark appropriate discourse markers where necessary (Ibid.p.49). The importance of this task is to strengthen students' understanding of the influence of discourse markers on the text structure (ibid.p.49).

Having finished the stage of recognizing the functions of conjunctives within discourse, students should pass to another stage which is more complex than the first one. In this stage, they should be asked to use conjunctives appropriately in producing paragraphs and/or essays. These kinds of tasks are useful to EFL students in the sense that the present study revealed that most of the conjunctive cohesion errors are due to the confusion in the use of the conjunctive connectors. This suggests that instruction should put some emphasis on how and why the inappropriate use of conjunctives can affect the semantic relationships of sentences and /or paragraphs. In this way, students will understand the effect of this inappropriateness of the use of conjunctives on discourse coherence. For instance, they will understand what happens when '*however*' is used in the place of '*in addition*'.

The appropriate use of conjunctives becomes part of a growing concern for both researchers and classroom instructors, with broad aspects of how people learn a language and how they master the rules of communication in that language. The goal in

both cases is to provide students with the possibility for effective and successful performance whenever they must communicate in English.

To avoid the conjunctive errors, students need be provided with exercises that improve their appropriate use of conjunctives. This involves explicit explanation of the function of the various types of conjunctive relations, namely additive, adversative, causal and temporal relations. Such knowledge is needed for avoiding confusion and coherence breaks in their writing. Moreover, the teaching of conjunctives does not need to focus only on the grammatical function of connectives, because this is not enough in itself. According to Holloway (1981: 215 cited in Zamel, 1984: 113), this grammatical emphasis has '*narrowed unduly our conception of conjunctive devices*'. In other terms, if the teaching of conjunctives focuses mainly on their grammatical function; disregarding their semantic one, the conception of conjunctives will be limited.

Unlike the previous conjunctive errors that are due to the inappropriate use of conjunctives, the findings reveal that students have made other types of conjunctive errors. They consist mainly of the use of conjunctives when they are not required and their absence when they are required: 13 errors are found in the former category of conjunctive errors and 22 in the latter. This implies that exercises need to be assigned to help learners to use the connectors when they are necessary, and to avoid using them when they are not necessary. In fact, the use of conjunctives when they are not required can result in an artificial and mechanical piece of prose, and despite the importance of such transition markers teachers should draw the attention of their students that learning when not to use them is important as learning when to do so. In this sense, Raimes (1979, cited in Zamel, 1984: 117) emphasizes this idea, in claiming that when overt markers are overused at the expense of communication, the writer is

simply using cohesive ties for decoration and not for meaning. Furthermore, it is important to help students to be aware that the semantic relationship between adjacent sentences can be understood without the presence of any explicit conjunctive connector. This semantic relationship is explained in Halliday and Hasan's (1976) work on cohesion. As they say

[...] We are often prepared to recognize the presence of a relation of this kind even when it is not expressed overtly at all. We are prepared to supply it for our selves, and thus to assume that there is cohesion even though it has not been explicitly demonstrated.

(1976: 229).

For instance, *He is thirsty. He drinks the bottle of water quickly.* In this example, one can understand that the second sentence expresses a result of the first one even though there is no overt conjunctive element.

Suggestions for further research

The present work is limited to the study of conjunctive cohesion errors in Algerian students' compositions. That is, other cohesive errors namely reference, ellipsis, substitution and lexical errors are beyond the scope of the present study. Hence, further research is needed to see whether students make the previously mentioned cohesive errors in their compositions or not. This exploration can be directed at a different level of study, at different text types or both. For instance, the study of lexical cohesion errors at the middle school level or at the secondary one. In addition, different cohesive errors can be investigated with different text types, such as argumentative, narrative or descriptive texts to see whether learners have the same cohesive errors in different genres or no, especially at the university level.

Finally, further research can also be directed to the exploration of the origins of different cohesive errors, either in the EFL or in ESL environments. This aim is motivated by the limitation of the present study. In other words, this work is limited

only to the description of conjunctive cohesion errors in students' compositions, without including the explanation of these errors in terms of their origin. This research can be significant in the sense that it can reveal to what extent do mother tongue of the learner influences his/her acquisition of second language.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Corpus of 100 papers of the third year students of the Department of English at the University of Tizi-Ouzou during the academic year 2007/2008.

Secondary sources

1. Applied linguistic books

Allright, D. and Bailey, M. K. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Arthur, B. and Peter, G. *Beginning to write*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Arthur, B. *Writing for Study Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Carrell, P.L. et al. *Working with Text*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Charles, F. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Chomsky, N. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1965.

Connor, U. *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Cook, G. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Corder, S. P. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1981.

..... (1973). *Introducing Applied linguistics*. London: Penguin, 1993.

Crombie, W. *Process and relation in discourse and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.

- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
-*Second Langue Acquisition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Hall, D. W. *Culture and Context*. USA: Longman, 2004.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
-(1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- Hamdi, M. *Writing*. Algiers: ENAL, 1990.
- Harmer, J. *How to Teach English*. England: Longman, 1998.
- Harris, J. *Introducing Writing*. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Hedge, T. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hubbard, E.H. *Reference Cohesion, Conjunctive Cohesion and Relational Coherence in Student Academic Writing*. Doctorate thesis, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1989.
- Hyland, K. *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- John, M. S. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Johns, M. A. *Text, Role, and Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Kern, R. *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Kim, S. C. *Coherence, Continuity, and Cohesion*. Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995.
- Kreuzer, R. J. and Cogan L. *Studies in Prose Writing*. New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc, 1961.

- Kroll, B. *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Lado, R. *Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Lieber, P. E. *Cohesion in ESL Students' Expository Writing. A Descriptive Study*. Doctorate thesis. New York University. Ann Arbor. University Microfilms International, 1981.
- Müller, S. *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.
- Nunan, D. *Research Methods in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Nunan, D. *Introducing Discourse Analysis*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Richard, K. *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Richards, C. J. and Lockhart, C. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sperber, D. and Willson, D. *Relevance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Ur, P. *A Course in Language Teaching, Practice and Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Van Dijk, T.A. *Some Aspects of Text Grammars*. Mouton: The Hague, 1972.
- Van Dijk, T.A. *Text and Context*. Mouton: The Hague, 1977.
- Van Tonder, S.L. *Lexical Cohesion in Student Academic Writing*. Unpublished MA dissertation, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1999.
- Veit, R. and Gould, C. *Writing, Reading, and Research*. Wilmington: Longman, 2004.

Wallace, J. M. *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Widdowson, H. G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

William, G. and Robert B. K. *Theory and practice of Writing*. New York: Longman, 1996.

Withrow, J. *Effective Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

2. Dictionaries

Crystal, D. *Dictionary of language and languages*. London: Penguin books, 1994.

Richards, J. C, Richard, S. Kendrick, H and Kim, Y, (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, London: Longman, 2002.

3. Articles

Aleksender, S. 'Lexical Cohesion in Text analysis' in PSICL, Vol. II, 1980. pp. 95-100.

Bamberg, B. 'What Makes a Text Coherent?' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, 1983, pp. 417-429.

Bartholomae, D. 'The Study of Error' in *College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 31, No. 3, October 1980, pp. 253-269.

Bensemmane, F. 'Lexical Cohesion, Pragmatic Coherence and EFL Reader' in *Publication of the Moroccan Association of Teachers of English (MATE), Proceedings of the 13th (MATE) Annual Conference, March 29-April 2, 1993*, pp. 75-81

Blakemore, D. 'Are Apposition Markers Discourse Markers?' in *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 32, No. 2 September 1996, pp. 325-347.

Brostoff, A. 'Coherence: "Next to" is not "Connected to" ' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 32, 1981, pp. 278- 294.

Carrell, P.L. 'Cohesion is not Coherence' in *TESOL QUARTERLY*, Vol.16, No.4, 1982, pp. 479-488.

- Chomsky, N. 'Review of Skinner's Verbal Behavior Language', Vol. 35, No.1, 1959: 26-58.
- Cooper, A. 'Give- new: Enhancing Coherence through Cohesiveness' in *Written Communication*, Vol.5, No. 3, July 1988, pp. 352-367.
- Corder, S.P. 'The Significance of Learners' Errors' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*.Vol.04, November 1967, pp. 162-170.
- Duane, H. R. 'Coherence in Writing' in *The English Journal*, Vol. 73, No. 5, September 1984, pp. 35-36.
- Fahnestock, J. 'Semantic and Lexical Coherence' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, December 1983, pp. 400-416.
- Fang, X and JIANG, X. 'Error Analysis and the EFL Classroom Teaching' in *US-China Education Review*, Vol. 04, No. 09 Sep. 2007.
- Farghal, M. 'Naturalness and the Notion of Cohesion in ESL Writing Classes', in *IRAL*, Vol. xxx, 1992, pp.45-50.
- Freebody, O. and Anderson R.C. 'Effects of Vocabulary Difficulty, Text cohesion, and Schema Availability on Reading Comprehension'. *Technical Report, Center for the Study of Reading* No.225, 1981.
- Hasan, R. 'Cohesion and Cohesive Harmony' in *Understanding reading comprehension, International Reading Association*. 1984, pp. 181-219.
- Hubbard, E. 'Some Coherence Correlates in Expository writing' in *SA Journal of Linguistics*, Supplement No.15, 1993, pp. 55-74.
- Johns, A. M. 'Coherence and Academic Writing' in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 1986 pp. 247-265.
- Kallgren, G. 'Some Types of Textual Cohesion and their Effects on Texts' in N E Enkvist, and J Wiksell (eds), *Papers from the fifth Scandinavia Conference in Linguistics*. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press, 1979, pp.136-145.

- Kroll, B. and M. and Schafer, J. C. 'Error-Analysis and the Teaching of Composition' in *College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 29, No. 3, October, 1978, pp. 242-248
- Kutz , E. 'Between Students' Language and Academic Discourse: Interlanguage as Middle Ground' in *College English, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 48, No. 4, April 1986, pp. 385-396.
- Lautamatti, L. 'Coherence Spoken and written Discourse' in *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 5, 1982, pp.117-127.
- Marcus, S. 'Textual Cohesion and Textual Coherence' in *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, Vol.25, No. 2, 1980, pp.101-112.
- Nemser, W. 'Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, Vol. 9, 1971, pp.115-123.
- Parson, G. 'Cohesion Coherence: Scientific texts' in *Functional Linguistics: Approaches and uses*. Germany: Houton De Gruyter, 1991, pp. 414-429.
- Richards, J. C. 'A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis' in *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 1971.
- Robin, B. M. 'Cohesion Paradigms in Paragraphs' in *College English, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 45, No. 5, 1983, pp. 450-464.
- Roselind, W. ' Sources of Errors: An Interplay of Interlingual Influence and Intralingual Factors' in *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2009, pp. 349-359.
- Schachter, J. and Celce-Murcia, M. 'Some Reservations concerning Error Analysis in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 4, December, 1977, pp. 441-451.
- Selinker L. 'Interlanguage' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* Vol.10, 1972, pp. 209-231.
- Smith, R. N. and Frawley, W. J. '*Conjunctive cohesion in Four English Genre*' in *British Library*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1983, pp. 347-373.

Steffensen, M.S. 'Register, Cohesion, and Cross-Cultural Reading Comprehension' in *Technical report, Center for the Study of Reading*. University of Illinois, No. 220, 1981.

Stotsky, S. 'Types of Lexical Cohesion in Expository Writing: implications for developing the vocabulary of Academic Discourse' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, 1983, pp. 430-446.

Tierney, R. J. and Mosenthal, J.H. 'The Cohesion Concept's Relationship to the Coherence of Text' in *Technical report, Center for the Study of Reading*. University of Illinois, No. 221, 1981.

Trager, C. and Waddle, C. D. 'The Use of Contrastive Data in Foreign Language Course Development' in *Trends in Language Teaching*, 1966, pp. 27-56.

Wardhaugh, R. 'The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis' in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 2, June 1970, pp. 123-130.

Wikborg, E. 'Types of Coherence Breaks in Swedish Student Writing: Misleading Paragraph Division' in *Connor*, U. 1990, pp.133-149.

Williams, R. 'Teaching the Recognition of Cohesive Ties in Reading a Foreign Language' in *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Vol.1 No.1, March 1983, pp 35-52.

Witte, S.P. and Faigley, L. 'Coherence, Cohesion and Writing Quality' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol.32, No, 2, 1981, pp.189-204.

Wolfgang U. D. 'Cohesion in English by Michael A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan' in *Linguistic Society of America*, Vol. 54, No. 3, September 1978 pp. 676-678.

Zamel, V. 'Teaching those Missing Links' in S Mackay (ed.), *Composition in Second Language*. Rowley: Newbury House, 1984, pp. 110-122.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Corpus of 100 papers of the third year students of the English Department at Tizi-Ouzou University during the academic year 2007/2008.

Secondary sources

1. Applied linguistic books

Allright, D. and Bailey, M. K. *Focus on the Language Classroom*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Arthur, B. and Peter, G. *Beginning to write*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Arthur, B. *Writing for Study Purposes*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Brown, G. and Yule, G. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.

Carrell, P.L. et al. *Working with Text*. London: Routledge, 2001.

Charles, F. *Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945.

Chomsky, N. *Aspects of the theory of syntax*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1965.

Connor, U. *Contrastive Rhetoric: Cross cultural aspects of second language writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Cook, G. *Discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Corder, S. P. *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. Oxford : Oxford University Press, 1981.

- (1973). *Introducing Applied linguistics*. London: Penguin, 1993.
- Crombie, W. *Process and relation in discourse and language learning*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Ellis, R. (1985). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- (1994). *The Study of Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
-*Second Langue Acquisition*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997.
- Hall, D. W. *Culture and Context*. USA: Longman, 2004.
- Halliday, M.A.K and Hasan, R. *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman, 1976.
-(1985). *Language, Context, and Text: Aspects of Language in a Social-Semiotic Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Hamdi, M. *Writing*. Algiers: ENAL, 1990.
- Harmer, J. *How to Teach English*. England: Longman, 1998.
- Harris, J. *Introducing Writing*. London: Penguin Books, 1993.
- Hedge, T. *Teaching and Learning in the Language Classroom*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Hubbard, E.H. *Reference Cohesion, Conjunctive Cohesion and Relational Coherence in Student Academic Writing*. Doctorate thesis, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1989.
- Hyland, K. *Second Language Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- John, M. S. *Genre Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.
- Johns, M. A. *Text, Role, and Context*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- Kern, R. *Literacy and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.

- Kim, S. C. *Coherence, Continuity, and Cohesion.*: Hillsdale: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1995.
- Kreuzer, R. J. and Cogan L. *Studies in Prose Writing.* New York: Rinehart and Winston, Inc, 1961.
- Kroll, B. *Exploring the Dynamics of Second Language Writing.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Lado, R. *Linguistics across Cultures: Applied Linguistics for Language Teachers.* Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Lieber, P. E. *Cohesion in ESL Students' Expository Writing. A Descriptive Study.* Doctorate thesis. New York University. Ann Arbor. University Microfilms International, 1981.
- Müller, S. *Discourse markers in native and non-native English discourse.* Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2005.
- Nunan, D. *Research Methods in Language Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1992.
- Nunan, D. *Introducing Discourse Analysis.* London: Penguin, 1993.
- Odlin, T, (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Richard, K. *Literacy and Language Teaching.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000.
- Richards, C. J. and Lockhart, C. *Reflective Teaching in Second Language Classrooms.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Sperber, D. and Willson, D. *Relevance.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986.
- Ur, P. *A Course in Language Teaching, Practice and Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Van Dijk, T.A. *Some Aspects of Text Grammars*. Mouton: The Hague, 1972.

Van Dijk, T.A. *Text and Context*. Mouton: The Hague, 1977.

Van Tonder, S.L. *Lexical Cohesion in Student Academic Writing*. Unpublished MA dissertation, Pretoria: University of South Africa, 1999.

Veit, R. and Gould, C. *Writing, Reading, and Research*. Wilmington: Longman, 2004.

Wallace, J. M. *Action Research for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1998.

Widdowson, H. G. *Teaching Language as Communication*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.

William, G. and Robert B. K. *Theory and practice of Writing*. New York: Longman, 1996.

Withrow, J. *Effective Writing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

2. Dictionaries

Crystal, D. *Dictionary of language and languages*. London: Penguin books, 1994.

Richards, J. C, Richard, S. Kendrick, H and Kim, Y, (1985). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching and Applied Linguistics*, London: Longman, 2002.

3. Articles

Aleksender, S. 'Lexical Cohesion in Text analysis' in *PSICL*, Vol. II, 1980. pp. 95-100.

Bamberg, B. 'What Makes a Text Coherent?' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, 1983, pp. 417-429.

Bartholomae, D. 'The Study of Error' in *College Composition and Communication*, *National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 31, No. 3, October 1980, pp. 253-269.

- Bensemmane, F. 'Lexical Cohesion, Pragmatic Coherence and EFL Reader' in *Publication of the Moroccan Association of Teachers of English (MATE), Proceedings of the 13th (MATE) Annual Conference*, March 29-April 2, 1993, pp. 75-81
- Blakemore, D. 'Are Apposition Markers Discourse Markers?' in *Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 32, No. 2 September 1996, pp. 325-347.
- Brostoff, A. 'Coherence: "Next to" is not "Connected to" ' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 32, 1981, pp. 278- 294.
- Carrell, P.L. 'Cohesion is not Coherence' in *TESOL QUARTERLY*, Vol.16, No.4, 1982, pp. 479-488.
- Chomsky, N. 'Review of Skinner's Verbal Behavior Language', Vol. 35, No.1, 1959: 26-58.
- Cooper, A. 'Give- new: Enhancing Coherence through Cohesiveness' in *Written Communication*, Vol.5, No. 3, July 1988, pp. 352-367.
- Corder, S.P. 'The Significance of Learners' Errors' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*.Vol.04, November 1967, pp. 162-170.
- Duane, H. R. 'Coherence in Writing' in *The English Journal*, Vol. 73, No. 5, September 1984, pp. 35-36.
- Fahnestock, J. 'Semantic and Lexical Coherence' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, No.4, December 1983, pp. 400-416.
- Fang, X and JIANG, X. 'Error Analysis and the EFL Classroom Teaching' in *US-China Education Review*, Vol. 04, No. 09 Sep. 2007.
- Farghal, M. 'Naturalness and the Notion of Cohesion in ESL Writing Classes', in *IRAL*, Vol. xxx, 1992, pp.45-50.

- Freebody, O. and Anderson R.C. 'Effects of Vocabulary Difficulty, Text cohesion, and Schema Availability on Reading Comprehension'. *Technical Report, Center for the Study of Reading* No.225, 1981.
- Hasan, R. 'Cohesion and Cohesive Harmony' in *Understanding reading comprehension, International Reading Association*. 1984, pp. 181-219.
- Hubbard, E. 'Some Coherence Correlates in Expository writing' in *SA Journal of Linguistics*, Supplement No.15, 1993, pp. 55-74.
- Johns, A. M. 'Coherence and Academic Writing' in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 20, No. 2, 1986 pp. 247-265.
- Kallgren, G. 'Some Types of Textual Cohesion and their Effects on Texts' in N E Enkvist, and J Wiksell (eds), *Papers from the fifth Scandinavia Conference in Linguistics*. Stockholm: Stockholm University Press, 1979, pp.136-145.
- Kroll, B. and M. and Schafer, J. C. 'Error-Analysis and the Teaching of Composition' in *College Composition and Communication, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 29, No. 3, October, 1978, pp. 242-248
- Kutz , E. 'Between Students' Language and Academic Discourse: Interlanguage as Middle Ground' in *College English, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 48, No. 4, April 1986, pp. 385-396.
- Lautamatti, L. 'Coherence Spoken and written Discourse' in *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*, Vol. 5, 1982, pp.117-127.
- Marcus, S. 'Textual Cohesion and Textual Coherence' in *Revue Roumaine de Linguistique*, Vol.25, No. 2, 1980, pp.101-112.
- Nemser, W. 'Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching*, Vol. 9, 1971, pp.115-123.
- Parson, G. 'Cohesion Coherence: Scientific texts' in *Functional Linguistics: Approaches and uses*. Germany: Houton De Gruyter, 1991, pp. 414-429.

Richards, J. C. 'A Non-Contrastive Approach to Error Analysis' in *English Language Teaching*, Vol. 25, No. 3, 1971.

Robin, B. M. 'Cohesion Paradigms in Paragraphs' in *College English, National Council of Teachers of English*, Vol. 45, No. 5, 1983, pp. 450-464.

Roselind, W. 'Sources of Errors: An Interplay of Interlingual Influence and Intralingual Factors' in *European Journal of Social Sciences*, Vol. 11, No. 2, 2009, pp. 349-359.

Schachter, J. and Celce-Murcia, M. 'Some Reservations concerning Error Analysis in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 11, No. 4, December, 1977, pp. 441-451.

Selinker L. 'Interlanguage' in *International Review of Applied Linguistics in Language Teaching* Vol.10, 1972, pp. 209-231.

Smith, R. N. and Frawley, W. J. '*Conjunctive cohesion in Four English Genre*' in *British Library*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1983, pp. 347-373.

Steffensen, M.S. 'Register, Cohesion, and Cross-Cultural Reading Comprehension' in *Technical report, Center for the Study of Reading*. University of Illinois, No. 220, 1981.

Stotsky, S. 'Types of Lexical Cohesion in Expository Writing: implications for developing the vocabulary of Academic Discourse' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol. 34, 1983, pp. 430-446.

Tierney, R. J. and Mosenthal, J.H. 'The Cohesion Concept's Relationship to the Coherence of Text' in *Technical report, Center for the Study of Reading*. University of Illinois, No. 221, 1981.

Trager, C. and Waddle, C. D. 'The Use of Contrastive Data in Foreign Language Course Development' in *Trends in Language Teaching*, 1966, pp. 27-56.

Wardhaugh, R. 'The Contrastive Analysis Hypothesis' in *TESOL Quarterly*, Vol. 4, No. 2, June 1970, pp. 123-130.

Wikborg, E. 'Types of Coherence Breaks in Swedish Student Writing: Misleading Paragraph Division' in Connor, U. 1990, pp.133-149.

Williams, R. 'Teaching the Recognition of Cohesive Ties in Reading a Foreign Language' in *Reading in a Foreign Language*, Vol.1 No.1, March 1983, pp 35-52.

Witte, S.P. and Faigley, L. 'Coherence, Cohesion and Writing Quality' in *College Composition and Communication*, Vol.32, No, 2, 1981, pp.189-204.

Wolfgang U. D. 'Cohesion in English by Michael A. K. Halliday and Ruqaiya Hasan' in *Linguistic Society of America*, Vol. 54, No. 3, September 1978 pp. 676-678.

Zamel, V. 'Teaching those Missing Links' in S Mackay (ed.), *Composition in Second Language*. Rowley: Newbury House, 1984, pp. 110-122.

Résumé

La cohésion est largement explorée dans l'écrit par différents chercheurs. Toutefois, à ce jour, les erreurs de cohésion dans l'écrit, à notre connaissance, n'ont pas été étudiées d'une manière profonde. Ainsi, cette étude est une tentative d'analyser les erreurs de cohésion dans les essais des étudiants. Elle vise principalement à analyser cent essais relevant du texte expositif écrits par des étudiants de troisième année du Département d'Anglais de l'Université de Tizi-Ouzou durant l'année universitaire 2007/2008. En analysant ces essais, nous cherchons essentiellement à identifier les erreurs de cohésion que ces étudiants ont fait dans leurs écrits ainsi que l'impact de ces erreurs sur la cohérence de leurs essais. Pour atteindre ces objectifs, une référence particulière est faite pour la classification des connecteurs inter-phrastiques par Halliday et Hasan (1976), et aux procédures d'analyse d'erreur. Pour identifier ces erreurs, les essais des étudiants ont été segmentés en phrases. Ensuite, ils ont été analysés. Les résultats de la présente étude ont montrés que ces étudiants ont fait 135 erreurs de cohésion dans leurs écrits. Ces erreurs sont classées en quatre grandes catégories. La première catégorie inclue les erreurs provenant de l'utilisation abusive des connecteurs. Celle-ci est divisée en quatre catégories mineures et douze sous-catégories. Le second type comprend des erreurs résultant de l'utilisation superflue de connecteurs ; l'utilisation de connecteurs quand ils ne sont pas nécessaires. La troisième catégorie porte sur les erreurs de cohésion dérivant de l'omission de connecteurs quand ils sont indispensables. La dernière grande catégorie porte sur la surutilisation des connecteurs. Cette étude a aussi révélée que ces erreurs ont un impact sur la cohérence des textes analysés. Par conséquent, selon ces résultats, les étudiants du Département d'Anglais de l'Université de Tizi-Ouzou ont besoin d'un enseignement explicite et l'apprentissage de l'utilisation des connecteurs d'une manière appropriée.

ملخص

إن استكشاف التماسك على نطاق واسع من قبل الباحثين في كتابة مختلفة. ومع ذلك، حتى الآن، لم يتم دراسة أخطاء متماسكة، وفقا لمعلوماتنا، تحقيقا دقيقا. وبالتالي، فإن هذه الدراسة هو محاولة لتحليل الأخطاء التماسك المترابط في تركيبة الطلاب. وهي تسعى في المقام الأول إلى تحليل واحد المقالات التي كتبها تفسيري 100 طلاب السنة الثالثة من قسم اللغة الانجليزية في جامعة تيزي وزو خلال العام الدراسي 2008/2007. في تحليل هذه المقالات، ونحن نسعى لتحديد الأخطاء التماسك المترابط التي جعلت من هؤلاء الطلاب في مؤلفاتهم، وتأثير هذه الأخطاء على تماسك مقالاتهم. لتحقيق هذه الأهداف، تجدر الإشارة بوجه خاص إلى هاليداي وحسن في (1976) تصنيف التماسك المترابط، وإجراءات التحليل خطأ. لتحديد هذه الأخطاء، ومقالات الطلاب مقسمة إلى الأحكام الهجائي. ثم، تم تحليلها. وأظهرت نتائج الدراسة أن هؤلاء الطلاب جعلت أخطاء 135 التماسك المترابط في مؤلفاتهم. وتصنف هذه الأخطاء إلى أربع فئات رئيسية. النوع الأول يضم الأخطاء الناجمة عن إساءة استخدام الروابط المترابط. وتنقسم هذه واحدة إلى أربع فئات بسيطة واثنى عشر الفئات الفرعية. والنوع الثاني يشمل الرئيسية الأخطاء الناتجة عن استخدام زائدة من الروابط، واستخدام الوصلات عندما لا تكون هناك حاجة لها. الفئة الثالثة ويتناول الأخطاء الناجمة عن التماسك المترابط إغفال الروابط عندما تكون هناك حاجة إليها. آخر صفقات الفئة الرئيسية مع الاستخدام المفرط للموصلات. وبالإضافة إلى ذلك، كشفت هذه الدراسة أن هذه الأخطاء قد تؤثر على تماسك المقالات تحليلها. لذلك، وفقا لهذه النتائج، وطلاب قسم اللغة الانجليزية في جامعة تيزي وزو في حاجة الى تعليم والتعلم واضحة لاستخدام عناصر التماسك المترابط بشكل مناسب.