Error Analysis of CTs in Iraqi Undergraduate EFL`s Writing

Baqir Jasim Mohammed College of Arts

Nadia Hameed Hassun College of Arts

١. Introduction

The process of acquiring a new language or target language (henceforth TL) involves specific problems which differ immensely from the problems encountered in acquiring the native language (henceforth NL). The former include getting a good mastery of its sound system, morphology, syntax, and semantics. Yet the problems noticed in the performance of the learners` writing are to be investigated alone since writing is the "most difficult of the language abilities to acquire." (Corder, ١٩٧٤: ١٧٧) Moreover; errors in writing in TL show special features and therefore the remedial steps which might be suggested will be different. To restrict the scope of study, error analysis of CTs in Iraqi undergraduate EFL learners' writing is chosen since its level of difficulty varies between native speakers (henceforth NS) who think in the language used (in this case it will be English) and non-native speakers (henceforth NNS) who think in their own native language (in this case it will be Arabic). While writing, non-native speakers have, in general, to think about all those rules they need to apply, rules that native speakers are supposed to automatically acquire. Therefore, non-native speakers are more prone to making mistakes and/or committing errors. Moreover, the CTs have not been given suitable room or attention during the teaching/learning process since the grammar of sentence has been given priority over the grammar of discourse.

This paper will attempt to:

١. provide a theoretical background for: a) Error Analysis, b) Models for Error Analysis, and c) Sources of Errors;

٢. examine some very closely related terms such as interlingual errors, negative L١ transfer/interference, interlanguage, and intralingual errors;

٣. survey the concept of cohesion and its subcategories of grammatical and lexical CTs;

٤. identify, describe, categorize, and diagnose Iraqi speakers' errors in CTs in English writing in order to find out the sources of those errors and a way for

remediation;

٥. discuss the results obtained and propose recommendations and future researches.

٢. Theoretical Background

٢. ١. <u>Error Analysis</u>:

The concept of error analysis refers to a type of linguistic analysis that focuses on the errors learners usually make. It consists of a comparison between the errors made in the Target Language (TL) and that in NL itself. The purpose of error analysis studies has been stated by Corder (١٩٧٤: ١٩) , the founder of this discipline, as follows: Systematically analyzing errors made by language learners makes it possible to determine areas that need reinforcement in teaching.

Errors made by foreign learners have been considered "important in and of themselves." For learners themselves, errors are 'indispensable,' since the making of errors can be regarded as a device the learner uses in order to learn. In ١٩٩٤, Gass & Selinker defined errors as "red flags" that provide evidence of the learner's knowledge of the second language. Accordingly, errors contains valuable information on the strategies that people use to acquire a language. Moreover, according to Richards and Sampson (١٩٧٤: ١٢),

> "At the level of pragmatic classroom experience, error analysis will continue to provide one means by which the teacher assesses learning and teaching and determines priorities for future effort."

According to Corder (١٩٧٤: ١٢٣), error analysis has two objects: one theoretical and another applied. The theoretical object serves to "elucidate what and how a learner learns when he studies a second language." And the applied object serves to enable the learner "to learn more efficiently by exploiting our knowledge of his dialect for pedagogical purposes.The investigation of 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 (Corder, ١٩٦٧:٢١) at a given point during the learning process, and prognostic because it can tell course organizers to reorient language learning materials on the basis of the learners' current problems.

Before we proceed, it is essential here to define a few terms that we shall use in this paper:

a) **Interlingual/Transfer errors:** those attributed to the NL. There are interlingual errors when the learner's NL habits (patterns, systems or rules) interfere or prevent him/her, to some extent, from acquiring the patterns and rules of the second language (Corder, ١٩٧١: ٩).

b) **Interference (negative transfer)** is the negative influence of the mother language (NL) on the performance of the target language learner (TL) (Lado, ١٩٦٤). It includes 'those instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language' (Weinreich, ١٩٥٣, p.١). Error analysis emphasizes "the significance of errors in learners' **interlanguage** system" (Brown ١٩٩٤, p. ٢٠٤). The term *interlanguage*, introduced by Selinker (١٩٩٢), refers to the systematic knowledge of a TL which is independent of both the learner's NL and the TL. Nemser (١٩٧٤, p. ٥٥) has referred to it as the *Approximate System*, and Corder (١٩٦٧) as the *Idiosyncratic Dialect or Transitional Competence*.

c) **Intralingual/Developmental errors:** those errors which occur due to the language being learned TL, independent of NL. According to Richards (١٩٧٤: ١٧٥) they are "items produced by the learner which reflect not the structure of the mother tongue, but generalizations based on partial exposure to the target language." The learner, in this case, tries to "derive the rules behind the data to which he/she has been exposed, and may develop hypotheses that correspond neither to the mother tongue nor to the target language" (Richards, ١٩٧٤: ٦).

٢. ٢ Models for Error Analysis:

Corder (١٩٦٧ & ١٩٧٤) has identified a model for error analysis which includes three stages:

١. Data collection: Recognition of idiosyncrasy.
٢. Description: Accounting for idiosyncratic dialect.
٣. Explanation (the ultimate objective of error analysis).

Yet, Brown (١٩٩٤: ٢٠٧-٢١١) and Ellis (١٩٩٥: ٥١-٥٢; ١٩٩٧: ١٥-٢٠,) and Hubbard et al. (١٩٩٦: ١٣٥-١٤١) have suggested another model of how to identify and analyze learners' errors which includes:

١. The selection of a corpus of language.
٢. The identification of errors.
٣. The classification of errors.
٤. The explanation of different types of errors.

Moreover, Gass & Selinker (٢٠٠١: ٦٧) has identified ٦ steps followed in conducting an error analysis. They are:

١. Collecting data,
٢. Identifying errors,
٣. Classifying errors,
٤. Quantifying errors, Analyzing sources of errors,
٥. and Suggesting remedy for errors.

٢. ٣. ١ <u>Cohesion and CTs:</u>

٢. ٣. ١. The concept of Cohesion:

The need for the description of the stretches of linguistic material beyond the sentence level necessitates the introduction of new terminology which can cope with the relevant linguistic tasks. One of these terms is 'cohesion' which has often been used to refer to the resources available in the language for signaling various types of relations between sentences and larger stretches of texts. Historically speaking, Halliday and Hasan (١٩٧٦) have been the first to write a comprehensive study of cohesion. The concept of cohesion is embodied and represented by CTs (henceforth CTs). These have been classified into grammatical CTs, and lexical CTs. Grammatical CTs can be further classified into reference, substitution, and ellipsis (Halliday and Hasan ١٩٧٦: ٣١); whereas lexical CTs can be further classified into reiteration, which includes four subcategories: repetition, synonym, general word, superordinate , and collocation. (Halliday and Hasan ١٩٧٦: ٣٧) The CTs, being one of the characteristics of textuality, i.e. part of the text oriented grammar and not the sentence oriented one, have not been given enough focus

whether in NL or TL teaching programmes. As a result, they constitute the main source of errors in cohesion in speech and writing of both.

٢. ٣. ٢. Grammatical Cohesion:

Grammatical cohesion is a vital component in making written text more coherent for the reader . Without it , the reader may be left with an incoherent piece of non-sequential discourse to decipher.(Macedo, ٢٠٠١:١٠). Grammatical Cohesion includes : reference , substitution and ellipsis which have been traditional topics in theories of cohesion.

a) Reference

Reference refers to the items that refer to something else in the text for their interpretation. Cohesion lies in the continuity of reference, whereby the same thing enters into the discourse a second time. (Halliday and Hasan, ١٩٧٦:٣١). In written texts, reference indicates how the writer introduces participants and keeps track of them throughout the text.(Eggins, ١٩٩٤:٩٥).These signals can refer to the context of situation (exophorically) or entities mentioned within a text (endophorically) (ibid) .It is this endophoric reference which is the focus of cohesion theory . It can be divided into three areas : anaphoric , cataphoric and esophoric . Anaphoric reference is the most relevant as it" provides a link with a preceding portion of the text" (Halliday and Hasan , ١٩٧٦:٥١).

Reference can be subdivided into three groups: personal pronouns, demonstrative and comparative reference . The category of personal reference keeps track of function through the text using:

a. proper nouns: e.g., John , Mr. James , Tom , ….etc,

b. personal pronouns: I, me, you, we, us, he, him , him , she , her, they , them and it,

c. personal possessive determines : my, mine, your(s) , his, her(s) , their(s) and its, and

d. relative pronouns: who and which.

The category demonstrative reference keeps track of information through location using proximity references:

a. Determiners: the, this, these, that and those.

b. Demonstrative adverbs: here, there, and then.

The category of comparative reference keeps track of identity and similarity through indirect reference using:

a . Comparative adjectives: same ,identical , equal , other, different, more , better….etc.

b . Comparative adverbs: similarly , differently , more, less ….etc.

(Halliday and Hasan ,١٩٧٦: ٣٧-٣٩).

b) Ellipsis:

The term ellipsis refers to the absence of language elements (a word, phrase, or clause) that left unsaid or unwritten but are understood by the reader from the text. According to the syntactic category of the presupposed elements, there are three types of ellipsis. They are:

a. Nominal ellipsis: this type of ellipsis occurs when a noun or noun phrase is presupposed, .e.g.,

١. He liked the blue hat; I myself liked the white (null).

The noun (hat) in the first clause is omitted in the second sentence since it is understood by the virtue of cohesion.

b. Verbal ellipsis: occurs when a verb or verb phrase is presupposed, e.g.,

٢. Tom drew a small boat and April (null) a big boat.

The verb (drew) in the first clause is omitted in the second sentence since it is understood by the virtue of cohesion.

c. Clausal ellipsis occurs when both a noun or noun phrase and a verb, or at least part of a verb phrase is omitted. It is mostly seen in dialogue in Yes/No questions, as in:

٣. A: Will you go?

B: Yes.

The interrogative clause (Will you go?) in the first clause is omitted in the second sentence since it is understood.

c) Substitution:

Substitution is the replacement of a word or structure by a "dummy"

word. It is a relation of sense identity rather than a relation of reference identity. There are three types of substitution. They are:

a. Nominal substitution occurs where the presupposed element is a noun or a noun phrase, e.g,

٤. Tom drew a big boat and April a small one.

The lexical item (boat) in the first clause is replaced by the word (one) in the second clause.

b. Verbal substitution occurs when the presupposed element is a verb or a verb phrase. The presupposing element which denotes the substitution is usually the word ' do' and its various forms .e.g.,

٥. He wanted to draw pictures there, and they really did.

The verb (wanted) in the first clause is replaced by the auxiliary (did) in the second clause.

c. Clausal substitution occurs when the presupposed element is an entire clause (simple-sentence-like structure). The most frequent presupposing element of this kind of substitution is' So', as in:

٦. Latecomers will not be allowed in school after ٨:٠٠ a.m. The headmaster says so.

"So" in (٦) replaces the whole sentence that latecomers will not be allowed in school after ٨:٠٠ a.m.

٢. ٣. ٣. **Lexical Cohesion**:

Lexical Cohesion refers to the "cohesive effect achieved by the selection of vocabulary" (Halliday and Hasan.١٩٧٦:٢٧٤). It arises from the mere presence in the text of lexical items that" hang together "by virtue of their meaning and their vicinity (Kaufmann, ٢٠٠٠:٥١٢). Lexical cohesion differs from other CTs in a text as it is non- grammatical, i.e., it does not rely on structural clues; it can work over long distances, and its absence does not render the text unintelligible. The challenge they represent to the linguistic analyst lies in the difficulty of detecting and measuring the degree of semantic (relatedness) given to any two words (Crane, ?: ١٣٦).

The use of lexical CTs helps to keep the discussion to a particular semantic

domain (www.hp.ntnu.no) It is a necessary element of communicative competence, i.e. the ability to communicate successfully and appropriately.(Mato, ? : ١٠٨).

In response to Halliday and Hasan (١٩٧٦), other researchers have discussed lexical cohesion (Gutwinski ١٩٧٦, Carrell ١٩٨٤, Hoey ١٩٩١, Martin ١٩٩٢, Cook ١٩٩٤). However, cohesion can be concluded as" the means by which texts are linguistically connected " (Carter ١٩٩٨: ٨٠). It is significant to recognize that lexical cohesion cannot exist without sentences. That is, CTs should be discussed not only as the meaning relations which hold between items, but also as explicit expression of those meaning relations within a text. Ultimately, it is necessary to consider cohesion as " a set of discourse semantic systems" (Martin, ٢٠٠١:٣٧).

The two categories of lexical cohesion are reiteration and collocation. They are:

a) <u>Reiteration:</u>

Halliday and Hasan (١٩٧٦) classify reiteration into four types. They are:

i. repetition:

It is the repetition of the same lexical item, i.e. a word or a phrase (Halliday and Hasan, ١٩٧٦: ٢٧٩), e.g drew/draw/drawing, rain/raining/ rainy.

Ex.١.Helen apologized for not <u>attending</u> the meeting held last week because she was very busy. But she promised that she will <u>attend</u> the next one.

The relation between the repeated items "attending" and "attend" is an example of repetition of a lexical cohesive tie.

ii. synonym:

In its general sense, synonymy means the identity of meaning shared by two or more different forms in certain context(AL- Khalidi, ١٩٩٧:٣٤).

Ex.٢.The decision was <u>refused</u>, or more exactly, was <u>rejected</u>.

The lexical items "refused" and "rejected" are synonymous; therefore, they represent a lexical cohesive tie.

iii. general words:

It can be defined as a relationship between a noun denoting various noun classes which is more general in meaning, having an anaphoric reference, (Halliday and Hasan, ١٩٧٦: ٢٧٤,٢٧٥).

Ex.٣. I spent the last weekend in the countryside. The place was very interesting.

The lexical item (place) is a rather general word compared to the lexical item (countryside).

iv. superordinate (metonymy) part-whole: It refers to the use of expressions indicating a part-whole relation.

Examples of this type are:

Ex.٤. John looked sadly at his crossbow.

The lock nut had been removed, so it was no longer fit for action.

This example illustrates the effect of lexical cohesion of the 'part-whole' type: even a reader who has never before heard of a lock nut will conclude that it must be a part of a crossbow.

b) Collocation:

Collocation pertains to lexical items that are likely to be found together within the same text. Collocation occurs when a pair of words is not necessarily dependent upon the same semantic relationship but rather tend to occur within the same lexical environment (ibid: ٢٨٦). The closer lexical items are to each other between sentences the stronger cohesive effect is (Crane,?: ١٣٦). Collocation refers to the semantic and structural relation among words, which native speakers can use subconsciously for comprehension or production of a text; e.g., go home, have fun, rain /rainy/ wet/ umbrella/ soaked.

Ex.٥. In every cry of every man,
In every infant's cry of fear,
In every voice, in every ban
The mind- forg'd manacles I hear.

(Yeats, ١٩٧٩:٧٧)

٣. Data Collection

In this paper, the implementation of grammatical and lexical CTs in the writing of Iraqi EFL undergraduate learners has been investigated. Forty fourth-year students in the department of English are involved in the analysis of grammatical CTs; whereas forty first –year students' responses has been analyzed in the case of lexical CTs. All the texts are from the students' responses to two questions on "What Means to Be a Friend" for the fourth-year students, and "What Means to Be Honest" for the first-year students. The following texts are chosen at random for analysis.

Text(A)

١.but when he died ,people and realizing all what he has been doing .

٢….. but the people of the country took not notice of these things he did for the country.

٣. All the truth he told them.

٤. He liked the poor people and the poor liked him.

٥. He helped the poor.

Text(B)

٧- what do we mean by friend

٨- This is the quality of being good.

٩- That is, not telling lies, not cheating or stealing telling the truth at all times.

١٠- For example, during the time of sad, Ali was not allowed to himself to leave me at that time.

١١- Pupils did not trust him at all, what he was doing pupils of the class didn't allow him to be our model.

١٢- They did not even listen to all what he was saying.

١٣- They thought he is an honest man.

١٤- He helped the pupils but the pupils of the class did not notice of these things he did for them .

١٥- But when he moved to another Collage now realizing all what he has been doing.

١٦- All the truth he told them , all the pupil he help.

Text(C)

١٧. A friend means helping friend , not leaving him at all times.

١٨. For example, one day I was very sad he help me too much.

١٩. As he was.

٢٠. As he was he hurry to make me forget in order not to hurt.

٢١. My mother (old women) he trying to help her.

٢٢. He always come and help me and my mother.

٢٣. And then not leaving me.

٤. Error Analysis of CTs

In the current study, the students' responses are analyzed in terms of those features of grammatical and lexical cohesion. CTs have been calculated by counting the number of words in the essays that belong to any of the domains of grammatical and lexical cohesion: reference, ellipsis, substitution, reiteration and collocation. A stream of main ideas represented by main verbs, phrasal verbs and idiomatic expressions (e.g. go home, put up, come in) are counted as a single lexical tie. The frequencies of using each cohesive tie are rendered into percentages.

٤. ١. Error Analysis of Grammatical CTs

a) Reference:

The analysis of the students' responses concerning grammatical CTs has shown that reference is the principal means of creating grammatical cohesion in the performance of students involved. The dominant reference type is pronominal forms. The frequency of using this strategy amounts to (٥٨ %) of the total occurrences of references. It is followed by proper nouns whose frequency amounts to (٢٢ %). Their heavy use appears to be due to their role as head nouns which supply primary information for reference. The frequency of the definite article' the'(١٧٪). The demonstrative and comparative reference as modifiers lessens relatively their frequency (٢٪ to ١٪). There are twelve instances of the use of the pronominals 'he' and 'him' in the whole text, as in:

Sentence No.(١) but when he died ,people and realizing all what he has been

doing .

The student mentions only one personality so 'he' could not be said to refer to any other person though it occurred many times. All The instances of 'he' and 'him' and 'man refer to the same person.

Sentence No.(٢)….. but the people of the country took not notice of these things he did for the country.

Sentence No.(٣) All the truth he told them.

The expressions 'these things' in sentence (٢), ' what he has been doing ' in sentence (١) are ' the truths ' referred to in sentence (٣). All have a cataphoric refernt. As to what ' the truth ' is, the quality of 'the truths' or whether they are true or not is left for the writer to decide. So we will need an exophoric text references to find out what the truths are . All the instances

Of these CTs make the text to have a unified whole.

Table (١): Types of Reference and Relative Percentage of Occurrences.

Reference	frequency
Pronominals: (he/ she/ him/ their)	٥٧٪
Proper nouns:(Ahmed/Ali)	٢١٪
Definite article : (the)	١٨٪
Demonstratives: (this , these, that/those)	٣٪
Comparatives :(bigger , the same , both)	٢٪
Total	١٠٠٪

b) <u>Ellipsis</u>

According to Bae (٢٠٠١:٧١)"Typically, ellipsis occurs in spontaneous conversations but is seldom used in formal writing." As such, it is noted that ellipsis has far fewer occurrences than reference (See table (٢) below). The frequency of elliptic CTs is ١,٥٪ as in the following example:

Sentence No.(٤)He liked the poor <u>people</u> and the poor (<u>null</u>) liked him.

Sentence No.(٥)He helped the poor (null).

The rare usage of ellipsis by the learners could be attributed mainly to learning language rules through non-English native teachers who rarely apply these CTs in their speech.

Table (٢): Types of Ellipsis and Relative Percentage of Occurrences.

Cohesive tie	frequency
Ellipsis	١,٥٪

c) Substitution

Like ellipsis, substitution seldom occurs in the EFLs' writing,"… because it is also a speaker / writer choice and not a compulsory feature " (Mc Carthy, ١٩٩١:٤٣). But in the responses of the students involved, the frequency of the substitution CTs is ٠٪.

Table (٣): Types of Substitution and Relative Percentage of Occurrences.

Cohesive tie	frequency
Substitution	٠٪

٤,٢. Error Analysis of Lexical CTs

In text (B), Sentences (٦, ٧, and ٨) are but a type of description of a friend. The expressions 'the time of ' and 'at that time ' in sentence (٩) are unnecessarily repeated. In the same sentence, The word 'Ali' which introduces the personality of the friend that the subject writes about is not repeated till the end of the writing .Instead , the pronominals 'he', 'him' are used for twelve times and 'man' which is a general word is used once in sentence (١٢).

In sentence No. (١٠) the lexical item ' pupils' is presented. It is repeated twice in the same sentence, twice in sentence (١٣), and once in sentence (١٥). They are referred to three times by the pronominals 'they' and 'them'. Consequently,' pupils' is repeated five times in a text of ten sentences. That is, an average of one word per two sentences. The word 'class' which is both a superordinate and a collocational

item of 'pupil' is repeated twice in the text.

The word 'truth' is used three times in the text in the sentences (٨), (١٠) and (١٥). These instances of lexical CTs, 'man' as a general word; 'class' as a superordinate and collocational word and the repetition of certain words in the text make the text a unified whole and the CTs contribute to topic continuity.

Text B begins with an explanation of what is meant by friendship. The friendship is introduced by the word friend in sentence (٦) and referred to by the pronominals 'he', which is repeated six times in a text of only seven sentences.

In the students' opinion, friendship is a company ; thus , the verb 'leave' is used in sentence(٦) and repeated in the last sentence in the text i.e., in the conclusion to make the text a unified whole. Sentence (١٧) is an exemplification of a friend by means of a practical description. In sentence (١٩), there is a partial repetition of the sentences (As he was) which seems to be a pause to remember thus follows the pattern of story telling. Other examples of lexical CTs of repetition occur in sentences (٢٠) and (٢١) where the words 'mother' and ' help' are repeated to make the essay vivid. The analysis of the students' responses concerning lexical CTs has shown that repetition is the principal means of creating lexical cohesion in the performance of students involved. The frequency of using this strategy amounts to (٦٧٪) of the total occurrences of lexical CTs.

The repetition of the same lexical items in different sentences of the same text creates a relation between them simply because a largely similar experiential meaning is encoded in each repeated occurrence of the lexical unit (Halliday and Hasan, ١٩٨٥:٨١).

Another example of the use of the CTs used is the employment of the word ' women ' as a general and collocation word. Any good man cannot help helping a woman especially if she is an old person. Thus, the friend is so good and perfect which emphasizes his being well. In comparison to the total number of the words in the texts, the ratio of the use of general words and collocation is very little. Their frequency is ١١٪ and ١٢٪ respectively. Like synonymy, Superordinate seldom

occurs in the EFLs' writing. Their frequency is only ٣٪ and ٧٪ respectively.

Despite the fact that all texts lack suitable linkers and they have a lot of grammatical errors, the high use of lexically repeated items help understanding the text. Unnecessarily repeated phrases could give a text the story telling structure which may not be appropriate for all situations especially in the case of essay writing.

Table (٤): Types of Lexical CTs and Relative Percentage of Occurrences.

Lexical CTs			
Reiteration	Frequency	**Collocation**	Frequency
repetition	٦٧٪	Collocation	١٢٪
Synonymy	٣٪		
Superordinate	٧٪		
General words	١١٪		
Total ١٠٠٪			

Table (٥) below shows the number of the occurrences of the lexical CTs employed in text B and C, and gives a total and clear picture of the lexical CTs which are representative of the texts analyzed.

Lexical CTs										
Text	**Reiteration**								**Collocation**	
	Repetition	frequency	Synonymy	frequency	Superordinate	frequency	General word	frequency	Collocation	frequency
A	Pupils	٥		٠	class	١	man	١	Class	١
	class	٢								
	Truth	٣							man	١
	Tell	٢								

B	Leave Friend Mother help	٢ ٢ ٢ ٤		٠	٠		woman	١	woman	١

٥. Conclusions and recommendations

٥.١. Conclusions:

The results of the data analysis conducted by this work indicate that Iraqi EFL undergraduate learners tend to appeal basically to reference, especially to pronominals and repetition.

The results show that the hypothesis adopted by this work is verified. Though the students' work show evidence of the use of some of the CTs identified by Halliday and Hasan (١٩٧٦), some of them are wrongly used which make the text difficult to understand. Moreover, the exaggeration of repetition of pronominals could be boring and confusing especially where two or more previously mentioned persons are involved. The majority of errors contains problems in reference, unclear references, misuse of the articles 'a' and 'the' and omission of determiners needed for clarity of meaning.

The students', inability to use these CTs can be blamed on different reasons:

١. the corrupting influence of the method of teaching followed by teachers of English in which the student is only listener,

٢. students have limited exposure to the day to day use of good sentence structure of the English Language coupled with the influence of native language,

٣. teachers have their various limitations because of the vicious circle of lack of proper exposure to the essentials of the English Language,

٤. crowded classes in schools which do not give chance for giving appropriate attention for individual students' performance,

٥. lack of basic an appropriate qualification of non-native teachers, and

٦. the transfer from the Arabic language to English.

The students have not mastered the use of all these CTs; therefore, they have not been able to use a variety of them. It is also noticed that some of the sentences lack adequate sentence links.

٥,٢. **Recommendations:**

Unfortunately, when teachers deals with students' writing they "tend to view the resulting texts as final products to evaluate, which conveys to the students the message that the function of writing is to produce texts for teachers to evaluate, not to communicate meaningfully with another person"
(Nunan ,١٩٩١:٨٨).Thus the following recommendations are thought to be useful:

١- Students should be given constant practice and explanation on organizing relevant meanings in relation to each other in a text.

٢-Semantic sequences of particular patterns of language use should be emphasized by the teacher.

٣- Focus should be laid on the reading of novels written by native speakers of English.

٤. Emphasis on writing must be placed from the beginning in order to develop good habits of writing.

٥. Students must be taught to follow a rigid procedure when writing , i.e., writing a plan, drafting and redrafting their text, checking the style, using linking devices to ensure cohesion and to make their texts more logical. Skilled teachers should revise their writing at all levels of vocabulary, syntax, and discourse so that writing classes should not be only concerned with the "mechanics of grammar, spelling, punctuation and vocabulary"(Nunan,١٩٩١:٩٠).

٦. Students must be directed to work in groups in the class and use their linguistic abilities in the TL.

٧- Students should be taken through the basic practice of writing simple sentences and doing coordination of messages in a text .

٨- Students should be given constant correctness and explanation of their mistakes or errors in writing composition.

٩- Students should be involved in interactional activities which necessitate varying the choice of the type of CTs.

١٠-The teachers should be directed to give more attention to their students' appropriate use of the language in the classroom encounters. This will increase the learners' awareness of the importance of cohesion in language learning.

Bibliography

١. AL-Khalid ,Iman (١٩٩٧)*Lexical Choice*. Unpublished Thesis. Baghdad: University of Baghdad.

٢. Bae, Jungok (٢٠٠١) *Cohesion and Coherence in Children's Written English : Immersion and E-only Classes* .Issues in Applied Linguistics. Vol.١٢ No.١, ٥١-٨٨.

٣. Brown, D.B. (١٩٩٤). *Principles of Language Learning and Teaching*. Third Edition. New Jersey: Prentice Hall Regents.

٤. Corder, S.P. (١٩٦٧). *The significance of learners' errors*. Reprinted in J.C.Richards (ed.) (١٩٧٤, ١٩٨٤) Error Analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition. London: Longman, pp. ١٩ - ٢٧ (Originally in International Review of Applied Linguistics, ٥ (٤)).

٥. ----------. (١٩٧١). *Idiosyncratic errors and Error Analysis*. IRAL, ٩, ٢, ١٤٧-١٥٩. Reprinted in Richards (١٩٧٤).

٦. ----------. (١٩٧٤). *Error Analysis*. In J. P. B. Allen and S. Pit Corder (eds.) Techniques in Applied Linguistics (The Edinburgh Course in Applied Linguistics:٣), London: Oxford University Press (Language and Language Learning), pp. ١٢٢-١٥٤.

٧. ----------. (١٩٨١). *Error Analysis and Interlanguage*. O.U.P.

٨. Carrell, P. L. (١٩٨٤) *The Author Responds* ….(Reply to Rankin ١٩٨٤) TESOL. Quarterly ١٨ (١): ١٦١-١٦٧ .

٩. Carter, R. (١٩٩٨) *Vocabulary : Applied Linguistic Perspectives*. London, Routledge.

١٠. Cook, G. (١٩٩٤) *Discourse and Literature; The interplay of Form and Mind* . Oxford: OUP.

١١. Crane, Paul A. (?) *Texture in Text : A Discourse Analysis of a News Article Using Halliday & Hasan's Model of Cohesion.*

١٢. Ellis, R. (١٩٩٥). *Understanding Second Language Acquisition*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

١٣. ---------- (١٩٩٧). *SLA Research and Language Teaching*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

١٤. Gass, S. and Selinker, L. (٢٠٠١). *Second language acquisition: an introductory course*. Mahwah, NJ: LEA, chapter ٣,٢.

١٥.Gutwinsk, W. (١٩٧٦) *Cohesion in Literary Text*. The Hague: Mouton.

١٦. Halliday, M. A. K. and Ruqaia Hasan (١٩٧٦) *Cohesion in English*. London. Longman Group Ltd.

١٧. Hoey, M. (١٩٩١*) Pattern of Lexis in Text*. Oxford: OUP.

١٨. Kaufmann,Stefan (٢٠٠٠) *Second Order Cohesion*. USA : Blackwell Publishers.

١٩. Hubbard, P., Jones, H., Thornton, B. and Wheeler, R. (١٩٩٦). *A Training Course for TEFL*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

٢٠. Lado, R. (١٩٦٤). *Language Teaching: A Scientific Approach.* McGraw-Hill.

٢١. Macedo , Alan R. (٢٠٠٠) .*Lexis*. Published M.A. thesis, UK: Birmingham.

٢٢. Martin, J. R. (١٩٩٢) *English Text: System and Structure*. Amesterdam: Bengamins.

٢٣. Mato,Keiko (?) *The Use of Lexical Cohesion in Reading and Writing.* South Africa.

٢٤. McCarthy , M.(١٩٩١) . *Discourse Analysis for Language Teachers*. Cambridge: CUP.

٢٥. Nemser, W. (١٩٧٤). *Approximative Systems of Foreign Language Learners*. In Richards, J. (Ed.). *Error analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. ٥٥-٦٣. Essex: Longman.

٢٦. Nunan (١٩٩١) *Language Teaching Methodology*. Prentice Hall International .

٢٧. Paul A. (?) *Texture in Text : A Discourse Analysis of a News Article Using Halliday & Hasan's Model of Cohesion*.Birmingham.

٢٨. Richards, J.C. (ed.) (١٩٧٤). *Error Analysis. Perspectives on second language acquisition*. London: Longman. pp ٢-١١ and ١٧٢-١٧٨.

٢٩. Richards, J.C. and G.P. Sampson (١٩٧٤). *The study of learner English*. In J.C. Richards (ed.) *Error Analysis. Perspectives on second language acquisition*, pp. ٣-١٨.

٣٠. Selinker, L. (١٩٧٤). *Interlanguage*. In Richards, J. (Ed.). *Error analysis: Perspectives on Second Language Acquisition*. ٣١-٥٤. Essex: Longman.

٣١. Selinker, L (١٩٩٢). *Rediscovering Interlanguage*. New York. Longman.

٣٢. Weinreich, U. (١٩٥٣). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague, Mouton.

٣٣. (www.hp.ntnu.no/engelsk/staff/ Jonanesson/lllgram/Lect٢٣.htm)

٣٤. Yeats, W.B (١٩٧٩)(ed.) *Poems of William Blake* . London : Routledge & Kegan Poul.

Table of Contents

List of abbreviations	
EFL`s	English as a foreign language
TL	target language
NL	native language
CTs	cohesive ties
NS	Native speaker
NNS	Non-native speaker