


<p>The Use of Reference, Substitution, Ellipsis and Conjunction A Form and Function Process in EFL Written Discourse</p>		<p>Linguistics</p> <p>Keywords: cohesion, coherence, grammatical cohesion</p>
<p>Maysa' Abdul-Kareem Mahmood</p>	<p>Department of English Language College of Arts & Letters. Cihan University. Iraq-Erbil.</p>	

Abstract

This study analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively the cohesive devices used by undergraduate students in their argumentative essay. 45 essays statistically qualified as the corpus of the study. Halliday and Hasan (1976) concept of grammatical cohesion was used as framework for the analysis of the essays. Reference had the highest frequency which is 90.67% of the total cohesive devices with mean score 53.37. Conjunction occurred 326 times in the essays, which is 9.08% with mean score 5.34 while substitution was the least used type of cohesive device which is only 0.25%. The cohesive devices are not significantly correlated with the quality of the students' essay. The resulting r using Pearson r is -0.054 which is not significant at 05 level of significance. Based on the qualitative analysis, it was found out that certain cohesive types assisted the students in the argumentation process. For instance, the use of adversative conjunctions helped the students establish counterclaims. However, 'but' is the most frequently used adversative conjunction by the students which may signify that their knowledge on the use of this kind of cohesive device is limited. There were instances where the students can use concessive like "yet or however" to establish stronger claims. Hence, qualitative analysis supports the concept of form and function. In the students' argumentative essays, certain forms were chosen over the others for specific purpose that supports the overall objective of an argumentative text.

1. Introduction

Text refers to "any passage, spoken or written, of whatever length, that does form unified whole" and is "best regarded as a semantic unit." A text has "linguistic features which can be identified as contributing to its total unity and giving it texture"(Halliday and Hassan,1976:1-2).Texture is provided by cohesive relation that exists between cohesive items. Cohesion distinguishes texts from non-texts and enables readers or listeners to establish relevance between what was said, is being said, and will be said, through the appropriate use of the necessary lexical and grammatical cohesive devices. Cohesion occurs when the semantic interpretation of some linguistic element in the discourse depends on another. It is the foundation upon which the edifice of coherence is built (Halliday and Hasan, 1985: 94) and it is an essential feature of a text if it is judged to be coherent (Parsons, 1991: 415; Castro, 2004: 215). Likewise, Cox et al. (1990) in Palmer (1999) stated that cohesion is important both to the reader in constructing the meaning from a text and to the writer in creating a text that can be easily comprehended.

Furthermore, cohesion refers to the linguistic features which help make a sequence of sentences in a text .It occurs in a text through the use of devices that link across sentences. According to Connor (1984), it is defined as the use of explicit cohesive devices that signals relations among sentences and parts of text . Cohesion is created through grammatical and lexical forms. lexical cohesion includes reiteration and collocation. These two kinds of cohesion help create texture or the property of being a text.

Coherence, on the other hand, according to McCagg (1990) refers to the logical relationship of ideas. Further, it refers to a semantic property of textuality. It is an aspect of comprehension that is established in the mind of the reader as a result of perception of relatedness among a text's propositions and between the text and the knowledge that the reader possesses of the world. According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), while coherence may be dependent on external factor such as the background of the reader and the "context of the situation", it may also be dependent on textual cohesion.

However, they also explain that a text can achieve coherence even in the absence of intersentence cohesion, so long as the semantic cues are available for readers to deduce from their background knowledge. It can be said, therefore, that coherence may also depend on reader's prior knowledge or "what they know" about the topic, and at times, on their cultural background even in the absence of explicit cohesive devices connecting one sentence to another.

However, a comprehension problem may also occur if there is limited background knowledge on the relatedness of sentences in a text. In such cases, readers rely much on a coherent text with appropriate explicit signals to compensate for lack of prior knowledge. A text is coherent when a reader understands the function of each succeeding unit of text in the development of its overall or global meaning. Widdowson in (Wikborg, 1978). However in order to understand the importance of cohesive devices as grammatical and lexical structure, it is highly important to consider their contribution in the meaning-making process of the text.

Contrary to the general notion of text as a product of combining sentences, it is actualization of meaning represented by sentences. The meaning or "what is meant" is selected by speaker/ writer from a set of options that constitutes meaning potential.

Hence, a meaning can be represented through a variety of grammatical forms, but the selection is based on the best option that can convey meaning most effectively. Connections can be done by using transition terms adding pointing words, using key terms and phrases, repeating words but with a difference (Graft, 2006).

2. Literature Review

The following related studies present findings on two important areas of concern in this present study: first, the relationship of the use of explicit cohesive devices to the quality of writing, and second, the functional role of cohesive devices as related to the generic structure and general purpose of the text. The study of Johnson (1992) sought to find out the relationship of cohesion to overall writing quality of a text or coherence. To achieve this, she correlated the amount and type of cohesive devices used in three groups of the students' essays to the overall quality rating of these essays given by the respective writings teachers of each group. The three groups are as follows: Malay students writing in Malay, English native speakers writing in English, and Malay students writing in L2 English.

The test procedure revealed that there is no significant difference between the amount and number of cohesive ties used to the overall quality of essays among the number of the three groups. However, it was also found out that the essays rated as “good” contain more semantic ties, such as repetition and collocation. In contrast, English essays written by native speakers rated as “good” exemplify the use of more intersentence syntactic cues.

The study of Field and Oi (1992) sought to compare the internal conjunctive cohesive devices used in argumentative essays of three groups of Cantonese L2 speakers of English and L1 speakers. Further, the use of the internal conjunctive cohesion was compared and analyzed based on the positioning of devices within the text. Particularly, the internal conjunctive cohesion (ICC's) were found in the following positions: initial paragraph position, initial sentence position and not being in initial position. The ICC's were also classified according to Halliday and Hasan's category of conjunctions which are the additive, causal, adversative and temporal relations.

The results revealed that the Cantonese L2 speakers use more cohesive devices than L2 speakers. In the analysis of the positioning of the devices, it was found that the ICC's for both L1 and L2 speakers are most frequently found in the initial sentence position (ISP). However, it was found that L1 speakers use the not in the initial sentence position (NIP) Significantly more than Cantonese writers. Also, the results showed that the conjunction for additive relations are the most frequently used. The discussion provided that, although there is a significantly higher use of ICC's in L2 writing, the frequency of ICC's depends on the natural style of the writer.

Palmer's (1999) study is concerned with coherence and cohesion in the English classroom. The purpose of his study was to analyze the way non-native English language students create coherent texts. Results have suggested that lexical reiteration is often used by ESL students in order to create texts which are coherent. He recommended the enhancement of the teaching of coherence and cohesion in English lessons, in an attempt to join any theoretical approach to both reading and writing instruction with a more practical activity.

As in Johnson's study, Meisuo also (2000) investigated qualitatively the relationship of cohesive ties in the expository essays of Chinese students with their quality of writing. The study revealed that lexical category had the highest percentage of tie, followed by conjunction and references which suggests a general pattern of cohesive features in the expository composition.

Unlike Johnson's study, Meisuo included quantitative findings which has revealed cohesive features such as errors, ambiguity, overuse and misuse of cohesive devices. Karasi (1994) reported a similar finding about the frequency order of cohesive categories in her study of expository essays of secondary students in Singapore, though her subjects used slightly more reference ties than conjunctions. Furthermore, Meisuo's study found that there was no significant relationship between the number of cohesive ties used and the quality of writing, or there was a significant difference between the highly-rated and poorly-rated essays in the frequency of use of cohesive ties. The findings seem to suggest that the number of ties alone could not be a reliable indicator of

the quality of writing. The findings are supported by Tierney and Mosenthal (1983), Connor (1984), Allard and Ulatowska (1991), Johnson (1992) and Karasi (1994).

Apart from the feature of overuse of additives and temporals, misuse of adversatives is also prominent in the essays studied. Students used such adversatives as “but, however and on the other hand” without any explicit or implied contrast, instead they were often given an additive function. Johns (1984), and Field and Yip (1992) report similar findings in their studies on the writing of Chinese tertiary-level teachers and Hong Kong Form 6 students. One of the implications of Meisuo’s study is to explain to students clearly with adequate examples the meaning and correct use of reference items and conjunction device in English, incorporating the well-developed taxonomy of cohesive devices by Halliday and Hasan (1976, 1985, 1994) and also their detailed description about the correct use of these devices.

Crossley and McNamara (2010) investigated the roles of cohesion and coherence in evaluation of essay quality. They analyzed expert ratings of individual text features, including coherence, in order to examine their relation to evaluations of holistic essay quality. The results suggest that coherence is an important attribute of overall essay quality, but that expert raters evaluate coherence based on the absence of cohesive cues in the essays rather than their presence. This finding has important implications. This finding has important implications for text understanding and the role of coherence in writing quality. McNamara, et al. (2010) in Crossley and McNamara essays written by college undergraduate and scored by expert raters using a holistic rubric.

The results of this study provide initial indications that text cohesion may not be indicative of essay quality. Instead, expert raters judged essays as higher quality when they were more difficult to process (less familiar words, more complex syntax). Of the studies reviewed, only Liu and Braine (2005) found correlation between the frequency of cohesive device and quality of writing.

Johnson (1992), Field and Oi (1992), Palmer (1999), Meisuo (2000), McNamara (2010) and Crossley and McNamara (2010) did not find significant relationship between the cohesive devices and the students’ essays. This study also looked at the significant relationship between the cohesive devices and the quality of writing of the students. However, this study did not include lexical cohesive devices in the analysis of the students’ essays.

3. Research questions

The main objective of this study is to analyze the cohesive features in the argumentative essay of undergraduate students. The specific objectives of this study are phrased in the following research questions:

- 1) What cohesive devices are used by students in their essay? How frequent are they used?
- 2) Is there a relationship between the number of cohesive devices and the quality of writing?
- 3) What are the common cohesive features used in the development of the students’ argumentative essay?

4. Methodology

4.1 Design

This study analyzed quantitatively and qualitatively, using Halliday & Hasan's (1976) taxonomy, the cohesive devices used by undergraduate students in their argumentative text. 84 essays were collected but only 61 became qualified as corpus of the study after the inter-rating. A frequency count was done to account for the reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction devices used in essays. Text analysis was done to describe the cohesive features in the students' essays.

4.2 The corpus and procedure

Eighty-four argumentative essays were collected from undergraduate students. The essays underwent inter-rating, and after which only 61 essays statistically qualified as corpus of this. The inter-rater reliability result using Cronbach Alpha is 0.81 which means that there is almost perfect agreement between the raters as regards the quality of the essays. The result is 2.86 which both indicate that the essays rated by the inter-raters possess the qualities of a well-written composition and that the students' writing ability is not far from one another.

The Alpha result was further confirmed using Kendall's Tau Correlation, the statistical tool used to determine the relationship when ranking is used like in rubrics ratings. The result of the analysis is 0.533 which is significant at 0.05 level of significance. The critical value for the Kendall's tau is 0.25. This also means that there is agreement between the raters. After the inter-rating, the cohesive devices- pronouns, definite article 'the', conjunctions, words that substitute for another word were underlined, and accounted for.

The researcher decided to analyze argumentative essay since it is one of the most common forms of text that undergraduate students write to fulfill their course require-

ments in a writing course, for instance in English 102/Expository writing or English 101b/communication skills 2 and it can be considered a form of academic writing because it is written for assessment of an academic audience (Mei, 2006).

4.3 The inter-raters

To assess the quality of the essays, the researcher adapted a Rubric and asked two teachers of English in the to grade them. They were asked to assess the essays according to content, mechanics, organization, etc. They have had training in the use of Rubric as a tool to assess skills-based output of students. The inter-raters have almost perfect agreement as proven by the Cronbach Alpha which is 0.81. The inter-raters were not the teachers of the students who wrote the essays.

4.4 The writing task

The students enrolled in English 2 /Expository writing during the first semester and English 101b/ Communication Skills 2 during second semester in the school year 2008 to 2009 were given a assignment. The students enrolled in Expository writing reading were second year Political Science students while those enrolled in Communication skills 2 were first year Computer Science in the University of Santo Tomas. Essay writing is a required English Writing course in the University taken during the second and third year of the students. Their ages range from 18 to 20 years. They have finished six years of elementary and six years of secondary schooling with English as subject among other subjects. They speak Kurdish as a mother tongue and Arabic as second language. Some use English as a medium of communication but on special occasions.

The students were asked to read about the Oil Deregulation Law in the Philippines.

This topic was chosen because at the time this study was conducted, the continuous oil price increase was the major concern/problem of many people; thus, the researcher thought of the argumentative essay as a venue for the students to express their opinions. The students were then asked to express their opinions in an essay of 400 to 700 words. The proposition/ topic for the argumentative essay is “That the oil deregulation law in the Philippines be abolished.”

4.5 Framework for analysis

Halliday and Hasan’s (1976) and Halliday (2004) concept of grammatical cohesion were used to analyze the essays. According to them cohesion can be grammatical or lexical. Reference, Substitution and Ellipsis and Conjunctions are the types of grammatical cohesion or cohesive relation. This study focused only on grammatical cohesion and did not analyze lexical cohesion. Reference has the semantic property of definiteness or specificity. Personal, demonstratives and comparatives are the types of reference. Personal reference includes personal pronouns, possessive determiners and possessive pronouns. Demonstrative reference is by means of location while comparative is indirect reference by means of identity or similarity.

Substitution is the replacement of one item by another, in wording. Example: My axe is too blunt. I must get a new one (Halliday, 1976). Nominal, verbal and clausal are the types of substitution. Ellipsis is the omission of an item. The three kinds of ellipsis are nominal, verbal and clausal ellipsis. Nominal ellipsis means the omission of noun.

Conjunctions are cohesive elements not in themselves but by their specific meanings.

They express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse. Conjunction is one type of cohesion, which specifies additive, adversative, causal or temporal relations between what has been said previously and adversative, what follows. Elaboration, extension and enhancement are the types of conjunction. The sub-types are

apposition, clarification, addition, variation, spatio-temporal, manner, causal-conditional and manner. Apposition and clarification are the two types of elaboration.

In apposition, some element is presented or stated again either by exposition or by example. In elaboration, some element is reinstated, summarized, made more precise, or clarified. The subtypes of clarification are corrective, distractive, dismissive, particularizing, resumptive, summative and verificative. Extension involves addition or variation. Addition can be positive, negative, adversative. Variation includes replacive, subtractive and alternative types. Spatio-temporal, manner, causal-conditional and matter are the various types of enhancement. Examples of spatio-temporal are here, there, behind, nearby, in the same place, anywhere else. Temporal can be simple and complex. Manner is created by comparison, by reference to means; comparison may be positive or negative. Causal-conditional expresses result, reason or purpose. Conditionals can be positive, negative, concessive. Matter is established by reference to the 'matter' that came before; this relation can be positive or negative.

4.6 Statistical tools

The following statistical tools were used to analyze the data: Cronbach Alpha and Kendall Tau was used to determine agreement between raters when assessment tools like Rubric R is used. Pearson was used to determine the relationship of the frequency of the cohesive devices with the quality of the essay.

5. Results and Discussion

Here, the quantitative and qualitative findings of this study are dealt with.

Research question 1

What are the cohesive devices used by the students in their argumentative essay? How frequent are they used? Table 1 presents the frequency of cohesive devices per type with corresponding mean and standard deviation. As can be seen from the table, reference had the highest frequency which is 90.67% of the total cohesive devices with mean score 53.37. Conjunction occurred 326 times in the essays, which is 9.08% with mean score 5.34 while substitution was the least used type of cohesive device, which is only 0.25%. It is apparent that reference is significantly more frequently used than the other types of cohesive devices. This is clearly shown in the table below:

Table 1. Frequency of Cohesive Devices

Variable	Conjunction	Reference	Substitution	Total
Total	326	3255	9	3590
% based on total	9.08	90.67	0.25	100.00
Mean	5.344262295	53.37704918	0.131147541	58.85246902
Stdev	2.529066006	11.36392528	0.340363033	11.40443183

The use of reference cohesive items like personal pronouns and demonstratives is important because they provide the concept of identifiability and establish anaphoric relations.

Table 2 shows the frequency of use of conjunctions as cohesive device. As seen from the table, extension-addition-adversative is the most frequently used conjunction with 77 counts or 23.62%, followed by extension-addition positive with 20.86%. The enhancement-causal-conditional-general conjunctions comprised 16.87% of the total. The percentage of enhancement-causal-conditional-concessive is 8.28% while enhancement-manner-means is 7.67%. The high percentage of use of addition-adversative, addition-positive, causal-conditional-general, concessive and enhancement-means as cohesive devices may be attributed to the type of essay the students wrote.

Table 2. Frequency of Conjunction

Types	Sub-types	Function	Total	%
		Expository	1	0.31
	Apposition	Exemplify	4	1.23
Ellaboration				
		Corrective	1	0.31
	Clarification	Dismissive	2	0.61
		Summative	1	0.31
		Verificative	8	2.45
	Addition	Positive	68	20.86
		Adversative	77	23.62
Extension				
	Variation	Replacive	2	0.61
		Subtractive	1	0.31
	Spatio-Temporal/Temporal	Following	20	6.13
		Simultaneous	4	1.23
		Conclusive	3	0.92
		Durative	2	0.67
	Manner	Comparison	4	1.23
		Means	25	7.67
Enhancement				
	Causal-Conditional	General	55	16.87
		Result	11	3.37
		Reason	1	0.31
		Purpose	4	1.23
		Conditional positive	5	1.53
		Concessive	27	8.28
Total			326	100.00

The nature of additives, conditionals and concessive makes it possible to strengthen claims by establishing strong connection with their supporting premises. The demonstrative non-selective reference has the highest occurrence of use, which is 61.14%, among the types of reference as seen in Table 3. The personal existential-head reference occupies 17.42% while the personal-possessive-modifier is 9.32% of the total number of reference items. The high frequency of use of

reference as cohesive device may be attributed to the fact that types of reference are used grammatically as part of a sentence as either subject, modifier or object.

Table 3. Frequency of Reference Cohesive Device

Types of Reference			Total	%
Personal	Existential	Head	566	17.42
	Possessive	Head		0.00
		Mod	303	9.32
Demonstrative	Selective	Head	94	2.89
		Mod	209	6.43
		Adverb	69	2.12
	Non-Selective		1987	61.14
	General	Mod	16	0.49
Comparison				
	Specific		6	0.18
			3250	100.00

Table 4. Frequency of Substitution Cohesive Device

Type	Frequency	%
Nominal	4	44.44
Verbal	3	33.33
Clausal	2	22.22
Total	9	100.

Table 4 shows that there is only nine occurrence of substitution as a cohesive device in 45 essays analyzed. There were four instances of nominal, three verbal and two clausal. Substitution may not have been often used since indefiniteness may not support claims. Students tend to be wordy to provide more evidence for arguments. As for Table 5, it presents the score given by the interraters and the number of grammatical cohesive devices in each essay. These numbers were correlated to find out if they have significant relationship.

Research question 2: Is there a significant relationship between the number of cohesive devices and quality of writing?

The resulting r using Pearson r is -0.054 , which is not significant at 0.05 level of significance (Table 6). The critical value for the r is also .25. The total score did not also correlate with the ratings of raters 1 (-0.030) and 2 (-0.060). Therefore, the cohesive devices are not significantly correlated with the quality of the students' essay.

Research question 3: What are the common cohesive features used in the development of the students' argumentative essay?

To identify the common cohesive features used by students in their argumentative essay writing, the same set of essays was analyzed qualitatively using Halliday and Hasan's framework. Each category or type of cohesive device was analyzed to identify the most frequent patterns in the

argumentative essays. The following data show the results of the analysis with the most common features of the cohesive devices in relation to the function of argumentative texts. Some extracts from students' essays were also given as examples of the cohesive features.

Table. 5 Frequency of Cohesive Device and Interrater Average

Essay #	Total per essay	Interrater	
		Rater 1	Rater 2
1	46	20	19
2	46	21	18
3	52	20	18
4	67	25	21
5	62	22	18
6	76	22	21
7	53	25	22
9	56	25	22
11	54	23	20
12	57	22	18
13	53	23	23
17	48	18	19
18	44	22	18
20	55	19	15
21	40	20	29
23	56	25	22
24	51	25	22
26	49	21	18
28	56	19	20
31	68	13	12
32	64	15	13
33	69	17	14
34	76	23	19
35	20	19	15
36	48	17	18
40	71	21	19
42	75	23	19
43	69	25	22
44	81	18	14
45	61	18	14

Table 6. Correlation Coefficient of the Essay Scores and the Frequency of Cohesive Devices

Correlations					
Pearson Correlation		Total Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Average Rater
	Pearson Correlation	1	0.030	0.060	_.054
Total Score sig.(2.tailed)			0.816	0.647	0.687
	Sum of squares &Cross- products	7803.672	_.61.557	_.113.836	_.144.615
	Covariance	130.061	_.1.026	_.1.897	_.2.410
	N	61	61	61	61
Pearson Correlation		_.030	1	0.686"	0.858"
Total Score sig.(2.tailed)		0.816		0.000	0.000
	Sum of squares & Cross- products	_.61.557	522.852	337.279	598.705
	Covariance	_.1.026	8.714	5.621	9.978
	N	61	61	61	61
Correlations					
Pearson Correlation		Total Score	Rater 1	Rater 2	Average Rater
	Pearson Correlation	_.060	0.686"	1	0.962
Total Score sig.(2.tailed)		0.647		0.000	0.000
	Sum of squares &Cross- products	_.113.836	337.279	462.918	631.557
	Covariance	1.897	5.621	7.715	10.526
	N	61	61	61	61
Pearson Correlation		_.054	0.858"	0.962"	1
Total Score sig.(2.tailed)		0.681	0.000	0.000	1680.294
	Sum of squares &Cross- products	_.144.615	598.705	631.557	27.546
	Covariance	_.2.410	9.978	10.526	62
	N	61	61	61	61

6. Conjunctions

The data on the frequency of conjunctions as cohesive devices show that adversative type of conjunctions was most frequently used in the students' writing. This is somehow expected as the nature of argumentative texts dictates the use of opposing or negating linguistic devices to establish counterclaims or counter arguments. Below are excerpts from students' essays provide examples of these adversative relations:

6.1 Frequent Use of Adversatives

Example 1: But, the gaining popularity of openness and the high percentage of poverty has somehow wavered the strong faith of the Filipinos. (Essay 31, paragraph 4, sentence 3).

Example 2: Some giant companies, on the other hand, cited the rise in the international prices as the reason for the increase. (Essay 33, paragraph 2, sentence 2).

Example 3: But, being a very Catholic country that we are, the religious sector who calls themselves as ‘prolifers’ are very much against this bill. (Essay 18, paragraph 3, sentence 1).

Example 4: But, the Church will educate people not to follow anti-life laws on moral grounds (Essay 25, paragraph 4, sentence 3).

The examples given show that adversative conjunctions extend previously-given information in the text to add opposing information. For instance, In Example 1, the conjunction ‘but’ suggests negative effects as opposed to the positive information given beforehand. In Example 2, an opposing reason was given as additional information to the previous one. Data analysis for adversative conjunctions also shows that there is a significantly high occurrence of adversative conjunction ‘but’ in the students’ essays.

6.2 Use of Causal-Conditional

The causal-conditional conjunctions also appeared frequently in the students’ writing. The following extracts illustrate how they were used in the argumentative essays:

Example 1: Because of this, companies earn more while Alarcon and Morales 123

the major stock holders enjoy the benefits they get from their company (Essay 35, paragraph 2, sentence 4).

Example 2: Therefore, it does not have any bias for or against natural or modern family planning method (Essay 17, paragraph 2, sentence 3).

Example 3: The use of contraceptives in the Philippines is not published. It is a free mark market. Therefore, this bill is unnecessary. (Essay 31, paragraph 5, sentence 1)

The causal-conditional general conjunctions are used in the argumentative essays to signal specific effects of the previously given information. For instance, Example 1 shows that the conjunction ‘because of this’ signals the effect of high demand of oil price hike which results in the high income of oil companies. The high frequency of causal-conditional conjunctions was also somewhat expected since cause and effect relationships are necessary in argumentative essays to establish evidence for argumentative claims. Causal conditionals are used to predict “what may

happen” if a certain proposition in the argument is to be done. Aside from specific conjunctions were also used by the students.

6.3 Use of Concession

Concessions are specific causal-conditional conjunctions. Concessive devices are special forms of opposing or negating devices. The following are extracts showing how they were used in the students’ essays:

Example 1: The Philippines is no longer considered as part of the Third World Country list, however, this does not mean that the economic stability of the country is in great shape (Essay 9, paragraph 3, sentence 1).

Example 2: You can easily see that poor families are already hampered with expenses; yet they still end up with more children than they desire (Essay 21, paragraph 2, sentence 3).

Example 3: However, different institutions such as the Catholic Church were alarmed with the issue and held many protests against the passing of such bill (Essay 17, paragraph 1, sentence 4).

The examples show that concessives also signal opposition or contrast to the previously-given information. However, unlike the more common adversative conjunctions, concessives do not only oppose or negate the previous information. Concessive conjunctions suggest that there is considerable truth in the previous claim or argument but the other premise is deemed to be stronger.

6.4 Use of Additive

Additive conjunctions are also highly frequent in the students’ essays. The following gives examples of how these additives were used:

Example 1: Also, most of the religious leaders have labeled the bill as the “Anti-Life Bill” or Act. (Essay 23, paragraph 3, essay 2).

Example 2: Also, pro-life groups strongly oppose certain forms of birth control, particularly hormonal contraception. (Essay 2, paragraph 1, sentence 6).

Example 3: And, as it continues people’s burden increases and the government started to think of a plan to lessen it. (Essay 40, paragraph 4, sentence 5).

The examples clearly show that additive conjunctions simply add new information to previous information. This signals that there is continuity of ideas in the text. While additives are highly important in establishing idea relations, there is not much variety of additives use in the students’ essays. Instead, they were limited to ‘also’ and ‘and’. This may suggest that the students’ knowledge of conjunctions may be limited, or they are more open and comfortable using the more common ones rather than other alternative like ‘moreover’, ‘furthermore’, ‘in addition’ and other conjunctions that establish extension.

7. Conclusions

The findings of this study show that reference is the most frequently used cohesive device (90.67%) followed by conjunctions (9.08%) and substitution (0.25%). No instances of ellipses were found since according to Halliday and Hasan (1976) they appear more in oral discourse than in written discourse. It was found out that there was no significant relationship between the cohesive devices and the quality of writing. The Pearson-r correlation result is -0.54 which is not significant at 0.05 level of significant. The critical value for r is 0.25. The total score of the essays using Rubric did not also correlate with the ratings of raters 1 (-0.030) and 2 (-0.060). Therefore, the cohesive devices are not significantly correlated with the quality of the students' essays. This result suggests the high frequency of gauge of the quality of writing. Meisuo (2000), Johnson (1992), Karasi (1994) in Meisuo, Connor (1984) in Meisue, Allard and Ulatowska (1991) in Meisuo, reported the same findings.

Hoewver. Liu and Braine (2005) found out a significant relationship between the frequency of cohesive devices and the overall quality of writing. Liu and Braines' analysis of lexical cohesive ties suggests that sentences which are functionally more important to the development of the text contain more cohesive ties than other sentences less important functionally. Liu and Braine may have found significant relationship between the cohesive devices and the overall quality of writing because their study included lexical cohesion. According to Connor (1990: 83) "One of the characteristics of coherence, on the other hand, is that it allows 'a text to be under-stood in a real-world setting' (Witte and Faigley, 1981: 199) and thus contributes to an understanding of its quality.

Based on the qualitative analysis, it was found out that certain cohesive types assisted the students in the argumentation process. For instance, the use of adversative conjunctions helped the students establish counterclaims. However, 'but' is the most frequently used adversative conjunction by the students which may signify that their knowledge on the use of this kind of cohesive device is limited. There were instances where the students can use concessives like "yet" or "however" to make stronger claims. In addition, reference items like this, that, among others established connection between previously given information to new information in the text. Demonstratives

were used to relate new information to those which have been mentioned before in the text. The definite article 'the' was frequently used because of its specifying agent property

The high frequency of its occurrence may also be attributed to the students' objective to establish common ground with the reader. Further, plural personal pro-nouns were used in the argumentative essays to suggest writer's awareness that he/she is arguing for a group and that the problem of the topic includes others ;thus, establishing common ground with the reader. Also, plural personal pronouns were used for widely-accepted truth or popular belief or opinion, while singular personal pronouns were used for personal judgment and opinion regarding the issue involved in the argumentation. Hence, qualitative analysis supports the concept of form and

function. In the students' argumentative essays, certain forms were chosen over the others for a specific purpose that supports the overall objective of an argumentative text.

References

1. Carell P (1992). Cohesion is not Coherence. *TESOL Q.*, 16(4): 479-488.
2. Castro C (2004). Cohesion and the Social Construction of Meaning in the Essays of Filipino College Students Writing in L2 English. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.*, 5(2): 215-225.
3. Connor U, Johns A (1990). *Coherence: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
4. Crossley S, McNamara D (2010). Cohesion, Coherence and Expert Evaluation of Writing Proficiency. Conference Proceedings at the 32nd Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society.
5. Enkvist NE (1990). Seven problems in the study of coherence and interpretability. In U. Connor and A. M. Johns (eds.). *Coherence: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
6. Graft G, Birkenstein C (2006). *They say/I say: The moves that matter in academic writing*. New York: W.W. Norton and Company.
7. Halliday MAK (2004). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold, pp. 524-585.
8. Halliday MAK, Hasan R (1976). *Cohesion in English*. London: Longman.
9. Hyland K, Richards J (2003). *Second language writing*. USA: Cambridge University Press.
10. Johnson P (1992). Cohesion and coherence in compositions in Malay and English. *RELC J.*, 23(1): 1-17.
11. Liu M, Braine (2005). Cohesive features in argumentative writing produced by Chinese undergraduates. Retrieved from <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science>.
12. McCagg P (1990). Toward understanding coherence: A response proposition taxonomy. In Connor, U., ed. And Johns, A., ed. *Coherence: Research and Pedagogical Perspectives*. Washington, DC: TESOL.
13. Mei WS (2006). Creating a Contrastive Rhetorical Stance: Investigating the Strategy of problematization in students' argumentation. *RELC J.*, 37(3): 329-353.
14. Meisuo Z (2000). Cohesive features in the expository writing of undergraduates in two Chinese universities. *RELC J.*, 52431(61).
15. Palmer J (1999). Coherence and cohesion in the language classroom: the use of lexical reiteration and pronominalisation. *RELC J.*, 30(61):61-85.